

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164515

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

McGRAW-HILL PUBLICATIONS IN SOCIOLOGY
EDWARD BYRON REUTER, CONSULTING EDITOR

THE TRAINING OF SOCIAL WORKERS

McGRAW-HILL PUBLICATIONS
IN SOCIOLOGY

EDWARD BYRON REUTER
CONSULTING EDITOR

Lumley—

PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY

Hertzler—

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Haynes—

CRIMINOLOGY

Thompson—

POPULATION PROBLEMS

Reuter and Runner—

THE FAMILY

North—

THE COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL WELFARE

Hagerty—

THE TRAINING OF SOCIAL WORKERS

THE TRAINING OF SOCIAL WORKERS

BY

JAMES EDWARD HAGERTY

*Professor of Sociology and Chairman of Department, Director School
of Social Administration, The Ohio State University;
Author, "Mercantile Credit"*

FIRST EDITION

McGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, Inc.

NEW YORK AND LONDON

1931

COPYRIGHT, 1931, BY THE
MCGRAW-HILL BOOK COMPANY, INC.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

*All rights reserved. This book, or
parts thereof, may not be reproduced
in any form without permission of
the publishers.*

THE MAPLE PRESS COMPANY, YORK, PA.

PREFACE

The greatest freedom of discussion should attend the development of training in any field of human usefulness. This fact is the reason for the present volume on the "Training of Social Workers."

Most of the subjects discussed in this book are in the realms of controversy. As organized training for the social worker is relatively recent, no traditions guide the teachers of social work. The theories with reference to the organization of the work of the schools of social work, the content of the courses offered, the methods of teaching, the purposes of the schools, the prerequisite requirements of students who enter the schools, are either derived from other schools which train professional workers in other branches of usefulness or else are born out of the necessity to qualify new people for the jobs of social work which need to be filled. Those confronted with the organization of the curriculum of a school of social work are confronted with many baffling theories: (1) What is the relationship of the technical training in social work to the social sciences and psychology and biology? (2) Should the training ever be given in an undergraduate school? (3) Is the graduate training now offered in the schools really graduate in character? (4) Are trade school methods used in the work now offered? (5) Should the schools be organized in universities and university standards maintained, both in the character of courses offered and in the methods of teaching? (6) What emphasis should be placed on social research? (7) What time should be allotted to field work, and what should be the purpose of field-work training? (8) Should the principles of

social work be taught chiefly by the case method of teaching or should the case method of teaching be restricted to the teaching of the various techniques? (9) What is necessary to make social work a profession? (10) What training should qualify a candidate for membership in the professional association of social workers? These and similar questions this book will attempt to answer.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to Professors Louise Mark, Charles C. Stillman, and Leila Kinney of the Ohio State University and to Miss Sydnor H. Walker of the Carnegie Foundation, who have read some of the chapters of this book and made valuable suggestions.

JAMES EDWARD HAGERTY.

COLUMBUS, OHIO,
July, 1931.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE.	V
CHAPTER I	
WHAT IS SOCIAL WORK	1
CHAPTER II	
SCOPE OF SOCIAL WORK	22
CHAPTER III	
THE NEED FOR SOCIAL WORK	31
CHAPTER IV	
HISTORY OF TRAINING IN SOCIAL WORK	39
CHAPTER V	
IS SOCIAL WORK SCIENTIFIC?.	61
CHAPTER VI	
THE TRAINING IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND IN BIOLOGY OF GRADUATES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES . . .	73
CHAPTER VII	
GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK.	79
CHAPTER VIII	
THE TRAINING OF THE SOCIAL EXECUTIVE	99
CHAPTER IX	
THE TEACHING OF RESEARCH METHODS.	117
CHAPTER X	
SOCIAL CASE WORK TEACHING	126
CHAPTER XI	
SOCIAL CASE WORK.	132

	PAGE
CHAPTER XII	
CASE RECORDING.	143
CHAPTER XIII	
FIELD WORK TRAINING	149
CHAPTER XIV	
WHAT IS A PROFESSION?.	162
CHAPTER XV	
IS SOCIAL WORK A PROFESSION?	174
APPENDIX	195
INDEX.	201

THE TRAINING OF SOCIAL WORKERS

CHAPTER I

WHAT IS SOCIAL WORK?

In the United States there are many millions of boys and girls between the ages of six and twenty-one growing up to maturity. These boys and girls are receiving an education to fit them for adult life in the American republic. In the process of developing body, mind, and spirit so that they can battle with all the complexities of the modern civilization into which they must enter as participants upon the attainment of adult life, they must make three very important individual adjustments:

1. Each one must develop habits of industry and receive training suited to his capacities to enable him to be an efficient producer capable of supplying all his economic wants. If he be a young man and marries, it becomes his obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of living for his family.

2. In growing up to maturity each one must develop habits of social adjustment that will enable him to live in harmony with people and in obedience to the laws of society. Failing in this he becomes a criminal.

3. Each one should grow up observing such laws of health as will enable him to attain maturity physically strong and free from disease.

Of the millions of young people coming to maturity each year in an individualistic society where each must

make his own adaptations, it is apparent that many must fail in one or more adaptations even among those who are not mentally and physically inferior. Those who are defective or subnormal constitute a class by themselves who should be favored by public or private beneficence. But upon some of the others the differences in the home and social conditions in which they are reared impose terrible handicaps. Under these circumstances a certain percentage of failures is inevitable. While some failures are due to personal causes, many more are traceable to social causes which may be eliminated.

Social work is organized to serve those who have failed or are failing in their social adjustments. It is the application of scientific methods by the trained social worker for the following purposes: (1) to relieve the distress of the poverty stricken, to make individual and social adjustments to enable those in poverty to become economically independent, and to study the causes of poverty for the purpose of eliminating them; (2) to study the individual delinquent to determine the causes of his delinquency, to work out individual and social adjustments that will enable him to live free from delinquency, and to remove the causes of delinquency wherever they are discoverable; (3) in cooperation with the medical profession to study the individual and social causes of disease as a foundation for a program of health education; (4) to study the causes and conditions of defectiveness, to remove causes and to cure where possible, and, when custodial care is needed, to apply scientific methods in the administration of institutions so that the purposes of custodial care will be accomplished; (5) to apply scientific methods in the administration of all other social institutions, such as those caring for dependent children, the crippled, the sick, and the delinquent; (6) to apply scientific knowledge to the handling of personality problems in the form of complexes so as to work out a more

normal adjustment of the individual; (7) to apply scientific knowledge to develop the recreational life and social life of people through such means as playgrounds and boy scouts, girl scouts, and camp fire girls activities.

Social work has gone through two stages and is now going through a third stage of development. The first stage was that of charity, "the feeding of the hungry, the clothing of the naked," the relief of distress, the correction of wrongdoing or the reformation of the criminal. In this stage distress was relieved too often without reference to the effect of the method of relief on the recipient. Dr. Holmes somewhere refers to tramps "as the wandering evidences of our benevolence." "The giving which pauperizes" has become a stock phrase of all social workers of the last generation. The disastrous effects of the Gilbert Acts of Great Britain in the closing years of the eighteenth century are matters of history. The poor departments of American cities in the sixties, seventies, and eighties expended large sums of money unwisely in caring for their poor, the result being a tremendous amount of pauperization. It has been generally concluded that giving without reference to method is unwise charity and perhaps in the long run does more harm than good. As an offset to the harm done recipients, the defenders of this charity claimed that giving was good for the soul of the giver and urged that some opportunity should be given for this form of self-expression.

In this period, in obedience to charitable impulses, great institutions of private and public beneficence were founded, such as insane asylums, orphanages, hospitals, poorhouses, and children's homes. These institutions were chiefly custodial in character; they made their inmates comfortable as far as possible, but little or nothing of a constructive character was done.

In the period of philanthropy succeeding that of charity the emphasis was put on cure and prevention. People in misery must always be relieved, but scientific aspects entered in and the effect on the recipient and others of his class was taken into account in choosing the methods employed. These methods were scientific in so far as they were based on experience in giving in dealing with human problems from a knowledge of human nature. The restoration of the respect of the individual and making him and his family self-reliant were considered fundamental. The methods of philanthropy moreover were scientific, since social workers in this period made a study of the causes of poverty, dependency, sickness, and delinquency, and assigned specific causes or a complex of causes to each class of misfortune. The institutions above referred to were changed in character. The insane asylums became hospitals for the cure of insanity. The institutions for the deaf and blind became educational institutions in the best sense to train the deaf and the blind to become self-supporting members of society. The orphanages became children's homes for an adequate training of the children, or else receiving institutions from which children were placed in natural homes as more suitable places in which they should grow up. Reformatories and industrial schools were also established with the purpose of reclaiming delinquents and fitting them for normal life in society.

Much reliance was placed upon preventive philanthropy in removing the causes of misery which social investigations had revealed. Laws were passed providing for shorter working days, especially for women and children. Child-labor laws came into existence, as did laws for the inspection of factories, standardizing housing conditions, compelling attendance at school, providing for mothers' pensions, controlling loan sharks, and regulating public employment agencies. Minimum

wages,¹ accident insurance, old-age pensions,² and censored amusements all were established by law. The gains through legislation of this sort have doubtless been tremendous, but leading social workers have been disappointed with the results even of this legislation.

But within the last ten years a new note has been struck in social work. The name social work has supplanted its predecessor philanthropy. The National Conference representing social workers carried the name social work. Most of the state conferences of social workers have accepted the latter name in one form or another, and the professional schools for the training of social workers have practically all abandoned the term philanthropy to designate the subject matter of their training.

Has social work come to connote anything new, something not suggested by the term philanthropy? Relief must be given, but in accordance with scientific laws. All the best in social work conducted as charity or under the name of philanthropy must be preserved. Social work assumes that no two individuals are alike, and it consequently emphasizes individual treatment based upon a careful diagnosis whether in delinquency, case work in relief, the placing of a homeless child, insanity, feeble-mindedness, or in the lesser mental disorders needing the attention of a psychiatrist. "Justice First," the subject of the annual address of the conference of charities and corrections in 1927, suggests a fundamental starting point. The *positive good* was suggested as a new note in social work by a president of the above-named conference, who urged at the same time that it should reach not alone the defective, the handicapped, and the underprivileged whom we have heretofore assumed were the subjects of consideration by the social worker, but all classes under certain circumstances, as the children

¹ In some states for women.

² In some states.

of the well-to-do may need the attention of the visiting teacher.¹ "A more abundant life—the individual to become the best he can be—the community to become the finest and fullest expression of social life that it can be, with no one left behind; such is the goal that grows more clear before us."

Dr. Cabot expresses the same idea in his book "The Goal of Social Work" when he says, "The social worker's goal, therefore, is the relief of misery and unhappiness so that people's enfranchized and organized desires can find their expression in the social relationships which are a part of their natural outlet."

The removal of the causes of misfortune or even the setting up of a wholesome environment, good as they are, are not an adequate goal of the social worker if the highest objects of social work are to be attained. The range of human nature is infinite, and no two individuals react the same way to an environment. The individual must be reached individually if he is to be reclaimed, reformed, or revitalized so that he can develop his personality and grow into a self-respecting and righteous member of society. After a thorough diagnosis, wherever possible the social worker must choose the environment and observe the reaction of the environment upon the case. This is now done in psychiatric work, in child placing, in probation work, parole work, in some institutional, and, to a certain extent, in nearly all forms of case work.

Social workers must deal understandingly with the whole range of social institutions and social activities to promote a more normal and richer human life. Applied sociology must establish the social activities in social institutions where the desired attitudes and social values will be developed. With the capacity for thorough case work and individual and social diagnosis, and with a thorough understanding of the significance of human

¹ Gertrude Vaile, *The National Conference of Social Work*, 1926.

institutions and the value of social activities it is possible for the social worker to draw rational conclusions. Broadly trained, with the possession of this knowledge and point of view, with the scientific spirit and attitude of mind, the social worker will find it possible to do constructive work. Such is the equipment, the training, and the point of view of the social worker of the future if social work is to be really constructive.

Social work itself, like work in all other professions, is an art. However, anything that is worth while in any profession must have its roots in science. Scientific social work is consequently based on science. However, it is more difficult to be scientific in social relationships than in any other field because of the complexity of the phenomena, because social phenomena are more difficult to understand than any other phenomena, and because, in most cases, experimentation is impossible. In many instances defectiveness may be traced to specific causes, as is often the case in insanity, feeble-mindedness, blindness, deafness, etc. In practically all kinds of mental trouble it is possible to observe reactions to different mental stimuli and to work out classifications based on a wide range of observations.

In the cases of poverty and pauperism the situation is more complex. It is easy to differentiate between poverty and pauperism, although each is traced usually to a complexity of causes. In instances of marked inferiority the causes are relatively simple. Many studies have been made describing the conditions and extent of poverty, a matter which is relatively simple as compared to an analysis of causes from the history of individual and family cases with an attempt to appraise the influence of separate causes. This latter study is more difficult and the probability of error in the conclusion is therefore greater. However, the probability of error in conclusion is reduced with the number of studies made and likewise

with the number of instances taken into account. In the application of remedial measures to reclaim the victims of misfortune we are on more certain ground. In methods of procedure in handling cases of misfortune definite reactions have been noted in almost countless instances and consequently conclusions have almost the value of certitude.

In handling causes of delinquency the situations are almost identical with those affecting poverty except that the phenomena here are more complex. In instances of feeble-mindedness and insanity again the causal relation is relatively clear. In most other cases we have a complex of causes with the scientific obligation of assigning to each cause its appropriate influence, which can only be an approximate expression of the truth. It is possible, however, to conclude with greater precision in the use of methods of reforming the delinquent or in restoring him to normal relations in society. This is true where scientific methods are used but not in the big institutions where multitudes are given the same treatment. Where the individual delinquent is thoroughly studied physically, mentally, and from the point of view of his present and past environment, it is possible through a knowledge of social agencies and environments to place the individual delinquent where his reactions to them will lead to transformations which in most instances, will make the unfortunate a law-abiding citizen.

If social work is to take its rightful place in society it must be based on science or scientific methods. In social cases to act without knowledge of the laws of society and human relationships, which are founded on wide observation and the tested experience of the past, is stupidity to the *n*th degree. When the seriousness of the consequences of such procedure is considered, our vocabulary fails in terms suitable to the situations.

Social work must deal with three large groups: the handicapped, the underprivileged, and the delinquent.

THE HANDICAPPED

Who are the handicapped? They represent that large class who because of physical or mental infirmity are unable to compete on even terms with the rest of mankind. The deaf, the blind, the insane, and feeble-minded because of their major defects would at once be placed in this class. Practically all states provide special state schools for the education of the deaf and blind at public expense in which they receive the sort of education calculated to make them independent. Special facilities are also provided through state commissions to assist them in making adjustments to mitigate the seriousness of their handicaps.

Many of the feeble-minded need permanent custodial care, and the great majority of those at large must be supported in whole or in part. The insane hospitals often cure insanity and restore cases to society. Others are permanent charges on society and permanent custodial care must be given.

The great majority of those who are handicapped are handicapped because of poverty. Most of the problems with which social workers have to do are directly or indirectly problems of poverty. Consequently the most important question which social workers must answer is: Why are people poor? While the conditions of poverty are well known to most of us, poverty itself is difficult to define. At the risk of this definition having the shortcomings of most definitions, a definition of poverty is here attempted.

Poverty is that condition of individual or family welfare in which those individuals concerned do not enjoy the necessities and conveniences of life which are regarded in their environment as adequate to whole-

some living. According to this definition poverty is relative. A state of life which in one part of the world might be construed as poverty in another section of the world would not be so considered. One writer has indicated that a very important factor in poverty is the fear and dread of want. According to him a family may be enjoying necessities and conveniences, but the fear and dread of want due to circumstances beyond control leave the family in poverty.

The percentage of poverty in this or any country at any time is always a moot question, since so much depends on one's understanding of what poverty is and upon available facts to establish a conclusion. The idea expressed in the last paragraph is best suggested by the query: How many people are within thirty days of the poor-house? Assuming that sources of income were suddenly cut off for all families in the United States, what percentage of them would have to receive public or private aid within thirty days or else become destitute? A much larger percentage than most of us imagine of the families of the United States would become dependent in thirty days under the conditions assumed.

Between twenty and twenty-five years ago many studies were made to determine the minimum income an average American family must have to avoid dependency. These estimates ranged all the way from \$600 to \$1,000 per year, and each writer attempted to state the sort of living conditions his estimate would provide. These estimates are far too low now. The World War and the intervening years have brought about radical changes in the costs of the necessities and luxuries of life as of other things. Wages too have risen and a moot question now is: Have wages risen as rapidly as the costs of living?

It is safe to say that an average American family, that is, a family of four or five children with two parents, should have an income of from \$1,800 to \$2,000 a year in

an American city at the present time to live in reasonable and frugal comfort. This assumes that the children are given a reasonable education and that insurance is carried which protects the family economically against the hazards of sickness or the death of the breadwinner.

All business and professional men of standing, all expert mechanics, and nearly all skilled men should be able to maintain this standard of living. Unskilled wage earners at the present scale of wages cannot maintain this standard. Certainly they should be able to do so, but this involves a wage of \$6 to \$7 a day. When this is asked for, the reply of the employer is that industry cannot pay such a wage to the unskilled wage earner. Industry at the present time must bear the cost of insurance against the destruction of the property, insurance to cover depreciation of plant, and liability insurance where it is required by law. These insurance costs are charged against industry as necessary costs of production before dividends are paid. Is it not reasonable to charge a living wage to the able-bodied, productive, unskilled wage earner as necessary costs of production before any dividends are paid, just as insurance costs are charged against industry as necessary costs of production? Will industry stand such an additional cost? If insurance risks should double within a month, this additional cost would be charged at once against industry to be distributed in higher prices on society. An increased wage cost all along the line in industry can be passed on to the consumer if it is necessary to do so, the same as the consumer is made to bear any other increased costs of production.

The competitive system has broken down in the matter of adjusting wages and prices. In the interests of justice, humanitarian ideals must be taken into account in fixing wages. Is not the able-bodied, industrious, self-reliant wage earner entitled to a wage that will

enable him and his family to live a life of reasonable comfort? Social workers should be advocates of reasonable minimum-wage laws, not alone for women and children but for men, and society should look to them for leadership because they are best informed concerning the conditions under which people live and work.

