IN-SERVICE TRAINING and REDUCED WORKLOADS

—Experiments in a State Department of Welfare

By

EDWIN J. THOMAS
Associate Professor of Social Work
and of Psychology
The University of Michigan

DONNA L. McLEOD
Research Associate
The University of Michigan

In collaboration with

PAULINE BUSHEY
Assistant Professor of Social Work
The University of Michigan

LYDIA F. HYLTON
Research Assistant
The University of Michigan

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION
New York 1960

Printed in the United States
of America

Library of Congress
Catalog Card Number: 60-7665

Wm. F. Fell Co., Printers
Philadelphia, Pa.

Contents

Figures and Tables

Foreword

In the field of social welfare it is often urged that in-service training and reduced workloads are available and effective means of improving service. Such proposals are in keeping with other efforts to raise standards in the public assistance programs. Little evidence from research is available, however, to test the arguments on the subject. This monograph contributes a careful evaluation of experiments with these measures.

The study was conducted in the Michigan State Department of Social Welfare and concerned cases carried in the Aid to Dependent Children Program. Like other state departments of welfare, the Michigan department has responsibility for implementing the broad objectives stated for the ADC program in the 1956 Amendments to the Social Security Act: to strengthen family life and to increase self-support and independence for recipients. And like other state programs, the Michigan ADC Program is facing a growing caseload containing an increasing proportion of families whose problems involve more than financial aid. The research project developed a training program focused on the use of casework to achieve rehabilitation of ADC recipients. Two experiments with the program were conducted. In each experiment the effects of reduced workloads as well as of training were independently assessed. The results apply, therefore, to the relative contributions of each measure as well as their combined effects.

One conclusion that may be drawn from the careful presentation of findings is that these two approaches have somewhat different consequences and that they do not, separately or

in combination, offer a panacea for upgrading services to achieve the objectives of the 1956 Amendments. But the study does identify aspects of family situations that change, at the same time that it cautions against expecting too much. Both the limitations and the advantages of in-service training and of reduced workloads are presented, and constitute useful guidelines to administrators who might plan similar training programs and staff changes.

This research project confirmed the feasibility of experimental studies in welfare departments. Such research requires, however, the skillful collaboration that was effectively developed in this project. It brought together social workers and social scientists. Dr. Edwin J. Thomas holds a degree in social work as well as a doctorate in social psychology; he was research director for the first study and research consultant for the second. Mrs. Donna L. McLeod, who was research assistant for the first study and research director for the second, is a sociologist. Professor Pauline Bushey, the training supervisor, and Professor Patricia Rabinovitz, field consultant, are social workers experienced in social work education as well as in administration and training in public welfare. Mrs. Lydia Hylton, a research assistant for the second study, is a graduate student in the Doctoral Program in Social Work and Social Science at The University of Michigan. The collaboration of persons with these backgrounds resulted in realistic and sensitive attention to practical issues along with unusual rigor of research design and scientific method.

These studies reflect collaboration also between the School of Social Work and the Michigan State Department of Social Welfare. This involved more than the usual cooperation that merely provides university researchers with data from a public agency. It required administrative decisions affecting the daily operations of the Department. Such decisions could never have been carried out without mutual confidence between researchers, officials, and staff members.

In no small degree the success of these collaborations must be attributed to the imagination, industry, and skill of Dr. Thomas, who had chief responsibility for the total project.

The patterns of collaboration that stand behind this project are not common but we should find them more often in the future. This report is one type of product that can be expected when social science research in social welfare is seriously undertaken. Such studies should strengthen the association between social work and social science.

FEDELE F. FAURI, *Dean*
The University of Michigan School of Social Work

Ann Arbor, Michigan
November 1, 1959

‘

Introduction

Although there has been increasing recognition of the significance of research in social welfare, specimens of carefully conducted evaluative studies employing control-group designs are very scarce.[1] The gap between aspiration and achievement in research is attributable in part to the well-known difficulties of conducting studies. But it also has roots in the prevailing conception of research held by many practitioners and administrators. According to this view research includes administrative surveys, the collection of operating statistics, and the "demonstration project," but does not generally extend to the evaluative study having control and experimental groups. While genuine control-group studies are not often suitable substitutes for the other types of inquiries, they can frequently contribute useful knowledge which other methods provide less adequately. Through the deliberate introduction in an agency of an experimental service coupled with appropriate control conditions, the field experiment offers a relatively precise and rigorous method for determining effectiveness as compared with nonexperimental methods. The added time and cost required to introduce both experimental and control conditions are generally outweighed by the comparative soundness of the inferences which the study affords.

The experiments reported here on in-service training and reduced workloads were conducted with a control-group design in the Aid to Dependent Children Program of the

[1] Examples of such experiments are *An Experiment in Mental Patient Rehabilitation* by Henry J. Meyer and Edgar F. Borgatta, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1959; and *An Experiment in the Prevention of Delinquency* by Edwin Powers, and Helen Witmer, Columbia University Press, New York, 1951.

Michigan State Department of Social Welfare. The studies reflect the possibilities for conducting experimental evaluations of pertinent problems in social welfare through collaboration of social researchers and welfare officials and also chronicle some of the practical difficulties frequently encountered when attempting to achieve research precision and control in a natural social setting. Although these studies should not be regarded as exemplary experiments with respect to their design or findings, they represent the type of study which must be conducted more frequently in social welfare if research is to contribute more fully to decisions about service, administration, and programs. The present report will have accomplished its purpose, if in addition to conveying the research findings, it suggests ways in which future evaluative studies may be more imaginatively conceived, rigorously designed, and carefully conducted.

The research consisted of three related studies, the first being a survey of the training needs of Aid to Dependent Children workers in Michigan and the other two evaluative experiments on the effectiveness of training and reduced workloads. The research problem and the results of the first survey are summarized in Chapter 1. Chapter 2 describes the designs and methods of both experiments. The results are not presented separately in all respects for each experiment but rather are ordered for each by changes achieved for workers (Chapter 3) and for families (Chapter 4). Conclusions constitute the final chapter of the report.

Acknowledgments

The two years of research described here were financed primarily by grants from the Fund for Research and Service in the Utilization of Human Resources of the University of Michigan. Additional support was provided by the Michigan State Department of Social Welfare and Russell Sage Foundation.

Many individuals helped make this study possible through their participation as advisers. Members of the Advisory Com-

mittee of the study from the Michigan State Department of Social Welfare were Lynn Kellogg, Supervisor of Public Assistance; Willis Oosterhof, Supervisor of Research and Statistics; and Warren Houghton, Supervisor of Personnel. Members of the faculty of The University of Michigan School of Social Work who participated were David G. French and Clarice Freud, and Ralph C. Fletcher, chairman of the Advisory Committee. Fedele F. Fauri, dean of the School of Social Work, and Willard J. Maxey, director of the State Department of Social Welfare, were members ex officio. Wilbur J. Cohen and Henry J. Meyer of the School of Social Work were most helpful in many informal consultations.

Numerous problems of conducting the research, which involved a mixture of research tactics and decisions about short-range welfare administration, had to be worked out with officials of the Welfare Department. In addition to officials already mentioned, we benefited from the advice of Carra Cooney, Thomas Cook, Bernard Houston, Roger Lind, Robert Toot, and Robert Johnson.

We are particularly grateful for the excellent cooperation given by the workers, and the case and county supervisors whose routine responsibilities were often made more pressing by the requirements of the research designs.

Patricia Rabinovitz of the School of Social Work was a field consultant throughout both studies; her knowledge of welfare training and administration was invaluable for planning and conducting the experiments. The experimental interviews conducted to assess the performance of the workers in the experiment required the use of a skilled actress to portray the "recipient." Mrs. Winifred Pierce served as the actress for both studies; her sensitivity, talent, and good memory contributed greatly to the success we had with the new research technique.

Five secretaries worked diligently on the projects, some helping with data analysis in addition to performing their other duties. They were Crystal Lazarus, Loretta Charron, Catherine Solinas-Herrero, Shirley Peterson, and Patricia

Farrell. Their patience and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

We are grateful to Donald Young, president, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., and Edgar F. Borgatta, social psychologists of Russell Sage Foundation, for reading the manuscript in first-draft form, evaluating it, and providing the guidance and encouragement to enable us to prepare the monograph in its present form. Margaret R. Dunne, editor for Russell Sage Foundation, performed invaluable editorial services.

EDWIN J. THOMAS
DONNA L. MCLEOD

Ann Arbor, Michigan
October 15, 1959

1. The Research Problem

THE IMPROVEMENT OF SERVICES to families receiving aid to dependent children under the Social Security Act was the general interest of the studies reported here. Two experimental innovations in the Aid to Dependent Children Program of the Michigan State Department of Welfare were evaluated: (1) provision of in-service training to workers who served families directly and, in a subsequent experiment, to supervisors of such workers, and (2) reduction of the usual workloads of ADC workers.

The research focused upon the nonfinancial services provided under the ADC program. The 1956 Amendments to the Social Security Act state that one objective is "to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help such parents or relatives who care for dependent children to attain the maximum of self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection. . . ."[1] This mandate represents a clarification of what has been more or less ambiguous in Aid to Dependent Children since the passage of the original law in 1935. In the context of the depression period when the program began, the primary emphasis was placed on periodic money payments to homemakers responsible for children who had been deprived of a parent through death, incapacity, or continued absence from the home. Launched on this basis, the ADC program has continued this essentially economic service through the determination of eligibility and need for financial assistance. Nonfinancial services directed toward family rehabilitation have been offered as well, to be sure, but generally they have been

[1] Social Security Amendments of 1956, sec. 312.

given sporadically and inconsistently as compared with financial assistance. The 1956 Amendments formally broaden services to be provided under Aid to Dependent Children by making the strengthening of family life and personal independence explicit objectives.

The need for placing greater emphasis on providing nonfinancial services in Aid to Dependent Children is highlighted by changes in the types of families receiving assistance. More and more families on the ADC rolls have problems requiring something beyond the assistance payment. There has been a decrease in the proportion of recipients made economically dependent through the death or incapacity of a parent and an increase in the proportion of recipients dependent due to the absence of a parent.[1] Thus increasingly the cause of dependency resides in what may be termed "family estrangement," arising from such factors as divorce, separation, and unwed motherhood. The problems of recipients from such families are likely to be more complex and severe than those of recipients whose dependency stems from the death or incapacity of a parent. Recipients from estranged families often have deep-seated psychological difficulties in conjunction with the ill-health and lack of occupational skills that may characterize many financially dependent individuals, regardless of the cause of dependency. The growing size of ADC caseloads also indicates the increasing number of these problem families.[2]

In-service training for workers seemed to be a promising means of improving nonfinancial services because the vast majority of public assistance workers have not been trained formally for their jobs. About two out of ten of the 30,000 public assistance workers have had graduate social work edu-

[1] In 1955 the percentages for a sample of 50 states were 53.2 for families dependent because of absence of a father, and 22.7 for families dependent because of unmarried motherhood; the percentages for 1948 were, respectively, 45.5 and 14.8. See Kaplan, Saul, "Support from Absent Fathers in Aid to Dependent Children," *Social Security Bulletin*, vol. 21, February, 1958, pp. 3–13.

[2] In 1955 the number of children exceeded 1,700,000 for the first time in the nation's history; see Cohen, Wilbur J., "Current and Future Trends in Public Welfare," *Social Security Review*, vol. 29, September, 1955, pp. 247–259. In January and February, 1959, the number of children was over 2,200,000; see *Current Social Security Program Operations*, Social Security Administration, United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February, 1959.

cation,[1] and only one in twenty has received the master's degree in social work.[2] While the prospect is dim for the foreseeable future that a significant proportion of the jobs in public assistance will be filled by professionally trained social workers, it is realistic to anticipate more systematic and larger training programs than have been conducted in the past.[3] Whether such training programs will be effective, and thus afford suitable ways to achieve better services, is not known.[4] The present experiments were designed to obtain some tentative answers to this question.

The studies also focused upon the effectiveness of reduced workloads on the assumption that additional time may allow workers to make better use of their knowledge and skill, and thereby improve services. We wished to test this assumption and also to provide the workers who received training the time to put into use what they were to learn. The question of whether reduced workloads would save relief dollars was not examined because the effects of nonfinancial services are relatively intangible and difficult to translate into monetary terms, even though long-range savings would be expected to follow from the effective provision of nonfinancial services. Moreover, evaluative experiments have already shown that reduced workloads bring net dollar-gains through improving the accuracy and efficiency of eligibility determination.[5] The im-

[1] Cohen, Wilbur J., *op. cit.*, p. 251.

[2] Wilensky, Harold L., and Charles N. Lebeaux, *Industrial Society and Social Welfare*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1958, p. 292.

[3] Plans to contribute federal support for state training programs in public assistance have been formulated by the federal government. See Winston, Ellen, "New Opportunities for Trained Personnel in Public Welfare," *Social Work*, vol. 2, April, 1957, pp. 8–13.

[4] Although there have been no control-group studies of in-service training in social work, there are reports of demonstration projects of staff training; for example, see Goldstein, Carol K., "Services in the Aid to Dependent Children Program in Illinois," *Social Service Review*, vol. 22, December, 1948, pp. 480–489.

[5] Hastings, Constance, and Saya S. Schwartz, *Size of Visitors' Caseload as a Factor in Efficient Administration of Public Assistance*, Philadelphia County Board of Public Assistance, 1939 (mimeographed document); Simon, Herbert A., and others, *Determining Work Loads for Professional Staff in a Public Welfare Agency*, University of California Bureau of Public Administration, Berkeley, 1941; Reed, Ellery F., *An Experiment in Reducing the Cost of Relief*, American Public Welfare Association, Chicago, 1937; Staman, Rebecca, "What Is the Most Economical Case Load in Public Relief Administration?" *Social Work Technique*, vol. 4, May-June, 1938, pp. 117–121.

portant question that has not been investigated in past research is what are the effects of reduced workloads on the quality of nonfinancial services for families.

The Training Needs of ADC Workers

Specific facts about the level of knowledge and skill, the attitudes of workers, and problems of recipients were needed before a training program could realistically be developed. Such facts would provide guidelines as to what the content of training was to be. To obtain the desired information a survey was conducted before embarking on the experiments. Questionnaires focused on the role of the ADC worker were completed by 109 workers and 26 supervisors from 12 county Bureaus of Social Aid in Michigan. Although this sample represents all sizes of administrative unit and a variety of community settings in Michigan, it was weighted most heavily by bureaus located in medium-sized, industrial counties. Interviews were also conducted with 48 families who were currently receiving ADC grants. These families were sampled from a large metropolitan area, Wayne County. While the sample of recipients was not representative for the state or the nation, it provided information that was not likely to be provided by the workers or their supervisors. Only pertinent results relating to the workers' need for, and receptivity to, training are summarized here.

Skill and Ability of Workers. The questionnaires given to the workers and their supervisors contained two "tests" which related to the level of the workers' skill and ability to provide casework. The workers' scores on the test of commitment to the values of social work were appreciably lower on all items than those provided by a validating sample of professionally trained social workers.[1] The case supervisors scored midway between the public assistance workers and the professionally trained group. The second "test" related to the analytic skill of the workers. Acuity in analyzing the problems of recipients depicted in a case vignette was low; on the average, the

[1] The tests are described more fully in Chapter 2.

workers were able to identify only a small proportion of the manifest problems described in the vignette. The workers were similarly not adept at formulating rehabilitation plans for the families portrayed in the vignette.

Judgments about the workers' knowledge and skill were obtained from their supervisors, who were asked to rate each worker's competence in a number of areas relating to the job. In general, workers were rated highest in those areas having to do with eligibility determination and job mechanics. They were rated low on knowledge of psychological aspects of behavior, understanding cultural differences, and household management; they were ranked only moderately low on casework methods.

Pertinent to how knowledge and skill are likely to be employed are the workers' conceptions of their job. It was found that they generally viewed their job more in terms of the determination of eligibility for financial assistance than as promoting the social and economic rehabilitation of the recipients. For example, when asked about the purpose of their job a large majority indicated that it was to determine eligibility for financial assistance and to employ various techniques for this task; relatively few said that it was to foster some social value, such as to help the children become better citizens or to hold the family together. Not only was eligibility determination viewed as the dominant activity; it was regarded by most workers as one which conflicted with efforts oriented toward rehabilitation and giving nonfinancial service. Thus 81 per cent of those sampled mentioned experiencing conflict between requirements to determine eligibility and the necessity to give other services; the intensity of conflict was rated, on the average, as relatively strong.

Recipient Problems. Although the sample of recipients was small, the responses clearly indicated, as one would expect, that most had problems beyond economic need. Problems that were not currently receiving attention by the recipient himself or by outside sources of help were sickness, personal worries, housing, and legal matters, in addition to financial

problems not directly related to the assistance grant. Perhaps more fundamental was what appeared to be a general lack of motivation for self-help, as inferred from the recipients' plans for the future. When queried about what they expected to do in the future, only one in five of the respondents stated a clear-cut plan that was plausible to fulfill. The lack of a realistic, articulate future time-perspective was accompanied by the belief of most that their chances of getting off ADC were not good. At the same time all the recipients were seemingly satisfied with ADC, agreeing that it was a good thing for them and their families. Coupling the inferred lack of motivation for self-help with the pervasive belief that ADC was a good thing suggests that many recipients were resigned, at least temporarily, to their dependency status.

Receptiveness to the Prospect of Extended Services. A secondary objective of the survey of training needs was to find out whether the workers and recipients would be receptive to the extension of services beyond economic assistance. The recipients indicated less eagerness for this than the workers, probably because the workers were more often perceived by the recipient as having an "investigating" function than an otherwise "helping" one. Consistent with a relatively limited conception of the worker's role was the indifference of most of the recipients about the prospect of seeing an ADC worker more often. Still, many recipients viewed the worker as potentially helpful in many more ways than workers were actually giving help, and most of the recipients expressed predominantly positive attitudes toward their present worker. There was no evidence that the recipients would resist any extension of services; rather the findings indicated that recipients would welcome further service provided it was offered by a friendly, sympathetic person.

The workers were largely receptive to the idea of an extension of their helping role. They and their supervisors were questioned concerning areas in which the workers would benefit from training. "How to motivate recipients" and "understanding psychological problems" were highly endorsed. Also,

the workers indicated relatively high motivation to help recipients, as judged by how strongly they said that they would desire to work on the case described in the short vignette. But it was clear that there was a major barrier to giving service in the workers' eyes—lack of time. Thus 67 per cent of the workers indicated on the questionnaire that there was not enough time to do casework with the individual family.

The Focus of the Training Program

The survey of the training needs of the workers suggested many possible topics for training. The selection of topics from among the alternatives suggested by the survey findings was governed, in part, by the project's prior commitment to providing nonfinancial services as means to foster movement of families toward strengthened family living and increased self-support, where these were feasible for the family. These rehabilitative objectives for Aid to Dependent Children, one recalls, had been stipulated in the 1956 Amendments to the Social Security Act. There was also commitment to social casework as a method of providing services and to a training program that would have promise of being effective for workers and, hopefully, for recipients in the time available for the studies. To train workers to motivate families toward suitable rehabilitative goals through the use of casework methods was consistent with these prior commitments and the findings from the survey of training needs.

Given this general goal of training, the content of training was evolved from the survey findings by the project's training supervisor and others of the research staff. Three themes capture the material emphasized in training.

1. The worker-recipient relationship in which the worker self-consciously utilizes his own strengths to achieve changes in recipients.
2. Conceptual schemes for understanding families, such as concepts of psychological functioning, elements of the current situation faced by the recipient, and analysis and identification of problems.

3. Approaches and techniques for enabling individuals to move toward appropriate, achievable goals, and the development and evaluation of treatment plans.

These topics were considered essential to achieve the training objective and incorporated many areas located in the survey as ones in which the workers could benefit from training.

The material covered in connection with specific topics was selected largely from the fund of knowledge of professional social work, but was adapted in all cases to the particular needs of the workers and to the public assistance setting. The details of content, how the topics were incorporated into an integrated program, and the procedures of training are described in detail in the Appendix.

2. Research Method and Design

Both experiments were conducted on in-service training and reduced workloads, but they differed in how training was given and in how time was saved. The objectives, designs, and measures of the experiments are summarized in this chapter.