There are some classes of unskilled workers who may not be entitled to this minimum wage and some provision should be made for them. Those who are physically strong but of a low order of intelligence may not have the intelligence to maintain minimum standards of work except under careful supervision. There are those, too, of good intelligence but not physically strong who are unskilled workers and may not be entitled to the minimum wage.

Many who are now unskilled workers and who receive low wages should be skilled workers and receive good wages. Many capable of receiving a fair education are unskilled workers for a variety of reasons. In the absence of vocational training, many have failed to appreciate the value of an education and consequently have joined the ranks of the unskilled. Others who have been compelled to work while young, have either had school opportunities denied them, or have been interfered with to such an extent that they could make but little progress in education. Still others have gotten into blind-alley occupations without realizing it or without the possibility of avoiding them, and have unwillingly or through no fault of their own gone to increase the ranks of the unskilled. With vocational guidance, a more far-reaching and practical education, the pressure now in the ranks of the unskilled can be relieved and those more capable individuals who now exist in poverty can be elevated to a higher economic plane.

There are personal causes of poverty which have never been adequately investigated. Drink and the use of

drugs have always been assigned as a great cause of poverty. Recently, however, we have been told that poverty is more often the cause of the drinking habit than the drinking habit of poverty. Whichever may be the cause, it has always been concluded that the amount of money expended for drink if used to buy necessaries and conveniences of life would greatly improve the standard of living of the families of drinking men. Perhaps the most serious situation is due to the debilitating and demoralizing effect of drink and drugs upon the worker. His working capacity is reduced and his earning power is greatly curtailed.

Laziness, shiftlessness, bad habits of spending and saving are important causes, and naturally one wonders whether these things are due to the habits of youth or are the result of causes more remote. Some of these weaknesses and perhaps most of them are due to the bad habits of early life, but others may be due to forces more far-reaching concerning which we know but little.

This is but a very brief and cursory reference to some of the causes of poverty. The social worker who must deal with poverty daily should have a comprehensive grasp of the whole social situation in which people become poor if he is to deal adequately with the everyday problems of poverty.

Ill health and deaths due to preventable diseases are responsible for more poverty and misery than most of us dream. Aside from the misery and pain it causes, disease reduces the vitality and working capacity of its victims. If knowledge which science has already revealed as to the nature and causes of different diseases were widely diffused, it would reduce greatly the death rate, prolong human life, and mitigate the terrors and economic burdens of unnecessary disease. In the last quarter of a century great progress has been made in preventing the spread of contagious diseases, in eliminating epidemic

diseases by removing causes and improving treatment, and in reducing the severity of other diseases and the death rate arising from them. Life expectancy has been prolonged chiefly by reducing the death rate of children under five years of age.

Health social service means the discovery of the causes of disease and the wide dissemination of information concerning these causes, along with training people to care for themselves when afflicted with disease. To accomplish these purposes large financial foundations are expending millions annually in studying the causes of disease and the best treatment. Many organizations have established health programs. Among these are instructive district nursing associations, tuberculosis nursing societies, and health clinics. Health dispensaries, too, such as those for tuberculosis and cancer, fresh-air camps, hospital social-service organizations and such propaganda organizations as public-health associations, hospital associations, and social hygienic associations—all have well-established health programs.

Public authority has long since accepted a definite responsibility for public health education and for social policies with reference to the cause, spread, and treatment of disease. All of our states have public health departments with local health divisions and the national government maintains a public health service. In recent years the school nurse is being employed at public expense in many communities.

Health is a matter of social rather than of individual significance. If disease had to do with the individual alone the state would be interested in him only as it is interested in each of its citizens. But the individual may spread contagion or infect others, and the state in the interest of public welfare must take active steps to prevent contagion and discover the cause of disease. While this is in process of writing the state of Ohio is

confronted with the spread of infantile paralysis, and boards of health are actively interested in preventing its spread.

As health is a social problem, the state is compelled to protect the weak and the ignorant from the exploitation of imposters and charlatans. When disease enters the home the poor are more often the victims of fakers than any other class. In most states, laws require licenses to permit physicians to practice medicine. In spite of these laws, quacks, faith healers, chiropractors, and Christian Scientists profit at the expense of the gullible.

Less than twenty-five years ago the most progressive hospitals learned that to economize on the services of their highly trained staff and keep their cases from returning again and again to the hospital for treatment it was more economical to follow the cases to their homes and give them and those with whom they were associated a health education on treatment and cause which would prevent them from returning to the hospital. This was the origin of the hospital social worker. As an organic part of the hospital she goes with the case to the home suspected of needing some reorganization for the benefit of the health of the case as well as of that of other members of the family, and under the authority of the hospital she works out solutions for the benefit of the entire family. The hospital thus becomes a public health center. The district nurses and tuberculosis nurses, though not associated with a hospital, perform a similar educational service in visiting homes of the poor especially where the poor are living in bad housing conditions. In cooperation with dispensaries and health clinics and in cooperation with the medical profession they render a great service in the interests of health.

The function of the health social workers is to teach people to make the social adjustments necessary to prevent illness and to care for themselves properly when

ill. We find them in public and private organizations, state and national, carrying on effective campaigns in a variety of ways to educate people to accomplish the above-named functions. We find them also in hospital service, in clinics, in dispensaries, in public health centers, etc. Dr. Richard C. Cabot in his book, "Social Service and the Art of Healing" describes the work of the health social worker as follows:

To make the doctor's work worth while to himself and to the patient, it must be done in cooperation with some one who has time and ability to teach hygiene and to see that it is carried out, to study the home conditions and report upon their part in causing or prolonging disease, and to help modify those conditions, financial, mental, moral, which stand between the patient and recovery. This some one is the social worker a man or woman trained to think of a human being as a whole just as naturally as the physician concentrates attention on a part of it.

THE UNDERPRIVILEGED

It is not my purpose to differentiate strictly between the handicapped and the underprivileged. All underprivileged people are handicapped but not all handicapped people are underprivileged. It happens that "underprivileged" characterizes some people better than the term "handicapped"; moreover its use differentiates a certain class from those who are handicapped but not underprivileged. It is with these ideas in mind that I am using the term underprivileged.

Who are the underprivileged? This terminology suggests a failure of society to equalize the opportunities for all the people. In times past we have idealized equality and have assumed that those governments which interfered but little with the activities of the individual and permitted him to work out his own economic and personal salvation unimpeded and unham-

pered by government regulation, were best. We have come to believe with Antone Menger that there is no greater inequality than the equal treatment of unequals. Individuals should be equal before the law, but this does not imply that the same legal treatment should be given very different persons. Not all people are equal from any point of view. As a matter of fact, no two people are equal.

In considering the status of the underprivileged our first thought is directed to children. On this subject the National Children's Bureau says,

The fundamental rights of childhood are normal home life, opportunities for education, recreation, vocational preparation for life, and moral, religious and physical development in harmony with American ideals and the educational and spiritual agencies by which these rights of the child are normally safeguarded.

Children who must attend inferior schools and study under incompetent teachers are underprivileged. Where private schools are superior to the public schools and the children of the wealthy are permitted to attend private schools under superior teachers they have advantages which the children of the poor do not enjoy. If the children of the lower walks of life cannot attend high school or college when it is a distinct advantage to attend high school or college, then they are underprivileged in this respect.

The right to a normal home life is one of the fundamental rights of childhood. Many are denied this right and are thus underprivileged. Many grow up in broken homes, others in crowded homes, others where the physical conditions of the home are anything but elevating, others in homes where the physical and moral surroundings are deteriorating if not degrading in their influence, and others where the moral atmosphere

of the home is positively degrading. These children are underprivileged.

It is not possible for social work to correct all the inequalities which surround childhood. Many worthy things it does do, however. Where home conditions are very bad, for example, it breaks up the home and provides a more normal home life. Through it the orphanage and children's home are being abandoned as improper environments in which children grow up. Child placing and child boarding in normal homes with all the standards of investigation and supervision are attempts of social work to remove as far as possible all the handicaps under which homeless children or children of disadvantaged homes are living.

Children should have a playtime and an opportunity for recreation and normal physical development. To guarantee these rights social settlements, playgrounds, recreation centers, summer camps, the playgrounds of schools, and the recreation opportunities of schools are established. Mothers' pensions are now authorized by the laws of many states to give children who have lost their bread-winning parent some of the privileges and opportunities of those who have not met with such a misfortune. These and many other agencies are at work to correct the inequalities of childhood.

Many adults are underprivileged. Through personal and other causes many do not enjoy the opportunities and privileges which their fellow men more favorably situated financially, enjoy. The right to employment of the able-bodied and industrious is now coming to be recognized. Periods of industrial depression often leave thousands of workers unemployed through no fault of their own. Under these circumstances unless they have laid aside considerable sums of money, they and their families will know all the terrors of extreme poverty and become subjects of charity. It is unfair that they

should bear so heavily the costs of industrial depressions and unemployment. Some form of employment insurance for such workers should be regarded a right.

Many states have laws providing insurance against industrial accidents and some sickness insurance. Where no such legislation exists the workers are underprivileged. In some countries old-age pensions are provided. The writer is not in favor of old-age pensions, as he would prefer to see much better wages paid and the worker left himself to make provision from surplus earning for his old age.

DELINQUENCY

With the rise of the juvenile court thirty years ago, a splendid opportunity came for social work in the field of delinquency. The conception that the delinquent was an individual to be reclaimed and that he had to be reached individually through a thorough study of his personality from the point of view of his heredity, his home life, his environment, his physical condition, his mentality, and an appraisal of the influences causing his misbehavior led to a demand for a well-equipped social worker. The successful probation officer must be a thorough case worker since he is required not only to make the diagnosis above described, but to have such a knowledge of the significance of social institutions as will enable him to place the delinquent in an environment where constructive work of a high order may be accomplished. While not many juvenile courts and probation officers measure up to the above description at present, successful juvenile courts must await the sort of case work above described.

The successful organization of the probation work of the courts, the keeping of appropriate records, the working out of cooperative relations in the community involves executive capacity of a high order. The

efficiency of the juvenile court depends in largest measure not on the judge but on the probation officers and the successful organization of probation work.

The most advanced criminal courts for adults are organizing probation work. While this work is not as well developed as the probation work for juveniles, the principles are the same. Cases coming before the court must be investigated to determine which are proper cases for probation. Of course those cases only should be probated where the prison sentence will do no good and may do positive harm, and where the individual may be reclaimed as a law-abiding citizen. Professional social workers should have these cases in charge, since there is involved follow-up work of the case when on probation, which includes the evaluating of the environment and the reactions of the environment on the probationer. The determination of who should be placed on probation also involves investigations which should be made by mature investigators.

Parole officers of penal institutions should be social workers. To an increasing extent the best authorities on penal problems are of the belief that all men let out of prison should be released on parole. If the prison is to be a reformatory all men released from prison should be tried out first before they are given complete liberty. If this is done parole officers should be appointed in sufficient numbers to enable them to do real case work with the number under the jurisdiction of each. It is only under such circumstances that parole work can be said to have been really tried. The parole officer should know the men in prison and should know the circumstances and conditions under which the man who is to be under his charge is released on parole.

In institutions for juvenile delinquents it has long been recognized that all leaving the institution should have a probationary parole period before they are finally

released. Unfortunately the parole officers of these institutions have always too many under their charge to do good parole work, but even if they had a reasonable number to supervise, the great majority of them have neither the capacity nor training to do good case work with them. Parole work for juvenile delinquents and parole work for adults must await a time when our faith in parole work is such as to enable us to employ a sufficient number of well-trained men and women to do high-grade constructive work with those released from penal institutions.

The internal organization of institutions for juvenile delinquents has not become so systematized in perhaps a majority of them as to preclude the possibility of individual constructive work of well-trained men and women. Summer camps for boys and girls have well-developed systems, but the system is of such a character as to permit individual constructive work of a high order. When institutions for juvenile delinquents are so organized and financed as to permit individual constructive work by well-trained men and women, it will be possible for them to accomplish measurable results before their charges are placed on parole.

CHAPTER II

SCOPE OF SOCIAL WORK

Social work has undergone many changes in the last fifty years. Charities and Corrections, the name under which the national association was organized, covered satisfactorily the work which was being done at the outset, but before 1900, social activities had developed out of harmony with the name of the national association. In the beginning public relief or public welfare work was all-important. There were asylums or hospitals for the insane and feeble-minded, institutions for the deaf and blind, poorhouses or almshouses, and children's homes, usually with the county as the unit, and public outdoor relief in which the township was usually the unit. In correction work there were reformatories, industrial schools, industrial homes, penitentiaries, workhouses, etc. In all state or national associations public welfare or public relief occupied the center of the stage, and the representatives of public organizations looked askance at representatives of private philanthropies. The writer recalls the difficulty of getting the representatives of state or local public institutions interested in constructive social work at the Ohio Conference of Charities and Corrections in the early years of this century. Even then the newer divisions of social work had little or no standing. Up to 1900, social work of the country was fairly well represented by Henderson's book, "The Defectives, the Dependents, and the Delinquents," and Warner's "American Charities."

The charity organization and the settlement movements representing the newer order of things had attained

considerable headway before 1900. The consumers' leagues, the child-welfare legislation, and factory inspection and factory legislation as concrete social movements had all arisen before 1900. Immediately following 1900, many other movements such as child-labor legislation, recreation, playgrounds, public health and a newer conception of institutional organization and management and other newer activities emerged, and they have since attained great development.

Although the name Charities and Corrections of the national association was not changed until 1917, the inadequacy of the old terminology to express the work of the association was realized long before the change was made in name. In the popular mind the term "philanthropy" succeeded "charities and corrections," and the first training schools for the education of social workers bore this name as the New York School of Philanthropy, the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. The terms "social service," "welfare work," "social-service work," and "social work," each in turn has bid for acceptance, while the training schools have abandoned the term "philanthropy" and are called schools of social work, social service, social administration, and social service administration.

In general, social work deals chiefly with poverty, disease, and crime and the problems directly or indirectly related to these. Its emphasis is on the pathological and the removing of the causes of the pathological. Social work is consequently interested in better legislation on the employment especially of women and children, in factory laws and factory inspection, in tenement legislation and housing laws, and in health and sanitary laws. It also concerns itself with playgrounds and recreation centers, and as the wealthy as well as the underprivileged need these things, social work cannot be said to be exclusively for the poor, the sick, and the delinquent.

Moreover, there are mental problem cases among the children of the rich as well as others, and there is no reason why the social psychiatrist should not serve the rich in the future as well as the poor.

Moreover, some of the work now done in the country by the farm bureau is of the same kind as some of the work universally designated as social when done in the city. This social work in the country is done by experts employed by the beneficiaries, and there is no reason why organized groups may not employ expert social workers and pay them for their services.

The one thing we should keep in mind is that social work assumes maladjustment of some sort, and its purpose is to bring about a better adjustment. In most cases it is work done by the expert who is employed by the privileged or by those in better circumstances for the benefit of those who are less circumstanced. There is no reason why social work may not be done by an expert for those who are seeking a better adjustment.

It is said that social work lacks unity because of the great variety of techniques it has. Perhaps the most definite technique is to be found in case work. A more or less definite technique prevails here when used in family rehabilitation, child welfare, and in delinquency in adjusting the individual to his family, or in adjusting him to his family or community in probation or parole.

Other techniques quite different from case work are found in community organization, in settlement work, in recreation work, and in other forms of community organization. Another technique is required in personnel work in industrial management, while still different techniques are found in work promoting legislation in social investigation and in health work. While there is a difference in the techniques of the social workers in these different fields, there should be much more that is common in the point of view and in the training of these

social workers than there is of difference in them. The fundamental thing to be kept in mind is that the problems of the social worker are social welfare and producing a better adjustment of those with whom he works.

Does social work involve simply doing good? If this were so, perhaps over one-half the race could make a claim as a social worker. Doing good may mean in many cases promoting social welfare and bringing about a better adjustment. However, many cases of so-called "doing good" may mean quite the contrary. Much that is done as social work at one time may be so standardized later that it ceases to be social work because of its character. The granting of allowances to the soldiers' families by the Red Cross during and since the World War was social work, as each family was a case and the allotment depended on circumstances, while the flat allowances to the soldiers of the Civil War was not social work because each of a class received the same amount. Providing for mothers' pensions today is social work, but it is conceivable that the allowances to mothers may become so standardized that the distribution of funds to mothers may cease to be social work.

(Social work is closely allied to many fields, and social workers must labor in conjunction with those working in them. Social workers dealing with problems of children whether of health, delinquency, or family rehabilitation, must of necessity work with teachers. If the teacher is well trained and has a broad point of view, some of her work with children would be designated social work if done by a social worker. This, however, does not make her a social worker. The physician has an intimate acquaintance with the problems of the home, and the following of his advice may lead to a better organization of the home and may even prevent delinquency. Our contention is that this does not make him to that extent

a social worker. A mother of children who has had considerable experience in dealing with their ailments often diagnoses disease and gives remedies which cure the patient. This, however, does not make her either a physician or nurse. It would be just as reasonable to claim that a mother is a physician by virtue of her services in the latter case as to claim that the physician and teacher are social workers in the former cases.

Moreover, the clergyman is often said to be doing social work and on that account is a social worker. Many laymen influence individuals spiritually in far-reaching ways, but this does not make them clergymen. Hospital social service is social work but not the work of the hospital nurse. The nurses of instructive district nursing associations and tuberculosis nurses who visit the homes of the poor to nurse and give instruction in caring for the sick are social workers, but not the private nurses who care for people in their homes. There is a clear line of demarcation between the two sets of services here discussed which is easy to understand.

Individuals serving on boards of philanthropic and social-work societies defining and approving policies are not by virtue of such service social workers. The writer of this chapter has served for many years as a member of boards of many social organizations, such as a charity organization society, a social settlement, the Florence Crittenden Home, the Tuberculosis Society, the Red Cross, the State Board of Charities, and has been chairman of a Red Cross committee on rehabilitation following a flood, but he has never assumed that because of these associations he was a social worker. Something more definitely technical should be reserved for the one who is to be designated a professional social worker.