The First Experiment: An Evaluative Study

Purpose and Design. The most direct methods possible were used in the first experiment for introducing training and lowering the workloads. A skilled training supervisor who was a staff member of the research project provided training for workers, and workloads were reduced to approximately half of the normal level by cutting the size of the workers' ongoing caseloads and by eliminating the processing of new applications for assistance. The training program described earlier was given to some workers and was withheld from others, while workloads were reduced for those receiving training and for a group not receiving training. As may be seen in Figure 1, the experiment contained three groups: Group I received direct, specialized training and workloads were reduced (eight workers); Group II did not receive specialized, direct training but workloads were reduced (seven workers); Group III was not given direct, specialized training nor were the workloads reduced (five workers). Group IV was given direct, specialized training but there was no reduction in workloads (six workers), and differs from the others in that it was actually part of the second experiment, having been added to that experiment because it was not feasible to include it in the first. Inclusion

of Group IV completes all four logical possibilities, so that by appropriate comparisons of findings for the groups one can infer the independent or combined effects of training and reduced workloads.[1]

FIGURE 1. DESIGN OF THE FIRST EXPERIMENT

Workloads	Status of training	
	Direct, specialized training of workers	No specialized training of workers
Reduced workloads	I. Training and reduced workloads (8 workers)	II. Reduced workloads only (7 workers)
Nonreduced workloads	IV. Training only[a] (6 workers)	III. No-change group (5 workers)

[a] This *training only group* was not included in the first study, but was added to the design of the second. Logically it belongs to the design for the first study.

The training supervisor met with the eight workers in the training program a total of four hours per week. A "practice" case drawn randomly from the caseload of each worker was then carried by him for special treatment involving weekly interviews. The case was used as a "living laboratory" to try out and apply what the worker was currently learning. Both lectures and group discussion were included in training sessions; readings were assigned and special practice cases were used for the illustration of points under discussion. Individual consultation, however, was never granted in order to avoid giving the worker direct instruction as to what he might do with the case. Each week the supervisors of the workers involved in the training program were briefed on what was covered in the sessions. The case supervisors maintained responsibility for the workers in the determination of eligibility for financial assistance in the cases, and the training supervisor had complete responsibility for the training program. The

[1] The appropriate comparison group for Group IV was the *no-change group* for the second experiment because direct comparisons of the findings for Group IV with the other groups in the first experiment were not permissible, owing to small differences in measures used in the experiments and the fact that there was an interval of one year between them.

reader is referred to the Appendix for further details about the training program.

The normal load for a worker, if he had only ADC cases, would be approximately 100; in addition, he would have applications for assistance. Workloads were lowered by reducing caseloads to 50 ADC cases per worker, and by not requiring workers to complete any applications for assistance. Thus the reduction lowered workloads to approximately half of the usual level for workers in Michigan. This reduced workload was introduced in Group I (training and reduced workloads) and served as a base for determining the size of the workload in Group II, where workloads were reduced but no specialized training was received by the workers. To compensate in this group for the lack of time spent in training, the caseload was set at 55, and again no applications were required. In the *no-change group* (Group III) there was, of course, no change in the normal flow of cases and no modification of the requirement that workers continue to complete applications on incoming cases. The five workers in this group had an average of 53 ADC cases, 72 old age cases, 5 aid to the disabled cases, and 2 aid to the blind cases. The composition of the caseloads in the other groups was controlled by having the workers handle only ADC cases. The plan was arranged prior to the beginning of the experiment and was set into motion about two weeks before the experiment began so that the workers would have time to adapt to it. Every month the size of the workload was checked in order to see that it remained at the stipulated level.

Comparability of Experimental Groups. Each group in the experiment was placed in a different county because there were too few workers and supervisors in the welfare offices available for study to reproduce all experimental conditions within a single welfare office. By keeping those workers separate whose experimental conditions were different it was possible to avoid "contamination" through communication, but the possibility of having noncomparable conditions between the counties was thereby increased. It was therefore

necessary to match the counties with respect to relevant characteristics before assigning experimental conditions. There was one medium-sized industrial county and one small county represented in Groups I and II of the experiment. In both of the medium-sized counties to which these groups were assigned there was a large industrial city which was the county center; the small counties similarly each had a central city, containing a few small industries. The two large and the two small counties were similar, respectively, with regard to population size and composition, and the percentage of persons living in urban areas. The county selected for Group III (the *no-change group*) was similar to the medium-sized counties for the other two groups.[1]

Efforts were also made to minimize differences among workers in the various counties. All workers were selected as participants in the project by criteria which, in effect, served to eliminate those without much experience with ADC cases, those who disliked ADC cases, and those who were not deemed competent to work with problems of ADC cases.[2] But these standards would not rule out many differences in skill and ability among workers. To check on whether such differences actually occurred, groups were compared with respect to more refined indicators gathered at the beginning of the experiment. The workers in the three groups were found to be highly similar with respect to the number married, the number hav-

[1] The large county for Group I had a white population of 256,686 and a nonwhite population of 14,277, with 74.5 per cent living in urban areas; the large county for Group II had a white population of 377,613 and a nonwhite population of 18,388, with 72.5 per cent urban; the small county for Group I had a white population of 64,308 and a nonwhite population of 821, with 39.0 per cent urban; the small county for Group II had a white population of 75,512 and a nonwhite population of 1,154, with 29.3 per cent urban. The no-change county had a white population of 144,332 and a nonwhite population of 9,183, with 69.0 per cent urban.

[2] The criteria used in selecting workers for the project were as follows: (a) administrative convenience in assigning workers to the project; (b) worker's liking for ADC cases; (c) the worker's willingness to remain with the bureau at least for the duration of the project; (d) the worker's willingness to do what was required as part of the research; and (e) the worker's judged competence in handling ADC cases. The criterion of administrative convenience in the no-change group was undoubtedly an important one, since workers were selected there almost exclusively in terms of whether or not they had a fairly large proportion of ADC cases in their caseloads.

ing had previous programs of in-service training, age, civil service examination score, length of experience with the bureau, and indications of skill and ability, such as analytic skill and motivation to help recipients. (See Appendix for further details.)

An important hazard in conducting field experiments is the likelihood that environmental conditions will change between the time that the study begins and the time that it ends. The environmental condition relating most directly to this study concerns employment conditions as they might affect the likelihood that recipients would be able to take jobs. To obtain information about these conditions the percentage unemployed of the total labor force during the period of the project was examined at its termination. The results disclosed that although there were differences among the counties in the percentage of persons unemployed, there were no important differences between the experimental and control groups, and the percentage of those unemployed in the *no-change group* was small.[1] Thus there were probably more jobs available in the no-change group, which would favor the chances of getting positive results for this group and therefore provide a conservative test with respect to the effects of the experiment in the other groups.

The severity and type of problem of the recipients seen by the workers varied freely from group to group. By statistical controls these effects were equalized in the analysis of changes for families described in Chapter 4.

Effectiveness of the Experimental Manipulations. Did the reduction in workloads save the amount of time that was expected? An estimate of the relative amounts of time available to the workers was the number of contacts between worker and recipient in the various conditions of the experiment. It was found that the average number of contacts in the *no-change group* was .67, or less than one per case; 1.82 in the *reduced*

[1] The average monthly percentage unemployed in Group I was 6.75 for the medium-sized county, 3.93 for the small; in Group II the percentages were 5.20 and 9.13 respectively, and in Group III the percentage was 3.93.

workloads group, or a little over two times as many as in the no-change group; and 2.06 in the group receiving training, or about three times as many as in the no-change group. Thus the difference between the no-change group and the other two suggests that the workers with reduced caseloads had twice the amount of time, or more, as compared with normal conditions. The more frequent contacts of the *training group* as compared with the group in which only caseloads were reduced are probably due to more concentrated efforts with a few families in the training group, which would tend to inflate the average for that group relative to the mean of the group with reduced caseloads where effort on cases was distributed widely over many families.

The training program was also conducted as planned.

The Second Experiment: An Engineering Study

Purpose and Design. The findings of the first experiment were sufficiently positive to interest officials of the Welfare Department and the researchers in training workers on a broader basis than was possible by direct training from a special training supervisor, and in reducing workloads without the large reduction of caseloads made in the first experiment. The problem thus shifted from the effectiveness of training and reduced workloads, as viewed abstractly, to the effectiveness of alternative methods of training and reducing workloads, granted that training and reduced workloads were desirable and worth implementing in the Welfare Department.

What were the alternatives available in this situation? Hypothetically there were many ways in which in-service training could be brought to workers in a large welfare program, but in the Welfare Department there were relatively few realistic alternatives. The one selected for research evaluation in the second experiment was a combination of commonly employed approaches. Workers were to be trained by this method: The case supervisors would receive training from a skilled training supervisor, and they would then convey systematically what they had learned to their workers. Although

this approach to training had not been used before in the Welfare Department, it was consistent with the Department's practice of using area representatives to instruct and work with the case supervisors, and with the traditional task of the case supervisor to teach her worker what she could in the course of regular case conferences.

Workloads also may be reduced hypothetically in many ways, although in the existing situation of the Welfare Department, as in others, there were relatively few practical alternatives. It was not possible for the Welfare Department to increase the number of personnel required for a direct reduction of workloads, and thus other measures had to be considered.[1] These fell into two classes: (1) to redistribute the worker's efforts and thereby save time for certain aspects of his job, and (2) to save time for all aspects of the job by some method short of directly reducing caseloads. Focusing the efforts of the workers on incoming applications rather than on cases requiring periodic reviews would be an example of the first approach. Simplifying work procedures would be an example of the second approach, and was selected for study because it offered the possibility of actually saving time for the workers in all their activities, rather than just providing a saving in some activities but not in others.

After agreeing upon these methods of training and saving time, a research design was formulated for conducting an experiment. As may be seen in Figure 2 the scheme followed the same pattern as that for the first year, directed toward finding out the independent or combined effects of each variable to be introduced. The four groups of workers were: Group I, specialized training through supervisory staff and work simplification (eight workers); Group II, work simplification only (five workers); Group III, training only (nine workers); and Group IV, a *no-change group* involving neither specialized training nor simplified work procedures (eight

[1] The State Welfare Commission was petitioned for an increased allotment of funds for personnel, but the Commission did not find it feasible to grant the request.

workers). A fifth group of the experiment not depicted in Figure 2 but noted in Figure 1, is the one involving direct training for workers without a reduction of workloads. Unlike the first study, the workers in the second carried old age assistance cases as well as ADC cases.

FIGURE 2. DESIGN OF THE SECOND EXPERIMENT

Workloads	Status of training	
	Specialized training through supervisory staff	No specialized training
Work simplification	I. Training and work simplification (8 workers)	II. Work simplification only (5 workers)
No work simplification	III. Training only (9 workers)	IV. No-change group (8 workers)

The training program developed in the first study was employed in the second for training the supervisors. The supervisors met with the training supervisor for four hours per week for two months. As soon as the supervisors had finished the program they shifted from the role of student to that of trainer to give the training program to their workers. Workers received training for three and one-half months, meeting with their supervisors for four hours a week. Two supervisors in Group I (training-reduced caseloads) were to train four workers each, and three supervisors of Group III (training-no work simplification) were to train three workers each. The supervisors had the content of training used for teaching made available to them and they drew upon it, the supplementary reading, and other documents of the training supervisor in conducting their own training program. In addition, they consulted periodically with the training supervisor about problems of content and procedure.

The decision to reduce workloads by simplifying procedures of work required that considerable attention be given to rethinking current activities of the workers in order to see how time might be saved. This was particularly challenging be-

cause the Welfare Department, like most other organizations, has a continuing interest in problems of efficiency. If the Department had not already been entertaining various new plans by which time might be saved, it might not have been possible to get new ideas for the study. The researchers immediately encountered a problem familiar to welfare administrators: How to maintain suitable procedures for documenting need and eligibility and yet cut the corners that would save time. It was apparent that whatever could be worked out as an experimental simplification of work had to be done without impairing the documentation of eligibility and need. After much thought the researchers and the officials of the State Welfare Department formulated the following procedures for saving time, which were initially estimated to save about one-fourth of the time the workers devoted to their jobs.

1. Reduced Case-Recording. It was found that one time-consuming task of the workers was recording on matters of eligibility and need for cases whose eligibility status was due for periodic review. Past procedure required recording of relevant details under such headings as age, residence, and need each time a review was required, and the completion of various forms connected with these categories. One way to simplify recording and still maintain proper documentation was to maintain the forms which related to eligibility and need, but to eliminate some of the case recording in the categories for which there were already prepared forms. Case-recording under the following headings was eliminated: age, residence, responsible relatives, blindness, temporary and permanent disability, need, relationship, and medical need.[1] For other areas in which recording was previously required, the workers were requested to make longhand entries describing the results of the reinvestigation; for example, such entries were made for dates of contacts, living arrangements, deprivation, suitability of the home (if any changes had occurred since the last investiga-

[1] Also no reinvestigation was required during the project for categories of age, residence, relationship, blindness, and temporary and permanent disability. During the project, moreover, it was not necessary for the workers to communicate with any relatives who at the last investigation had been judged unable to contribute. All other relatives, however, were to fill out a simplified form for responsible relatives.

tion), potential employment, and their recommendations. These modifications saved time for the workers by reducing the amount of note-taking, dictating, and proofreading required for case records, and incidentally resulted in less typing for clerks.

2. *Relieving Workers of Selected Clerical Duties.* It was found that some of the workers' activities, although important, were sufficiently routine and clear-cut to be transferred to clerks. The intent in transferring some of the more routine activities was not, of course, to make a clerk into a caseworker, but rather to relieve the caseworker of simple, and at times burdensome, tasks that frequently prevented his performing more essential activities. The clerks, moreover, were able to take on additional responsibilities because of being relieved of transcribing so many case recordings. The following duties were shifted from the workers to the clerks:

a. Preparation of routine forms, letters, and reminder cards for workers.

b. Computation of the total requirements on the budget sheet, using figures entered by the workers, and also of medical costs.

c. The screening of telephone calls and office contacts, handling routine matters, and taking messages whenever possible. This modification no doubt brought about a redistribution of the worker's time as well as possible saving of time.

Comparability of Experimental Groups. As in the first study, it was possible in the second for the researchers to exercise some control over the counties and workers selected. Each group of the experiment was located in a different medium-sized county; all the counties were similar with respect to population size, the proportion of nonwhite, and the percentage of urban dwellers.[1]

[1] The county for Group I had a white population of 98,286 and a nonwhite population of 9,639, with 58.8 per cent of the population being urban; the county for Group II had a white population of 162,503 and a nonwhite population of 22,458, with 69.6 per cent of the population urban; the county for Group III had a white population of 109,325 and a nonwhite population of 11,478, with 68 per cent of the population urban; the county for Group IV had a white population of 116,804 and a nonwhite population of 9,901, with 65.8 per cent of the population urban; the fifth cell of the design, which is logically Group IV of the experimental design of the first year, had a white population of 117,182 and a nonwhite population of 17,424, with 64.4 per cent of the population urban.

Workers were selected on the basis of their willingness to remain with the project for its duration and to do what was required as part of the research. The actual selection of workers was made by the supervisors, who had been given the researchers' criteria for the size and composition of caseloads. They also made whatever reassignment of caseloads was necessary as a result of the redistricting of caseload areas.

The control of the size and composition of caseloads was less direct and more complex than in the first study. The size for a county was kept at a stipulated "normal" level, with only small variation (5 per cent) allowed for deviation among the counties. However, workers' loads within counties varied, ranging from 30 to 50 for ADC cases and from 100 to 150 for other categories.[1] "Production" requirements were also established for workers by stipulating the number of applications to be completed each month. The only deviation from these standards found at the end of the project occurred in the *no-change group*, where about half of the expected number was completed. The no-change group also completed a low average number of case reviews, as compared with the other groups.

The extent to which the workers participating in the study appeared to be similar on background characteristics and skill and ability was assessed after the experiment had terminated. Using the same indicators employed in the first experiment, it was found that workers were generally alike on all characteristics except experience and analytic skill. Workers assigned to the "simplified work" group had much more experience on the average than workers assigned to the other experimental groups, and workers who did not receive special training were somewhat more skilled in formulating treatment plans than were the others. (See Appendix for further details.)

Information about the employment conditions in the various counties was obtained at the termination of the project. It was found that the average percentage of unemployed during the project ranged from 8.95 to 9.77 in the labor market areas

[1] Aid to the blind, hospitalization, and intake were excluded.

where four of the counties were located, but the area in which the no-change county was located had an average of only 4.57 per cent. To the extent that the percentage of unemployed in an area is an indication of the likelihood that persons are able to get work, it would appear that the no-change county is favored.

The single noteworthy trend in the findings is that the no-change county appeared to be favored over the other counties in many ways. Fewer applications and case reviews were processed and the county area had a relatively low unemployment percentage, suggesting that somewhat more jobs were available there. The consequence of having conditions favor the no-change county is that its use as a base for measuring the increment of change due to training or work simplification provided a conservative test of the effects of these conditions.

Effectiveness of Experimental Manipulations. The plan for training described earlier was carried out generally as intended. An exception occurred in the training and work simplification group where one of the supervisors found it necessary to drop out of the study, making it impossible for her to discharge her responsibility to convey to her workers what she had learned in the earlier part of the project.

The success of the experimental effort with respect to work simplification is less clearly ascertainable. Although the procedural changes were put into effect as prescribed, it appeared from the scattered evidence available that less than one-fourth of the workers' time was saved. A time study was conducted for a week midway in the project. Although the findings are not regarded as reliable because the time sample was small, they suggest that from six to eight hours, or somewhat less than the ten hours originally estimated, were saved.

When evaluating the results of the second experiment it should be noted that the variables are "weak" as compared with those of the first. The transmission of training from the training supervisors to the case supervisors and then from the case supervisors to the workers probably weakened its impact and allowed for more variability of the end-product received by the workers. The simplification of work, it turned out,

saved even less than the estimated 25 per cent originally planned, and this percentage is only half of the amount estimated to have been saved in the first experiment.

Measurement of Change

The training program was a complex experience comprised of numerous and diverse influences. In addition to the known components of the program there were undoubtedly influences of unknown origin that brought about unanticipated changes in workers. To increase the likelihood of discovering all the effects of training, measures were therefore taken on more characteristics of possible effectiveness than would have been necessary if the training program had been a simple clear-cut influence. The measures of possible effectiveness were of three types: those of internal processes of workers, performance of workers, and changes in the families seen by the workers.

Internal Processes. Examination of the training program indicates the areas of internal process in which workers could change. In general, we would expect changes to be effected in knowledge, analytic skill, motivation to help recipients, and attitudes. Measures in these areas are described below.

1. Tests of Knowledge. The training program, one recalls, had three themes: (1) the worker-recipient relationship, (2) assumptions about human behavior, and (3) approaches to and techniques for treatment. Objective tests examined the workers' knowledge in these areas through a questionnaire administered before and after the training program. Examples of a true-false question in each of the areas follow:

_____A worker's own emotions and feelings are often not important when dealing with a client in public assistance.

_____If a client does not give you an accurate picture of her behavior, this is good evidence that she is consciously trying to conceal some information which she feels may be damaging to her position.

_____It is at times desirable for a worker to appear to accept a client's distorted picture of what his situation is as long as the worker keeps a realistic picture of the situation in mind.

The foregoing items appeared in the tests given in the first experiment. These tests were only crude measures of knowledge because they had to be devised before the training program had been given. The tests given in the second experiment were better because of improved items and because the content was separated into parts. The second tests separated scores on matters relating to casework practice from those on understanding human behavior.

The sample question below, taken from the second year's test, provided the worker with the opportunity both to judge the correctness or incorrectness of the alternatives and, in each case, to state her reason.

> Mrs. W. has told her ADC worker that she would like to get a job. She has mentioned some concern about the uncertainty of employment conditions, and the fact that so many people are getting laid off work from time to time. In discussing the jobs which have been suggested to her at the employment agency, Mrs. W. had thought that one was too far away from her home, another would be "too technical," and others unsuitable for one reason or another. The latest offer involved secretarial skills which Mrs. W. had at one time. She said she was afraid that she had forgotten everything.
>
> a. The worker responds that she is sure that Mrs. W. would be able to handle this kind of work again. This response was: correct_____, incorrect _____. Why?_____
>
> b. The worker suggests to Mrs. W. that she may be just making excuses to herself in order to hide her fear of giving up the ADC grant, and explains why these fears are unwarranted. This response was: correct_____, incorrect_____. Why?_____

2. *Analytic Skill.* One component of the helping process was the identification of problems. In training, workers were aided through practice with cases to become more acute in noting types of problems at various levels of inference. They were also aided in how to formulate treatment plans, although less directly than in identifying problems. Tests of analytic skill in both areas were developed in the belief that any increase in skill in either area would be apparent, at least to some extent,

in the way the worker identified the problems and formulated treatment plans for a case.