It has been stated that there is a variety of techniques in social work. This feature, however, is not peculiar to social work. In the medical profession the technique of

the surgeon is different from the technique of the general practitioner, and in the legal profession the technique of the criminal lawyer is different from the technique of the corporation lawyer; and the technique of each is different from that of the attorney working in a small community. Although there are a number of techniques in social work, the use of each technique has in mind the improvement of general welfare or the working out of better individual or social adjustments.

Social work involves the use of social science, sociology, psychology, economics, and political science to accomplish its purposes and aims.) The techniques employed are based upon the fundamental principles of the social sciences tested by the experience of years in solving individual and social situations. This is scientific social work.

The term social workers should be applied only to those who are employed professionally, that is, to those giving their entire time to the work and usually working at it for pay. Just as those dabbling in medical or legal practice are not considered physicians or lawyers, neither should those laboring incidentally in social work be considered social workers.

Furthermore, only those social workers who use scientific methods should be considered as engaged in social work. It will be recalled that in the early development of social work in this country, those engaged in public work, especially those in institutional work, looked with suspicion on the newcomers in the field who were doing constructive and preventive work. Naturally it will be questioned whether the name social workers will be denied those using the methods of thirty or forty years ago. It is our belief that the term should be denied all those not using scientific methods.

The best argument for the other side of the question is presented by Dr. Edward T. Devine in his book on social work. He says:

It (social work) is used to denote the whole complicated net-work of activities which center around the social problems of poverty, disease, crime, and other socially abnormal conditions. The unifying element in social work lies in these common social problems with which it is concerned, rather than in a common method or motive.

On the meaning of social work he says:

Social work, then is the sum of all the efforts made by society to take up its own slack, to provide for individuals when its established institutions fail them, to supplement those established institutions and to modify them at those points at which they have proved to be badly adapted to social needs. It may have for its object the relief of individuals or the improvement of conditions. It may be carried on by the government or by an incorporated society or by an informal group or by an individual, or it may be a temporary excrescence on some older institution which exists primarily for some other function. It may be well done or badly; according to the most enlightened system which intelligence and experience and sympathy and vision can devise, or according to the archaic methods of careless and lazy emotion. It may be inspired by sympathy or expediency or fear of revolution or even of evolutionary change, or by a sense of justice and decency. It includes everything which is done by society for the benefit of those who are not in a position to compete on fair terms with their fellows, from whatever motive it may be done, by whatever agency or whatever means, and with whatever result.

I have no objections to calling all the things described here social work if many of them are considered in the same light as the work of the fakir and pseudo-scientist in medicine, the pettifogger in law and all the irregularities in education. The regular physician must be licensed to practice medicine, the lawyer must be admitted to the bar, and teachers must be licensed to teach. These are the regular members of the professions they represent. Yet in spite of these efforts at standardization for the

protection of the professions and in the interest of the public, many unlicensed pretenders and so-called healers impose on the public and attempt to cure disease, many irregular and unlicensed men pretend to practice law, while nearly every one attempts to teach.

The members of the profession of social work have not the protection of the state in the form of a license to those who are competent to practice the profession. As a matter of fact, many regular organizations often employ persons with neither experience nor training as apprentices and then later make them regular members of their staffs. If social work is to receive the recognition which its importance deserves, its leaders must fight to place it on a more dignified plane by denying recognition to the undeserving just as law, medicine, and education are denying the recognition to those unworthy of a place in these professions. The National Association of Social Workers has set standards for admission to membership and these standards, low as they are, should be recognized as the minimum for social workers. All social work done by others should receive a recognition comparable to that accorded all unlicensed persons practicing medicine, unlicensed teachers, and those practicing law who have not been admitted to the bar.

Somewhat farther on Dr. Devine says:

There is social work which is so badly done as to defeat its purpose. There is philanthropy which confirms dependence instead of relieving it; there are reformatories which educate to crime instead of away from it; there are laws intended to improve conditions which make them worse. Such undertakings are social work but of a low grade.

This is no overstatement of the case. In every community of over 100,000 inhabitants in the United States where there is a great variety of social organizations it is safe to conclude that over one-half of them are doing more harm than good.

Why recognize this sort of thing as social work at all? If this work is antisocial, as Dr. Devine admits, why not designate it as it would be designated in any other field of knowledge or activity? We would not consider a man a lawyer who was getting his clients involved in a violation of law, a man a physician who was regularly sending his clients to their graves, or a man a minister of the gospel who was sending people to the devil. Social work is the use of social science by a professional social worker in bringing about better individual and social adjustments and promoting human welfare, and not in producing maladjustments and driving the world to perdition.

Much of social work is of a pioneer character. Some of it is restricted to a particular time and place, and when the need for it passes it ceases to exist. The kindergarten was first organized by the settlement and as soon as its methods were standardized and the need for it was established it was taken over by the school, and the settlement then ceases to conduct the kindergarten. The playground and recreation activities of communities as organized community social activities were first developed by the settlements, and while these have now become recognized activities of the school they are still conducted by the settlement.

CHAPTER III

THE NEED FOR SOCIAL WORK

It has often been said that if the regular social institutions such as the family, the church, the school, and the state, functioned perfectly, there would be no need for social work; that its need is in direct proportion to the inefficiency of these and all other social institutions and agencies. Assuming the correctness of this point of view, one can see clearly that the need for social work will always be great, since we can never hope for the perfect working of man-made institutions.

If the home and the family functioned to rear healthy, socially minded, intelligent, self-sustaining individuals, there would be little need for family case work. But this assumption calls for a large contract. Even if the parents have average mentality and balance, there is some chance that some of their children will be below normal in mentality, or eccentric. If one or both parents are below normal in mentality, or above the average in eccentricity, the likelihood of their having abnormal children is great. But either or both parents may die, or the parents may be separated before the children grow up, and in such cases there will always be opportunities for the best kind of social work. Even if the parents live, and live together until the children grow up, it is too much to expect that society will ever be rid of ignorant, incompetent, unsocial, or poverty-stricken people who will not assume the responsibilities of parenthood.

If the school functioned as a social institution and assumed that it was its primary obligation to develop the child intellectually, physically, morally, and spiritually

instead of teaching certain subjects, and if it had the funds to employ competent teachers and to supply superior physical facilities, there would be relatively little for the social worker to do to make up for the deficiencies of the school. It is not likely that the school will soon attain the point of view above indicated, and if it does, the other elements will not be attained for generations to come.

Much difference of opinion prevails with reference to the functions of the church in social work. One distinguished clergyman, Dr. Washington Gladden says:

It is safe to assert that the state of the Christian Church in this country at the end of the first decade of the 20th century is not all that could be desired.

What was the relation of Jesus Christ to the poor, the sick, and the unfortunate, and what proportion of his public ministry was given to what we would call social science?

It must be remembered that in all the earlier periods of Christian history systematic and organized philanthropy was almost wholly the work of the church. Hospitals, orphanages, infirmaries, most organizations for the care of the sick, the needy, and the unfortunate, were church agencies. The Roman Catholic Church of today is the inheritor of that conception of the relation of the church to the unfortunate classes, which explains the fact that her work for the relief of suffering and need is so much better organized than that of the *Protestant Churches*.

In passing it (philanthropic leadership) over to the state, the church has divested itself of its most vital function. The loss is lamentable, almost fatal; the weakness of the church in this latter day is due to it. The church must recover the function; it is not a mere matter of expediency; it is a question of life or death.¹

If this point of view is followed it simply means that the church will be doing social work now done by other

¹ "The Municipal Church," *Century Magazine*, Vol. 80, pp. 493-499, 1910.

agencies. The other point of view is that the church as a teaching organization will develop social-mindedness among its people, so that the regular institutions of society may function better, and the people affiliated with religious organizations will be inspired to see that the social work needed will be done more thoroughly than heretofore.

If industry was organized free from the exploiting point of view, if the awards of all classes of workers were evenly adjusted with reference to service and need, the amount of work to be done by the social worker would be greatly reduced. Relatively little progress has been made to even up things. The extraordinary gulf between wealth and poverty seems to be becoming greater and greater. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research, 86 per cent of the people of the United States gainfully employed earn less than \$2,000 a year. As long as these conditions exist, there will be a need for social workers to advocate the passing of more just laws and the assumption of a more humane point of view of government to take care of and to bolster up the underprivileged and to teach people to reduce by voluntary effort the handicaps among men.

If the state were doing its full duty, there would be much less need for social work. Much of the inequality mentioned in the last paragraph is due to social causes for which organized society is to blame. Social justice is even yet only a vague dream. There is need for propaganda in the direction of just laws, which the social worker is most competent to promote. The burdens of government are far greater than they should be. Through short-sighted policies in international relationships, which were responsible for our great World War, governments have placed enormous burdens on the backs of people to pay war debts. Through political corruption leading to maladministration, other great

burdens have been imposed. Through the failure to exercise common sense in appointing competent people to service in public administration, the costs of government are enhanced and public administration is inefficient.

The attitudes of the early settlers of the United States, and of those who succeeded them, were not favorable to the development of social work. Many of them came to this country because of religious and political persecution in the Old World. They were not always consistent in setting up their religious and political organizations in the New World, since in many cases they in turn persecuted those who differed from them. But nevertheless the leaders did not want interference from outside forces. It was these interferences which caused the American Revolution and gave us our independence. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States were individualistic documents. The people wanted freedom from religious persecution and from too much political control.

Even throughout the nineteenth century people came from Europe because of political and religious persecution. Before 1850 the Irish came in large numbers; the Germans and other races came after the Revolution of 1848; and the Jews have come all through the century because of the greater freedom they enjoyed in the United States than in Europe. All these classes craved freedom and they desired to be let alone.

The resources of the United States, as compared with Europe, were such that it was relatively easy to earn a living here. The trials of the pioneer were, of course, hard, but his prosperity depended on his industry, frugality, and initiative. The children of the immigrant usually attained a higher economic station in life than that in which their parents lived and that in which they were born. It became apparent to them that any one could rise in America if he was worthy, that is, if he had

ability, industry, and initiative, and that there were no barriers whatever to any heights which a person might attain if he had superior qualities in him. It was likewise concluded that if an individual failed, his failure was due to personal causes, shiftlessness, drinking, gambling, etc., and the average citizen had but little sympathy for those who failed.

Under these circumstances there was a definite bias against helping the needy unless it was very apparent that they were victims of misfortune. When such was the case, especially in communities outside of the large cities, it was assumed that the neighborly spirit could be relied on to take care of the cases of real need. At first public relief began with the farming out of the worthy poor and their children. When these classes became too numerous to be taken care of by this method, county poorhouses were established. In private philanthropy, associations known as provident societies or associations for improving the conditions of the poor, were formed in cities to supplement the relief given by public philanthropy. Prior to 1875 no large amounts were given either by public or private philanthropy because relatively little was needed, and because the social philosophy of the time in America stood in the way of adequately taking care of those in need.

Within the last sixty years even individualistic America is coming to appreciate that there are causes of need and failures in social adjustment not due to personal causes, and that socially we are responsible for many if not most of the failures because we have not given adequate attention to the causes of disease, poverty, crime, and other maladjustments. We are beginning also to see that because our standard of living is higher in America than in Europe and because of other reasons there is a greater need for social work here than in Europe. Poverty is there often too sodden, too hopeless,

to warrant any ameliorative effort beyond relief of distress in its more acute forms. Peasant life on the Continent, regardless of the country in which it is found, has its limitations in welfare. The resources of the soil are such that it is difficult to see how a much higher standard of living can be attained than that which now prevails. In towns and cities where factory production prevails and where the wage earners work in stores, the limitations on welfare seem to be nearly as fixed as they are in the rural communities.

In the United States, although much is to be desired in a better standard of living for the rank and file, the situation is not so hopeless. Our capacity to produce has been increased to such an extent within the last twenty years by the improvement of machinery and by a better organization of productive forces, that it is now possible to produce all we need while the productive forces remain idle more than one-fourth of the time. This points very definitely in the direction of fewer working days a week and a shorter working day. Moreover, if the annual wealth produced by the United States were more equitably divided, a satisfactory standard of living could be guaranteed every able-bodied industrious frugal wage earner without resort to charity. Because of the opportunity of improving the welfare of the masses of the people of the United States at the present time, there is great need now for welfare work which will protect the interests of the wage-earning classes and obtain legislation which will secure a more nearly equitable distribution of the national dividend.

The rapid growth of American cities, the continual shifting of population in the United States from section to section and especially from country to city, the constant changing of wants and methods of satisfying new wants, all make individual and social adjustment difficult. With these constant changes and fluctuations,

failures in adjustment will be frequent, and consequently the need for social work will be great.

Producers as a class have yet to discover that their best markets are to be found in the demands of independent, thrifty, prosperous consumers. Since a poverty-stricken population must restrict itself to a few plain commodities, its demand for goods has little significance to producers.

The political organization in the United States makes the unification of social work difficult. The centralized unit of public social work is the state, and there are forty-eight states. There is consequently unity only to the extent that the social legislation and the social policies of one state are copied by the others. As a matter of fact, there is much in common in social legislation and social policies in the different states. Each state has its subdivisions—county, township, and city—to each of which is delegated or is permitted a certain class or kind of welfare work. In these respects, in the lesser subdivisions the public welfare work in the various states differs.

In private philanthropy there is much more uniformity in welfare work throughout the country. Private philanthropy is more scientific than public philanthropy; it observes the laws of the applied social sciences more carefully, and consequently does the same sort of work in all places where it functions, whether in New York or in California. Moreover, the various organizations engaged in private philanthropy are bound together in national associations which tend to make their work more uniform and to apply the best practices everywhere.

The first chapter of Herbert Spencer's volume on the study of sociology, written in 1873, which was the beginning of his notable work on the principles of sociology, bears this significant title, "Our Need of It." In this chapter he points out in a striking manner the importance of a science of society for social guidance. Ignorant,

uniformed people, he reminds us, state positively, even dogmatically, what the social policy should be covering complex social phenomena concerning which they are densely ignorant. Since Spencer wrote this chapter there has been but little change in the cocksureness of the man on the streets concerning matters about which, in the nature of the case, he can know but little. The need of a science of social relations is as great as when Spencer began his notable work, and the need of a profession (social work) to apply what we already know of a science of social relations is as great as the need of a science of sociology.

CHAPTER IV

HISTORY OF TRAINING IN SOCIAL WORK

There is nothing new in the experience which the professional schools of social work are having in the training of social workers. This experience has been duplicated by the older professions of law, medicine, education, and engineering. The apprenticeship method of approach to the profession has always preceded the method of systematic training.

There was a time when the young aspirant for a place in the medical profession took a position in the doctor's office. In this capacity he read the doctor's books, rode with him when he visited his cases, and observed his methods on sick calls. He watched the doctor carefully when the latter treated his patients in his office and when he performed operations. After a time as a result of these experiences the aspirant, too, became a doctor. This method of acquiring a professional education in medicine gradually gave way to the private school, and it in turn to the university medical college with its systematic training, its clinics, its laboratories, and its hospitals. The attainment of this stage required time, the accumulation of a literature, the development of scientific knowledge, and great progress in the art of applying scientific knowledge to specific cases of disease.

In the legal profession the young student read law in the office of the lawyer, observed the handling of clients, and noted the advice given them as they came to the lawyer's office. He attended the sessions of the courts to learn the methods of procedure which prevailed there, and afterwards, upon motion of some attorney, was

admitted to the bar. He became what is known even yet in legal circles as a case lawyer—that is, he learned what he needed to know about his case after it came to him. The necessity for systematic and rigid bar examinations is a matter of recent years. The apprenticeship method of becoming a lawyer gradually gave way to the private law school, and it in turn to the university law college, with its professional teachers, its systematic courses of study, its case method of instruction. These changes came very slowly as there were always reactionaries in the legal profession who contended that the best way to learn law was by the apprenticeship method. In nearly all states now the passing of a rigid state bar examination even by those who graduate from high-grade law colleges, is a necessary requisite to admission to the legal profession.

The social workers who are over-zealous to accomplish a high state of efficiency in professional training for social work are hereby reminded of the long period of struggle of both the medical and legal professions in attaining their present status.

The National Conference of Charities and Corrections, which was organized in 1873, was in existence twenty-four years before Miss Mary E. Richmond went to the national conference at Toronto in 1897 to make her plea for the establishment of a Training School in Applied Philanthropy. During all these years social workers became such through the apprenticeship route, and there was really no serious thought of their acquiring knowledge or skill in any other way. Some social agencies which had a number of apprentices in the office at one time formed reading classes for the study of social literature, and a certain period each week was often given over to reports on readings and discussions. Even today, over thirty years after this plea was made, many more persons become social workers through the apprenticeship route

than through training in the schools. The method of assigning readings to novices employed by social agencies and of setting aside a period each week for discussions is still in vogue.

In her epoch-making address Miss Richmond pointed out the importance of social workers' having definite understandings.

If an agent of a relief society has occasion to confer with the head of a foundling asylum, is it not likely that the ends they have in view, that the principles underlying their work, that the very meanings which they attach to our technical terms, will prove to be quite at variance? What an incalculable gain to humanity when those who are doctoring social diseases in many departments of charitable work shall have found a common ground of agreement, and be forced to recognize certain established principles as underlying all effective service? Not immediately, of course, but slowly and steadily such a common ground could be established, I believe, by a training school for professional social workers.

With reference to the breadth of training of the school, she said:

We feel, of course, that every form of charity could be improved by a better knowledge of charity organization principles; but it seems to us of the first importance, also, that our agents should have a better all-round knowledge of other forms of charity. The school that is to be most helpful to our charity organization agents, therefore, must be established on a broad basis, and be prepared to train relief agents, child saving agents, institution officials, and other charitable specialists.

As to the chief aims of the school she said:

To give our professional charity workers better habits of thought and higher ideals, this should be one chief aim of our School of Applied Philanthropy. I need not say how slowly a good school grows, or how slowly it makes its influence

felt. But, if these twenty years have taught us anything, they have taught us that plans which are to find their full realization the year after next are not worth initiating. The chief and perhaps the only claim which this rough sketch of a plan can have to consideration is to be found in the willingness of its advocates to leave much to the future.

In the summer of 1898, the New York Charity Organization Society organized a six weeks' training course in New York City in the Charities building. This school was continued for seven summers and had an average attendance of approximately thirty. Those who attended were chiefly social workers of limited experience who came to improve their efficiency. Trips were planned almost daily to the different types of institutions and agencies, and prominent social workers from New York and other cities gave single lectures or groups of lectures on the field of social work involving their experience.

In 1903 the New York Charity Organization Society extended its program to include a six months' winter course. The following year the society under its committee on philanthropic education organized the New York school of philanthropy and made Dr. Edward T. Devine, the general secretary of the New York Charity Organization Society, its first director. A full year's course was planned consisting both of class work and field work intended primarily for the benefit of those who had no social experience. The classroom teachers or lecturers were practically all social workers.

In the same year, 1904, a School for Social Workers, maintained by Simmons College and Harvard University, was organized under Dr. Jeffrey R. Brackett, president of the Department of Charities and Corrections of Baltimore. Dr. Brackett served as director of this school for a period of sixteen years. The character and aims of this school were almost identical with those of the New York school.

Under the leadership of Mr. Graham Taylor of the Chicago Commons, the Chicago Institute of Social Science was established in 1903 as a part of the extension department of the University of Chicago, to train social workers. Nearly all the students who attended were employed by the social agencies of Chicago. In 1906 the Chicago Commons assumed responsibility for the administrative expenses of the Institute. In 1907 a department of research under Julia C. Lathrop and Sophonisba P. Breckenridge was established. In 1908 the school was organized on an independent basis and incorporated as the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy under Mr. Graham Taylor. It continued under this organization until it was taken over by the University of Chicago in 1920.

Regular classroom work was begun by the St. Louis School of Philanthropy in 1907 when a fifteen weeks' course was offered. The first full year's course was not begun until the autumn of 1908. The school was organized by the social workers who desired to provide training for themselves, but it had some affiliation with the University of Missouri chiefly through the influence of Dr. C. A. Ellwood. Dr. Thomas J. Riley of the University of Missouri became the first director of the school. In 1909 the name of the school was changed to the School of Social Economy, and the affiliation of the school was transferred from the University of Missouri to Washington University, St. Louis, with the appointment of Dr. Riley, the director of the school, as professor of sociology at Washington University. The school was conducted by Washington University until 1915, and after one year of independent existence, it was again affiliated with the University of Missouri, where it has been since conducted in its extension department.

The Philadelphia Training School was organized in 1909 by the social workers of Philadelphia as a training

school for their own social workers. The teaching staff consisted of some of the leading social workers of the city, and the field work was provided by the social agencies of the city. In 1916 the school was incorporated as the Pennsylvania School for Social Service, and a greatly enlarged program was planned.

The Richmond School of Social Work and Public Health at Richmond, Virginia, was organized in 1917 by Dr. H. H. Hibbs, Jr., its first director. This was the first training school in the South for social and public health work. In 1919 a department providing training in recreation, physical training, and playground work was added. In 1919 William and Mary College organized an extension department in the city of Richmond, and in the following year, 1920, the extension Department and the School of Social Work and Public Health were placed under one management by the appointment of Dr. Hibbs, director of the latter, as director of the extension department. The school was not completely under the jurisdiction of the college until the year 1925-1926, when the college was able to provide fully for its maintenance and operation.

Another Southern experiment in the training of social workers was the Texas School of Civics and Philanthropy, which was organized by the social agencies of Houston as an independent school. It was taken over by Rice Institute in 1918, when its director, Dr. Stuart A. Queen, resigned to enter the military service.

THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS TO THE CLOSE OF THE WORLD WAR

While all except the Pennsylvania School had university relations at one time or another in their history, these university affiliations meant little or nothing in the organization and carrying on of their work.¹ In

¹ This statement does not apply to the Richmond School. This school maintained university standards when it became an organic part of William and Mary College.

some instances the university supported the school financially, but in most cases the university affiliation was used to give it a degree of respectability which it would not have enjoyed otherwise. These schools were all organized by social workers who planned their curriculums and determined their policies, aims, and educational systems.

There was very much in common in all these schools. They were all large city schools, and their students came very largely from the community in which they were situated. The one possible exception to this was the New York School, which has always had some students from different parts of the country. In many, perhaps most, instances the students had experience in social work. Such topics as poverty, the history of poor relief, the state in relation to charity, public and private institutions, constructive social work, child-helping agencies, the treatment of the criminal, improvement of living conditions, the scope of charity, preventive policies, agencies and methods, etc., were generally treated. The large schools had more offerings than the smaller ones and announced curricula of training for more occupations than the smaller ones.

During the period under discussion a more definite technique in family welfare had been worked out than in any other field of social work. Because of this and because more positions were available in this line of work than in any other, family welfare work was emphasized in all the schools. The case-work course gradually developed in which actual cases covering a wide range of problems were presented to the students for solution. In other lines of social work, such as the organization of community programs, the technique of organized recreation, and social work administration, etc., no definite techniques had developed, and the schools were handicapped in giving adequate instruction.

As social workers were needed for positions which were becoming available everywhere it became an ambition of the schools to give their students a technique and experience which would enable them to accept positions of some responsibility immediately after completing the work of the school. For this reason field work was emphasized. As a matter of fact the most substantial work offered in some, perhaps most, of the schools was the field work given by some of the agencies affiliated with them. At the outset the field work was badly organized. An attempt was made to give the student experience as an understudy and then later some experience in solving problems which came up in the agency, so that as soon as his course was completed he could accept a position of responsibility either as a case worker in an agency, or in some other position of responsibility in an agency. To make the student immediately efficient as a social worker upon graduating was one of the chief aims of the school. So strongly have some of the older social workers been imbued with this idea of a school for social workers that even now when they discover that a graduate from a school is not an efficient social worker at the time of graduation, they think that something is wrong with the school.

Since many of the students who attended these schools were graduates of colleges, the impression was often given that the schools were graduate schools. High-school graduates were admitted to these schools, and, since some of them admitted students upon a written test, students were admitted who were not high school graduates. No preprofessional courses were required in order to enter these schools, although training in the social sciences was recommended by some of them.

The class work of these schools was seldom taught by professional educators, but by social workers who had little or no experience in teaching. Often courses were

taught by lecturers who came in from a variety of social agencies. Where this method of instruction prevailed there was much duplication and emphasis of non-essentials, the material was often badly classified, and the courses lacked unity. Those who have had experience in bringing outside lecturers to the classroom in social work or any other line know that unless the lectures are carefully outlined all the shortcomings above designated will appear.

During this period the trade-school rather than the professional-school theory of education prevailed. The students were taught to be craftsmen. An attempt was made to teach them the techniques of the occupations they were preparing to enter. They were trained to be efficient in the occupation they were to pursue at the time they graduated from the school. No effort was made to lay a broad foundation for their work by giving them preprofessional courses or requiring that they should have had such courses before they entered the school. Moreover, it was not required that students should have the necessary foundation course to both the preprofessional and the professional courses of the school.

SOCIAL-WORK TRAINING OF THE UNIVERSITIES TO THE CLOSE OF THE WORLD WAR

As has been pointed out, the social workers led the way in making provision for the training of social workers in independent schools of social work and in schools with a nominal connection with a university. In such schools the policies and ideals of social workers were carried out. Some gestures were made in the last decade of the nineteenth century in the direction of social-work training by Wisconsin, by the Hartford Theological Seminary, and by the University of Chicago under Professor C. R.

Henderson.¹ Shortly after the first private schools of social work were organized, a number of the universities began offering courses in applied sociology and courses in social technology with the purpose of giving training to students preparing for careers in social work.

The work developed at the Ohio State University is perhaps typical of that developed in other universities, especially the state universities. In 1906 the department of economics and sociology published a bulletin announcing training in business administration and social service. In this bulletin it was stated that the

development of charity and philanthropy along scientific lines has opened up a new career to the trained student. In this field of work the city university has a great advantage.

The bulletin then goes on to list the public welfare institutions, state, county, and municipal, situated in or near Columbus. The announcement concludes with the following paragraph:

In the general course dealing with dependent, defective, and delinquent classes, the students are required to visit the various state and county welfare institutions and agencies in Columbus. Opportunities are afforded to do practical settlement work, charity investigation work in connection with the associated charities, and work in connection with the juvenile Court. The studies in this group are arranged to combine practical work with the theoretical work, so that students upon leaving the university may take positions of responsibility in settlement, charity, and general philanthropic work.

In the curriculum in social service in the sophomore year, students were required to take a year's work in sociology including one term's work on the principles of sociology, a one-term course on the family, and a third-term course on primitive society. In this year they were

¹ See STEINER, *American Journal of Sociology*, pp. 493-494, January, 1921.

also required to take the fundamental course in economics, a course in American history, and a course in physiography. In the junior year the fundamental course in philosophy and psychology were required.

Before graduating, the student was required to take courses in dependents and defectives, criminology, and organized philanthropy, besides courses dealing with racial problems and a seminary or investigative course in which each student was required to write a thesis on some subject of social significance based upon his own investigations. These students were also required to take courses in accounting and statistics, social psychology, and the theory of mental development. At this time university credit was not given for field work. Students were expected to get their practice work with some social agency in the summer between the junior and senior years or to do their practice work while carrying their junior and senior work. Those desiring to go into social-settlement work often resided in the settlement during their senior year and sometimes during both their junior and senior years.

By 1910 the social-service training at the Ohio State University had taken more definite form. In the bulletin of this year the following statement was made,

The state of Ohio has thousands of paid and volunteer social workers, most of whom are untrained for their work. If it is the duty of the state university to train its students for efficient citizenship, it should offer facilities for the training of professional and volunteer social workers. The new ideas of philanthropy, if put in practice, would reduce the number of dependents and criminals, and make more efficient the state and county institutions and the private charities.

A year of field work was offered for credit with some social agency under the supervision of the agency and a member of the department, and two years' work was offered in modern charity, preventive philanthropy,

poverty, and criminology. One year's work in the organization and remuneration of labor and labor legislation and one year's work in applied psychology, including abnormal psychology, were required.

These courses were gradually expanded until the College of Commerce and Journalism was organized in 1916, at which time a curriculum for the training of social workers leading to the degree of bachelor of science in social administration was adopted as an organic part of the college.

To the extent that the work at the Ohio State University typifies the social-work teaching of the universities, the contrast between the social-work training of the private school of philanthropy and of the university is marked. In the latter the emphasis is on fundamental courses in the social and biological sciences and on the semi-professional courses in applied sociology and psychology with a minimum of field work. In the former the emphasis is on field-work and case-work technique with little or no emphasis on fundamental courses and the so-called pre-professional courses in applied sociology. In the latter the work was taught primarily by professional teachers, in the former by social workers. In the latter students were not expected to be efficient social workers as soon as they graduated, as the chief interest of the school was in the growth of the student and in his status eight or ten years after he graduated. In the former emphasis was placed on the efficiency of the student on the completion of his course, since social agencies were ready to take on social workers, and their judgment of the school was determined by the efficiency of its graduates as soon as they got them.

The World War gave a tremendous impetus to the training of social workers by both groups of schools but especially by the university. Many of the members of

university faculties went into war activities in both industrial and social work. Having need for many social workers in all communities, the National Red Cross organized training schools in many parts of the country to offer six weeks' courses for the training of home service workers. Fifteen universities participated in the giving of these courses, some of which had no place hitherto in their curriculums for the training of social workers. These courses were definitely outlined at the headquarters of the National Red Cross, conferences were held at Washington with the directors of the schools in which the purposes and plans of the courses were discussed, and field work was provided by the local chapter of the Red Cross in the community where the course was given. From one to four such courses were given by each institution.

Most of the institutions which gave these courses saw a new opportunity for service, and when the war was over reorganized their courses of study so as to include training for social workers.

TRAINING IN SOCIAL WORK SINCE THE WORLD WAR

In the summer of 1919 the New York School of Social Work invited all the schools then offering training in social work to meet at the headquarters of the New York School to discuss problems of mutual interest to all of them. A few days later representatives of these schools met at Atlantic City, New Jersey, at the time the national conference on social work met there, and organized the Association of Training Schools of Social Work. The institutions which had representatives at the New York conference and later became charter members of the association were as follows: The New York School of Social Work, the Boston School of Social Work, the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, the St. Louis

School of Social Work, the Richmond School of Social Work, and the Pennsylvania School of Social Work; the following universities and colleges were also represented at this conference: Bryn Mawr College, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Smith College, University of Chicago, University of Minnesota, the Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Toronto, and Western Reserve University.

The growth of this movement may be seen from the number of members of the association in July, 1931.

1. Atlanta School of Social Work
2. Bryn Mawr College
3. University of California
4. Carnegie Institute of Technology
5. University of Chicago
6. University of Cincinnati
7. Fordham University
8. Indiana University
9. Loyola University
10. McGill University
11. University of Michigan
12. University of Minnesota
13. University of Missouri
14. National Catholic School of Social Service
15. New York School of Social Work
16. University of North Carolina
17. The Ohio State University
18. University of Oregon
19. Pennsylvania School of Social and Health Work
20. Simmons College, School of Social Work
21. Smith College Training School for Social Work
22. School of Social Welfare, University of Southern California
23. Training School for Jewish Social Work, New York City
24. Tulane University
25. Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.
26. School of Applied Social Sciences, Western Reserve University
27. College of William and Mary, School of Social Work and Public Health, Richmond, Va.
28. The University of Wisconsin

Aside from these there are the following schools not members of the Association:

1. Dallas Institute of Social Education
2. Rice Institute, Houston, Texas
3. Boston University, School of Religious Education and Social Work
4. George Washington University, Washington, D. C.
5. Harvard University, Department of Ethics
6. University of Louisville, School of Social Work and Occupational Therapy
7. University of Oklahoma
8. University of Washington, Seattle

The private schools of social work in existence when the association was founded in 1919 have tended to establish university affiliations. The Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy has been taken over by the University of Chicago; the Richmond School of Social Work is an organic part of William and Mary College; and the St. Louis School of Social Work has been absorbed by Washington University, St. Louis. The Simmons College School of Social Work is the Boston School of Social Work with little or no organic change. The New York School of Social Work and the Philadelphia School of Health and Social Work have no university affiliations. A number of private schools without university affiliation have emerged since 1919 as, for example, the National Catholic Service School, the Atlanta School of Social Work, the Dallas Institute of Social Education, and the Training School for Jewish Social Work. The last three are not in the national association.

There has been but little change since 1919 in the number of private schools giving training in social work, but the number of universities offering training in social work has increased from nine to twenty-two schools in the association. If the schools not in the association, offering training in social work, be included, there are at present (1931) thirty colleges and universities offering training in social work.

Professor Tufts of the University of Chicago writing in 1922 on "Education and Training for Social Work,"¹ gives four types of organization of instruction for social work:

(1) The separate school independent of connection with college or university; (2) the definitely organized professional school connected with a college or university; (3) a definite organization of courses under the charge of a single dean or other officer of administration and with a staff of instructors unified for the purpose of such organization, although having their own departmental status; (4) a loose aggregation or grouping of courses in some one department or some several departments, with little if any administrative unity and with a minimum of professional direction.

He then concludes,

Obviously the first two types are in a class by themselves as definitely professional schools. The last type can claim very little of the proper professional environment or purpose. The third type is somewhat intermediate, and is likely to depend for its character very largely upon the personality of the administrative officer in charge.

He reaches the further conclusion that

. . . both purposes of the professional school are more likely to be met by institutions of the first and second type.

In a former page he has stated that

. . . the most obvious purpose is that it should fit men and women to become skilled social workers [and] that a second function of the professional school, hardly less important, if indeed it is less important than the first, is the development of the field of professional work through scholarly research and publication.

We accept most heartily the purposes of the professional school as stated by Professor Tufts. Whether

¹ TUFTS, "Education and Training for Social Work," p. 107, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

these purposes of the professional school are best met by institutions of the first and second types above referred to must be determined by a more thorough analysis of the different types of schools than Professor Tufts has made.

A number of observations concerning these types are pertinent. In the first place, there may be little or no difference between the first two types, the separate school independent of connection with a college or university, and the definitely organized professional school connected with a college or university. Many, perhaps all, of the separate schools have sought connection with universities because of the supposed advantage in status or for financial or other benefits that this university relationship would give them. In nearly all these cases the independent school had no thought of modifying its real organization, its character, or its methods of professional education, and in most cases the college or university did not require any modification of its organization or program when the school was affiliated with it.

In other cases when the college or university organized its own professional school of social work, it developed its school almost in complete imitation of the independent schools which had been set up by social workers and in accordance with the philosophy of professional education upon which the social workers had determined. This held true with reference to the content and character of the curriculum, the amount and kind of field work required, the kind and character of the professional courses given, the number and amount of fundamental courses required, and the number and character of pre-professional courses required. Not all the universities, however, organized their professional schools in complete imitation of those which had been set up under the dominance of social workers and in imitation of the private schools. Some of them adopted their own philosophy of professional education and set up curricula

and employed professional educators and social workers in conformity with this philosophy.

One group of schools, Number 2 of Professor Tufts's classification, namely, the definitely organized professional school connected with a college or university, is almost identical with the separate independent school, whereas the other is very different from it. Which class under Number 2, may we ask, has Professor Tufts in mind? The second class under Number 2 is much more like his Number 3 class, "a definite organization of courses under the charge of a single dean or other officer of administration and with a staff of instructors unified for the purpose of such organization, although having also their own departmental status."

Whether the two purposes of the professional school are better met by the independent school and the first class under Number 2 or by the second class under Number 2 can only be answered by a more thorough analysis on broad and fundamental principles of the two types of schools.

Which fits men and women best to become skilled social workers? Which is most desired, immediate or remote returns? The first class of schools undoubtedly fits them better for immediate returns. Is this the great desideratum in professional education? I do not believe that it is.

Professional education does not necessarily involve teaching to do specific things. It is very important to give the student in social training the fundamental principles of the social sciences and of psychology and biology, subjects furnishing an excellent discipline in clear thinking on social questions. Moreover, give him the broad outlook and the wholesome point of view of life which the successful social worker should have and which are the natural result of the preprofessional courses. Finally, give him the good training in the principles of

social work which will enable him to employ clear thinking with a wide grasp of principles to the solution of social problems as they arise from day to day in his work. Teaching him these is much more important than teaching him the specific techniques of different occupations. The possessor of the techniques will please the social executive more at the outset, but he will not grow as rapidly as a social worker, and at the end of five or six years will be greatly distanced by the student whose professional training has been based on fundamental principles.