The pattern of assessing analytic skill was the same for both experiments. A case vignette was presented to the worker and followed by one question about the problems he recognized in the case, and another asking what he might do to help the family if he had all the time he needed. Scores on analytic skill before and after each experiment were obtained from a reliable scoring scheme that took into consideration the clarity of thought as well as the appropriateness in terms of casework criteria.[1] Except for small improvements in how questions were asked and responses scored in the second experiment, the measurement of analytic skill was the same in both.

3. Motivation to Help the Recipient. At many points in the training program there was emphasis on a positive approach to recipients that implied that motivation to help the recipient should be high. A limited aspect of motivation to help was measured by responses to the following question, asked about the family portrayed in the case vignette: "How much do you feel you would like to work on this case?"

4. Attitudes. Of the many attitudinal areas dealt with in the training program two were singled out for measurement. The first was what we have termed "commitment to the ethics of professional social work," measured by a test developed and validated for use in the survey of the training needs of ADC workers. The utility of the test for assessing changes of ethical orientation, due to training, derives from the similarity of six values inferred from the test items and selected themes covered in the training program. The inferred values which corresponded generally to selected themes of training were: humani-

[1] The scoring scheme for the first experiment shows the categories for each response in that category. For the question concerning the problems of the case depicted in the vignette, the categories were: nonexistent problems (−2), superficially conceived problems (−1), manifest problems (+1), and appropriately inferred, underlying problems (+2). Responses to the question about the treatment plans the worker would formulate for the case were similarly treated. The workers gave responses that could be classified into the following three categories: plans inappropriate to the case (−2), plans for service for manifest problems (+1), and plans for treatment of appropriately inferred, underlying problems (+2).

tarian versus utilitarian approaches to persons, noncoercive versus coercive methods of influence, concern versus nonconcern for the client's feelings, awareness versus nonawareness of the self as an instrument of change, acceptance versus nonacceptance of deviant individuals, and positive versus negative methods of motivating individuals. To evaluate possible changes in these values the test was given before and after the training program in both studies.

The other area of the test concerned giving help universally versus giving help selectively. The seven ethical areas together comprise only a small sample of values and ethics and therefore the test reflects neither the full range of commitments of the professionally trained nor the beliefs of the professionally nontrained. Although the test discriminates well between the professionally trained and nontrained workers, it must be viewed as a limited instrument, useful at best for inferring differences on a few values held to in social work.[1]

The worker's attitude toward ADC cases was also measured. The following question was asked: "How much would you say you liked working with ADC cases as opposed to cases in the other categories of assistance?"

Performance. To learn how the worker performed with recipients, an experimental interview was devised and conducted with workers in both experiments. In this interview an amateur actress played the part of an ADC recipient, and the ADC worker played her own role as a helping person with this "recipient." The actress, "Mrs. Lang," was trained to follow a script so that her behavior in the situation was predictable and controlled. Mrs. Lang had a history, parts of which were made known to the workers just prior to entering the experimental interview. She was a definable person as set forth in the memorized script and knew a definite set of facts about herself which she could reveal to the worker when questioned appropriately.

[1] For further details concerning the test and the relationship between scores on it and organizational size of the welfare offices, see Thomas, Edwin J., "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size," *American Sociological Review*, vol. 24, February, 1959, pp. 30-37.

The experimental interview was broken up into six episodes, each designed to tap specific aspects of behavior which should have been influenced by the training program. Illustrative of the content covered in the interviews are the episodes from the first experiment.

Episode 1

This episode concerned the problem that Mrs. Lang had with her son Harold. Mrs. Lang had received a report from the school that the boy was not doing well and had been truanting. The aim of the episode, which lasted five minutes, was to determine how adequately the worker obtained relevant facts from the recipient upon first contact when she knew little more than selected face-sheet facts.

Episode 2

This episode terminated after the worker responded to Mrs. Lang's initial statement, which concerned her daughter Barbara, who had been having nightmares that a bear was chasing her and who also showed fear of their dog. The aim of this episode was to test the worker's reaction to a complex child-care problem, which may or may not have been serious.

Episode 3

This similarly brief episode involved the statement by Mrs. Lang that she had been making dresses for the girls with cloth that she had bought, and also that Harold did not like it. He wanted the money that she had used to buy the cloth. The purpose of the episode was to test whether the worker reinforced the strength of the client or explored the implied negative aspect.

Episode 4

This brief episode found Mrs. Lang angrily expressing her feelings toward her husband, saying that he drank all the time and that he did not stay at home. She further expressed great hostility toward her husband, also blaming her son Harold. The objective of this episode was to test the worker's reaction to what might be indications of two defense mechanisms: displacement and projection.

Episode 5

In this episode Mrs. Lang was depressed, saying that she had no money and could not do the things that she wanted to do. The

intent was to test the worker's reaction to an expression of frustration and depression, which provided a generally suitable opportunity for the worker to support and reassure the recipient.

Episode 6

This episode was again a long one, allowing free interaction between Mrs. Lang and the worker for a period of five minutes. Mrs. Lang presented her problem in this episode, indicating that she wanted to go to work and that she was tired of staying home all the time; she asked the worker if she thought she might get a job. Among the many things the researchers wished to test in this episode were the extent to which relevant facts relating to the employment situation were explored, and the way the worker handled the client's seemingly strong desire to seek employment.

All sessions of the play were conducted in an identical fashion with the workers participating in the research both years. Before entering the experimental interview each worker read an information sheet about Mrs. Lang. Upon entering, he was introduced to the situation by a researcher who acted as a moderator, describing the interview as a "role play," and orienting the worker before the start of each episode. The first and last episodes were timed and all were recorded on tape by the researcher. From the tape records of the interviews the reactions of the workers were analyzed and transformed into statistical indices of measures of performance.

The design for administering the experimental interview was not the same in both years. For the first experiment it was possible to administer the experimental interview only at the termination of the experiment. While it would have been desirable to administer the experimental interview before as well as after the experiment, time was an important factor during the initiation of the experiment and launching of the training program, and it was not feasible to spend the additional time that would have been required to develop the script, train an actress, and work through experimental procedures. In the second experiment it was possible to administer the experimental interview to the workers both before and after the experiment.

A significant feature of the experimental interview was control of the "recipient's" behavior. How much predictability of the "recipient's" behavior was there? In two of the episodes, a total of twelve minutes of free interaction was allowed between the actress and the worker. In the first experiment, 81 per cent of the responses of the actress concerning information about herself and her situation during these twelve minutes was predictable from the script and from the rules by which she played her role; the figure for the second year was 91 per cent. For both years four of the episodes did not allow free interplay between the actress and the worker, since the actress presented her problem followed only by the response of the worker. In these episodes, of course, the response of the actress was totally predictable since she was following a prepared script.

The reactions of the workers to the experimental interview are worth noting because it was an entirely new experience for them. Evidence from many sources indicated that the interview was a feasible method of studying the workers' performance, although it was more demanding than most questionnaires and pencil-and-paper tests. Workers' reactions varied from anxiety, in a few cases, to enjoyment. Most of the workers judged the "recipient" to be realistic and her problems plausible, although they thought that their performance was generally below their usual standard.

From the tape records of the experimental interviews for both years' experiments, the following areas of content were coded. The specific measure for the second experiment was in some instances different from the first because the episodes and script were modified slightly. The reliability of coding was satisfactory for all codes, most scores indicating 85 per cent agreement or better.

1. Information: Its Giving, Seeking, and Use. Both studies obtained scores for workers on the amount of information sought in the experimental interview, the amount of information given to the recipient, and the amount gained from the recipient by direct questioning. The code rewarded the worker with posi-

tive scores for using the information given to him by the actress, and either did not reward him or penalized him for failing to make use of information given him. Workers were rewarded for such things as following up a cue given by the actress (for example, the statement, "I want to do the right thing"); purposely opening up an area for exploration; purposefully attempting to get new, appropriate information; insightfully verbalizing the feelings implied but not stated by the recipient; and making explicit use of information just given in that episode. Generally, failure to do these things either penalized the worker by a score of a negative unit, or he was given no score.

2. Methods of Influence. The term "influence" was used generically in the research to refer to the way in which the worker intentionally performed with respect to the client, and did not imply the negative connotations of purposeful manipulation of the recipient. The importance of finding out the methods of influence used by workers in performance with recipients is that it is ultimately through the specific behaviors of the worker that changes in recipients, to the extent that the changes occur, are brought about. Whether or not the worker employed directive, imposing methods of influence was of particular interest. For both studies material was coded for the extent to which the worker imposed his own orientation upon the recipient, rather than exploring facts of the situation or neutrally suggesting possible alternatives for action. The following categories used in the second experiment indicate how responses were coded: the imposition of the worker's ideas, as shown, for example, by giving advice, opinion, or evaluation with respect to the goal that the client might pursue or other aspects of the client's life situation; exploration, as evident in unbiased questions intended merely to gain information and not to influence the recipient one way or another; differentiation, indicated by neutral statements opening up alternatives for action which neither apparently seek a response from the recipient nor are intended to press her to pursue the alternative.

3. Appropriate Reassurance. Although support and reassurance

were not explicitly stressed as techniques in the training program, there was great emphasis upon the importance of the worker-client relationship. One consequence of having assimilated material provided in training on the worker-client relationship is genuine support and reassurance for recipients. In the course of the experimental interview the worker was afforded numerous opportunities to reassure the recipient appropriately. Instances of appropriate reassurance were coded for all six episodes for both years of the research.

4. Diagnostic Acuity. The experimental interview provided an opportunity to test the worker's analytic skill with "live" material, but unlike the questionnaire measures of analytic skill described earlier, the experimental interview provided an opportunity to apply psychological knowledge that may have been gained in the course of the training program, and did not focus upon the identification of problems or treatment plans. Immediately following the experimental interview each worker completed a short questionnaire which inquired into his understanding of the dynamics of the behavior involved in the family situation. The codes for analyzing the responses of the workers for both years were aimed toward finding out the workers' judgments of what the family members were doing and why.

5. Approaches to Treatment. The purpose of having separate episodes in the experimental interview was to focus each upon specific behavior that should have been changed as a result of exposure to the training program. For example, Episode 3, relating to constructive activity of the recipient, provided the worker with essentially two ways of responding: he could support and reassure the constructive activity of the recipient or he could pursue the implication that the son was being neglected. The correct response for the worker consistent with the material presented in the training program was to support and reassure the constructive activity; a response inconsistent with the approach of the training program would have been to criticize Mrs. Lang for the implied negative element. For both years of the research, codes were developed to

classify the responses of the workers for the four short episodes that were terminated immediately following the response of the worker to the statement of the problem by Mrs. Lang.

Families. An important part of the study was to assess changes which occurred in families in the course of the experiment. To obtain information about the families, all workers participating in the project recorded data on Client-Information Schedules every time there was a contact with a person in the family. Information was obtained on 1,139 families the first year and 1,461 the second. For each family, the worker recorded by category all the problems and changes observed in the course of the project, both for the area of family life and for the area of self-support.[1] Moreover, identifying information for the family was obtained, such as number of children, race, and so on.

An essential function of the schedules was to obtain information from which it would be possible to infer the presumed cause of the change, and whether change was in a positive or negative direction. To obtain information about the former, workers were requested to indicate for all instances in which changes occurred in an area for the family the specific change and whether the change seemed to be due to external factors. The direction of change was inferred by the research coders from the specific record made by the worker of the problem and the change. In general, changes which presumably may be attributable to the worker included all those which the worker himself did not clearly label as arising from external factors and which, in the judgment of the coder, could not be attributed to outside factors. While not all such changes can in fact be due to the efforts of the worker, it was assumed that external influences in the five counties involved in the study

[1] In the area of family life the following were the major areas in which problems were recorded: family relationships, health factors, environmental factors, factors of social responsibility, individual resources (emotional), and individual resources (capacities). For each of these areas there were subcategories of problems. For the area of self-support, there were the following five categories for recording information: whether there was a plan for employment on the part of a family member, whether vocational skill or training was developed or maintained, whether a family member took employment, whether a relative was supporting the family, and whether there were outside sources of income.

were reasonably constant throughout the project period and, therefore, that variations in the category of changes attributable to the worker include some true changes in recipients or their situations which may be attributed correctly to the efforts of the worker.

Precautions were taken to guard against bias in recording. The workers, for example, were not told that recording on the schedules was to evaluate the experiment. This aspect of the study was presented as an incidental survey of ADC families, designed to assess the extent of problems and family change over a period of time. Thus the researchers attempted to dissociate the schedules from the experiment proper to avoid the problem of having the workers see themselves as the ones being evaluated through the records.

Most of the workers believed that the recording was for a "census of family problems" rather than as an evaluation of their own efforts. Thus for the first study five of the 20 workers mentioned what would be regarded as the "true" purpose, and these also mentioned the "assessment" purpose. Eight of the 36 workers in the second study mentioned a purpose which showed an awareness of the possible relationship of their efforts to changes in families. In neither study were the workers who surmised the true purpose located in only the training groups.

The problem of bias is complex and was not left to rest on the evidence mentioned above. The extensive information collected for families was valuable, if found to be relatively complete and free from distortion. To examine carefully the question of bias, special analyses were undertaken to learn about how accurate and impartial the workers were as observers of the problems and changes of families. The findings indicated the major source of "bias" to be incompleteness, which was due to such factors as lack of motivation to record, oversight, and limited perspectives for categorizing problems and changes of families. There was little evidence, however, that what was recorded contained large distortions or inaccuracies, and an analysis of the "validity" of the recording

disclosed selected, expected, positive relationships between scores of family change, derived from the Client-Information Schedules, and measures of performance and of analytic skill, taken from the experimental interview and questionnaires. It therefore appeared that what was recorded was at least moderately reliable. Another consideration to be weighed is the large amount of information collected, which lends stability to this sample with respect to biasing factors that are not systematic. On balance, the biases were not judged to be pervasive or strong enough to warrant the rejection of the recorded material. All measurements are to varying degrees imprecise approximations of that which is measured, and ours are no exception. But the unknown error introduced by the incompleteness of recording forces readers to be especially conservative in interpreting findings and to look upon the results for changes in families more skeptically than upon those for changes in workers.

Summary and Conclusions

This chapter has described the design of two experiments on training and reduced workloads and the measures used to examine the effectiveness of the experimental innovations. In the first experiment, training was given directly to workers by a special training supervisor and workloads were reduced to approximately half of their usual level by assigning fewer cases to workers and eliminating the requirement that they process in-coming applications for financial assistance. The second experiment was designed to evaluate alternative methods of training and reducing workloads; in this study, training was given to workers by case supervisors who had previously received in-service training from the special training supervisor and workloads were reduced by simplifying procedures of work.

Although the innovations of the second experiment were more practical and feasible, from an administrative point of view, than those of the first, they were relatively indirect and "weak." Training in the second experiment had to be given

twice before reaching the workers and the simplification of work saved only about 10 per cent of the workers' time instead of 25 per cent originally anticipated. Other than the failure of work simplification to save the expected amount of time, the experimental modifications of both experiments were carried out as initially planned.

For both experiments the measures of possible effectiveness were of three types: those of internal processes, those of performance of workers, and changes in families seen by the workers.

3. Changes Effected for Workers

THIS CHAPTER describes the changes for workers, presenting results separately for each experiment in order to highlight the impact of the different methods of training and reducing workloads. Although a total of 56 workers participated in the experiments, the number is small when one considers the fact that no more than nine took part in any one experimental group. To guard against the danger of drawing incorrect conclusions from the trends revealed by comparing the different groups, a relatively strict criterion for determining the reliability of the findings was adopted: that of statistical significance.[1] Unless otherwise stated, it may be assumed that all findings reported as significant are based upon differences that could occur only rarely by chance. While this standard decreases the likelihood of exaggerating differences that are not large, it should be noted that its use with a small sample of workers can lead to overlooking differences that would be reliable if a large group of workers had been studied. Thus the findings reported here tend to be a generally conservative estimate of the effects for workers.

Effects of Direct Training

Inspection of the findings disclosed early in the analysis that reduced workloads, either singly or combined with training, were not associated with improvement of the workers as measured by the before-after questionnaires or the experi-

[1] The .05 level of significance was adopted. All tests used for this chapter were performed with Fisher's Exact Test.

mental interview. Because the changes found were associated with training, the essential comparisons required for testing and reporting findings were between the direct training groups and their appropriate control groups. Thus, for the first year the group having had direct, specialized training and reduced workloads (Group I, Figure 1) was compared with the two groups which did not have training that year, and the group having had only direct training the second year (shown as Group IV) was compared with the groups that did not receive *any* training in the second year (Figure 2). These comparisons amount to two independent tests of the effectiveness of direct training, one for the first experiment where direct training was accompanied by lowered workloads and another for the second experiment where direct training was given without reduced workloads.

Knowledge. One would expect the workers' knowledge to be subject to relatively immediate influence by training, as compared to more deep-seated aspects of internal processes. The findings only partially support this expectation. Direct training in the first year produced no improvement, as measured by the objective tests given before and after training. We believe, however, that the tests were not fully satisfactory, partly because they had to be constructed before the training program had actually been presented. As noted in the preceding chapter, the tests used in the second experiment were improved versions, and thus the findings for the second year more adequately reflect the changes in knowledge that in fact occurred. In the second year all six of the workers who received direct training improved their knowledge of casework techniques—a significantly greater proportion than was found for workers not receiving training. But it is noteworthy that no improvement was shown on the part of the test relating to knowledge of psychological functioning. Other findings to be recounted shortly indicate, however, that the workers' psychological understanding must have improved, at least to a moderate extent.

Analytic Skill. Analytic skill was measured by improvement in the identification of problems, in the formulation of treat-

ment plans, and in diagnostic acuity with a "live" case—the "recipient" in the experimental interview. Table 1 reports the results for the first two areas of analytic skill for the first study. The workers who had received training generally improved their skill to identify problems, as compared with the workers who had not received training. The table also shows that training did not bring about improvement in the formulation of treatment plans. Findings are comparable for the group

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF WORKERS IMPROVING IN ANALYTIC SKILL, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION (FIRST STUDY)

Area of analytic skill	Condition of experiment: Direct training, reduced workloads ($N = 8$)	Reduced workloads only ($N = 7$)	No-change group ($N = 5$)	p-Value[a]
Identifying problems in cases				
Case A	7	2	0	<.01
Case B	7	4	2	
Case E	6	2	0	<.05
Formulating appropriate treatment plans				
Case B	5	5	2	
Case E	6	3	3	

[a] By comparing the direct training group with the other two groups.

receiving direct training in the second experiment, as seen in Table 2. Thus the results from both experiments indicate that direct training produced improved identification of problems, but no improvement in the formulation of treatment plans. The failure of training to affect the formulation of treatment plans can be attributed, in part, to greater emphasis in training on identifying problems than on conceiving treatment plans.

The third aspect of analytic skill, diagnostic acuity, was derived from the experimental interview. Seven out of the eight workers who received training in the first experiment had

TABLE 2. NUMBER OF WORKERS IMPROVING IN ANALYTIC SKILL, COMPARING DIRECT TRAINING WITH NO TRAINING (SECOND STUDY)

Area of analytic skill	Condition of experiment			
	Direct training, no reduced workloads ($N = 6$)	No training, simplified procedures ($N = 5$)	No training, no procedural change ($N = 8$)	p-Value[a]
Identifying problems in cases	6	0	3	<.004
Formulating appropriate treatment plans	3	0	3	

[a] By comparing the direct training group with the other two groups.

high scores, as compared with four of the 12 who had not received training—a significant difference. The results for the second year are based upon more differentiated measures of diagnostic acuity and were derived from experimental interviews conducted with workers before as well as after the training program. The second experiment did not show improvement in diagnostic acuity for the workers who had received direct training, unless we take into account the amount of information obtained by the workers, which, unlike the situation in the first year, was found to be positively related to scores on diagnostic acuity. It was found that all three of the workers who obtained a high amount of information also improved in diagnostic acuity—a somewhat higher proportion than the proportion of those who received a high amount of information in the nontraining groups. But this difference only approaches statistical significance and pertains to acuity regarding the recipient's psychological functioning. Acuity in formulating treatment goals was not found to improve with training.

Taken together, the results for diagnostic acuity suggest: (1) that the ability of workers to size up the problems of real persons generally improved as a result of training; (2) that

knowledge of psychological functioning probably improved to some extent as a result of training or it would not have been possible to obtain the scores found on acuity relating to the recipient's psychological functioning; and (3) that again the results show that training did not improve skill in the formulation of treatment goals.

Motivation to Help Recipients. The improvement in motivation to help, noted in both experiments, was found almost exclusively among workers who had received direct training. In the first experiment, half of the workers who received training improved, while none of the workers improved who had not received training. In the second experiment, three out of the six workers in the training group improved, whereas one of the 13 improved in the groups not receiving training. Unlike the difference for the first study, this difference just failed to attain significance. In all, the findings indicate that training is associated with increased motivation to help.

Attitudes. There was no improvement found in the workers' commitment to the ethics of professional social work or their liking for ADC cases. In contrast to knowledge and skills, these aspects of internal process involve considerable affective investment and are conceivably less amenable to change through relatively brief in-service training. Moreover, the workers scored high in the first testing on their liking for ADC cases.

Performance. The measures of performance obtained from analyses of the tape recordings of the experimental interviews revealed only one significant result, which was that the workers who had received direct training appropriately reassured the "recipient" in the experimental interview much more frequently than the workers who had no training. Thus in the first experiment, all eight of the workers who had received training received high scores on reassurance, as compared with two of the 12 who did not receive training. In the second experiment, three workers of the five for whom scores were available in the *direct training group*, had increased reassurance scores, whereas none of the 13 who had not received training had higher scores.

The workers' approaches to treatment in the four brief episodes that did not allow free interaction beyond the initial response of the worker were analyzed. For only the episode concerning a depressive state of the recipient was it found that training increased significantly the number of workers using an appropriate approach. This finding tells us nothing new, however, because the responses of the workers coded as appropriate for this episode contained supportive statements, for the most part, thus showing again that the workers who had received training were more likely to reassure appropriately than those not receiving training. In the second experiment, there was no change for any episode of the four. These findings indicate, therefore, that there was no evidence that the workers who had received training approached treatment problems more appropriately than those who had not received training, except for supportive statements, which in large measure are what we have classified earlier as appropriate reassurances.

In the experimental interview there was a definite set of facts in the script which the actress could have given if she had been asked appropriate questions. The set of facts, in short, was available for the asking. Did training enable workers to obtain these facts more fully than those workers who had not received training? The answer is no. Training was not related to the amount of information obtained or sought in the experimental interview.

Training was also unrelated to the method of "influence" used by workers. In both experiments the workers who had received training were as likely to use imposing, directive methods as were workers who had not received training.

Summary. Direct training brought about selected positive changes in internal processes. These were: (a) improved skill in problem identification, (b) increased motivation to help recipients, and (c) improved knowledge of casework techniques and psychological functioning. But training did not improve the workers' skill in formulating treatment plans, at least as

measured by two methods used in the studies. No other changes of internal processes were found.

There were fewer changes in performance as measured by the experimental interview than there were changes in internal processes as measured by the questionnaire. There was no evidence of change in performance with respect to the pattern of seeking and giving information, or in methods of influence. The single area in which performance changed was that of supportive behavior, as evidenced by the frequency of appropriate reassurance. The workers who had received training improved markedly in the frequency with which they appropriately reassured the "recipient" in the experimental interview as compared with those workers who had not received training.

In no instance was there evidence that reduced workloads brought about changes in internal processes or performance for workers.

Effects of Indirect Training

One of the important ways in which the second experiment differed from the first was the addition of another link in the causal chain; this was the training of supervisors, who had the task of first assimilating the training program before transmitting it to their own workers. If the supervisors did not change as a result of the training, there would be less chance that the workers whom the supervisors subsequently trained would change. Although the efficacy of the supervisors in conveying a program of training to workers is not reflected entirely in evidence about the extent to which the supervisors themselves changed, information about their learning is crucial because so much hinges on the supervisors as mediating links. We therefore looked at evidence relating to how much the supervisors learned.

The supervisors and their counterparts who did not receive training completed questionnaires before and after the training period. These questionnaires measured internal processes in the same way that the workers' questionnaires did. Although

the after-measures were taken at the end of the second month, there was undoubtedly considerable learning that took place after this time, both from teaching the material and through periodic consultations with the training supervisor. The results for the supervisors presented below are therefore probably an underestimate of their true improvement.

Changes Effected for Supervisors. The supervisors who had received training were compared with supervisors in counties where no training was given. There were only 11 supervisors in the entire group; thus training had to be virtually 100 per cent effective for results to be statistically significant. In interpreting these results, individual differences among supervisors as well as overall results will be noted.

Looking first at areas of knowledge, it was found that of the six supervisors who received training,[1] three improved in understanding psychological functioning, as measured by the questionnaire, and three did not; two out of three improved in the nontraining group. The improvement scores in the training group, however, were much higher than in the nontraining group. Knowledge of casework practices improved slightly for all but one supervisor in each group. There was no evidence that the training group improved more than the nontraining group in the area of knowledge.

Turning next to analytic skill, it was found that although five of the six supervisors showed improvement in the identification of problems, their improvement was not substantially greater than in the nontraining group. However, in the appropriateness of treatment proposed, all six supervisors in training improved, whereas none of those improved who had not received training—a significant difference.

There was no indication of improvement on motivation to work on problem cases, commitment to the ethics of professional social work, or on attitudes toward ADC cases.

Individual differences among supervisors are pertinent also. One supervisor in a training group found herself unable to

[1] One county supervisor participated in the training program in order to equalize the size of the training groups. However, this supervisor was not expected to train workers.

accept the role of conducting the training program with workers, and was allowed to withdraw from the project. It did not appear from the findings that inability to learn the material accounted for this person's withdrawal. The supervisor showed improvement in one of the two measures of knowledge and in one of the two measures of analytic skill. Her initial attitudes also do not appear to account for her withdrawal. However, there was considerable evidence that her attitudes changed during the project. After training, this supervisor dropped on scores of ethical commitment, and indicated that she no longer felt that service was a legitimate part of the worker's function. Whether these changes in attitudes were a cause or a result of her inability to continue is not known.

If the success of training the supervisors were judged entirely in terms of the above findings, the picture would be bleak indeed. The supervisors not only showed relatively little improvement on the before-after measures, but one of them found it impossible to carry out the teaching function, which suggests that this method of training might have limited feasibility on a large scale. Fortunately, the case does not rest here, for the workers trained by the case supervisors improved in more areas than did the supervisors. We turn now to these findings.

Changes Effected for Workers: Internal Processes. Essentially one method of comparing groups was used to infer the effects of training through case supervisors; it was to contrast the two groups of workers which received training from the case supervisors with the two groups which did not receive training (see Figure 2 on page 28). No other comparisons were required because, again, the workload reduction was found to have no influence on positive changes for workers.

One recalls that in the second experiment the test of knowledge was separated into two parts: techniques of casework relationship and psychological functioning. Table 3 presents the number of workers improving in knowledge in these areas for the four groups of the experiment. The workers who received training through supervisors, whether or not work was

TABLE 3. NUMBER OF WORKERS IMPROVING IN KNOWLEDGE OF CASEWORK RELATIONSHIP TECHNIQUES AND PSYCHOLOGICAL FUNCTIONING, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION (SECOND STUDY)

Area of knowledge	Condition of experiment			
	Training and simplified procedures ($N = 8$)	Training, no procedural change ($N = 9$)	No training, simplified procedures ($N = 5$)	No training, no procedural change ($N = 8$)
Casework relationship techniques	5[a]	4[a]	1	2
Psychological functioning	2	5	2	4

[a] $p < .04$ comparing groups having training through supervisors with groups having no training.

simplified for them, improved significantly in the techniques of casework relationship, as compared with those workers not receiving training. The table shows, however, that training had no influence upon improvement in knowledge of psychological functioning.

As in the first study, analytic skill was considered with respect to three components. With respect to the first two of these, Table 4 shows that the workers who had received train-

TABLE 4. NUMBER OF WORKERS IMPROVING IN ANALYTIC SKILL, COMPARING INDIRECT TRAINING WITH NO TRAINING (SECOND STUDY)

Area of analytic skill	Condition of experiment			
	Training and simplified procedures ($N = 8$)	Training, no procedural change ($N = 9$)	No training, simplified procedures ($N = 5$)	No training, no procedural change ($N = 8$)
Identifying problems in cases	7[a]	5[a]	0	3
Formulating appropriate treatment plans	6[b]	5[b]	0	3

[a] $p < .02$ comparing groups having training through supervisors with groups having no training.

[b] $p < .03$ comparing groups having training through supervisors with groups having no training.

ing improved significantly in the identification of problems in cases and formulating appropriate treatment plans. It is surprising to find that training led to improvement in the formulation of appropriate treatment plans in the second study, whereas in the first study, where the impact of training was presumably stronger, there was no significant improvement.

An explanation may be that there was greater emphasis in the second training program upon the formulation of appropriate treatment plans. One recalls that the supervisors in the second experiment were found to have improved significantly in this area of analytic skill, which probably resulted from an increased stress by the training supervisor on formulating treatment plans.

Turning now to the measures of diagnostic acuity, we find in contrast to the first experiment that the workers in the second did not improve as a result of training. If the measure of diagnostic acuity is viewed as a test of the worker's ability to apply the knowledge of psychological functioning gained in training, the failure to obtain results for this measure is consistent with the finding that the workers did not improve in the area of knowledge involving psychological functioning. Thus it would appear that we have no evidence that training through supervisors leads to improvement in knowledge of psychological functioning.

In contrast to the first experiment, the second experiment revealed no differences in motivation to help recipients. But consistent with the first study are results showing that training through supervisors did not affect commitment to the ethics of professional social work or attitudes toward ADC cases.

Changes Effected for Workers: Performance. In the second experiment the experimental interview was given before and after the experiment. Although this procedure was superior to the after-only measurement for most variables studied, it was not suitable for assessing how much information the workers obtained in interviews. The reason for this was that when interviewing the "recipient" a second time the worker would be going over material she had already covered, at least in

some measure, in the first interview. The worker, therefore, would be expected to have different motivation to obtain information from the "recipient" the second time. The findings bear out these observations: in the second experimental interview the workers generally spent less time and tended to obtain either more or less information than they did in the first interview. These factors would work against finding any measurable increases in the amount of information obtained from the "recipient" in any of the experimental conditions; actually no such increases were found.

But these factors should have had no great effect on how adequately information was used in the interview. The worker should still have motivation to follow up significant information and to explore relevant rather than trivial areas. These features of the way in which information was used were scored for workers in the second experiment. There was found to be no overall relationship between training and how information was used. But expected results emerged when workers who were rated as "low investors" in the second interview were excluded. Thus for the "high investors," training was significantly associated with the appropriate use of information, whereas lack of training was not. Although the scores on investment were not themselves related to training, it would appear that for those investing themselves highly in the test situation there was a relationship between training and the extent to which cues provided by the actress were suitably followed up.

The results for the second experiment for improvement in appropriate reassurance were similar to those obtained in the first. Six of the 16 workers who received training through their supervisors improved in the use of appropriate reassurances in the experimental interview; none of the 13 who did not receive training was found to improve.

For the four brief episodes of the experimental interview the appropriateness of the worker's approaches to treatment was coded. Significant improvement as a result of training was found for the episode which dealt with strength that the

"recipient" displayed. A suitable approach for this episode was essentially the use of appropriate reassurance, and also exploration or clarification. Since most of the responses that contributed to improvement in this episode were appropriate reassurances, it appears that we have further confirmation of the relationship between training and increases in the use of appropriate reassurance. In no other respect were the workers found to improve in their approaches to treatment for the "recipient."

Again it was found that the workers who had received training were as likely to use directive methods of influence as those who did not receive training.

Summary. The success of the indirect method of training of the second experiment depended partly on how much the case supervisors learned from the project's training supervisor and how adequately they taught the workers. With regard to what the supervisors learned, the findings were not encouraging, for in general the supervisors displayed scores comparable to those earned by a control group. Moreover, one of the supervisors found it impossible to carry out the training function, which required another supervisor to carry the burden of training her workers. Claims to success for indirect training thus could not rest on how much the supervisors learned, as measured by tests, or on the general ease of assuming the teaching role.

The most definitive test of whether the case supervisors could effectively train workers, however, was revealed in the changes of the workers trained by the supervisors. Here the results were more encouraging. The workers showed positive change in the following: (a) problem identification, (b) formulation of treatment plans, and (c) knowledge of casework techniques. No other changes of internal processes were found.

The test for changes in performance disclosed significant improvement in appropriate reassurance for workers who had received training. Training was not related to the amount of information obtained from the "recipient" in the experimental interview, but there was some evidence that it was associated

with the suitable use of information. There were no changes of the methods of influence used by the workers or of approaches to treatment, other than the use of supportive techniques.

Simplified procedures were not associated with any positive changes for workers measured in these ways.

Comparison of Effects Upon Workers in the Two Experiments

By comparing the similarities and differences between the results of the two experiments, conclusions emerge that neither experiment by itself strongly supports. What are these conclusions?

1. Reduced workloads, whether accomplished directly by a large reduction of caseloads or by a simplification of work procedures, do not bring about any changes for workers in internal processes or performance. This conclusion is not the patent truism that it would appear to be, for it was conceivable that a reduction of workloads would have broadened the workers' conception of their role, with a reevaluation of what the task of the caseworker is in public assistance. Adopting a new role could well have been reflected in measured improvements in both the area of internal processes and of performance. The importance of not finding any measurable changes in workers due to reduced workloads is that more active efforts to change the roles of workers are required to bring about an upgrading of the performance above the level at which they generally perform.

2. Workers appeared to be more amenable to change in some areas than others. For internal processes, more changes were found in areas involving knowledge and intellectual skills than in those relating to values, attitudes, and beliefs. And considering all aspects of internal process, there were generally more changes in this area than in performance. Thus both experiments disclosed some improvement in knowledge, and in analytic skill. But ethical commitment and attitudes toward ADC cases uniformly remained unchanged. The area of performance that changed in both experiments was reas-

surance and support, but the amount of information obtained by workers, the extent to which they employed directive interviewing methods, and approaches to treatment other than the supportive remained unaffected. There were differences between the results of the experiments, to be sure, but they do not violate the sequence suggested above. Whether the common areas in which change occurred reflect merely the topics emphasized in training or the general points of vulnerability to change is, of course, not known from the studies.

3. Direct training of workers by a special training supervisor brought about more positive changes in workers than training by the case supervisors. In addition to the changes mentioned above which were found for workers in both experiments, the workers who received direct training showed more improvement in knowledge, diagnostic acuity, and motivation to help, as compared with those trained by case supervisors.[1] The superiority of direct training over indirect training is entirely plausible, for the training supervisor had the requisite knowledge and teaching skills for conducting a training program while the case supervisors generally had just acquired the knowledge and lacked previous teaching experience. The superiority of direct training is only relative, however, for there were more areas in which workers changed, regardless of the method of training, than there were among workers receiving direct training as contrasted with those receiving indirect training.

[1] The first two findings derive from a statistical comparison of direct versus indirect training groups in the second experiment; the third finding is based upon positive effects due to direct training in both experiments, and the absence of effects with indirect training.

4. Changes Effected for Families

Is it possible for public assistance workers who have had brief, in-service training to achieve changes in the families they interview? And if so, what are these changes likely to be? This chapter is addressed to these questions.

Before describing the changes found for the 2,500 families involved in the experiments, we report three case histories of families that changed through the efforts of their workers. These histories give meaning to the information abstractly summarized in cold statistics by detailing the concrete problems of ADC families, the specific benefits that the workers were able to provide, and the intimate interpersonal relationship that can develop between a recipient and her ADC worker. A simple, but fundamental point emerges from these cases: public assistance workers who have received in-service training of the kind we describe can help families in many ways.

The cases presented below were selected from the 24 families receiving ADC assistance who were interviewed intensively by the workers receiving training in the second experiment. The researchers interviewed the families before the workers had seen them intensively and at the end of the training period to obtain insights about the dynamics of the helping process, and the relationships workers were able to establish with the families.

Three Families That Changed

A Mother in Conflict.[1] Mrs. Grant presented many nervous symptoms when first interviewed, including extreme stuttering

[1] All names of persons, and in one instance the name of a town, used in the case histories in this monograph are imaginary.

and bizarre vocal intonations. Although she relaxed somewhat during the interview, it was at times difficult for the interviewer to understand her. Her younger son appeared to have similar speech difficulties. Mrs. Grant was dressed in a houserobe and explained that she hadn't been at all well, describing her illness as anemia. Both boys also had health problems. One needed to have his tonsils and adenoids removed, and the other was subject to headaches and attacks of asthma.

The mother was twenty-six, a high-school graduate, divorced, and, as already indicated, had two children, one of whom was illegitimate. Mrs. Grant gave the impression of being well groomed despite her attire, and was extremely well mannered. Her apartment was quite attractive and tastefully furnished. She demonstrated patience and affection toward her son, who was present during the interview.

Mrs. Grant expressed a desire to get a job, indicating that she recognized her nervous condition and felt it was due to difficulty in managing financially. "If I could get a job, you know, feel independent, my nerves would be better. I have become very nervous again. I had a breakdown in '51 trying to pay the bills." Of the recipients interviewed, Mrs. Grant was the only one who responded that ADC was *not* a good thing for her and her family. In giving her reason for this belief she expressed conflict about dependency. "Because children ask questions. The oldest boy has gotten to the point where he'll say, 'Now, why don't you work like so-and-so?' It's hard to explain to them. And then as they grow older you will really have to think about it. They would feel more secure if they could say, 'My mother works at such and such a place.' " She said that she had not, however, been able to find a job that would "cover the whole thing." Mrs. Grant also expressed guilt about past behavior. When asked how she felt about answering questions necessary to establish her eligibility for ADC, she responded, "Well, sometimes, you know, asking about the mistakes you have made—you would like to just bury them—and then sometimes I feel pretty bad about digging up the past, but I know that it's necessary."

On the return interview, dramatic changes were observed. Mrs. Grant had remarried; she had secured full-time employment; stuttering and nervous symptoms had lessened considerably. She appeared much happier and more relaxed. The case

was to be closed as soon as she received her first army allotment check.

What role, if any, had the worker played in these changes? Mrs. Grant had not mentioned her worker in the earlier interview when asked to whom she would go for help with various problems. In the second interview she replied, "My closest friend is my caseworker." Throughout the interview she mentioned how much the worker had helped her, that she had "done all anyone could," but her discussion of help was always general. "She always comes by and we sit down and discuss, you know, the problems: the medicine, the doctor's bills, the children, and the landlady, and how I'm getting along." Interviewer: "Can you tell me more about this?" Mrs. Grant: "Just sit and talk." Interviewer: "Do you feel that it's difficult to discuss some things with the worker?" Mrs. Grant: "No, because I think I have discussed just about everything with her." Mrs. Grant did not relate any of her personal problems or discuss her marriage with the interviewer. From the interview it was impossible to learn any more about events leading up to her marriage and employment.

From the training supervisor it was possible to learn more about what had occurred. Mrs. Grant had been reticent about talking to the worker in the initial visit. It was noted that she misrepresented information concerning a man who had been seen several times at her apartment. Gradually, during subsequent interviews, the woman poured out more and more of her problems and feelings to the worker. At first she had told the worker that she wanted to work but couldn't because of her anemic condition. Within a short time she had obtained employment. Her primary concern centered around whether or not to marry a boy friend. She feared loss of security for the children. The boy friend, who was in the service, had left and was about to be sent overseas. In talking these problems out, the mother was able to come to a decision to marry him. She called him back, and they were married.

During the course of these visits the worker noted that Mrs. Grant's stuttering and nervousness were lessening. On the final visit she noted that the woman did not stutter at all. Mrs. Grant telephoned the worker to tell her about the wedding and thanked her repeatedly for her help.

When offered a helping relationship with the worker, the woman was able to respond and come to a more suitable resolution of her problems; the woman's acute anxiety was reduced and she became more independent. The recipient had been receiving ADC for six years prior to the beginning of the project. Whether or not she would have remained on ADC without the worker's help is difficult to say. It is probable, however, that the worker helped her avoid a prolonged period of distress and possibly a less constructive resolution.

A Family Without Hope. Mrs. Markell appeared in the first interview to be totally without resources or motivation for self-help. A small woman, looking old for her forty-five years, she seemed completely overwhelmed by the problems in her situation and quietly resigned to accept them. The family had recently moved from Alabama and both husband and wife appeared neither to understand nor to be making any attempt to cope with their new environment. Mrs. Markell had not gone beyond the fifth grade in school and had difficulty understanding many of the questions in the interview. She seemed flustered and confused by the situation.