The difference between the two types of training is the difference between the professional school of education in the university today, which bases its principles of education on good, substantial background courses, and the old type of normal school which attempted to teach the technology of teaching.

Since Professor Tufts wrote, the faculty members of the different types of schools have been very active in productive scholarship. Much has been written in the last five years which is of great value in professional education. Time alone will enable us to judge the relative merits of what has been written.

Professor Tufts refers to the fourth type of organization as "a loose aggregation or grouping of courses in some one department or from several departments, with little if any administrative unity and with a minimum of professional direction." Most of the social-work training in the university quite naturally originated with departments of sociology and under the inspiration of professors of sociology. The professors of applied sociology have usually cooperated in offering education for social work. Reference has already been made to the impetus to this branch of education given by the World War. After the war professors in different universities saw an opportunity for a popular appeal by offering courses in applied

sociology and psychology, and advertised training courses for social workers. Some of the universities began advertising courses of this kind without being able to offer anything substantial to the social worker. Some of the courses offered were old courses rechristened with a popular appeal, with little or no change in subject matter. Some that began in this way gradually improved their offerings and faculty, changed their organization to meet modern requirements, and are now giving substantial training for social workers.

It is a matter of considerable interest that professors of sociology who have been interested in giving courses in applied sociology or social technology to undergraduate students have frequently met with difficulty. Departments of sociology are usually in colleges of liberal arts, and deans and faculties of liberal arts have often been opposed to the inclusion of technical or practical courses in a curriculum leading to the A.B. degree. At the Ohio State University a great deal was said about the purity of the arts degree when courses of a technical nature in both economics and sociology were offered, before a separate organization was set up for this line of work. Those interested in offering courses in technical social work have often been compelled to set up independent organizations, such as schools of social work, either within or without the liberal arts college. Others have been compelled to postpone their line of work until the A.B. degree was taken, and then organize a graduate course in social work. Opinions may differ as to whether social work should be taught as a graduate or undergraduate subject, but there can be no difference of opinion on this: that if it is taught as undergraduate work, a separate organization, such as a school or college, should be set up for its administration. A better *esprit de corps* can be developed where courses are grouped under one organization and where students may be assembled in separate

units for the teaching of technical and professional courses.

The sociologist who has been interested in giving courses in applied sociology and social technology has often been made uncomfortable by the very definite but short-sighted antipathy between many social workers and some of the older professors of pure sociology. The social worker who had no sociology but an elementary course twenty or twenty-five years ago, and who is ignorant of the later developments of the science, naturally has some prejudice against sociology as a subject which has little practical value to him. Consequently, in some of the independent schools of social work organized under the influence of the social workers, sociology is neither a prerequisite study to the training school of social work, nor is it required before graduation. It would seem to me to be just as inconsistent for the school of social work not to require a course in sociology which deals with the structure and functions of society and the laws of human association as a prerequisite to the technical courses in social work as it would be for the college of medicine not to require physiology as a prerequisite to the study of medicine.

Some of the older professors of pure sociology have viewed with misgivings training in courses in social technology and even courses in applied sociology. They have assumed that there was no theoretical knowledge concerning the subject matter and that workers and teachers in these fields were influenced by their sentiments and emotions and are engaged in occupations that are relatively unworthy.

This group of sociologists is rapidly diminishing in importance with the rise of a younger group of sociologists who are making sociology a real science rather than a social philosophy.

If social work becomes a profession, as we believe it will in time, it will be taught in schools and colleges in universities just as other kinds of professional education are given in the schools and colleges of universities. The private schools of social work will disappear as the private professional schools of law and medicine have disappeared, except those of relatively low grade. When education for professional social work becomes in a thoroughgoing way a university function, then university standards will prevail in social-work training.

CHAPTER V

IS SOCIAL WORK SCIENTIFIC?

One method of dignifying a calling or an occupation is to say that it is scientific or else that it is based on scientific principles. In conference circles in recent years we hear much of scientific charity, and the claim is repeatedly made that social work is scientific. It is this claim which I wish to analyze in this chapter. Is modern charity, or social work, scientific?

The science which should have most to do with social work is sociology. Having a very definite interest in both sociology and social work, I have been much disappointed in the attitude of mind of some of the leaders in each camp. Some of the older sociologists are represented by either or both of the two points of view following: Some believe that sociology is a pure science and is wholly devoid of any ideas of utilitarianism. According to their point of view, if sociology serves a useful purpose, it is purely accidental. Others dislike the association of sociology with applied sociology and social work and feel that the men in sociology who are interested in applied sociology and social work are tommyrotters and are a more or less disreputable class of people. I am happy to say that the sociologists who represent either or both of the above points of view are rapidly diminishing in number.

On the other hand, some of the leading social workers look askance at sociology. If they studied the subject at all they studied it at a time when sociology was a social philosophy and almost totally devoid of human interest. They are inclined to believe that psychology and

economics are of some value to the social worker in solving some of his problems but that the utility of sociology to the social worker is questionable. Some of the professional schools of social work reflecting this point of view do not require the students in training for social work to take Sociology either as a prerequisite to their training or as a part of their training as social workers. Most of these are either private schools of social work or else schools which have been superimposed on universities.

Both of these points of view are wrong. If sociology is a science of society instead of a social philosophy, then its study should be as valuable to the student in training for social work as physiology is to the medical student. If scientific methods are used in sociology, the laws of group life, the relation of the individual to the group, the laws of social control, the factors entering into and involved in social progress, etc., should be of great value to the social worker.

Social work is very much misunderstood. The layman on the streets has a vague and inadequate idea regarding the work of the social worker and his problems. I have been hoping that some one would give us a definition of social work which would be simple, concise, full of meaning, and easily understood. I am not sanguine over the value of definitions, but I have been looking for some time for a successful interpretation to the public of social work. Our failure to provide such an interpretation is extremely serious, since the success of social work depends to a great extent on public appreciation and public support.

Social work is frequently defined to the complete satisfaction of the social worker. Take these statements as illustrations, the first from Dr. Devine's "Social Work."

In this book

. . . social work is used to denote the whole complicated network of activities which center around the social problems of

poverty, disease, crime, and other socially abnormal conditions. The unifying element in social work lies in these common social problems with which it is concerned, rather than in a common method or motive.

Observe this clear-cut, succinct statement from Halbert's "What Is Professional Social Work."

Social work is the business of producing, changing or adjusting social organization and procedure in the interests of human welfare according to scientific standards.

This definition is satisfactory to most social workers but is very inadequate for the layman. Moreover, it is not sufficiently comprehensive. Elsewhere in this volume I too have defined social work, but my definition is not concise, brief, nor easily understood by the man on the streets.

The popular conception of social work is as old as civilization itself, but the scientific approach to social work in the United States began only about sixty years ago. The first thirty years of social work in the United States were represented primarily by remedial care and institutional treatment. Institutions were established to house and care for children, dependent adults, the insane, the feeble-minded, the epileptic, the blind, and the deaf, and outdoor relief was given by public and private agencies to the dependent poor in their homes.¹ This was a period primarily of organizing and perfecting institution management for the protection, care, and comfort of the handicapped classes. This was a period, too, in which investigations were made into the causes and extent of poverty, crime, sickness, maladjustment, etc.

Within this period two groups of social workers—the social settlement workers and the family case workers—went more deeply into the causes of the handicapped, and

¹ Institutional care for defective classes began, of course, much earlier.

handled more scientifically the problems with which they were confronted, than other classes of social workers. This was due to the fact that the settlement workers lived among the people they served and thus had an intimate acquaintance with their problems. They had a first-hand knowledge of why people were poor, what poverty meant in housing and living conditions and in the absence of the conveniences and luxuries of life; they knew also of the extent and of the seriousness of sickness and of the economic and social conditions which drive a larger percentage than is their fair average into delinquency and often into careers of crime. The charity organization society or family case worker through visiting the homes of the poor and in attempting to work out a solution of their problems knew well the circumstances and forces with which they were surrounded. These two groups, then, within this period terminating with 1900, had a much more thorough knowledge than all other groups of social workers of the extent and significance of misery and were using methods which have recently become more general in working out solutions.

Since 1900, campaigns of prevention have been launched. Studies of the last decade of the nineteenth century had made obvious the existence of social causes of poverty, disease, and crime from which it was almost impossible for the victims to escape. It was concluded from these that the wise thing was not to spend so much money in alleviating distress, in curing illness, and in reforming criminals but to proceed at once to remove the causes of poverty, of sickness, and of crime.

Moreover, the environmentalists were in the saddle then, and much was hoped for in changing the environment and in perfecting human institutions to make the world better. The advocates of heredity have since had their day, but the pendulum is beginning to swing slowly again in the direction of environment.

In the interests of preventive philanthropy many laws have been passed, such as the compulsory-education laws guaranteeing to the youth a minimum education, child-labor laws preventing the employment of children under stipulated ages, in destructive occupations, laws restricting the employment of women, and laws concerning the sanitary and other conditions under which both women and children are employed. We have had housing codes stipulating the minimum conditions under which people live, and we have had housing and factory inspectors to maintain minimum conditions under which people may live and work. Minimum-wage laws, laws providing insurance against industrial accidents, mothers' pension laws, old-age pensions laws, sick-insurance and unemployment-insurance laws have all been advocated in the interest of preventive philanthropy. Attempts have been made to control the exploiter. We have laws censoring amusements and controlling shark loans and pawnshops, and many other laws.

In preventive philanthropy greatest progress has been made in preventive medicine, in removing the causes of disease, in prolonging human life, and in mitigating human suffering. Least progress has been made in preventing delinquency, doubtless partially because the problems of delinquency are handled by a profession which makes few changes and looks to the past in determining methods of procedure.

The contrast between service philanthropy, the old philanthropy, and preventive philanthropy is well expressed by the late Professor Simon N. Patten in his book, "The New Basis of Civilization." Contrasting service altruism, the charity of personal service, with income altruism, the charity which makes gifts of money "for public and far reaching ends"—a form of preventive philanthropy, he says:

The difference is that which separates the old from the new charity. The one crossed the road to help the Samaritan after he had suffered under bad conditions of highway management; the other patrols the road and arrests the wayside thieves before the traveler falls among them. Service altruism binds the wounds, breathes forgiveness, and solaces the victims of recurring disasters without attacking their causes. Income altruism hews to their base, for it has the money power to police and to light the road to Jericho.

It must be understood that there is no clear line of demarcation between service and preventive philanthropy. Distress must always be alleviated, the unfortunates must always receive our tender solicitude. There is no antagonism between prevention and cure. No one understood this better than Professor Patten himself. The difference is one of emphasis only.

The ambitions of the advocates of preventive philanthropy have not been realized in the preventive measures adopted since 1900. This is due to the fact that the removal of the so-called causes does not secure results mechanically. Specific agencies or instrumentalities which drag down may be removed, but something else is necessary of a constructive character to establish adequate attitudes of adjustment to a more normal way of life. And people must be reached individually. This is a contribution of the newer social work which began fifteen or twenty years ago.

Take the illustration so often used before conferences of social workers in contrasting preventive with service philanthropy to emphasize the value of preventive philanthropy. I refer to the case of the ambulances at the foot of the cliff to care for those who fall over as representing the old philanthropy, and the building of the fence at the top of the cliff to keep people from falling over as representing preventive philanthropy. The newer philanthropy is not satisfied with the building of

the fence at the top of a cliff by philanthropic agencies. If a fence is needed at the top of the cliff, why should not the people build it there themselves instead of waiting until philanthropic agencies build it? The newer philanthropy will educate people to build fences at the top of all cliffs wherever danger awaits the unwary. The newer philanthropy will educate people to cooperate in removing all dangers wherever possible and to place danger signals at all places where dangers cannot be removed.

Whether the problem is an individual, a family, or a community problem, successful social work is based on thorough diagnosis. Take the instance of Douglas Darrant, one of the case studies of the Judge Baker Foundation studies of Boston.

Douglas was a bright twelve-year-old boy living in a small New England town. His parents were of Scotch descent and eminently respectable. The father was in business, and he and the boy's mother exercised average surveillance over their son. The son had become a confirmed thief and the parents were at their wits' ends to know why he should be a thief. In one of his escapades he fell into the hands of a state-wide social agency in 1919, which turned him over to the Judge Baker Foundation for study and diagnosis. According to their practice, both a mental and physical examination was given the boy, and a thorough and exhaustive case study made of him. It was discovered through the confession of Douglas that conditions existed in the small town where Douglas lived of which the grown-up people were not very well informed. It was learned that in his early youth he came under the influence of a gang of boys somewhat older than he, who indulged in bad sex practices and in minor thefts and taught and trained Douglas in their own habits. It was learned that there were groups of young boys and girls in the town who indulged in promiscuous relations without the knowledge

of the older people of the town. The investigators became convinced that the morale of Douglas had been destroyed by excessive indulgence in sex practices and that his stealing was traceable directly to this cause. This conclusion is, of course, directly in line with other researches into the delinquencies of youth.

Douglas' case having been successfully diagnosed, the investigators immediately proceeded to reclaim not only Douglas but the community in which he lived.

Some time later the statement was made that

The moral conditions in the town have been altered, it seems, in a very interesting way. The agency made some further investigation which corroborated Douglas' statements, and informed the minister and other prominent people, who said that they had some suspicion of these unfortunate affairs in the life of the young people, but had thought it too delicate a matter and too difficult to be approached either from the school or the church standpoint. The judge of the district stated that he had long felt that something ought to be done because of his having had to deal with two or three cases of illegitimacy. The chief of police said that it was his experience that the influential people in town would not stand interference in their affairs.

The story of the wonderful betterment of the moral conditions may be speedily told. The parents of Douglas communicated with other parents, who obtained corroboration of what Douglas had said from their own children, and these people formed clubs—a fathers' and sons' club, and a group of women who looked after the girls. These organizations have done valiant service and have thoroughly altered the moral situation through frank recognition of it, and through simple personally applied common-sense measures, particularly looking after the recreational activities of the young people.

Douglas ceased his stealing and his other bad habits and his school record greatly improved. Had the ordinary course of procedure been followed in his case, he would have been sent to a reform school for boys from

which he might have been graduated into a reformatory for young men and later sent to the penitentiary as a confirmed criminal.

The case of Douglas Darrant emphasizes the importance of thorough diagnosis before treatment. Careful diagnosis is now universally recognized in the medical profession. Any one can give medicine but only an expert can successfully diagnose a case. Treatment without diagnosis is just as likely to lead to disaster in social work as it is in medical practice. Moreover, social diagnosis is much more difficult than is medical diagnosis because there are many more factors to be taken into account, factors that are less understood than are the factors to be taken into account in medical diagnosis. The social factors with which the social diagnostician deals are much more complex than are the factors with which the medical diagnostician deals.

The social worker dealing with a delinquent case knows not only that it is necessary to eliminate a bad environment but that he must build up within, in order to reclaim his case successfully, and develop in the case the right social attitudes in order that the case may make the proper use of his environment in becoming properly adjusted to it. That no more headway is made in reducing delinquency and crime is due largely to the fact that the control of crime is under a profession which is unscientific and is always looking to the past for its methods of procedure and forms of control. In juvenile court work where some improvement has been made, politics has defeated reasonable accomplishment. The promises of the juvenile courts of twenty-five years ago have not been realized, and this has been due to incompetent juvenile judges and probation officers. In only a few places in the United States have we high-grade courts. Moreover, very successful juvenile courts must await the development of child-welfare clinics, and these

in turn must await a better organization of social agencies, especially those dealing with the problems of children. The physician must have years of training into the background and technique of his profession before he can practice medicine. Of course, no one will claim that the social worker has had a training in his field comparable to that which a physician has for his work, which is less complex than is that of the social worker. Preventive social work is important; it is fundamental. But the emphasis now in social work is on building up within, on the positive, the constructive, on developing right social attitudes, on fortifying against the destructive, whether of disease or behavior, on making the individual efficient as a producer and an effective member of society. In accomplishing these things diagnosis takes first rank. The following instrumentalities are used: education, technical and industrial education, boys' and girls' clubs, recreation and playground centers, camps, settlements, child-welfare clinics, visiting housekeepers, visiting nurses school nurses, health clinics, boarding homes, and probation work. How to use these and other agencies comes within the province of treatment by the trained and experienced social worker.

In our earlier philanthropy we divided mankind into two classes, the handicapped and those who are not handicapped. This classification is very clearly expressed in the definitions and the statement of the case I quoted from Devine. We do not recognize such a distinction now. The handicapped on certain grounds may very easily pass into the group of the unhandicapped, and the latter class in certain characteristics may become handicapped. In my ten years as dean I have done case work with university students in most unusual and exceptional ways and certainly university students are not often considered a handicapped class. Even in our summer federation courses offered to students of relatively mature

years who were receiving training to become social federation executives, students suffering under complexes which militated against their efficiency have approached me for advice after laying bare their personality characteristics. Those of my readers who are married and have children know very well that every child is a problem. Indeed, every intelligent person knows that he has been a problem to some one. Social workers of the settlements know very well that in the contacts of those of the avenues with those of the settlement the latter have as much to give in personality traits as they receive.

Good social work is a primary requisite in all democracies. This is especially true in the United States because of what has happened here. We have become individualists gone mad. Our resources have seemed unlimited. Our population has been widely scattered. There has been in the past an inordinate demand for people to settle on the soil. It has been possible for individuals to rise from humble to exalted positions in American society. Failures have been attributed to personal causes, and but little sympathy has been expressed for those who fail.

The scene has changed and is changing rapidly. There are less opportunities for the lowly to rise than formerly. The handicapped are about us on all sides. Over fifty years ago in his "Progress and Poverty," Henry George pointed out in eloquent terms the sodden poverty which exists amid advancing wealth. People are poor and handicapped because of low wages, unemployment, the sickness or death of the breadwinner, accidents, illness of other members of the family, desertion, bad housing conditions, and other causes beyond the reach of correction by the individual victims of misery.

We formerly thought that as long as the gates of opportunity were wide open every one had an equal chance to reach the destined goal. We have since learned that

there is no inequality greater than the equal treatment of unequals. Social work is then a most imperative need of a democracy, in order that things may be gauged so that we shall all share each other's burdens and equalize the conditions as far as possible for each and all in the race of life. The clubfooted boy should not be compelled to compete on equal terms with the fleet of foot. Our health clinics, our child-welfare clinics, our parks, our playgrounds, our community centers, our settlements, and other social instrumentalities are intended to even up the conditions as far as possible for the health and happiness of all.