The family was living in a dark, dilapidated shanty which was much too small for its eight members. The husband expressed considerable concern about his inability to work. A large deficit in the budget made it extremely difficult to manage. Both mother and son needed to have teeth extracted.

Since the visits of the public assistance worker Mrs. Markell's appearance had changed remarkably. She seemed much younger, due to increased brightness and self-assurance in her manner, and to a more youthful and attractive hairdo and way of dressing. She had just returned from a domestic job, where she was employed six days a week. The family had moved to a much larger, more substantial home, which was considerably lighter, better heated, and better furnished. The son's teeth had been attended to. The husband had obtained glasses. Additional information from the training supervisor revealed that the husband had been referred to Vocational Rehabilitation, and that this agency was working with him at the time. Mrs. Markell, was able to handle the questions in the interview somewhat better.

All of these changes, according to Mrs. Markell, were due to the efforts of her ADC worker.

It appears at first that the worker in this case was simply providing a number of additional services which accounted for the change, rather than motivating the recipient. For example, when asked how she happened to get a job, Mrs. Markell replied, "I asked her to get it for me. She telephoned to Meadowbrook [a nearby town] and got it." It may be noted, however, that in the earlier interview Mrs. Markell answered the question as to whether she had considered working by saying, "I am not able." This suggests that there must have been some work with Mrs. Markell before she requested help in getting a job. It is certain that the woman's sense of personal value and adequacy had been greatly improved between the first and last interviews, whether it was directly due to the worker's efforts, or to the job, or both.

Mrs. Markell, while mentioning her worker repeatedly and warmly throughout the interview, was able to conceive of help only in terms of the specific services which she mentioned. Her limited ability at verbal communication may have had something to do with this.

She thought that the worker had come to see her because of the many problems with which she had been helped. She explained, "When you need help, she'll come every week. Jes' any day she's liable to drop in." Her attitude toward the visits was certainly positive, although it was expressed largely in the form of a smile or nod.

This family had pressing needs and was apparently totally unable to cope with its situation. The worker was helpful by accomplishing appropriate referrals and by enabling the parents to achieve a greater sense of personal adequacy.

A Family with No Apparent Need. In Mrs. Roth we have a mother who appeared to be functioning fairly adequately and showed some motivation, both in handling current problems and in seeking financial independence. What, if anything, could the ADC worker do here, beyond continuing verification of eligibility? Despite the apparent absence of need for help, there was no indication of real movement toward goals. When the researcher first saw her, Mrs. Roth was vaguely concerned about the separation from her husband and the problem of carrying on by her-

self. When the researcher returned for the second interview, while the mother showed greater concern about this marital problem, she had made definite plans to see a lawyer regarding a divorce, and was prepared to start payments for it. She mentioned that the caseworker had provided her with information as to possible action.

Mrs. Roth mentioned when first seen that she had been trying to find a job. She also spoke of a desire for some kind of special training in nursing or in a beauty school, hopes for her children's education and longing for a house, though she had not formulated plans for any of these. By the second visit of the interviewer she had obtained a part-time job and had organized the other desires into a planned sequence of goals which she hoped to achieve. She saw her chances of getting along without ADC as improved. She was looking for a full-time job which would enable her to take a night course in nurse's training. When this was completed she planned to give one child piano lessons and to put some money in the bank toward payment on a home.

In discussing her plans she mentioned her worker several times, saying how nice it was that the worker had told her about a school of nursing since, "That was what I wanted to be anyway." She mentioned that the worker was going to try to obtain a scholarship for her. With regard to problem areas, the mother said that the teacher had reported an improvement in the school adjustment of one of her children. At another point in the interview she mentioned that the worker had on occasion discussed problems in handling the children and had made helpful suggestions. The interviewer noted an improvement in housekeeping, despite the fact that the mother said this was more difficult to manage since she had been working.

There were several changes in the recipient's attitudes toward her worker and in her concepts of the worker's role. In the first interview this mother was uncertain whether the worker was sympathetic with her situation. In the second she responded that the worker was "very much so." Her overall attitude toward the worker changed from neutral to very positive. In the early interview she emphasized the investigating aspect in describing the worker's job and mentioned help only in "getting money." Afterward she did not mention the investigating aspect at all, and mentioned many other kinds of help in addition to money, including giving of advice, information, and "just talking." When

asked about specific problem areas in the first interview, she thought the worker could not help with any of these because "I would have to work these things out myself." Afterward she thought the worker could help with all her problems, and gave examples of several with which she had helped.

Her perception of the reasons for the regular visits was that the worker would be in the neighborhood and would just drop in "as a friend." Though she mentioned specific ways in which the worker had helped with problems discussed above, she perceived help more in terms of the relationship. To the question "Has the worker helped you with any problems?" she responded, "She's somebody you can talk to. You can talk to her about anything." There was no evidence that concern with maintaining eligibility affected this relationship.

This is a case in which a mother, who was functioning fairly adequately at a constant level of dependency, was given the support and direction needed to mobilize existing motivation and move toward greater independence. It is clear from the researcher's interviews that the worker played a significant role in the various changes described.

Although not all the changes in these families are a direct consequence of the worker's efforts, one could hardly fail to conclude that the workers were instrumental in bringing about many of the improvements. The cases disclose a variety of areas in which family members change; there were changes in the area of marital relationships, employment, personal resources, health, housing, and personal adjustment. The conditions for improvement in the cases were very near optimal; the families were seen often and regularly, and the workers had established positive helping relationships with the mothers.

We turn now to the 2,500 families for whom the conditions for improvement were generally less advantageous. The results for each experiment are reported separately.

Effects of Direct Training and Reduced Workloads

The 1,139 families seen during the course of the first experiment are representative of ADC recipients in only a general

way, for the sample comes largely from the medium-sized, industrialized counties of Michigan. Taking the entire sample, less than half the families were white (44 per cent); over half of the homemakers were thirty-five years old or younger (54 per cent); relatively few families had children two years old or younger (25 per cent); half of the families had been on ADC two years or less.

Other descriptive characteristics of the sample are these: 65 per cent of the families had one, two, or three children; the major cause of deprivation to the children was separation of the parents (18 per cent of the families), unwed motherhood (16 per cent), divorce (13 per cent), illegitimacy of the child plus some other cause of deprivation (10 per cent).

All recipients who happened to come to the attention of the agency during the course of the project were included in the sample. There was no reason to expect that the recipients in one county would be similar to those in another, and they were not in every respect. Thus there was a relatively high proportion of Negroes in the *no-change* county; there was a relatively high proportion of older homemakers in the *training group;* and there was a proportionately high number of unmarried mothers in the *reduced-workloads group*. Also, families often differed from county to county in the number of problems they had and in the number of positive changes found. In order to draw reasonably valid inferences about the possible effects of the conditions of the experiment, it was necessary to control those factors which were known to have some influence upon changes in families. Statistical controls had to be made for the following characteristics of families: race (white versus nonwhite); family size (large versus small); and major cause of deprivation to the children (for example, unwed parenthood, separation, divorce, and so on).[1] By using

[1] Information was available on all families for seven factors which, at the outset, were possible sources of variation among groups of the experiment. These were the presence of infants, the number of children of high-school age, the length of time the family was on ADC, the age of the homemaker, the number of children in the family, race of the family, and the cause of deprivation. The first two of the control factors were eliminated from consideration because the groups of the experiment did not differ in the proportion of families so char-

statistical controls on these characteristics, it was possible to take into account the important ways in which the groups of the experiment were different.

Closings. Closing a case is one objective measure of completed work, although it is not a precise indicator of success in working with the family. Closings were examined and it was found that training was not associated with the proportion of cases closed. The percentage of cases closed was roughly the same—a little over ten—in all groups participating in the experiment.

This result is perhaps deceiving, however, because there are many different reasons for closing cases. Some reasons for closure appeared to suggest a "rehabilitative" outcome for the family, whereas others did not. Examples of the former included closings because the homemaker took employment, the father was no longer incapacitated, or support was being received from the father. Other reasons classified as rehabilitative closures were employment of another family member living in the home; support from some other relative residing outside the home; reunion of the parents where this was reported to the worker; marriage of the mother; and money received from other sources, for example, pensions, OASI.

Examples of reasons for closure classified as "nonrehabilitative" included detecting the father in the home, unsuitability of the home, and refusal of the homemaker to seek employment. Other reasons classed as nonrehabilitative were child

---

acterized. The next two factors—length of time on ADC and age of the homemaker—were eliminated because for neither were there any changes in family life, or in self-support, associated with them. The number of children in the family was kept as a control because it was associated with the number of family problems. As expected, families with fewer children had fewer problems ($p < .10$). Race was kept as a control factor not only because the number of problems in the family varied by it, but also because Negro families were slightly less likely than white families to have positive changes occurring in the areas of family life and self-support. The cause of deprivation to the children was kept as a control factor because, apparently, it greatly influenced the number of problems in the families and the likelihood that positive changes in the area of self-support and family life would occur. Of the three control factors, the last was clearly the most important one in terms of its association with changes in families.

referred for foster care or institutionalized, recipient refused to take legal action against a husband, recipient refused to comply with some other regulation, "excess" property, and inability to determine need.

The category of rehabilitative closures, it is clear, differs from the nonrehabilitative in containing families that had become more self-sustaining and independent, and had not failed to cooperate in some way with the Bureau. Table 5 shows that

TABLE 5. CASES CLOSED FOR REASONS OF REHABILITATION AND NONREHABILITATION, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION
(First Study)

Experimental condition	Reason for closing		
	Rehabilitation	Nonrehabilitation	Other
Training group	27	17	4
Reduced-workloads group	20	10	6
No-change group	8	22	5
	$X^2 = 15.54, p<.01$		

there was a larger proportion of closures classified as nonrehabilitative in the no-change group as compared with the other two, and the groups in which workloads were reduced had a larger percentage of closures classified as rehabilitative. For the second experiment, there was no difference between the percentage of rehabilitative closures for the direct training group (2 per cent) compared with the no-change group (3 per cent). This result would be expected because the direct training group of the second experiment had no reduced workloads and the groups with simplified procedures had saved relatively little time. It appears, therefore, that reduced workloads independently resulted in rehabilitative closures.

Changes in the Area of Family Living. Changes in the area of family life were expressed in three ways. The composite measure classified a family as indicating positive change if there were more positive than negative changes for the family and if it had at least as many positive as negative changes that

could not be attributed to external influences. Referrals were included in this measure along with other changes. The second measure excluded referrals and was therefore termed the restricted measure. In it were included families showing at least one positive change in family life which could not be attributed to influences external to the worker. The base of the percentages for these two measures were families having at least one problem and one worker contact—almost the entire sample. The third measure was successful referrals, which included families referred and making contact with the other agency, where the referral could be attributed to the worker's efforts and no other positive changes occurred for the family. For only 24 per cent of the families was there positive change on one of these three measures.

The results for the three measures are given in Table 6, where it is clear that reduced workloads, whether with or without training, are associated with positive change. For all three measures the no-change group is significantly lower than the other two groups.[1] Training adds only an insignificant amount of positive change over that contributed by reduced workloads. Thus positive family change appears to be facilitated by

TABLE 6. PERCENTAGES OF POSITIVE FAMILY CHANGE FOR THE AREA OF FAMILY LIVING, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION
(First Study)

Measure of positive family change	Condition of experiment		
	Training and reduced workloads ($N = 413$)	Reduced workloads only ($N = 386$)	No-change group ($N = 239$)
Composite change	26	20	1
Restricted change (no referrals)	16	11	1
Successful referral (no other positive change)	7	6	0

[1] Zubins t test for the significance of the difference between proportions was used for the analyses of family change.

reduced workloads, but not by training. The results for the second experiment further support this conclusion. The direct training group, in which there was no workload reduction, had low percentages of positive family change and these were essentially identical with those of the no-change group of that experiment.

The results noted above refer to all families, irrespective of such factors as race, family size, or cause of deprivation—characteristics with respect to which earlier analyses showed that control was necessary. The significant question was whether workloads would be associated with positive family change, controlling for these characteristics. The answer is yes, as Tables 7 and 8 disclose. For each characteristic the

TABLE 7. PERCENTAGES OF ADC FAMILIES IN WHICH POSITIVE CHANGES OUTNUMBERED THE NONPOSITIVE, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION AND BY CONTROLS (FIRST STUDY)

Control characteristics	Condition of experiment: Training and reduced workloads (N = 413)	Reduced workloads only (N = 386)	No-change group (N = 239)
Race			
Nonwhite	31	19	1
White	22	21	1
Family size			
Small	29	18	1
Large	19	20	1
Cause of deprivation			
Absence of mother	6	26	0
Death of father	19	15	5
Incapacity of father	32	24	0
Divorce	24	22	0
Separation	27	26	0
Desertion	36	5	0
Institutionalization of father	31	25	0
Unwed motherhood	30	11	0
Absence of father, nonspecific	50	47	0
Illegitimacy of child, plus other causes	22	19	0

TABLE 8. PERCENTAGES OF ADC FAMILIES HAVING AT LEAST ONE POSITIVE CHANGE NOT ATTRIBUTABLE TO OUTSIDE FACTORS, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION AND BY CONTROLS (FIRST STUDY)

Control characteristics	Condition of experiment		
	Training and reduced workloads ($N = 413$)	Reduced workloads only ($N = 386$)	No-change group ($N = 239$)
Race			
Nonwhite	20	11	1
White	14	10	1
Family size			
Small	18	10	0
Large	15	12	2
Cause of deprivation			
Absence of mother	6	5	0
Death of father	12	0	0
Incapacity of father	11	12	0
Divorce	9	13	0
Separation	21	18	0
Desertion	18	5	7
Institutionalization of father	24	12	0
Unwed motherhood	25	6	0
Absence of father, nonspecific	50	35	0
Illegitimacy of child, plus other causes	15	10	0

no-change group has a percentage of positive change below either or both percentages for the groups having reduced workloads. These results are for the composite measure of change (Table 7) and the restricted measure (Table 8). The percentages for successful referral were too small for undertaking this type of analysis.

The findings take on more meaning when we look at the concrete ways in which families changed. Reduced workloads were associated with positive changes attributable to the worker in almost all specific areas of the broader categories of family relationships; these were health, environment, social responsibility, and individual resources. The specific areas

within the more general categories in which positive changes occurred were housing, housekeeping, patterns of conduct, the development of individual resources (for example, homemaking skills), and a sense of personal value. Also noteworthy are those aspects of family life that showed essentially no positive change. These were the relationship of the children in the family to their relatives and to their siblings, dental needs, environmental relationships involving cultural and minority group conflicts, mental capacity of the family members, and symptoms of emotional disorder. The nature of these latter problems and the short duration of the project would generally preclude obtaining change in most of them.

But what about training? Are we to conclude that training brought about no positive family change, but that reduced workloads did? Let us begin with percentages reported in the tables. The training group had slightly higher percentages of positive change on all measures than the group having only reduced workloads (Table 6), and the small margin of superiority generally held up for the different types of families (Tables 7 and 8). We cannot conclude, however, that the margin, although small, is to be taken at face value. It turned out that the margin was due to a feature of the training procedure. The workers were required to interview frequently a small number of "practice cases," and all 30 changed positively on one or another of the measures. When these 30 cases were removed from the others in the training group, the seeming advantage of training disappeared. The percentage in the training group dropped from 26 to 21 for the composite measure, and from 16 to 13 for the restricted one.

It matters little whether the higher or lower percentages are accepted as the more valid estimates of family change for the training group, for in neither case could one conclude that training was significantly superior to reduced workloads without training. What is significant is the high positive change displayed by the 30 cases interviewed intensively, which indicates that repeated interviews with families increase the likelihood of achieving change.

Changes in the Area of Self-Support. The area of self-support includes indications of actual independence as well as indications of potentialities for self-support. Taking employment would be an example of the first, whereas evolving a plan for employment and developing skills and resources for employment would be examples of the latter. All positive changes occurring between the beginning and the end of the project that could not be attributed to outside factors were coded. Relatively few families showed such positive changes in any of the self-support areas—only 16 per cent.

The results indicated that reduced workloads were associated with positive changes in the area of self-support, and that training added no change above that associated with reduced workloads. The percentage of positive change in the area of self-support for the *training group* was 6; for the *reduced-workloads group*, 7; and 1 for the *no-change group*. The difference between the combined proportions in the training and reduced-workloads groups, as compared with the no-change group, was significant. Findings from the second experiment show that the group receiving training had essentially the same percentage of positive changes in self-support as the no-change group (5 per cent as against 4). The very few negative changes that occurred were scattered unsystematically over the groups.

Does the relationship between reduced workloads and changes in self-support hold up for different types of families for which controls were necessary? It may be seen in Table 9 that in all cases the proportion of changes in the area of self-support for the no-change group is less than the proportion in the other two groups, with the minor exception of families deprived because of the absence of the mother, where there were no changes. Thus the few positive changes that occurred in self-support were associated with a reduction of workloads rather than with in-service training or with the normal operation of the no-change group.

Findings relating to taking employment are of particular interest. For 16 families in the groups having reduced work-

TABLE 9. PERCENTAGES OF ADC FAMILIES HAVING POSITIVE CHANGES IN THE AREA OF SELF-SUPPORT NOT ATTRIBUTABLE TO OUTSIDE FACTORS, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION AND BY CONTROLS (FIRST STUDY)

Control characteristics	Condition of experiment		
	Training and reduced workloads (N^a = 434)	Reduced workloads only (N^a = 417)	No-change group (N^a = 276)
Race			
Nonwhite	9	5	2
White	4	11	0
Family size			
Small	6	7	1
Large	6	7	1
Cause of deprivation			
Absence of mother	0	0	0
Death of father	6	10	4
Incapacity of father	5	4	0
Divorce	9	10	0
Separation	2	5	0
Desertion	9	4	0
Institutionalization of father	2	4	0
Unwed motherhood	6	5	0
Absence of father, nonspecific	0	35	5
Illegitimacy of child, plus other causes	10	4	0

[a] The *N*s for families are larger here than those reported in Tables 6, 7, and 8 because families with no recorded problems could legitimately be included for the analysis of changes in the area of self-support whereas such families were excluded for the analysis of changes in the area of family living.

loads, assistance payments were stopped as a result of a member of the family, or a relative, taking employment. These families constitute about 2 per cent of all the cases. There were no families recorded as having assistance payments stopped for this reason in the no-change group. Moreover, in the training and reduced-workloads groups an additional 33 families had family members or relatives who brought in funds for the partial support of the family. For 19 of these 33 families the funds brought in by the relative or family member resulted in a decrease in payment for at least one month of the

project. In only one family was there a similar contribution in the no-change group. Altogether, then, in the training and reduced-workloads groups, approximately 5 per cent of the families had members or relatives taking employment which resulted in the partial or full support of the family. The similar percentage for the no-change group is essentially zero.

Effects of Indirect Training and Procedural Modifications

The measures for family change for the second experiment were almost identical to those used for the first, and the analyses were performed using the same subgroup of families—those with at least one problem concerning which there had been at least one contact during the project period. The 1,461 families of the second experiment were generally similar in demographic characteristics to the sample of the first experiment, with the exception of race; 61 per cent of the families were white in the first study as compared with 44 per cent for the second.

The results for the second experiment for the five areas in which positive changes were measured are presented in Table 10. The table shows no effects of training or of modified procedures for: (a) the percentage of rehabilitative closures; (b) change in family life, either as expressed as the percentage of families with at least one positive change or as a composite score; (c) successful referrals, where there were no other positive changes; or (d) change in self-support. The results were essentially unchanged when controls were made for race, size of family, and cause of deprivation.

The table also shows that one group differed consistently from the others on four of the five measures. This was the group having simplified procedures and no training. It is not likely that it was the simplified procedures in this group that brought about the changes, because the other group having simplified procedures had lower scores. The fact that the group in question was relatively low on the number of contacts with recipients is further evidence that additional time gained through simplified procedures was probably not responsible

TABLE 10. PERCENTAGES OF ADC FAMILIES HAVING POSITIVE CHANGES, BY EXPERIMENTAL CONDITION (SECOND STUDY)

Measure of positive change	Condition of experiment			
	Training and simplified procedures ($N = 278$)	Training, no procedural change ($N = 258$)	No training, simplified procedures ($N = 153$)	No training, no procedural change ($N = 225$)
Rehabilitative closures	3	4	5	3
Composite change, family life	9	8	20	7
Restricted change, family life (no referrals)	5	6	16	5
Successful referral (no other positive change)	3	3	7	1
Some change, self-support	2	6	3	4

for the changes reported in the bureau. Moreover, there was relatively more complete and accurate recording done in this bureau as compared with the others.

Even though the recording of family change was less complete in the second than in the first experiment, the findings of the second are generally consistent with those of the first. Thus training, independently of reduced workloads, was found to effect no appreciable family change. The finding that procedural modifications were not associated with family change is consistent also when it is remembered that such modifications saved only a small portion of the time that direct workload reduction accomplished in the first experiment. If family change requires intensive contact with families and if procedural modification saves only a small amount of time, little family change would be expected to follow from procedural modifications.

Reduced Workloads Versus In-Service Training—An Interpretive Summary

Although training and saving time are not similar means to attain common objectives, the inclusion of the two in the same experiment makes possible a comparison of the relative effectiveness of each.

The findings may be summarized by the different experimental conditions introduced. There were no positive changes in families associated with the group in which there was no change from the previous mode of operation. In contrast, reduced workloads were independently associated with positive changes for families, as evidenced by a larger proportion of rehabilitative than nonrehabilitative closures, positive changes in the area of family life, and positive changes in the area of self-support. The increment of family-life change brought about by giving in-service training *and* reduced workloads is very small, and in-service training is not associated with changes in self-support or with rehabilitative closures.

These results are for the first experiment, in which the reduction of workloads accomplished an appreciable saving of time for workers. No positive family change was found to be associated with procedural modifications or indirect training. The failure to find positive change in the second experiment, however, does not open to question the results for the first, because the procedural modifications were estimated to have saved much less time for workers than the direct caseload reduction of the first experiment.

It is appropriate to ask why reduced workloads, as accomplished in the first experiment, were effective in bringing about positive changes for recipients. The reduction of workloads obviously increased the time that the workers had to devote to recipients; one recalls that there were approximately three times as many contacts with the recipients in the groups with reduced workloads as in the *no-change group*. The results presented in the preceding chapter have shown that there were no

changes in the workers' skill or ability brought about by reduced workloads, and thus it is the time factor that accounts for positive changes in families.

We get insights into what the workers did with their time in the bureaus with reduced workloads from their spontaneously given observations. These comments are organized topically below:

More frequent family contact. One worker put it this way: "The reduced caseload of the past three months has enabled me to keep in closer contact with my recipients and also to remember them individually and what particular problems confront them. The special study in which I have participated gave me the time to work closer with, and for, my clients."

Increased familiarity with families. Another said: "The ADC study has been very valuable to me. I feel that I have learned a great deal. It has opened a wider scope of attention to the family as a whole, but particularly to the children. It has more or less helped to show symptoms of problems in the family where the mother either was unaware of, or refused to accept or acknowledge, them. The reason for this, I think, is the reduced caseload to the figure where I felt I could take the time to fully discuss each child with the mother."

More time for case conferences. One worker said: "There has been adequate time for case studies and for conferences which heretofore had been more or less brief because of limited time on the part of the caseworker and supervisor.

More frequent referrals. This same worker said: "Referrals to other local agencies have been increased. The advantage of these is reflected in improved planning by the mothers and better adjustment of children in the home and school. In addition, I believe many case records have shown a better picture of the family situation."

Thus it appears that workers used their time to do what they already knew should be done, with the result of bringing about positive changes for families.

Although no attempt has been made to assess the dollar savings that might result from reducing workloads, it is probable that in the long run there would be net dollar savings

accruing directly to the agency through reduced relief costs, and to other welfare agencies through increased self-support and strengthened family living for the recipients. It should not be forgotten, however, that reduced workloads do not bring about any positive changes for the workers and therefore the reduction of workloads is not an appropriate method to bring about improvement of the skill or ability of the workers. Thus there is a definite ceiling on how much workers can accomplish with reduced workloads if they are not also given in-service training.

The failure to find that training would produce reliable effects upon families over and above those contributed by reduced workloads is probably due to the brief period of the experiment and the small number of contacts that the workers had with most of their families. The families seen intensively as "practice cases" in the training sessions of the first experiment all evidenced some positive change in the area of family life. Similarly remarkable results for the families seen intensively in connection with training sessions in the second experiment were found. (See Appendix.) If the workers who had received training had worked intensively with a larger number of families over a longer period of time, the relationship between in-service training and positive changes for families would probably have been larger than was indicated in these experiments.

5. Conclusions

INSTEAD OF REVIEWING IN DETAIL the methods and findings reported in preceding chapters, comments in this concluding chapter are confined to some of the broader implications of the research. We discuss, first, the implications of the studies for conducting routine in-service training and having small workloads in public welfare and, finally, the research experience itself.

Should Workers Have In-Service Training and Small Workloads?

The initial question prompting the studies was whether in-service training and reduced workloads were suitable means of improving nonfinancial services to recipients in Aid to Dependent Children. The two experiments conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of training and reduced workloads revealed selected areas of change for workers and families. The findings were consistent and mutually supporting, thus strengthening our confidence in the results.

But it is nonetheless necessary to draw conclusions cautiously from the results. Because training was effective in bringing about only selected changes for workers, the extent of effectiveness may be differently interpreted, depending upon how much change is expected from training. The association found between reduced workloads and positive family change must be viewed similarly with caution, for the schedules on which family changes were reported produced only rough approximations of the actual changes that occurred. And, finally, only one program of training was studied. A program

placing less emphasis upon rehabilitating families toward appropriate goals through the use of casework may produce entirely different results from those found in these studies. Ensuing comments about the action implications of the studies therefore cannot be taken as corroborated conclusions, even though they are consistent with the findings. The speculations are offered to stimulate further thought and research.

Training would appear to be most effective for public assistance workers when provided by a skilled training supervisor, coupled with ample time for the workers to hold frequent interviews with the recipients. For workers to have the time to work intensively with families they need very small caseloads as compared with most current caseloads—probably as few or fewer than the 50 ADC cases (without applications) set as the level in the first experiment.

But the effects of training—if the program is similar to the one described in these studies—will probably be modest when placed against the numerous changes that one might expect to occur. The workers in the present studies improved in intellectual skills, but showed little measured change in attitudes, values, and beliefs relating to the provision of casework, other than motivation to help recipients. Performance was also an area in which little change was found; only supportive behavior improved with training. Positive changes for families could not be attributed to training independently of reduced workloads or more frequent interviews with families. To achieve improved performance and more extensive attitudinal change, a training program consisting of more than the sixty hours of instruction offered here would appear to be required. But whether families would also show improvement due to longer training of their workers is uncertain, for all that we know from the present experiments is that frequent family contact bears an association with positive changes in families.

If one's objective is to optimize more limited aspects of effectiveness, the findings suggest different prescriptions. Workers do not have to have a special reduction of workloads simply to assimilate the content of training. The workers who

received training but who had no workload reduction improved about as much as those who had training and a large reduction of workloads.

Moreover, in-service training can be given with reasonable success by case supervisors provided, of course, the supervisors are themselves trained beforehand. In the second experiment, where training was given by case supervisors who had earlier received training from the project's training supervisor, it was found that the workers improved almost as much as workers who received training directly from the project's training supervisor. Experience in conducting the training program suggests, however, that some case supervisors may have difficulty in assuming a more formal training role because of lack of previous teaching experience and extensive knowledge of social casework. For these reasons, only selected in-service trained case supervisors or training supervisors with extensive training in casework and past teaching experience would be best suited to give the training.

But the success of training depends upon more than the particular methods and personnel used. A workable conception of the difference between the processes of casework and eligibility determination is required as well. Such clarification helps to define the roles of the workers when undertaking each activity and avoids a confusion of the processes. The distinctions between the processes found to be useful in the training program follow. (1) The casework relationship is voluntary, subject to termination at any time at the discretion of the worker or the choice of the recipient; each shares control and responsibility for the service. The recipient, in contrast, exercises more control than the worker over the payment service. The worker's responsibility is legally defined and not a matter of personal discretion, whereas the recipient may to some extent willfully maintain the conditions that make him eligible for the payment. (2) The casework process involves decisions and inferences covering a wide range of psychological and social factors, whereas payment determination requires decisions, largely legal and objective in nature, about whether need

and eligibility exist as defined in policy. (3) The casework process generally requires more time and has a more unpredictable point of completion than does payment investigation. (4) While the worker-recipient relationship in both the casework process and payment determination is characterized by courtesy, consideration, and respect, the casework process is also characterized by the conscious utilization of the worker's "self" through use of his strengths to permit a controlled degree of dependency and in turn to assume appropriate responsibilities.

A recognition of these differences, we believe, can help the worker avoid intervention in the recipient's right to assistance, and can free the worker for an active approach to casework with the recipient, after first having completed the payment inquiry. The workers who received this orientation in the training program viewed the two processes as complementary, especially in the stage of reviewing eligibility when it was possible to lay the foundation for the casework relationship as numerous concrete matters of fact were discussed.

Training for the provision of nonfinancial services also depends for its success upon factors external to the content and orientation of the training program. Clearly the workers must find casework compatible with payment determination. Thus if a worker lacks conviction that casework has a legitimate function in an income maintenance program, requiring him to provide casework services may be distressing. The same may be said about the significance of eligibility determination. Workers may experience conflict also if the recipient fails to distinguish, as the worker does, between "investigating" for eligibility and the otherwise "helping" activities; if the agency expects casework from workers, but fails to provide sufficient time for it; or if the supervisor and other welfare officials conceive of the two processes at variance with the worker's conception.

As a method for improving services, reduced workloads is fundamentally different from training, for the provision of more time for workers to do their jobs does not promise to

change fundamentally their knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Increasing time for a worker, at best, allows him to make better use of what he already knows. Thus there is an inherent ceiling on how much services may be improved through reduced workloads.

That this ceiling is approached more closely by a large rather than a small workload reduction is not surprising. In the first experiment two groups of workers had their workloads reduced to approximately half the normal level. When compared with a *no-change group*, these groups were found to have produced more "rehabilitative" case closures, and more positive changes in self-support and family living for the recipients. But in the second experiment, where procedural modifications were the means used to reduce workloads, no such positive changes were found. The reason that work simplification was not associated with family change was that a saving of only about 10 per cent of the workers' time was effected. The simplification of work is clearly worthwhile even when it is not reflected in immediate changes for recipients. But to accomplish even modest measurable changes in families in three and one-half months, the studies indicate that workloads must be reduced greatly from most current levels.

The implications of the experiments are sobering for anyone who optimistically believed that in-service training and reduced workloads were simple, assured methods for upgrading services. If the rehabilitative objectives of the 1956 Amendments to the Social Security Act are to be realized even in part through these means for improving services, it seems apparent that long, intensive on-the-job training will have to be given to public assistance workers, along with much smaller caseloads than is the case now in most welfare departments.

An Appraisal of the Research Experience

The experience of conducting these studies has reaffirmed our belief that fruitful investigation may be made of the complex problems of public welfare and social work. Collaboration with an ongoing welfare program can benefit the research as

well as the operating program. Such collaboration enabled the researchers to select significant problems for study that were of practical concern to the welfare officials, and to conduct field experimentation within the Welfare Department under conditions that combined some of the rigor more common to the laboratory with the benefits of studying workers in their natural organizational surroundings.

By participating in planning different phases of the research the welfare officials had an opportunity, without prompting from the researchers, to reappraise existing policies and procedures relating to the topics of the research. Such reexamination is valuable even though it does not always culminate in different policies and procedures. The research findings were perhaps more useful for the Welfare Department because they referred to its own personnel and program. As the results became known, the Department often attempted to change its policies and work procedures, sometimes with success, even though the research did not have the objective of investigating the existing policies and procedures of the Department or of recommending changes for the Aid to Dependent Children Program.

These investigations have also shown that the seemingly elusive and intangible qualities of how the worker thinks and acts and the way recipients respond to welfare services are to varying degrees subject to systematic, objective measurement. The technique of recording the problems and changes of families in specific categories of a schedule was intended to yield observations on relevant problems and changes, gathered systematically, for all families affected in the experiments. This technique was only partially successful, however, because the workers often failed to provide complete entries. With further refinement and vigilant attention to the task of obtaining complete recording of observations, this technique may be an efficient way to obtain information about families that would be available otherwise only through the more time-consuming method of having researchers interview families directly.

The efforts to measure the thought processes and performance of the workers were more successful than the attempts to measure family change. Such internal processes as skill in identifying the problems of families and formulating treatment plans, ethical commitment, and knowledge of casework were found to be measurable through tests constructed especially for such purposes. A similarly direct method of measurement was the experimental interview. This was used to sample the performance of workers who interviewed a "recipient" portrayed by an actress trained to follow a prearranged script defining all aspects of her behavior. It was found that a reasonably lifelike "recipient" could be simulated and, at the same time, her behavior could be standardized with a high degree of predictability. The advantages of an experimental interview over less rigorous methods is that the performance of workers may be ordered and evaluated against a known, relatively constant "recipient."

When the experiments were conceived it was not possible to introduce all the elements of an ideal design. Thus the training program consisted of sixty hours of participation per worker, while more thorough training would have been desirable. There was also little time allowed for families to change. Measures of family change should have been taken after the project at various times as well as before and during its operation. The limitation of having a small number of workers has been noted in preceding chapters. Two to three times as many workers as actually participated would have been desirable to offset the unreliabilities of small samples. These are but a few of the limitations of the experiments determined by lack of time and funds at the disposal of the researchers and by the practical realities of doing research in an ongoing welfare operation.

The limitations indicated above do not invalidate the studies, but they do affect what can be concluded. In a word, the findings of this report constitute a relatively conservative estimate of the more immediate changes that were found to be associated with a brief period of training and reduced work-

loads. The results may be viewed as yardsticks, or points of reference, for comparing the results of future studies which, hopefully, will examine problems related to those studied here. The absence of findings comparable to those obtained in the present experiments made it difficult to judge the effectiveness of training and reduced workloads on any comparative basis. The judgment of the effectiveness of innovations in further studies can at least benefit from knowledge of the changes found in these studies.

APPENDIX

THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Appendix: The Training Program[1]

THIS APPENDIX describes in detail the orientation to the training program, its content, and methods of training; and evaluates the program.

Orientation: Casework in Public Assistance

The philosophy presented here concerning the place of casework in public assistance pervaded the entire training program. Casework service and the giving of financial assistance have a common base in Aid to Dependent Children and other programs of categorical assistance. Both have the welfare of society, of the family as a whole, and of individual parents and children as their ultimate objective, and both are predicated on concepts of democracy and of the value, dignity, and rights of the individual.

Beyond this base there are differences between the two services and the respective processes through which they are implemented. Assistance is a service that must be given, or to be more precise, paid to the applicant, regardless of the use made of it or any other evaluative considerations, as long as the recipient's situation meets the defined criteria of eligibility. Casework is a service that is extended only as long as the worker considers that the recipient is making constructive use of it and desires it. Evaluation of the use made of the service is an essential element of casework, and the worker bears the responsibility of terminating the service when it is not needed or not achieving constructive results. In short, *payment* service can be terminated only for reasons specified in the eligibility

[1] The Appendix is based upon material prepared by Pauline Bushey, the project's training supervisor, who formulated the content and procedures of training.

requirements; *casework* can be terminated at any time at the worker's discretion or the recipient's choice. This difference has a number of implications, one of the most significant of which is that worker and recipient share control and responsibility for the casework service. The recipient alone has relatively more control over the payment service in that he can, to a degree, maintain the conditions that made him eligible for payment.

A second difference lies in the nature of the decisions involved in the respective processes. The assistance service requires decisions as to whether the circumstances in a family situation do or do not come within certain conditions, essentially of a legal nature, which are objectively defined in public assistance policy. In the casework process, decisions involve exploration of motivation, identification of problems, and selection of treatment objectives; they involve evaluation of competence in behavior, judgment, and conscience, of personal and mental endowments, and of the quality of the intrafamilial relationships. Such decisions and evaluations necessitate the use of norms and values. In theory, diagnostic and treatment considerations can be brought into the eligibility determination process as the worker aids the applicant or recipient in thinking through the choices involved in applying for assistance and in accepting or refusing it on the terms on which it is available. In practice, the recipient may and very often does have his choices already made and would resist the worker's bringing in any considerations beyond those necessary for processing the payment. The ADC program has been in operation over twenty-five years, and the terms of eligibility are well known. Many recipients today know how much money they "may" have and still be eligible; how much money they "may" earn without grant reductions; how long they "must" live in a community to receive payment; how long they "must" have been separated from a husband to receive payment, and so on. They have often made their "determination" in these matters before coming to the agency, sometimes with the help of a public official or a private attorney. From a case-

work point of view, the worker may consider some of these choices and determinations to be unwise, but it would be inappropriate and possibly contrary to policy for him to try to raise questions about them in the course of determining eligibility for payment.

A third difference has to do with the worker-recipient relationship. In processing the assistance application or case review, the worker's relationship to the recipient should be characterized by courtesy, consideration, and respect; nothing beyond this is essential to eligibility determination, and indeed this may be the limit or extent of the relationship preferred by some who apply for assistance. The worker-recipient relationship in casework service is also characterized by these qualities, but in addition requires that the worker draw upon and utilize his own strengths in an active helping process, permitting a certain controlled degree of dependency and assuming corresponding responsibilities in turn. It is in this way that the relationship acquires the importance and emotional significance to the recipient which enables him to relinquish unrealistic and self-defeating "solutions" of his problems and to move toward more responsible and mature solutions.

Timing is a fourth difference. The payment service is completed when eligibility is determined and payment begins or is continued. The casework process continues through frequent interviews until it is determined that there is no need for casework, or that the recipient does not want, or cannot use, it.

A recognition of the differences between the two services and their respective processes can help the worker avoid inappropriate intervention in the recipient's right to assistance. Even more important, it frees the worker for an active approach to casework with the recipient. When the two services are not realistically separated, a worker may find it difficult and bewildering to help the recipient establish or maintain his eligibility, while at the same time trying to help him move toward independence. If both are purposes of the program, which takes precedence? If assistance is seen as having first priority in time, the worker can process the grant with appro-

priate courtesy and dispatch. Thereafter a relationship on a different level can be offered, which the recipient is free to reject.

The Content of Training

The content of the training course was the same in all essential respects for both years of the project. It was organized around several central topics. The first was the helping process which was comprised of four topics: problem identification, current living situation of the recipient, personality structure and functioning, and motivating and treatment techniques. The helping process was presented as the means by which the worker could enable a recipient to move toward a more satisfying living experience and one that would utilize more fully his maximum strengths and capabilities. The helping process was described as deriving its dynamic or effective quality from the relationship that develops between recipient and worker, which was the second theme. Underlying the helping process and the worker-recipient relationship were a number of assumptions about the nature of human behavior. These assumptions constituted the third theme. The content covered in each of these areas is described below.

Problem Identification. For purposes of study, problems to be identified were divided into two types: manifest problems and implied, underlying problems. The former were defined as behavior patterns or environmental circumstances that interfere with constructive family living or an individual's achievement of social and economic independence; they are specific and overt. An underlying problem was defined as an explanation, hypothetically stated, that accounts for one or more of the manifest problems.

Problem identification required that the worker note both the circumstances and behavior patterns regarded as "problems" by the recipient, and also the circumstances and behavior patterns regarded as problems according to prevailing standards of society. The selection of priorities in beginning work with the recipient, and the determination of goals de-

pended, in large measure, upon accurate identification of problems and awareness of *whose* frame of reference was being utilized in designating something as a "problem." The identification of norm-deviant behavior was clearly differentiated from "judging," "condemning," and other hostile or punitive processes.

The identification of underlying problems was at first a matter of speculation for the worker. Such speculation was freely encouraged even at an early stage of the training experience because some of the intuitive insights frequently appeared to have validity (indeed, subsequent developments in case situations often confirmed them), and because it encouraged a more imaginative and analytical orientation than is typical of a worker's attitude toward a recipient's behavior. Also, it stimulated curiosity about the functioning of the human personality. The relevance of problem identification to the training goal of motivation was brought out by emphasizing the fact that a worker must know the problems that impede an individual from constructive achievement before he is in a position to be helpful in the resolution of such problems.

The Current Living Situation of the Family. The helping process was described as proceeding in a series of interacting experiences as worker and recipient work together on different problems. The process is more likely to be effective, and to move forward successfully, if the worker has a realistic grasp of the current "life-situation" of the family as a group and of its individual members. Such overall knowledge makes possible a wiser selection of problems with which to begin work, and of feasible goals toward which to plan. Although the circumstances of a current living situation are interacting and interwoven with one another, they must be separated for purposes of study.