All successful social work is based on science. We insist that those in training for social work shall have as a groundwork the fundamental courses in social science. We feel that the more scientific the social worker is, the more successful social worker he will be. Moreover, the scientific social worker should become the most valuable contributor to the science of society, since he is living all the time in the best social laboratory in the world, and his contributions will be measured by his equipment, his training, and his scientific attitude of mind.

Real social work is based on science, but social work is itself an art. Just as the physician knows that the medicine which he gives to a sixteen-year-old boy afflicted with a certain disease will effect a cure, and that the same medicine given to another boy of the same age with the same affliction may not effect a cure with the latter but may make him sick, so the social worker knows that he can seldom treat two cases alike, although the conditions and circumstances may appear to be the same. Experience in each instance in handling a great number of cases is important. Social work, as medicine, is an art.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRAINING IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES AND IN BIOLOGY OF GRADUATES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The purpose of this chapter is to find out what training is received in the social sciences, in psychology, and in biology by those who enter schools of social work after they have graduated from an American college or university. The great majority of those who enter such schools are women, and for this reason this investigation is restricted to women graduates. Training in the social sciences, in psychology, and in biology should be a part of the fundamental equipment of the social worker. This training is not given in the high school, and unless the graduate from the college or university receives it as a part of her college education, she does not receive it at all when she enters the school of social work.

The colleges and universities chosen for this investigation, all in Ohio, are fairly representative of those throughout the country from which students enter the schools of social work. They are Ohio Wesleyan University, Ohio University, Otterbein College, Wittenberg College, Denison University, and the Ohio State University.

Ohio Wesleyan University, at Delaware, Ohio, is a college of the Methodist Episcopal Church and is rated as one of the very best educational institutions supported by this religious organization in the United States. It was founded in 1844 and had a registration in 1927 of 2,008 students, of whom 934 were men and 1,074 were women. It has strong departments in economics, sociology, and political science.

Otterbein College was founded by the United Brethren Church at Westerville, Ohio, in 1847. Otterbein College is a member of the Ohio College Association, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and the Association of American Colleges. Its registration in 1927 was 545, of whom 248 were men and 297 were women.

Wittenberg College, controlled and supported by the Lutheran Church, located at Springfield, Ohio, was founded in 1845. The total assets of the college amount to over \$3,250,000, while its productive endowment is \$1,387,000. It had a registration in 1927 of 1,003, of which 568 were men and 435 women.

The Ohio University, located at Athens, Ohio, a state-supported institution, was organized in 1809. It has two colleges—a college of liberal arts and a college of education. Both men and women are admitted on equal terms. Its total enrollment in 1928–1929 was 3,454.

Denison University, at Granville, Ohio, thirty miles east of Columbus, was founded by the Baptist Church. It was first organized in 1831 as the “Granville Literary and Theological Institution.” The theological department was abandoned and the name of the institution was changed to Granville College in 1845. Ten years later its name was changed to Denison University. The total amount of property invested in Denison University is \$5,000,000, \$3,000,000 of which is income-yielding endowment. The total enrollment in 1927–1928 was 1,034, of which 500 were men and 534 were women.

The Ohio State University, with an enrollment of over 10,000, is one of the great state Universities of the Middle West. It has ten colleges and a large graduate school. The standing of this university is too well known to need further description.

This investigation is restricted to the women graduates of liberal arts colleges. The investigation included all

the women graduates for two years, 1928-1929, at Ohio University, Otterbein College, and Wittenberg College. The total number of women graduates for the two years was: Ohio University, 106, Otterbein College, 105, and Wittenberg College, 106. The investigation for the other institutions had to do with one year, 1929. In this year there were 89 women graduates at the Ohio State University, 195 women graduates at Ohio Wesleyan University, and 89 women graduates at Denison University. We have every reason to believe that the amount of work taken in the social sciences, in psychology, and in biology by the women graduates of the above institutions for the years indicated is fairly representative of what they would take in any year.

Practically all the leading universities and colleges of the country require in the fundamental courses in the social sciences, in psychology and in biology, six semester hours' credit or ten quarter hours' credit. If students receive less than this in the above subjects they are not adequately trained in the fundamentals of the above sciences. For this reason this study contains not only the number of women students in each institution who had no work at all in each subject, but also the number of women graduates who took less than six semester hours in each subject. Thus it points out the percentage of women graduates who were inadequately trained in each subject.¹ The results appear in Table I on page 76.

Applying the test described in Table I one finds that the percentage of these 690 recent graduates who are inadequately trained in each subject is as follows: 56.7 per cent in sociology, 46.9 per cent in psychology, 88.4 per cent in economics, 86.5 per cent in political science, and 72.6 per cent in biology. Only one in ten had any work whatever in psychology and only one in four had work in sociology. More than one-half of these women were without training

¹ See also Appendix, Tables II, III, IV, V, and VI.

in biology, nearly two-thirds were without any training in political science, and nearly three-fourths were innocent of economics. These figures, however, represent the

TABLE I.—WOMEN LIBERAL ARTS GRADUATES FROM SIX OHIO COLLEGES CREDITED WITH SPECIFIED NUMBERS OF SEMESTER HOURS IN SOCIOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY, ECONOMICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE, AND BIOLOGY

(For detailed tables showing data by colleges see Appendix, Tables II to VI.)

Number of credit hours	Sociology	Psychology	Economics	Political science	Biology
	Number of graduates				
None.....	176	76	508	452	372
Under 6.....	215	248	102	145	129
6 to 11.....	207	306	62	72	152
12 to 17.....	52	37	7	13	27
18 to 23.....	12	12	3	6	4
24 or more.....	28	11	8	2	6
Total.....	690	690	690	690	690
	Percentage distribution				
None.....	25.5	11.0	73.6	65.5	53.9
Under 6.....	31.2	35.9	14.8	21.0	18.7
6 to 11.....	30.0	44.3	9.0	10.4	22.0
12 to 17.....	7.5	5.4	1.0	1.9	3.9
18 to 23.....	1.7	5.7	0.4	0.9	0.6
24 or more.....	4.1	1.6	1.2	0.3	0.9
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

average of the entire number studied. The variations from college to college were of course pronounced.

If we consider only those graduates who had at least the fundamentals of the science (six or more semester hours) we find their proportion varying most in sociology, for 86.6 per cent of Ohio State graduates as contrasted

with 15.1 per cent of Ohio University graduates had had the elementary courses in this subject. Psychology was the most popular of these subjects, and yet only 10.3 per cent of the women graduates of the Ohio Wesleyan University had credit for six semester hours or more. Economics and political science were almost equally unpopular. At no college did the proportion presenting six or more credit hours in either of these subjects equal one to five of the graduates. These facts appear more clearly when presented in tabular form.

If we consider those graduates who presented credit hours sufficient to constitute a major, or at least one or two additional courses (twelve hours or more) we find the proportions for the most part slight. Only sociology at Ohio State, Ohio Wesleyan and Denison, and psychology at Ohio State were presented by more than one-tenth of the class in amounts exceeding eleven credit hours.

To sum up the situation, we find the chances that graduates in liberal arts will have had the fundamental course in psychology are better than in any other subjects considered. Whether or not they will have had the course in sociology will depend largely upon the college from which they come. The chances are that they will not have had the work in biology, even if they come from Ohio State University, where the proportion is highest. The likelihood that they will have had either economics or political science is slight, no matter which of the six schools they come from.

The situation with respect to advanced courses is equally bad. The student who has had any considerable amount of advanced work in any of these subjects except psychology and sociology is rare. With all its popularity, psychology is elected sparingly except at Ohio State, and sociology can hardly be considered to rank as an advanced elective except at Ohio State, Ohio Wesleyan, and Denison.

It is believed that the amount of work taken in the social sciences, psychology, and biology in the colleges and universities considered in this study is representative of what is taken in these subjects in the colleges and universities of the country. If this is true, the holders of A.B. degrees who enter the schools of social work of the country are inadequately trained in the social sciences, psychology, and biology.

Since all students of social work should have fundamental courses in all these subjects, the percentage of women graduates of liberal arts colleges of the country who have adequate training in these fundamental courses is very small indeed. If the students of the schools of social work do not have fundamental courses in these sciences, it is impossible for them to take the pre-professional courses in social work which are based on the fundamental courses.

The regular graduate student in any university of the country cannot take graduate work in any subject until he has completed all the fundamental courses in that subject, and he must take the latter without credit. A graduate student in sociology, for instance, must have a background of courses not only in sociology but in economics, history, and psychology before he can pursue very far his graduate work in sociology.

If the schools of social work which are presumed to be graduate in character should insist that holders of A.B. degrees who enter them should take fundamental courses they have not had without credit, and if the social work courses they offer are not elementary in character, they will give themselves a status comparable to other graduate schools of the country. How many of them meet this requirement?

CHAPTER VII

GRADUATE OR UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK

I feel that it would be absurd to discuss the above question were it not for the fact that writers chiefly from the so-called graduate schools of social work have seriously questioned the advisability of giving training in social work to undergraduates. The colleges of law and medicine, which were established many years before the schools of social work were established, are undergraduate colleges, and no one is seriously raising the question as to whether they should be graduate or undergraduate organizations. Harvard University, all of whose professional schools are graduate schools, has graduate schools of law, medicine, and business administration.

The American Medical Association now prescribes two years of collegiate training as a prerequisite to the medical-school course of all medical schools in its association, and prescribes definitely nearly all the courses which are prerequisite to the medical college. The better colleges of law usually require two years of college work as prerequisite to the college of law without stipulating what courses should be studied, and some of the law colleges do not even require any collegiate training as prerequisite to the course in the college of law. If these older colleges with better established courses of study than prevail in schools of social work and with greater financial opportunities for their graduates than the graduates of the schools of social work have, are not graduate, why should it be insisted that the schools of social work should be graduate schools?

Another factor in the case makes the insistence that schools of social work be graduate more ridiculous still. The great majority of social workers of the country have never been trained in schools of social work of any sort, and a great majority of them do not have college training. A great many social workers (unfortunately we are not able to say how high the percentage is) have not even had a high-school education. In the face of such facts as these, is it not ridiculous to say that advanced undergraduates are not capable of receiving training in social administration?

Moreover, the schools of commerce or business administration, which came into existence about the same time as the schools of social work, and the schools of education, which came into existence somewhat earlier than the schools of social work, are practically all undergraduate schools. In both of these types of schools, a four years' course or a two years' course based upon a more or less definite prerequisite two years' work, leading either to the degree of bachelor of arts or bachelor of science, is organized. In the undergraduate schools of social work, a four years' course leading to the degree of bachelor of arts or bachelor of science is organized, or a two years' course based on liberal electives and some required work, with the third and fourth year's work occupied with preprofessional and professional courses. The organization of the work of the undergraduate school of social work is almost identical with the organization of courses in business administration and in education in the universities. There are in each case the required fundamental courses, the liberal elective courses, the preprofessional courses, and the professional courses leading to the degrees of bachelor of arts, bachelor of science in business administration, in education, and in social work or social administration. It is rather strange that writers on education in social work do not see the

analogy of training in education and in business administration to social work, a training which has had a comparable development to social work in time and in many of its conditions, rather than the analogy of legal and medical education to training in social work. But even if the latter analogy be followed, there is no warrant in concluding that the schools of social work should be graduate schools.

Some of these writers, who should have a better knowledge of the problems of colleges of education than any other professional schools, have failed to see the similarity between the schools of education and of social work. A great majority of the students in schools of education are women. A great majority of the students in the schools of social work are women. Most women who go into either field have the alternative of choosing between education and social work as their field of professional service, and they do as a matter of fact make a choice between these two occupations. The factors of personal preferment and financial reward are the chief ones taken into account. The fact that many of them can receive better returns after graduating from a teachers' college than they can receive after graduating from an undergraduate or so-called graduate school of social work explains the much larger number preparing for teaching than for the profession of social work.

The present organization of the schools of social work has been determined very largely by local conditions. As has been said, the first schools organized were private in character and were dominated entirely by the social worker's point of view. Emphasis was placed on field work and the teaching of techniques, as the social agencies desired workers made to order. University men who wished to offer courses on the training of social workers and who were dominated by the theories of education of the first private schools saw at once an

insurmountable obstacle in the offering of this sort of training in a liberal arts college, which was undergraduate. Nevertheless, they assumed that the only place where they could offer undergraduate training in social work was in a liberal arts college. They jumped to the conclusion that the only place, then, where they could offer training of this sort was in the graduate school, where they could accept students who had an A.B. degree from any school and where they could offer training patterned after the private school which, as we have said, was dominated by the educational point of view of the social worker.

They assumed that the only alternative to the procedure was the offering of such undergraduate courses in a liberal arts college as would pass muster before a liberal arts dean and a liberal arts faculty on their technical character. Of course, liberal arts colleges do not look with enthusiasm on the giving of credit for courses containing liberal amounts of field work and courses which teach techniques. Consequently, where courses for the training of social workers have been offered in a liberal arts college, professors interested in such training have been compelled to compromise, making the courses as technical and professional in character as the college faculty would permit. In this connection, I recall vividly my own experience for a period of ten years in offering technical and professional courses in business administration and in social service in a liberal arts college, until a separate organization was set up for the teaching of these subjects.

The private schools first organized were not graduate schools and only by the most liberal interpretation as to what constitutes graduate work can most of them be considered graduate schools now. They offered training for social workers and admitted on examination those who were not graduates of colleges. In this way many

were admitted who were not college graduates, some of whom were not even high-school graduates. As many who were college graduates, perhaps a majority, in some instances, sought admission to receive training for social work, the impression, although unwarranted, has often been given that these were graduate schools of social work.

I am convinced that courses in social administration should be offered in a liberal arts college only in the initial stages of the development of this work unless the work is organized in a school of social administration within the liberal arts college and in case this is done, those responsible for the school have freedom to develop the work of the school unhampered by arts college traditions. A much better plan, however, would be the organization of an independent undergraduate college or school outside of the liberal arts college, such as the organization which usually prevails for colleges of commerce and of education.

It is relatively easy for a state university to organize an undergraduate school or college of social administration as soon as its work is sufficiently developed for the organization of a school or college, since it has many precedents for doing so. A well-rounded state university has at present undergraduate colleges of arts, engineering, agriculture, education, and commerce, and some of them have colleges of veterinary medicine and pharmacy. These colleges usually have four-year courses leading to the bachelor's degree. If these universities have colleges of law and medicine, they are usually professional colleges based on two years' training in some other college, usually a liberal arts college.

As stated above, the purposes and aims of the colleges of commerce and education coincide most closely with those of colleges of social work. Fortunately for them, they have enjoyed a freedom of development from outside sources which the colleges or schools of social administra-

tion have not enjoyed, for business men and educators have never attempted to impose their theories of education upon the colleges of commerce and education. For instance, business men have never assumed that it is the function of a college of business administration to teach the various techniques of business or to break students in for the different occupations of business. Moreover, they have never assumed, except in the highly technical work of accounting, that the student should be very efficient in his work at the time he graduates.

Are the so-called graduate schools offering real graduate work? I have used the expression "so-called" advisedly. There is a great distinction between giving graduate work and giving work to students who have graduated. For some time after the Harvard graduate school of business administration was organized, those admitted to it were not required to have an elementary course in accounting or an elementary course in economics. When these students studied accounting as graduate students they were taking a course which is ordinarily offered to first- and second-year students in undergraduate colleges of business administration.

Some of these so-called graduate schools of social work admit those holding an A.B. degree. No definite prerequisites are required and elementary social work is taught them. Fundamental courses in the social sciences are not required in some of them, and even courses in sociology and psychology are not required. Only by the most liberal construction as to what graduate work really means can the teaching of elementary social work to those who hold the A.B. degree and who have not had fundamental training in the social sciences, to say nothing of the necessary background courses, be construed as graduate work. Work of this character very definitely depreciates graduate work in all universities where it is offered.

In graduate work in general, fundamental courses in the subject in which the student is majoring are required as prerequisite work upon his beginning graduate study, and if the student has not had these fundamental courses, he must take them without credit while he is taking other graduate work. For example, fundamental courses in sociology are not accepted as graduate credit in any course in which a student is either majoring or minoring at Ohio State University. There is no reason why similar requirements on fundamentals should not be made of graduate students in social administration as are made of all other graduate students.

A committee of the American Association of Social Workers, which presented a report that was not adopted to its association meeting of 1927, upon invitation brought its report before the American Association of Schools of Social Work at its meeting in December, 1927. One feature of this report on background courses was opposed by some representatives of the graduate schools. It was as follows, "We therefore recommend that he (the student) present not less than thirty semester, or forty-five quarter credits in the background sciences such as: biology, psychology, economics, political science and sociology." This was the amount of work which the candidate was expected to present when he began his work at the training school. If the course was an undergraduate course, the student was expected to complete this amount of work before he began his technical courses.

From what was said during and after the meeting, it became apparent that the average graduate who enters the school of social administration would not meet the requirements, and if such a rule were adopted, undoubtedly the majority who entered these schools would be compelled to take some of these courses without credit.

On the other hand, it would be relatively easy for the undergraduate schools of social work to meet all these requirements and also to require other courses of a preprofessional character. At the Ohio State University, all of the students in social work must have as a minimum ten quarter hours of psychology, ten hours of biology, ten hours of economics, ten hours of political science, and ten hours of sociology. In addition to these, they are required to take several other courses in the following subjects as preprofessional work: sociology, psychology, and economics. I am confident that the fundamental courses required here are also required at all universities where undergraduate training in social work is given.

In the third year at the Ohio State University an intermediate group of courses is required that is neither technical nor, from a general point of view, fundamental. They are, however, considered fundamental for the training of the social worker. There are required in the third year nine quarter hours in social investigation, in which the project method is used in giving the student the scientific attitude in the collecting of material, the analysis of data, and the assembling of the material in constructive papers. Four credit hours are required on standard of living, four credit hours on the family, and a three-hour course on criminology. Two technical courses, one on the social treatment of dependents and another on the social treatment of the child, are also given in the third year. Twenty per cent of the work of the student in each of the four years must be taken in liberal elective studies. With the exception of this 20 per cent, all the work which the senior in social administration takes in his senior year is professional in character. I am confident that not one in twenty of those having the bachelor's degree who enter the so-called graduate schools of social work have the broad foundation in the social sciences and the training in the preprofessional courses

which all those who enter the fourth year of undergraduate work in social administration at Ohio State must have.

It is an open question whether the courses listed in the third year of the social administration curriculum as preprofessional in character are preprofessional or professional. They are not professional in character in so far as other students than those in social administration who have had the prerequisite courses are admitted to them. But should not all students of social work have training in social investigation courses on the family, on the standard of living, and on the causes of delinquency?

In the first and second years of the training course for social and civic work at the University of Minnesota, the student is required to take courses on the introduction to sociology, modern social reform movements, social statistics, principles of economics, American government, psychology, zoology, and rural sociology. In the third year, the student is required to take case work, elementary field training in case work, criminology, housing problems, child welfare, group work in the community, and a course on health. In his senior year the student has an opportunity to choose a general course on case work, group work, medical social work, or rural social work.

In Washington University, St. Louis, where the curriculum in social work is offered in the junior and senior years, in the freshman and sophomore years the student must have had fundamental courses in sociology, psychology, economics, and zoology.

In William and Mary College, where a four-year course in social work is given, students are required to take in the first two years fundamental courses in sociology, economics, political science, and psychology. In the junior year a number of preprofessional courses are required.

The above are typical of what is required in fundamental and preprofessional courses in undergraduate curriculums of social work.

It is claimed that in an undergraduate course in social administration, students do not have the cultural background and the broad training which they should have and which those who have the A.B. degree who enter the other schools get. The fundamental and preprofessional courses required in undergraduate training listed above give the student a broad and thorough foundation in the social sciences. Aside from the courses required in the first and second years, considerable freedom is enjoyed in choosing liberal electives. Moreover, 20 per cent of his work at the Ohio State University in the third and fourth years must be taken in liberal electives.

Relatively little social science worthy the name is taught in secondary education. Is it not far better in the interests of a broad liberal education for students to emphasize the social sciences, psychology, and biology in the university rather than to continue with more of the same studies they had in the high school, and thus almost completely ignore in their training the above-named subjects? It is a fair assumption to make that students who continue in the university the subjects they studied in secondary education to the relative exclusion of the social sciences not only do not have a good foundation for training in social work but are not liberally educated. A broad training in the social sciences in the university does certainly liberalize the training of those who graduate today from the secondary schools, where training in the social sciences is sadly neglected.

Figures presented elsewhere show that unless training in psychology, biology, and the social sciences is required in the university, the average graduate of a liberal arts college will not have the equivalent of two semesters' or

two quarters' work in the above-named subjects, which I assume to be fundamental for the social worker.

It is said that the average graduate has not the age, the maturity, and the poise necessary to become a social worker, maturity and poise being considered necessary to the social worker because of the adverse impressions given to those who are to receive advice from him if he does not have these characteristics. The average college graduate is twenty-two or twenty-three years of age. If the professional course in social work consists of one year's training, and the student enters this course immediately after graduating, he will be, upon completion of this graduate course, only one year older than the average graduate. If two years of professional training are required, under similar circumstances he will be two years older than the average graduate. If the average graduate completes his work at twenty-two years, then the graduate student who takes a course in social administration will be either twenty-three or twenty-four years of age. Will the difference between twenty-two years of age and twenty-three or twenty-four years be a vital matter to the social worker, from the point of view of age and maturity, in giving advice to those in need of it? I do not believe that one or two years' difference in age is vital in this period of the life of a young man or woman.

If all students, upon graduation, deferred the pursuit of the graduate work in social administration for several years, during which time they had experience in other fields, and completed their social administration work at the age of twenty-nine or thirty, they would then have the maturity which age will give for their social-work experience. However, much would depend upon the experience of the student during the five or six years after he graduated as to whether he would ever be a fit candidate for a position as social worker. If after

graduating he has been buffeted about for five or six years, has become disheartened and discouraged, and turns to social work as an escape from experiences which are disagreeable, he will not ordinarily be a promising candidate for any social-work position. The social worker should be well balanced and optimistic and have a wholesome point of view of the world instead of being a sufferer from complexes with which the discouraged and disappointed at thirty years of age are often afflicted.

Has the undergraduate student the maturity and mental grasp which will enable him to pursue successfully courses in social work? A number of years ago, I conducted a seminary in sociology which was opened to seniors with the permission of the instructor and to graduate students, and I discovered that the seniors at the Ohio State University who had training in sociology and allied subjects were much more mature and were much better prepared to make investigations and write theses than were the average graduates from other colleges, since the others were nearly always inadequately trained in the social sciences. As these students from other colleges are typical of the average graduate who enters the so-called graduate school of social work, the conclusion is of course obvious. Professors of sociology in large universities where the work in sociology is well organized have had experience with students from other colleges which coincides with my experience.

Miss Sydnor H. Walker in a book recently published, "Social Work and the Training of the Social Worker," considers the question whether undergraduates can successfully pursue training in social work as follows:

The most important point at issue seems to be whether or not the subject matter of social work can be effectively handled in the undergraduate college. Some survey of the subject matter to be covered is needed before an opinion can be formed.

There must be consideration, first, of the subject matter now included in schools of social work and, second, of the possible modifications in curricula which might affect the feasibility of undergraduate preparation. The writer obviously has in mind undergraduate training in a liberal arts college. As has been stated before, undergraduate training in social work should be given in a liberal arts college only in the initial stages of social-work training unless a separate organization, such as a school, is set up in an arts college for the organization and administration of social-work training.

Miss Walker writes further concerning the function of social work training as follows:

What the student in a school of social work is expected to acquire is a scientific attitude towards observation and collection of data, ability to analyze and plan upon the basis of pertinent facts . . . In the classroom and through field work the student also gains a knowledge of community resources, skill in assembling them with respect to various types of cases, ability to diagnose the client's disability, and constructive imagination in getting results.

If my experience in seminaries with seniors well grounded in the social sciences and with graduates from colleges not well grounded in the social sciences, and that of other professors of sociology, is well founded, then seniors who have had good preliminary training are better qualified to do the above things which Miss Walker describes than is the average graduate who has not had this fundamental training.

After considering various factors bearing on the capacity of undergraduates to receive successfully social-work training, Miss Walker concludes:

There is nothing to prove that it would not be possible to develop the student by varied experience with social problems throughout the whole undergraduate course, so that by his senior year he would be better adapted to social work than is

the graduate student whose previous experience has been fortuitous. If, for other reasons, it is thought desirable to provide undergraduate training in social work, the matter of maturity does not seem an insurmountable obstacle.

It is claimed that in the undergraduate course in social administration an inadequate amount of field work is given. In the schools of social work a larger amount of field work is required, as a rule, than in any other professional course. In medicine, after the individual completes his regular work, he is required to be an interne in a hospital, where he acquires his experience. The student who studies law is not required to take a field-work course, and the engineer does not get any field-work experience except in the laboratory. In two instances in the state of Ohio, in engineering and in commerce, the field work and the classroom work are organized upon a fifty-fifty basis. I refer to the University of Cincinnati and Antioch College. The time required to complete the courses in each of these instances is, I believe, six years. However, the methods of these institutions have not been copied in other places.

The question at issue, it seems to me, lies in this, as to whether it is our business to offer training in social work or to teach the techniques of the different occupations of social work before the individual begins his social-work experience. In collegiate training schools in business education, it is frankly admitted that it is not the function of the business school to teach the various techniques of business but to teach principles and theories with the idea of developing a sufficient maturity in a student to enable him to apply these principles and theories in a variety of situations in solving business problems. It seems to me that in our attempt to teach the techniques we are concerned with the training of people to do specific things, in the training of people to

fill the ranks of social workers, rather than the training of executives and administrators and leaders in social work.

The question also comes up whether, in our schools of social work, we are to follow the trade-school conception of education or the university conception of education. In the trade school people are taught techniques, they are taught how to do specific things and given practice in doing specific things, and are expected to be effective and efficient at the time they complete the work of the trade school. In the universities, as a rule, we do not believe that the teaching of techniques constitutes adequate material for a university education. When both principles and theories are taught, we are less concerned about the efficiency of the individual at the time he graduates than we are about his efficiency five or ten years after he graduates. The trade schools are interested in immediate efficiency. The universities are not. The university assumes that the individual should be given a breadth of view and a grasp of fundamental theories and principles so that he will be able to apply his principles and his theories to the solution of problems which arise from day to day and so he will be permitted to grow through his experience in the actual work of the world during a series of years. We believe that the individual who has had a broad training and who has been trained in fundamental principles will be farther along at the end of six or seven years after he has completed his work than the individual who has been taught to do specific things.

Much is being said at the present time about the difficulties of successfully combining field work with academic work in both graduate and undergraduate courses, especially the latter. Nearly all schools have found it difficult to require field work of a character for which university credit should be given. When the purpose of field work is clearly understood both of the above difficulties are not impossible of solution. We assume that

the major purpose of field work is to give the student a clearer perception of the principles of social work in whatever field he may be doing his field work rather than to give him a practice or experience which will enable him to fit more definitely into a specific job. When the latter is accomplished, and it very often is, it is an incidental function of field work.

This is, however, a very different point of view from that of the schools which are organized on a fifty-fifty basis between academic work and field work, or from that which attaches much more importance to the field work than academic work, as is the case of one school which gives its academic work in the summer term and the field work during the rest of the year.

For practical purposes it is imperative that some one on the faculty of the school should organize and supervise the work of the students from the angle of the school and make the contacts with the social agencies. Of course, some one in the social agencies should have charge of the students and supervise them from the point of view of the agencies. But if university standards are maintained, some one connected with the school should be very actively associated with the students' field work.

The quality of the field work is much more important than its quantity. When this is appreciated field work will not be so difficult to arrange. At the Ohio State University it has been found better to arrange the field work of students at times when they are not carrying academic work. By this arrangement it is not necessary for them to pursue their field work in the city where the university is situated. We require fifteen hours of field work. This is, of course, independent of the course in social investigation which all must take and in which the project method of teaching is used. Students are often given an option between taking their field work the summer quarter between the junior and senior years or some one quarter

of the senior year, preferably the spring quarter. Case-work courses along with field-work courses are strongly recommended.

In Great Britain the training schools of social work do not emphasize the teaching of techniques at all and such courses as¹ "case work," "family work," and "community organization" do not appear in the curriculum of the English school in the list of courses. As a matter of fact the English schools go to an extreme in avoiding the giving of courses of a professional character and seem to be satisfied with the giving of fundamental courses and courses having a philosophical basis.

A report issued by the Joint University Council for Social Studies in 1918 gives the unanimous views of the Council on the question of curriculum, as follows:²

1. A historical account of the origin of existing social and economic conditions, with particular stress on the more recent stages of their evolution.

2. A description of present-day social and economic life.

3. The analysis of economic facts, together with an introduction to methods of investigation.

4. The discussion of the principles and methods of social administration, including industrial law, the functions and organs of local government, and the working of voluntary agencies.

5. A philosophical statement and examination of social principles, aims, and ideals.

The above does not look like the outline of a course in social administration, but in the long run it is a more satisfactory course on social work than those which teach techniques to students who do not have the fundamental courses in the social sciences.

The English attitude toward one type of the American school is perhaps best represented by the observation of

¹ MACADAM, "The Equipment of the Social Worker," p. 64.

² *Ibid.*, p. 59.

the above-quoted author, Miss Macadam, on the New York School of Social Work:

It is a "trade" school in the sense that it finds tools, puts them into the hands of its students, and shows them how to use them, and it is not ashamed to do this.

Miss Macadam says further with reference to the English point of view:

Social work in this country [Great Britain] has not acquired its own technique to the same extent as is the case in the United States. This is largely accounted for by the fact that here the movement for the education and training of the social worker was removed to the University at an early stage, whereas in America it remained much longer in the hands of practical workers. We have seen earlier that our emphasis has always been laid on a grounding in social principles rather than on "ends," however important these may be. The aim of social training in this country is to send out future workers of all grades with the right outlook on life and its problems. Nevertheless, though "technique" may to British eyes appear to be overdone across the Atlantic, we must admit the possibility that we have gone too far in the other direction and sometimes neglected the science of practical administration. This points to the need of a race of teachers who are practitioners as well as philosophers, and fortunate indeed is the school which possesses them!¹

If, in preparing to write her chapter on education and training for social work in America and other countries, Miss Macadam had taken pains to examine the curriculums and the philosophy of education for social work in some of the universities which are not under the dominance of social workers, she would have discovered much that would have pleased her. When she discovered that these institutions were giving undergraduate courses, she unfortunately did not consider them worthy of serious consideration. She says:

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

It is true that this training is sometimes provided during the undergraduate course of study, but this is done with a gesture of apology. A letter received from a professor in a large state university is indicative of this:

“Since the University of —— is a public, tax-supported institution, it is under considerable pressure of public opinion to supply the various kinds of technical and vocational training desired by different factions of the public. As a consequence our professional training for social work is organized in the undergraduate college when, as a matter of principle, we should prefer to have it a postgraduate school. In the interests of raising professional standards, we encourage students to remain at the University for a year or more after having received the undergraduate degree.”

Having supervised undergraduate social training for a period of ten years in a liberal arts college and fifteen years in a college specifically organized to give professional training, I offer no apology for supervising undergraduate training in social work. In the light of the foregoing facts and arguments, how can I offer an apology? I urge our graduates of distinct promise in social work to remain an additional year and take a master's degree in social administration. I also agree with the professor quoted that we would prefer a postgraduate to an undergraduate school in social administration, but his general statement does not fairly represent the views of those responsible for undergraduate training in social work in state universities.

There is great need too for a real graduate school organized on a plane comparable to the other graduate schools of the country. There should be a graduate school of social administration which those who take an undergraduate course in social administration may attend without duplicating what they have taken in undergraduate study. Elementary social work and work which freshmen and sophomores can carry should not be

taught as graduate work. Moreover, field work of a simple, detailed character is not real graduate work. If those admitted to the graduate school of social administration are not graduates of a recognized undergraduate school of social administration, they at least should have had as a prerequisite to the graduate school substantial fundamental courses in the social sciences, and in biology and psychology, and a number of pre-professional courses in social administration. In other words, graduate work in social administration should be placed on a plane comparable to that of graduate work in other fields of study.

Many more students can be reached by an undergraduate school of social administration than by a graduate school. As many more people today become social workers through the apprenticeship system than through the schools, no effort should be made to curtail the number who attend schools, which would be the case if only those who had an A.B. degree were admitted to the schools. The necessity of receiving training to become social workers is not now always apparent. Moreover, the difference in financial returns of those who receive training in the schools and those who do not is not sufficiently marked to offer a special inducement to one who wants to be a social worker to attend a training school.

CHAPTER VIII

THE TRAINING OF THE SOCIAL EXECUTIVE

The schools of social work have ignored their opportunity of training social executives. They have been busy training case workers, probation officers, health workers, psychiatric social workers, settlement workers, etc., and have neglected the most important task they should be engaged in, namely, the education of the leaders, the organizers, the administrators—in short, the executives in social work administration. For this omission two reasons may be assigned: First, the demand for superior craftsmen, which led to the organization of the first schools of social work. Executives became weary of training workers for their staffs, felt that they were not doing a good job, and consequently concluded that this work should be taken over by a specialized agency, the school. Second, is the fact that when the schools were first organized, the importance of having trained executives was not appreciated. As a matter of fact, but few of the leaders in social work believed that executives could be trained.

The schools of business administration which were organized about the same time as the schools of social administration pursued a very different policy. From the very beginning, the former assumed that their chief function was to train executives. They also trained accountants, statisticians, actuaries, etc., but their main emphasis from the beginning was the training of men who could hold responsible positions in the business world as executives. Of course, it was not assumed

that the graduate of the college of business administration would take a position at once as an important executive. He would probably have to accept a position at the outset as a minor executive or even take a routine position, but as a consequence of his training it was believed that after successful experience, he would gradually advance from a position of one responsibility to another.

It has been only within the last few years that leaders of social work have appreciated the importance of training social executives. Within the last ten years, a great impetus has been given to the organization of the social work of cities in councils of social agencies or community funds under the leadership of social executives. This movement has gone ahead by leaps and bounds so that at the present time cities have organized community funds. Executive ability of a high order is required of the directors of community funds. As the schools of social work have been in existence now a good many years, one would naturally expect that those selected to head community funds would be graduates of the schools. As a matter of fact, relatively few of the directors of community funds graduated from these schools. Some of these executives have come from the ranks of social work but most of them have been drawn in from other fields of activity—business, politics, the ministry, teaching, the law, etc. Those searching for directors of community funds have desired to secure men of executive ability and experience, and as the schools of social work made no pretense at training executives, they were weighed in the balance and found wanting, and so did not secure these prize social-work positions. Within the last five or six years, several important executive positions at the head of community funds have been vacant all the time, and those who feel the responsibility of recommending capable directors for these positions con-

fess their inability to recommend men of adequate training and ability as candidates for the positions.

As the training schools of social work are now interesting themselves in providing training for social executives, the important quest is: What kind of training should the social executive receive? This training should naturally be based on a job analysis of the work of a social executive since this study would naturally suggest the training which he should receive. This study has not been made, however, and therefore this method of procedure is not available. A judiciously arranged questionnaire in the hands of twenty-five or thirty of the leading social executives of the United States in diverse social fields, so worded that it would enable each executive to state specifically what he does and how he occupies his time over a period of four or six weeks, would furnish an excellent basis for the study of the work of the social executive. It is much more important in a study of this kind to learn specifically what the executive does than to have him philosophize on what the social executive ought to do.

I do not mean to say that a job analysis of what social executives are doing is sufficient to determine what the social executive should do. This assumes that what is now being done is conducted along right lines and is adequate. I am aware that job analyses are now being made in various lines of work on the theory that the results will show what ought to be done in each line. This theory does not assume the possibility of progress. A job analysis is very valuable because it furthers the surest kind of progress, that based on an exact and thorough knowledge of what is being done. When we know what social executives are actually doing in the different lines of social welfare we have a point of view to enable us to say what they should do and what qualities they should possess. This is the best possible

knowledge that a trainer of social executives should have.