The current living situation was broken down into these categories: age and sex, roles, physical health, psychological health, economic situation, and the social-environmental situation. Each of these constitutes an important facet of the current life-situation of an individual or a family. A sufficient number

of facts in each area was ascertained to assure that it was understood, and to place it in realistic perspective to all other areas. Equally important were the feelings and attitudes which the recipient had about these facts. The categories of the current living situation were not formally defined but were discussed and explored, with illustrations drawn from the "practice cases" and others.

Age and sex have a bearing on the goals and objectives that might appropriately be considered. They were taken into account in gauging motivation for change and the quality of intra-family relationships, especially parent-child relationships. They were described as playing an important part in the development of the worker-recipient relationship.

Roles were considered extensively within the following framework: that there is a multiplicity of roles in an individual's life-situation, in that he may simultaneously be spouse, parent, employer, employee, neighbor, social group member, church group member, political party member, peer in one group, leader in another, and so on; that he may have recognized (and unrecognized) expectations of himself in each of these various roles, others may have expectations of him, and he may have expectations of others; that there may be adequacy of functioning in some roles and impairment of functioning in others; and that an awareness of the different roles carried by a recipient helps to make possible a more insightful understanding of his current living situation.

In considering physical health, the worker was encouraged not to think in terms of making medical diagnoses, but to use his observations about the recipient's general health (impairments, vitality, fatigue, weight in relation to age, and so forth) to assess the advisability of planning toward medical examination, or toward preventive or corrective measures. With respect to physical health it was noted that it had an effect on attitudes, feelings, and hopes, and was in turn affected by them; similarly, that health status affects functioning and the relationships in an individual's life, and may in turn be affected by what the person does and the kinds of relationships he has

(or lacks); and that physical health, current and potential, is a major determinant of goals and objectives which may feasibly be contemplated.

Workers, of course, were not encouraged to diagnose mental illness, but were helped to make observations about behavior, appearance, and conversation, which lead to general impressions of the current psychological health status of an individual. Suggested criteria of good psychological health included the following:

1. The recipient is in equilibrium, rather than in such psychological states as are described by the familiar expressions "going to pieces," "scared stiff," "beside himself," "going downhill," "losing his grip," "going from bad to worse."
2. The recipient is happy in reasonable relationship to his circumstances. He is neither irrationally gay and "slap-happy" in the midst of real trouble, nor morose, fear-ridden, sad, and hopeless in a situation which includes some rewarding aspects.
3. The recipient's behavior is reasonably purposeful and goal-directed in relation to his circumstances. He is neither ambitious for goals which are unrealistic in view of his personal endowments and his current life-situation, nor willing to settle for life objectives which do not utilize his capacities and potentialities. The prayer written by Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, which is used as the creed of Alcoholics Anonymous, expresses this succinctly: "Oh God, give us serenity to accept what cannot be changed, courage to change what should be changed and wisdom to distinguish the one from the other."

The worker was encouraged to use the criteria in these ways. When behavior, appearance, or conversation falls markedly outside such criteria, especially the first two, it is probable that the recipient is suffering some kind of psychological disturbance and psychiatric consultation is indicated. If not available, it is still entirely possible that a supportive relationship can be established with the recipient and, on a trial-and-error basis, it may be possible to find out whether he can use this relationship to work out more satisfying solutions to his problems. The effort to establish and develop a relation-

ship is contra-indicated, as a broad general rule, only when behavior is markedly bizarre or eccentric and is associated with a definite pattern of withdrawal from human associations, or when behavior is characterized by excessive and extreme fear and suspicion, associated with tendencies to believe that others plan to attack his well-being.

The economic situation as a facet of a recipient's current life-situation was, of course, the one most familiar to the workers. Most of them had a broad knowledge of the array of facts that require consideration to achieve a realistic grasp of the financial realities of a recipient's life. As with the other aspects, the feelings associated with the various facts of the economic situation were regarded as important as the facts themselves, for they indicated problems and suggested solutions, and revealed much about a recipient's values and characteristics.

The environmental aspect of the current living situation included housing, neighborhood, and cultural, religious, national, and social group affiliations. It was described as a facet which is particularly important to understand in the life-situation of recipients who are members of minority and displaced groups, because differing values and loyalties may be involved and may be in conflict with one another. This aspect of the total living situation was considered in connection with the various roles that the recipient enacted.

Exploration of background history was not described as being essential in undertaking the helping process. The rationale for this rather unorthodox decision was somewhat as follows. The recipient's past experience has value for a caseworker in understanding the current situation and behavior, in more or less direct ratio to the worker's knowledge of the growth and developmental processes of the human being from infancy through old age. In a short-term training course it is impossible to cover such extensive content. It was also thought that an exploration of the vast amount of information which comprises the past history of an individual or a family, could become unmanageable from the standpoint of making disci-

plined and selective use of it in evaluating the current situation. Therefore, the past was dealt with only to the extent that chronicity of salient aspects of the current situation was considered and evaluated. In particular, problem areas in the recipient's life-situation were scrutinized with a view to ascertaining whether they were recent and "new" experiences for him, or whether they were of a continuing nature, and only repeated, in new forms, old problems that were typical of the past.

Personality Structure and Functioning. Personality structure and functioning were covered under three headings: the impulses, the conscience, and the ego functions. Content for this area was drawn from psychological literature which is extensively utilized in social casework.[1]

Study of the impulses centered around the innate human capacities for loving and hating; for being aggressive in constructive and destructive ways, and for acquiring values and standards of a social and anti-social nature. The influence of earlier experiences on the impulses was dealt with only in a general way. The view presented was that if the individual has had his basic needs for care, love, and dependency met well and consistently in infancy, his positive capacities for loving, being constructively aggressive, and acquiring socially useful values are fostered. Conversely, if the needs of an individual were not met in his infancy, or if they were met in inconsistent and frustrating ways, the negative capacities for hating, being destructively aggressive, and for acquiring anti-social

[1] See: Alexander, Franz, *Fundamentals of Psychoanalysis*, William Norton and Co., New York, 1948; Alexander, Franz, T. M. French, and others, *Psychoanalytic Therapy*, Ronald Press Co., New York, 1946; English, Oliver Spurgeon, and Gerald H. J. Pearson, *Emotional Problems of Living*, William Norton and Co., New York, 1945; Erikson, Erik H., *Childhood and Society*, William Norton and Co., New York, 1950; French, Thomas M., *The Integration of Behavior*, vol. 1, Basic Postulates, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1952; Freud, Anna, *The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense*, International Universities Press, New York, 1946; Fromm, Erich, *Man for Himself*, Rinehart and Co., New York, 1947; Mullahy, Patrick, *Oedipus—Myth and Complex*, Hermitage Press, New York, 1948; Sullivan, Harry Stack, *Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry*, William Alanson White Psychiatric Foundation, Washington, 1947. Also content was drawn from the lectures and other material from a seminar in social casework conducted by Mrs. Helen Harris Perlman, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago; and some of the material covered in Mrs. Perlman's seminar was subsequently incorporated into her book, *Social Casework*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1957.

values are fostered. No attempt was made to document the view or interpretation of the impulses outlined here, or to elaborate it intellectually. It served primarily as an organizing concept, around which the workers could explore their own ideas about impulses and impulsive behavior, and around which they could bring together their observations about impulse-based behavior in recipients. It also served a useful purpose in their trying to identify and evaluate the quality of a recipient's underlying impulse needs, hostile or benign, constructively or destructively aggressive, social or anti-social.

Content dealing with conscience included some of the following ideas: that conscience constitutes that part of the personality which embodies the standards, ideals, self-expectations, and sense of obligation which an individual has; that it strongly influences behavior; that the human being has no conscience at birth, but he does have a capacity for developing one; that, initially, controls of impulse-directed behavior are imposed by the parents and only gradually over a period of time do they become internalized, so that the child controls his own impulse-directed tendencies even though no one is present to observe or to enforce control.

Several types of conscience defect were described: the rigid, punitive, inhibiting conscience, which places unreasonable limitations on the pleasures and enjoyments that a person could appropriately permit himself; the conscience with "blind spots," which permits behavior, in particular areas only, that run counter to an individual's professed standards and ideals; the "weak" conscience, which produces so little guilt that it is ineffective in curbing and controlling impulse-directed behavior; and the pathologically underdeveloped conscience, which permits guilt-free indulgence in anti-social or delinquent behavior.

Responsibilities of the worker were stressed: to be a model of a whole and dependable conscience for the recipients; to accept an individual, but not to approve his anti-social or self-destructive behavior; and to avoid contemptuous or condemnatory evaluation.

The ego was described as the sum total of the functions that maintain the personality in operation as a whole.[1] The various ego functions were described with the primary objective of giving the workers a tool that would help them look for various areas of functioning in the behavior of recipients, and to evaluate the strength and adequacy of functioning in the different areas. Six such areas were covered. Perception was roughly equated with acuity and accuracy of observation, and awareness of factors and aspects of the immediate reality situation, both external and internal. Integrative functioning was described in terms of the individual's ability to learn from past experience, his "common sense," and the quality of his judgment. Executive functioning, or action, was described as the ability to carry out plans and decisions. The function of maintaining relationships was described, as well as the fact that each individual has his own characteristic way of relating to other people. Frustration tolerance was explored, and related to material about impulsive pressures.

The function of maintaining a defense system was explored extensively. The training objective regarding defenses was not to give the workers intellectual exercise, but to help them note more precisely the distortions and irrationalities of thinking and behavior in recipients, and to gain some understanding of the underlying reasons for these. The overall interpretation of defenses was as follows. Rational means of dealing with problems and responsibilities sometimes cannot be maintained because the "truth," or the reality of the situation, is too painful to be faced; it is too frightening, too overwhelming, too threatening to self-esteem or self-expectations. Since the problems and responsibilities still have to be dealt with in one way or another, the ego then mobilizes substitute defense mechanisms that protect painful areas sufficiently to enable the person to go on functioning. In varying degrees, awareness of the

[1] Descriptive rather than technical terms were used throughout the course. There is, however, no adequate substitute for the idea encompassed by the word "ego." For all other technical terms, brief written definitions were made available to facilitate reading which the worker might wish to undertake in the social work literature, but these definitions were not used in group discussion.

"truth," or the reality of a situation, is blotted out, or repressed, when defenses are utilized rather than wholly reasonable means of adapting to circumstances or dealing with problems. The threats, conflicts, and pressures that lead even the so-called mature and well-adjusted person to make use of defensive devices were explored at considerable length. The more common defenses were described in this way:

> Probably the best defense is to take the unacceptable impulse and use its energy for something good or useful (*sublimation*); for example, overcoming fears by mastering or excelling in an activity that involves doing the thing of which one is fearful.
>
> We offer excuses that are not true or are only partially true (*rationalization*). There are practically always a number of motivations at work for any activity or any attitude. We rationalize when we select an acceptable motive to explain our behavior or our attitude and conveniently ignore other motivations which are in operation but which we do not like to see or admit. This is a defense we all make use of at times.
>
> We blame others for something that is really our own fault. This defense (*projection*) can often be seen at work in children, as for example, the child who drops the dish and then says, "The floor broke it." Obviously this is a defense against fear of punishment by the parent. In later life it can equally be a defense against fear of punishment or condemnation by one's own conscience. This defense in an adult is an unhealthy one and, carried to extremes, a person may attribute all of the destructive impulses which he himself feels, to other people, even to the point that he may become fearful, suspicious, and accusatory of others with no reality basis whatever, and may excuse himself of all responsibility for creating problems, or for helping to solve them.
>
> A person may be unreasonably hard on himself, or critical of himself (*self-punishment*), sometimes to such extremes that he is always hurting himself "accidentally." This is often seen when individuals deprive themselves unnecessarily of opportunities for pleasant and rewarding experiences, or put up unnecessarily with impositions on the part of others. At first it is hard to see how this is a "defense," but the thing happening here is that the individual is having such angry, resentful, destructive feelings that he feels guilty about them and can only endure his guilt by persistent self-

punishment. The self-punishment is thus a defense in that he is more at peace with himself than if he gave in to his resentful and destructive impulses.

Unreasonable fears or phobias are substituted for the real fears (*displacement*). Examples commonly seen in children include a fear of the dark and fear of thunder. What happens here is that the child has fears, not of these items as such, but of other things which it is not safe to talk or think about. A person can dislike someone close to him and not be able to admit this to himself, but be able to hate, instead, another person who resembles the disliked person.

It is possible, when a person feels ambivalent toward a person or a situation, that he does not want to admit to himself the negative feelings and so he covers them up by greatly exaggerating the positive side (*overcompensation*). Thus when we see a parent overprotecting a child, we can speculate that this parent actually has some quite strong feelings of rejection of the child and he is compensating for these feelings by the exaggerated protection—which, of course, actually works to harm the child though in an indirect manner which the parent refuses consciously to recognize. This is a widely used defense. Frequent examples are boasting to cover up a feeling of inadequacy; shyness to cover up a wish to show off; excessive pity to cover some pleasure in the misfortunes of others, and so forth.

A simple refusal to admit something is a very common defense (*denial*). This can easily be seen at work in the child who announces loudly, "I am not afraid of the dark," even when he hangs back and avoids the darkened room. This can be carried a step farther where the child may say, "I *like* the dark." Whenever we see an individual protesting too much, it is advisable to speculate whether the opposite of what he is protesting may not be the "real" truth.

Sometimes in the early years a person has to adopt a certain behavior pattern in order to defend himself as well as possible. An example is the person who got along best in the family by permitting the older brothers and sisters, as well as parents, to boss him around and impose on him. This becomes a habit pattern and continues on in life, with the result that such a person practically invites people to impose on him. Obviously this habit pattern no longer serves any useful purpose and in fact is self-

defeating (*repetition compulsion*). The habit of indulging in behavior that "invites" punishment is another example. Stereotyped activities that serve no useful purpose, such as excessive scrubbing, are also compulsive defenses.

An individual may "pull inside himself" and not make the effort to use his abilities (*ego constriction*). It is hard to distinguish between passivity that is ego constrictive, and passivity that is due to mental dullness or prolonged lack of stimulation and opportunity.

A very commonly found defense, and in fact one which nearly everyone makes use of to some extent in time of stress, is that of backsliding into a more dependent kind of behavior than is characteristically true of that person's way of operation (*regression*). Many of our recipients are experiencing stress and conflict situations and it is important to distinguish between a reasonable or unavoidable degree of dependency, and regression to a degree of dependency that is unrealistic. It is also important to bear in mind that a recipient may have much more strength and competence than he shows in time of stress, which is the time the social worker is likely to see him.

Psychosomatic illness and symptoms are sometimes considered to be defense mechanisms. We are familiar with the cold or headache that suddenly comes on just when a most unpleasant responsibility confronts us.

Even with the aid of the fairly simple configuration covering impulses, conscience, and ego functions, it was evident that personality structure and function was a large subject for a training course of limited duration. It was, however, thought to be more important to give a whole picture than to give depth and detail for any one part of it. The ADC worker daily sees people whose behavior falls within the broad limits of the so-called normal, as well as others whose behavior is pathological in varying degrees. A holistic presentation of personality functioning may well be more helpful in enabling the worker to understand the meaning of many different kinds of behavior than a more thorough study of a few aspects of personality functioning which may or may not be applicable to the particular case.

The content includes relatively little that is entirely new. It constitutes not so much a new "body of knowledge" as a way of organizing knowledge which, to one degree or another, is already familiar to the worker, but is used intuitively rather than in a conscious, disciplined way. By being organized, with the various aspects of personality functioning related to one another in a schematic fashion, the worker's previous knowledge drawn from his own life experiences, becomes more usable. In addition, an overall view of this material enables the worker to see his own strengths more clearly.

The avoidance of technical terminology facilitated the workers' identifying what they "already knew," and integrating it into new patterns. The process of patterning old information in new ways seemed to promote a new way of looking at people, a way which was at once more accepting and more analytical, more empathic, and more evaluative.

Motivating Techniques. A knowledge of the various techniques that are used in the interview was presented as the fourth element of the helping process. It was emphasized that skill in using techniques is helpful, but that it does not take the place of any of the other elements in the total helping process. It was noted that help can be effective even though in any one interview a worker misses an opportunity to use a technique, or even if he misuses a technique, occasions to use "techniques" keep coming as frequently as trolleys on a busy streetcar line. But, conversely, it was stressed that no matter how brilliant the use of techniques in an interview, if the relationship is not dependable and if the problem identification is faulty, casework service will be ineffective. Techniques were described in this way:

> *Exploration.* If the worker is uncertain as to why a recipient is telling something, or asking a question, or making a request, complaint, accusation, and so forth, it is wise to make further inquiry as to just what the recipient has in mind, and why it is important to him.
>
> *Suggestion and question.* This is a kind of indirect advice-giving, and does not arouse defenses to the degree that direct advice does, because it leaves the recipient free to reject it without making an

issue of the matter. Moreover, it gives the recipient an opportunity to bring out his reactions to the idea being suggested.

Clarification. This is the process of correcting distorted ideas such as fears, prejudices, notions that are unrealistic, and the like. There are two means of clarification:

a. Direct approach. This is directly facing the recipient with the real facts. Such a process is indicated when the recipient knows, *consciously*, that he is distorting, as in purposeful deception. It is necessary to be sure of the facts and to be nonaccusing in manner. One "accepts the recipient" even though one shows up the behavior for what it is.

b. Indirect approach. When distortions are defenses (that is, the distortion is wholly or partly *unconscious* and the recipient really "believes" it), they should not be directly contradicted or disproved but they can often be approached indirectly. Example: A mother exaggeratedly criticizes and depreciates her child because she is *really* afraid she is a bad mother. Worker might: (a) give appropriate reassurance by saying, "You have wanted so much to help and understand John, haven't you?"; (b) draw out ideas and feelings by saying, "Can you tell me more about John's behavior; what are some examples?"; (c) comment on the probable fact of the matter by saying, "Johnny may have some good qualities too."

Verbalization of feelings. Sometimes it is quite evident that a recipient is in the grip of strong feelings, which may be either hostile and attacking, or positive and benign, but he cannot bring the words out to express them. It is frequently very good technique to verbalize that a person may be feeling somewhat angry, somewhat proud, somewhat pleased with someone in the family or himself, and that it is all right to say so if he wishes. This "gives permission" to have feelings without having to feel guilty about it. It is usually the best technique to use when a recipient reacts to a worker, during the interview, with embarrassment, anger, or fear.

Direct advice. This technique is usually futile and often arouses added defenses. It may be indicated sometimes for recipients in real trouble, as for example, having difficulty with the law. Also, direct advice may be helpful for the impulse-ridden client who has weak self-control (poor frustration tolerance) as a kind of external control to help bolster the weak internal controls. To be

effective, however, direct advice when offered must always be given as an expression of concern for the individual's welfare—an attitude of "I am on your side."

Interpretation. The process of explaining to a person *why* he has developed a distorted idea, irrational prejudice, or an untrue fixed idea; *why* he behaves in ways that go counter to his own welfare, and so forth. This technique is never an appropriate one for a caseworker to use, except under supervision of a consulting psychiatrist.

Universalization. Such a process consists in pointing out that most human beings, at some time or other, share the same miserable experience the recipient is enduring. It is usually quite helpful to the anxious recipient who feels frightened or inadequate, or that he has been a great failure.

Identification and approval of evidences of ego strength. If any of the techniques can be identified as most important, it is this one. It is applicable to all cases, and is equally applicable in the early interviews and later when the relationship is more stable. This is not to be confused with *superficial* compliments. It is necessary for the worker carefully to evaluate the personality of the recipient, so that he may be sure that he is correctly perceiving genuine evidence of real strength in some area of ego functioning and is not being misled by a deceptively nice-looking defense. Obviously, it is damaging to recognize and praise behavior or words which later prove to be wholly or partly unrealistic.

Information giving. Giving pertinent, factual information which a recipient needs in planning or carrying out a plan is always appropriate. (Be sure to ascertain that the person does not already know what you are explaining, or he may feel that you are belittling him.)

Ventilation. The process of permitting a recipient to "unload" a flood of pent-up feelings, usually of a hostile nature. There is often considerable value in letting a recipient release such pent-up feelings, although this is often followed by a reaction in which the recipient may feel guilty and ashamed for having "let go." It is, therefore, usually wise to prepare a recipient for the fact that he may feel a little reaction afterward and that it will not be necessary for him to be worried about having said too much.

Limit setting. Hostile ventilation should not be permitted to go beyond reasonable limits. Similarly, inappropriate behavior

should be controlled. For the recipient of poor organizing and managing ability, who tends to scatter his energy and plans in all directions, it sometimes has treatment value for the worker to structure the interview quite closely, holding the subject matter to very realistic topics and plans, and even controlling the conversation.

Gifts. Gifts of a material or service nature are often very helpful in promoting a relationship, as well as in meeting a realistic need.

Help in doing something. Such help consists in looking for a house, finding a job, looking for clothes, and so forth. This technique is often indicated for recipients with generally poor ability to organize and manage (weak executive function of ego), and for recipients who are temporarily overwhelmed by misfortune. Active help of this kind must be sensitively limited to what is needed and to what the recipient can accept and use constructively.

Referral. This treatment technique follows our giving all possible appropriate service. (Referral procedures were not studied in this course.)

Skill in the use of techniques was described as lying in the worker's knowing when to use one rather than another with a particular recipient at a particular time. It was stressed that this skill arises less from a knowledge of the various techniques themselves than from an understanding of the recipient and his situation, and of his needs at a certain moment.

Worker-Recipient Relationship. A major theme of the training course was that the relationship is the medium by which the worker helps the recipient achieve a change of behavior through the conscious utilization of the worker's strengths. The worker-recipient relationship was not formally defined, but was described in terms of a number of the conditions that characterize an effective and useful relationship.

> The worker will try to ascertain the recipient's underlying feelings about his problems and the members of his family, will be on the alert for distorted or irrational feelings, but will seek to understand rather than to oppose or resist such distortions.
>
> The worker will try to ascertain the recipient's ideal or concept of himself and his situation, will be on the alert to note discrep-

ancies and distortions between this ideal and the reality situation, but will seek to understand such distortions rather than to oppose and challenge them.

The worker will be strictly honest in the relationship, refraining from approval if it cannot be given validly. Acceptance and approval of deviant and destructive behavior depreciates the recipient's constructive potentialities and, therefore, in the long run undermines the relationship.

The worker will try to define his own appropriate degree of responsibility in the relationship, and to be dependable in meeting it.

The deeper and more secure the relationship, the more the worker may test the recipient's ability to feel and act more appropriately, and to plan more realistically.

The worker will try to understand his own feeling reaction to the recipient, and to control the outward expression of negative feelings.

The worker will keep in mind the fact that the relationship with the recipient is maintained to carry out the purposes and responsibilities of the ADC program, and not for the worker's personal gratification, although satisfaction in helping a recipient solve his problems is usually a by-product of successful casework.

Assumptions About Human Behavior. To state that one person can help another achieve constructive change is to make several assumptions about the nature of human behavior. The most obvious, for example, is that the behavior of individuals is capable of change. In the training course described here an effort was made to identify the principal assumptions about human behavior that underlie the provision of services, within the ADC program, aimed at motivating recipients toward maximum self-sufficiency. These assumptions are broader in scope, of a more fundamental nature, and involve value-judgments to a greater degree than the theories concerning personality presented in a preceding section. They were described as convictions or beliefs accepted by most members of the social work profession. The training objective was to stimulate the workers to take a new look at their own thinking about these assumptions and to assess the validity of their own con-

victions. As formulated for the workers, the assumptions were the following:

> Behavior is understandable when viewed as the way an individual manages his internal needs and pressures, and the circumstances and pressures of his external environment.
>
> Behavior is capable of being modified by changes in capacity for managing internal and external pressures, by changes in other internal factors, by changes in the external situation, or by any combination of these.
>
> Capacity for appropriate management is diminished when pressures, either internal or external, approach the limits of tolerance.
>
> A person recognizes some of his internal needs and pressures, misperceives, or is unaware of others.
>
> In our democratic culture the right of determining one's own behavior should be respected within legal limits.
>
> Relationship is the medium through which a worker helps a recipient achieve a change of behavior, and the essential means is the conscious utilization of the worker's strengths in the helping process.

The focus on motivating for strengthened family life and maximum social and economic self-sufficiency, which was the essential theme of the training course, was maintained by identifying the motivational aspects and potentialities associated with each of these principles.

Conditions, Methods, and Procedure of Training

Although the content of the training program and techniques of instruction were the same for both years of the research project, there were differences in the method of introducing training to workers. During the first year, training was conducted by the training supervisor, who was a staff member of the research group. The second year of the study, the training supervisor presented the training course to the case supervisors in the bureaus, and they in turn trained the workers. In each year some sixty hours of training were given each training group over a period of three and a half months. During the combined two years of the research, training was

given to a total of 31 workers, five case supervisors, and one county supervisor; and 68 practice cases received special study and treatment.

In general, the workers selected for training were those who were rated as satisfactory in job performance, who had been with the agency long enough to know eligibility determination procedures, who had some expectation of remaining with the agency, at least for the duration of the project, and who indicated some preference for working with ADC cases. Administrative convenience was also a factor in the selection of workers, as was the willingness of workers to enter the training experiment.

Training sessions throughout the entire project were held for each group twice each week in two-hour periods, the groups meeting in private rooms provided by the bureau offices. Training *per se* was confined to the class period, and no assignments were made requiring work in addition.

During the first year of the research project, the training group was composed of two workers in a small county bureau in a predominantly rural area, and six workers from a bureau office in a large industrial city. With regard to personal characteristics, the average age of the group, which ranged from the middle twenties to the late fifties, was forty-two years; six were married, one widowed and one divorced; three had completed college, receiving B.A. degrees, and one of these workers also had a degree in dentistry; one worker had previous training through an orientation program offered by the State Department of Social Welfare; all eight workers had been employed by the bureau for an average of five years each, and the average Civil Service score of the group was 82.16.

Training was conducted from February 5 to May 14, 1957, and although the case supervisors were not included in the training program of this year, they were informed of the training content and the progress of training through regular meetings with the training supervisor.

During the second year of the project, two supervisors from one county bureau, and three from another, both medium-

sized industrial communities, participated in a training program conducted by the training supervisor. The county supervisor was included in the former group to obtain the size of group considered to be a minimum for effective teaching. This training program began October 1 and ended December 1, 1957. From December 1, 1957, to March 15, 1958, the casework supervisors conducted the training program for their workers. The two supervisors in one bureau were to have presented the program to four workers each; however, one supervisor withdrew from the training program and the remaining supervisor taught the entire group of eight workers. In the other bureau office, three supervisors conducted training for three workers each. During the period of supervisor-worker training, the training supervisor presented the training program to six workers in a county bureau located in an educational center. This instance of direct training during the second year was included in order to complete the research design of the previous year.

Personal characteristics of the worker-trainees in the second year of research differed somewhat from those of workers participating in the first training project. Their ages, which ranged from twenty-two to sixty years, averaged forty years; 17 of the workers were married, 4 were single, and 2 widowed; all but one of the trainee group reported having some college education, and 13 workers had college degrees, including two at the master's level; 6 members of the group reported some undergraduate courses in social work, 6 had had some graduate training, and 14 had received other training through extension courses, or institutes offered by the State Department of Social Welfare. This group had averaged slightly over four years of employment with the bureau, excluding one worker who had just joined the bureau at the time the training course began. During both years of training, both white and Negro workers were included in the training groups.

The method of presenting the content of the training program was the same for all groups during the full period of the project. The content described in the foregoing section was

presented during the first third of the training program, and for the remainder of the time was simultaneously reviewed and applied to cases drawn from the workers' current caseloads. Informal lectures were used in presenting content, with opportunity for the group to react by question, discussion, difference of opinion, and illustrations. Excerpts from pertinent social work literature were mimeographed and distributed for reading during the group meetings.[1] The material contained in this literature was then discussed, and related to the content of the training course.

As a supplement to the lectures, and to give the workers a record of the content studied, the training supervisor during the first year of the project provided written summaries of the course content and high points from the group discussion of this material. Reading and discussion of these minutes at the beginning of each class period served as a systematic review of the course content, to supplement oral with visual presentation, and to stimulate additional discussion on the part of the workers. It was not possible for the case supervisors to provide such summaries in the second year.

At the first class session, each trainee was asked to begin weekly visits to one ADC recipient. These cases were selected at random from a list of periodic reviews due in the current month. Initially, the worker and recipient were concerned with determining continued eligibility for assistance, but the intent and plan of the training course was to enter upon the helping process, and to develop a relationship between worker and recipient. Each trainee reported to the group his progress with the family, describing the relationship which seemed to be developing, identifying problems, and continuously round-

[1] Scherer, Lorena, "Protective Casework Service," *Children*, vol. 3, January–February, 1956, pp. 27–31; Young, Leontine, "Diagnosis as a Creative Process," *Social Casework*, vol. 37, June, 1956, pp. 275–280; Josselyn, Irene, "The Caseworker as Therapist," *Social Casework*, vol. 24, November, 1948, pp. 351–355; English, Oliver Spurgeon, "The Psychological Role of the Father in the Family," *Social Casework*, vol. 35, August, 1954, p. 323; Reynolds, Rosemary, and others, "Casework and the Aging Population," *Social Casework*, vol. 30, February, 1949, pp. 58–65.

ing out the constellation of facts that made up the current situation for that family.

No effort was made to keep the study of the helping process and of the worker-recipient relationship, as described above, in step with the study of families whom the workers were visiting weekly, although one was used to illustrate the other. Each worker's case became a "laboratory" in which he applied the content of the training course. For example, the problems of a particular family might have been described by a trainee prior to the definition of "manifest" or "underlying" problems. When these definitions were later presented, the previously identified problems in that family situation were used as illustrations of these two types of problems, and were reexamined in the light of the definition. There was extensive group discussion and involvement as progress, or lack of progress, in the development of each worker-recipient relationship was described in the group meetings, and as the continually unfolding body of knowledge about each case gave changing perspectives on the problems presented and possible treatment goals.

Consultation on cases other than the special study cases was never given to individual workers during the course of the training program, although in the group meetings the workers sometimes reported case situations from their current loads. This practice was encouraged when vignettes and incidents from such cases were used to illustrate a point or a question, but was discouraged when it seemed that the worker was seeking advice or help as to next steps in the casework process.

For all cases reported in group meetings, workers were asked to fill out worksheets. Initially, the worksheets required identifying information only. As the successive steps of the helping process were covered, the trainees added headings to these sheets and made additional entries. For example, "manifest problems," was the first such heading added, and "underlying problems" the next. As new steps were added in the training program, the worker reconsidered entries under "problems," and in this way continuously refined and sharpened the problem identification.

One question of importance to the training program was its relationship to the eligibility determining functions of the agency. This relationship was determined before training began, and it was agreed that each worker's regular supervisor would continue to carry responsibility for interpretation and application of agency policies governing the eligibility of recipients, and the amount of payment. The determination of eligibility was thus regarded as being chronologically the first responsibility of the agency and the worker. Once eligibility was established, and as long as it continued, the recipient was considered eligible for casework service. This was, therefore, considered chronologically to be the second, but equally important, responsibility of the agency. If the implementation of a treatment plan for the family involved an increase or decrease in the amount of payment, the recommended change was cleared by the worker with the case supervisor to determine whether or not it was within policy. It was also established that a recipient's acceptance or rejection of casework service would not affect eligibility for financial assistance. This relationship between payment and service processes was maintained during the two years of the training program, and even when the case supervisors conducted the training groups in the second year, questions of eligibility were separated from the processes of training.

The use of "live" case material was an important feature of the training program, as was the method of selecting the cases. As stated above, the selection was made from a list of cases due for periodic review during the current month, and the name chosen, if possible, was that of a recipient not previously known to the worker. This selection was made by the research staff in the second year prior to the beginning of the training project. Cases due for annual review of the recipient's eligibility status thus provided a reason, understandable both to the worker and to the recipient, for the worker to enter the recipient's current situation. The total sample of cases drawn the first year provided only one case for each worker. In the second year, the sample provided two for each worker, which

would allow an alternate practice case in the event one recipient should be dropped from the caseload or from the special study program.

Qualitative Appraisal

The most precise evaluation of any training program such as the one conducted in these studies would be in terms of objective measurement. But evaluation of a qualitative type is also important, for it captures factors not taken up in the tests, measures, and statistics. The evaluations reported here are based on the observations of the training supervisor of the research project.

Case Movement. The 68 cases that received study and special service as "practice cases" were classified at the end of the training project according to their apparent need for casework service and the extent to which they responded to it. Seven (10.3 per cent) were found to be adequate in handling the problems and responsibilities of day-to-day living. Although problems were present among these families, they appeared to have adequate strengths and to need no casework service.

Forty-one families (60.3 per cent) had problems which they were handling inadequately, but in which they were able to make some constructive change through casework service. Included in this group were several whose gains were extensive, including successful resolution of conflicts about marriage and employment, marked gains in personal adequacy and self-confidence, improvement in family relationships and household management, and the like. Thirty of these families were considered to have potential for further constructive change, had it been possible for the special help to continue.

Twenty families (29.4 per cent) had problems which they were handling inadequately and even with casework help made no gains. Nine of these families, it was felt, might have made gains if the termination of the project or closure due to financial ineligibility had not made it necessary to discontinue the special help.

If we can generalize from these cases it would appear that most of the recipients were not handling their difficulties ade-

quately and could have benefited from casework service. Over half of those needing service were judged to have made some constructive change as a consequence of casework service.

Reactions of Recipients to Casework. Casework service was not threatening to recipients and was not resisted. On the contrary, there was convincing evidence that the service was wanted and welcomed, and had value to the client. Of the many conditions that operated to produce a positive reaction to casework service, two were seen as essential. The first was that the casework was provided on the basis of a positive worker-recipient relationship, purposefully promoted by the worker. The second was that the worker by word, attitude, and act communicated to the recipient that he was free to accept or reject continuing contacts after the eligibility determination, either initial or in review, and that the recipient's choice in this respect was not a factor in his eligibility or the amount of payment.

Reactions of Workers to Training. A majority of the workers welcomed the training opportunity and indicated they had convictions about the need for service and the necessity for having training to be able to meet needs effectively. Others believed that only the determining of eligibility and amount of payment were the functions of the public assistance worker, and that service aimed at family analysis and change was either inappropriate or beyond the competence of any except fully trained workers.

Almost without exception, the workers initially experienced anxiety about continuing interviews with recipients beyond the completion of the eligibility review. They felt that recipients would be fearful or resentful of any expression of interest in subjects not clearly the "business" of a public assistance worker, or that the recipients would feel they were being "spied upon." The initial anxiety of the workers subsided as differences in need for casework services and ability to use help began to emerge. They eventually came to realize that for some recipients, the weekly visits and the worker's interest were new and valued experiences.

Compatibility of Eligibility Determination and Casework. Can one worker provide both eligibility determination and case-

work? Experience in this training program indicates that the process of determining eligibility constitutes an excellent springboard for development of the worker-recipient relationship, and that it is desirable for the worker who gives the payment service to continue with the case. In the interviews for application or periodic review, worker and recipient have clearly defined requirements with which to work. Such requirements are concrete and easy to talk about in the initial stages of an acquaintanceship. The entire process is aimed at payment, which the recipient wants, and he thus experiences the worker as a "giving" person who wants to help him secure his financial rights. It is reasonable to anticipate that the recipient will be more free to utilize casework help, where this is possible and feasible, if he can continue with the same worker whose readiness to help has already been experienced and tested in the eligibility process.

Having one worker provide both services avoids the problem that arises when a service worker learns about income which the recipient is earning in his progress toward independence, but which he has not reported to the eligibility worker. When one worker follows through with casework service, no question of reporting to another worker can arise. He is working closely with the recipient, and is in a position to reinforce the rewarding, rather than the "penalizing" aspect of increasing independence.

Without exception, workers in the training course concluded that casework service was the more challenging and rewarding process, but that they would want to work into it by way of the eligibility determination process.

Training Method and Procedure. Through planning and conducting the training programs it became apparent that some approaches were preferable to others. Some of the preferred elements of method and procedure are highlighted below.

The trainee groups ranged from two to eight members. It was clear that training was carried on most effectively in groups of six. This number was small enough to permit active participation and presentation of case material by all members. A group of two was limited in its intra-group reaction and

stimulation. Two one-to-one relationships in such a group operated simultaneously between the group leader and each of the members, and were found to be more complex than the leader-group situation. Groups of eight members were satisfactory, except that the time available to each member for presentation of case material was limited.

In addition to size, group composition was found to be important. It was learned that having the groups composed of persons in a peer relationship was conducive to freer discussions and avoided problems of deferring to the opinions of others of higher status.

The use by each worker of a case selected by chance (from those coming up for review) for special study yielded unexpected positive results. The cases were "live" and stimulated more interest and involvement than prepared, written cases. Constituting a small cross-section of the caseload, these cases, moreover, were found to have greatly varying needs and potential for constructive change. Some of these recipients were found to have problems that seldom receive attention in a public assistance caseload because they are not readily apparent in the early stages, or are not "dramatic" enough to command attention on an emergency basis. It was observed in the training program that until a family was studied diagnostically, its potential for constructive change as well as its ability to utilize help, remained unknown. Any family may be one for whom the money payment alone is not enough.

The program of direct training, given by a person outside the agency, created some difficulties for both supervisors and workers. The presence of an outsider interfered with the accustomed role of the supervisors with regard to their workers, in that the workers were giving a new service in which the supervisors were not directly involved. To avoid these difficulties training for the provision of casework service should be introduced first to the supervisory staff and at a later date to the worker staff.

Training should unquestionably be given to case supervisors by individuals who have had adequate preparation in the study and practice of social casework and in teaching,

supervision, and group leadership. Most case supervisors in public assistance do not have all these skills, and thus outside assistance will generally have to be obtained.

But what about using in-service trained supervisors to provide training for the workers? The experience of using this method in the second experiment is one of mixed success and failure. In general, the case supervisors who conducted training courses were able to present the theoretical information and to stimulate a great deal of pertinent and thoughtful discussion; they appeared able to provide constructive guidance to the discussions of basic attitudes and values which came out in connection with theoretical considerations; they succeeded in motivating their workers toward the provision of casework in public assistance; and, finally, the workers whom they instructed, improved on selected tests used in the study.

But it became increasingly clear as the second year of training progressed that the case supervisors had been given a complex and difficult task. Within two months' time they were being asked to master a procedure that employs processes differing fundamentally and extensively from those involved in establishing eligibility for assistance; in addition, they were given responsibility for teaching their workers and for guiding them in the application of casework process to the practice cases. As stated previously, one supervisor withdrew from the project before beginning to train her workers. Others of the supervisory group expressed uncertainty and anxiety but continued with the program. For these reasons, the use of in-service trained case supervisors for training workers would probably have to be highly selective.

Overall Evaluation. It was the training supervisor's impression that a fairly extensive training experience was provided in the sixty hours set aside for this program. The relatively short intervals between the meetings made possible a maximum continuity and carry-over of interest, and the total time was sufficient to permit coverage of a considerable body of basic content as well as the integration and application of theory to a limited number of cases.

Was this much training sufficient to enable the workers to do casework? In evaluating recipient movement and worker learning, there was evidence that most of the workers had the ability to learn some of the basic elements of the helping process and to organize and expand their knowledge of the structure and functioning of personality. Case reactions attested to the effectiveness of help given. A few of the workers, as one might expect, seemed to benefit little from the training. But, in general, the viewpoint that public assistance workers cannot learn some important elements of casework through in-service training does not appear to be correct.

One often hears another objection to teaching casework to public assistance workers. It is that even if workers do learn some aspects of casework, the knowledge may do more harm than good. Experience in the training project did not substantiate this view. While some workers, to be sure, used inappropriate techniques on occasion, the effects on recipients were negligible or, at worst, resulted in a retardation or deterioration of a positive worker-recipient relationship. In general, inappropriate approaches to treatment, where they were noted, could be attributed to well-entrenched behavior patterns of the workers rather than to innocent mal-use of what was learned in training.

One of the most significant features of the training program, as viewed in retrospect, is the conception of the differences and similarities between casework and eligibility determination. Opinions on this subject in public welfare range from convictions that casework interferes with the recipient's right to assistance to beliefs that the activities of both are essentially indistinguishable. Our orientation to this question, as set forth at the beginning of this Appendix, enables the worker to protect the recipient's right to assistance while determining his payment eligibility, and also allows the worker to extend casework on a voluntary basis and to continue this service if the recipient's situation meets the defined eligibility criteria, with full recognition of how it differs from matters of eligibility and need.

INDEX

Index