I know that there are those who believe that if an individual is a trained social worker he does not need any special training to qualify him to fill a position as a social executive. With this point of view, I disagree. I have observed many failures as executives of well-trained men who were devoid of the qualifications which an executive should possess. The social executive should be a trained social worker for reasons stated later in this chapter, but he should also have specialized training for the qualifications which an executive should possess.

To what extent does the work of the social executive differ from the work of other executives? How much is common in all classes of executive work? To have executive ability even of a high order in one field of usefulness may be altogether inadequate in others. Some of the community-fund executives drawn from other executive positions within the last ten years have been relatively successful, whereas others have been flat failures. Just why have some succeeded while others have failed? An answer to this question can be found only by an analysis of the functions of the social executive and by checking the qualifications of specific cases against these.

Two extreme types of executives at once suggest themselves. The first surrounds himself with a staff of subordinates and is unwilling to give them complete responsibility in anything. They are expected to await the last word in anything from their chief. He is usually a very busy man. He is always loaded up with responsibilities and details, always holding innumerable conferences because he desires to be in on everything and to feel that his judgment is important in every decision that is made. Such an executive may assume this role because he is a vain man and would be most unhappy if he was not in

on everything and deciding everything himself; or he may have the incapacity to organize his force and delegate authority and responsibility.

The second type of executive is an organizer. He surrounds himself with a group of men as able as the money at his command will enable him to employ, and selects them with reference to the functions they are to perform. After policies are defined, these subordinates are given complete responsibility for the work they are to do, and each one is held accountable for the successful performance of the functions of his office. Whenever the work of a subordinate is related to that of others or to that of the chief, conferences are held to define policies and outline appropriate action. This type of executive will delegate practically everything, and leave himself nothing to do if this is possible.

From an experience of ten years as dean of a college, I discovered that even though I delegated to others practically everything which came within my province, I always had plenty to do. The definition of new policies, the handling of moot questions on appeal, the employment of a suitable personnel, the maintenance of an *esprit de corps* of the staff—all these will give adequate scope for the activity of any executive at the head of a large organization. What is said here of the chief executive officer will apply almost equally well to subordinate executives. If he does his work well, the executive should have time to think and plan. To be intensely active and to exhibit the appearance of being very busy are not the marks of a good executive.

It is obvious, of course, that not all executives are of these two extreme types. They shade off into each other from one extreme type to the other with all kinds of variations and gradations. Another variation of the executive type is the one who must have his judgments

confirmed and who consequently must have frequent conferences with many in on the decisions reached.

All good executives must be the possessors of seven well recognized qualities:

1. They must have organizing ability.
2. They must have strong personalities (including the capacity to cooperate with and work with others).
3. They must have functional knowledge of their work.
4. They must have a knowledge of the technique of their work.
5. They must have ability in personnel work.
6. They must have leadership.
7. They must be effective, and they should be able to measure the effectiveness of their work.

The quality most common in all executives is organizing ability, an ability which can be carried over very conveniently from one field to another. Good organizing ability will offset many other weaknesses of an executive. It is apparent that the two types of executive above described are found in all sorts of executive enterprises. No one, certainly, would regard the first type of executive in any enterprise a good executive, but all would recognize the second as a good type of executive.

Organizing ability displays itself to the observer the moment he enters the offices of a real executive. The chief executive may or may not have an office manager, but whether he has or not, if he is a good executive he will insist that the offices be effectively organized. What are his facilities for accurate record keeping, for statistical analysis, and for the investigation of things an executive needs to know? What is his arrangement of desks and office furniture; has he the best stenographic and typewriting facilities, the best arrangements for conferences, etc.? Often a glance at the office arrangements will reveal at once whether the executive is competent or incompetent in office administration. Those characteristics that indicate efficiency are common to all good

executive organizations. The office management may serve different purposes because of different executive functions, but fundamentally the organization and arrangement of things will be practically the same.

Organizing ability, with reference to the capacity to delegate responsibility and the disposition to do it, is the same in all high-grade executives.

The social executive must be democratic. It is imperative that he work with other agencies and institutions whether he is the executive of a community fund, a charity organization society, a state institution, or in charge of probation work. Cooperation of this sort is not so important in the work of many other executives, but with the social executive it is imperative. His success is measured to a large extent by his capacity to secure teamwork and by his ability to secure a very favorable public opinion for what he represents.

In some lines the autocratic personality may prove to be a very high-grade and efficient executive. The commanding man who knows may secure effective teamwork in his organization and the greater results. If efficiency is the only test, no one could secure better results than he. In some fields an autocratic organization may be much more effective than a democratic organization. Even in government an autocratic administration is much more effective in securing immediate results than a democratic administration if the autocrat is wise, well trained, and benevolent. This truth has been well known for a long time, but only in recent years have we produced a Mussolini. In democracy there is too much debate, too much friction, too much uncertainty, and too much narrow-gauge politics. What has proven true in autocratic governmental administration may prove true in industry and in many lines where executive capacity expresses itself. Of course, no one in this country will admit that in the long run

autocratic governmental administration is superior to democratic administration, although the occasion does not warrant a proof for this contention here.

There is no place, however, for the autocratic executive in social work. The very nature of social work and the conditions under which it must be carried on preclude this. The good will of coordinated, cooperative agencies, team work on the part of executives, the thorough, sympathetic cooperation of all factors in the organization, the cooperation of the public as a result of the purposes and aims of the social work organization—all make impossible effective autocratic social work organization.

When we say an executive must have a strong personality, what do we mean? Some would say that he must have personal, mental, and physical vigor to a high degree. However great these qualities may be, they are not indispensable. But the executive should give the impression of strength, and should make those who serve him or who depend upon him feel that in the work of his position he knows what to do and how to do it. Another executive may know as well what to do and how to do it, but if his appearance, his behavior, and his attitude, do not give the impression that he has an understanding of what his occupation requires of him, he begins and conducts his work under a great handicap. If he is compelled to spend time to convince those on the outside with whom he must officially deal as well as those within his organization that he has executive capacity, he is under a great handicap in competition with those in whom executive capacity is always assumed. Moreover, in the case of those with weak personalities, the organization is always in danger of going to pieces because of lack of confidence in the executive, and often supreme efforts have to be made to hold things together.

A good executive must have a functional knowledge of the enterprise in which he is engaged. This consists of

three things: (1) a knowledge of the underlying principles and functions of social work; (2) a knowledge of the purposes and aims of the social organization; and (3) a knowledge of the place of the organization in the field of social work. These functions are just as important in other executive enterprises especially in the different fields of business enterprise, as in social work.

In his pamphlet, "The Development of Executive Talent," Dr. W. W. Charters, director Bureau of Educational Research Ohio State University presents the following analysis:

Managerial background may be of three types. There is first what we call the functional background. By that term, we mean a background which is made up of the underlying principles and functions of business, a knowledge of the products of the company, and the place of the organization in the world of business. An executive with this functional background knows also the function of each of the divisions within the organization and apprehends the processes of marketing, production, distribution, and organization as they apply to his establishment.

In addition to this functional background, there is in many institutions a need for a technical background. By this we mean a familiarity with those processes which are carried on within the organization to produce whatever product it is the business of the company to manufacture. We find in organizations which use highly specialized technical processes that the common procedure is to route the prospective executive through all important divisions at a leisurely pace, so that he may in truth, as well as in appearance, master the essentials of the technique and thereby acquire this necessary technical background . . .

The third element in executive background is considered to be of primary importance. This we may call the personnel background. By this term we mean a knowledge of people and an appreciation of their motives, their intentions, and their ambitions. This type of background cannot be com-

pletely learned from books, although up to a certain point books are extremely useful . . . Some people naturally possess this ability or seem to acquire it with little effort; others are extremely slow in developing understanding. But in either case understanding can be deepened by training.

Under the first of the three qualifications for functional knowledge, a knowledge of the underlying principles and functions of social work, there is implied the necessity of having a good education, at least a college education. Elsewhere we have pointed out the kind of education the professional social workers should have. The social executive should not have less than is required by the best schools of social work. The social worker should have training in the fundamental principles of the social sciences including history, sociology, economics, political science, and also biology, psychology, and social statistics. More than the fundamental courses in some of these sciences, notably sociology, economics, and psychology should be required. The social executive should have training in the so-called preprofessional courses, such as the family, immigration, races, public health, labor problems, etc. The social executive should also have specialized in some field of social work, such as case work, community organization, penology, recreation, or psychiatry. It would be better if the social executive functioned in some field in which he specialized, although this is not necessary. To have specialized in some field is important. He should, however, have a thorough knowledge of his own organization. If he is the executive of a family case-work society, he should know all the ramifications of case problems. If he had been a case worker and case supervisor, this would be a great asset to him. If he is to be an executive in charge of probation work, he should have studied criminology, penology, and criminal law; he should also know the purpose and

philosophy of probation. Similar statements may also be made concerning the executive's familiarity with any field in which he is to be an executive.

The executive should have a knowledge of the techniques of work over which he is an administrator. In this respect the social executive does not differ from other types of executives.

The dry-goods jobber should be familiar with the techniques of the various departments of the jobbing house. He must be familiar with the purchasing market and he must know the time to buy, the place to buy, and all the conditions under which a jobber may buy; he should know the classes of goods which will sell best with profit to the store in each department; he should know also the classes of things on which most profit is made. He should know who are his best purchasers, and where, in the nature of things, his best potential market is and how it can be best cultivated. He should know when to give and when to withhold credit and when to seek credit for his institution. The methods of the traveling salesman and the types most successful should be known to him. He should, of course, be familiar with the best type of office organization and accounting systems for the particular type of house of which he is an executive.

The jobbing executive should have all this knowledge, not that he is going to function as director of the purchasing organization, as head of a department, as traveling salesman, as credit manager, or as office manager, but so that he will be able to appreciate the efficiency of these various heads, to make constructive suggestions to them in conference, and to appraise the multitude of details which make up the store. He must be able also to inaugurate constructive suggestions when made, and keep his store abreast of the times in organization and improvements.

The executive in social administration should have a knowledge of his organization comparable to that of the jobber. If he is the executive of an institution for delinquent boys, he should be familiar with the problems of organization and administration of an institution and, if it is organized on the cottage plan, he should be familiar with all problems and methods entering into cottage administration. There should be a policy of parole and placing, and here he should be familiar with all types of cases. He should know the best type of employer, guardian, home, or other situation in which a boy should be placed, and he should understand all the better methods of following up cases so as to know if the environment in which the boy is placed is best for this kind of boy. The institution for delinquent boys should be an educational as well as a disciplinary institution. As superintendent he should have the point of view of the better school superintendents in order that he may know the type of educational director to head the educational work of the institution. The selection once made, he should know, too, whether or not the director is doing a good job.

From the disciplinary point of view he should be familiar with the most advanced ideas with reference to the reclamation of boys of this sort while in school. How much control should be exercised? How much freedom should they enjoy? How much personal responsibility should they have in the institution to prepare them for personal control in adjustment to society when they leave the institution? These and many other questions of like nature the executive should be able to answer before he can successfully administer such an institution.

In all these instances, as in that of executive of a jobbing house, the superintendent of the institution should not exercise direct control, and perhaps he should not exercise direct control in any department of his

institution. He should, however, have an understanding of every phase of the work of his institution in order that he may have the comprehensive grasp of things which an executive should have if he is to administer it in an effective and progressive manner. What is said here with reference to the technical knowledge which the executive of an institution must possess will apply equally well to the social executive in charge of a case-work society, a playground association, a community center, a council of social agencies, or a community fund, etc.

An executive should be strong in personnel work because a wise selection of his staff is the most important function with which he can concern himself. This has to do with the employment of minor executives, with the selection of other employees so that each will be excellently adapted to the work he has to do, with the maintenance of an *esprit de corps* in his staff, and whatever changes take place, with the maintenance of a strong organization to carry out the purposes of the organization of which he is the executive head. Whether the function of hiring is delegated or not, the executive is responsible for the maintenance of a strong organization.

The social executive should be a leader. Leadership and strong personality usually go together, but there is no necessary connection between the two. A person may have a strong personality and not be a leader, and in exceptional cases a man may be a good leader and not have a strong personality. It is imperative that the great social executive should be a leader.

What makes a man a leader of men or a leader in any field of activity? This question has occupied the serious thought of men in all ages, and many serious attempts have been made to describe what leadership is. Without going into these, it may be said that the leader is the embodiment of those qualities which are most highly

prized by followers. These qualities are personal qualities, and if the leader is a leader in any particular department of life, he must possess qualities most highly appraised in the field of activity in which he is a prominent participant. The conditions which determine leadership in social work are no different from those which exist elsewhere where leadership expresses itself.

Whatever the agency or institution which the executive heads, it may be possible for him to continue the methods and policies of his predecessor without change, and his clientele may be satisfied. In fact his board of directors and his clientele may be more satisfied if he pursues such a policy than if he pursues some other, because in this case they are not disturbed and each one, so far as he is concerned, can pursue the even tenor of his way. It is possible, too, for the executive who makes some progress and simply keeps up with the procession to please his board and his clientele.

The great social executive, however, must have imagination and vision. He should have a constructive imagination. He should see in advance the steps which his organization should take and gradually lead his board and his clientele forward as rapidly as it is possible for them to go. This process requires in him not only a constructive imagination but a knowledge of human nature, the good sense and judgment to know his clientele, and the capacity to lead them forward step by step to higher goals.

Too much imagination without a sense of the appropriateness of things may easily lead to ruin. Some executives can see into the distant future and wish to accomplish in a month or a year what would normally require a decade to accomplish. They fret and stew and make things disagreeable for everybody, and their experiments end in failure. Experiments which are based on an incapacity to see the other fellow's point of

view, and which are the products of too vivid an imagination inevitably result in failure. Some one has to start all over again, so that this executive usually does more harm than the conservative or reactionary executive.

Of one of the latter class, Mr. Robert Kelso writes in the Survey of 1928:

A while ago a committee sought an executive for a relief agency. There was a staff of visitors in this society and a grist of cases involving a good deal of work each year. The job has been run pretty much on a dole basis by persons grossly underpaid, watched over by a board of directors who met to hear reports of husbandry but did not direct. They realized that the work was being done for very little money, wherefore they were content.

After looking over the field and viewing a few high priced prospects who didn't want the job unless they were to be given a chance to improve the service, the committee made this rare discovery, which many another of like kind had made before them, namely, that there was a minister who could be had at minister's pay. Being a preacher, he was, of course, honest, and having been trained to the pulpit, he was, of course, a leader. He took the job.

After several years, this executive is still rendering exactly the service he gave at the beginning. His motions, fully satisfactory to the board, are well nigh automatic. The operation continues to be a dolanthropic interference in the family life of the poor, devoid of constructive planning for rehabilitation. The staff render loyal service. They work hard. They are worth about what they are paid, which is not quite a living wage. The executive is faithful, and will continue so unto death. So far as results can demonstrate it, however, there has been never a vision nor even a dream in the minds of that executive and his directors. Do faithfully from day to day that which your hands find to do. In this case the brain was located below the wrist.¹

¹ *The Survey*, Vol. 57, p. 821.

The position of the social executive is difficult because of the peculiar position in which he is placed. In a sense he is his own boss if he is a major executive. In business organization, the executive usually has an executive over him who is holding him responsible for results. If he is at the head of a business concern, he will have a board of trustees over him, to whom he is responsible and who will hold him responsible for results. The members of this board are usually selected because they have large financial interests in the concern and are capable of employing and supervising the work of the chief executive. Having large financial interests in the success of the enterprise and being responsible to the stockholders who elected them, they will exercise a continuous check on the work of the executive and will hold him responsible for efficient management and for making profits for the enterprise. He feels continual pressure on him, for he knows that mistakes and failures will result in dismissal.

The welfare executive does not usually feel such pressure. The members of his board are not financially interested in the success of the enterprise. They are interested only in a humanitarian way. They are often selected by him because they are interested in the work of his enterprise, and, if the executive is a conservative or reactionary, because they too are conservative or reactionary and will leave him alone. Most board members give only a perfunctory consideration to the work of their executive. If he gets along with other agencies and organizations and keeps out of trouble, board members will ordinarily be happy. The ideal executive for the complacent board is one who follows a routine, treadmill policy, and gives the members of the board little to do.

Most board members do not have the capacity to check up on a social executive and to hold him responsible for a

higher standard of work. When his work is highly efficient, there is no one to encourage him and he must go his way alone. The incapacity of members of his board to initiate new ideas throws this burden on him alone. If he is a great executive, he must be progressive and initiate new ideas, and in putting them in practice he often meets with antagonism and continued opposition from those who are distanced in the race.

The good social executive must be on the firing line all the time. He must be informed on the best not only in his own line of work, but on that in other fields either directly or remotely related to his own. He must attend all the conferences in his own field and usually some conferences in many other lines of activity.

As the success of his work depends largely on a favorable public opinion, he must educate the public. This is usually not an easy thing to do, and in this respect social executives have usually been failures, since the public has never adequately appreciated social work in any field. The usual avenues of publicity are open to him. To succeed in an educational program, he should thoroughly understand the other fellow's point of view and use a language which all can understand.

The social executive must be efficient. Here again he meets with difficulties not usually encountered by other executives. The business executive has efficiency systems by which he can measure results, and consequently can know how his work compares from year to year, month to month, and day to day. Knowing these things he can experiment, introduce changes, and compare results. No methods of measuring results have been introduced in social work which have proved to be successful, and consequently no method is available to the social executive to prove his efficiency. In social case work, we talk about a case load, and say that no social worker should carry more than a certain number

of cases and that every case worker should carry a minimum load. But even where the case worker carries a reasonable load, we are unable to measure the efficiency of his work. We can check up on quantity, but we have but little check on quality since the results are to be found in human elements that are intangible. Two case workers may each carry the same load, but the effectiveness of the one may be immeasurably greater than that of the other.

Although there are many things common to all executives, the work of the social executive is more difficult than that of others, since he deals more than others with human, personal relations, and the results are more or less intangible. The social sciences are not exact sciences and so long as this is the case the social executive must deal more or less with the immeasurable. But the social sciences are becoming more definite, results are becoming more measurable, and with these changes to which the social worker can contribute, the work of the social executive will become more simplified.

CHAPTER IX

THE TEACHING OF RESEARCH METHODS

In a number of schools of social administration courses are offered in social research. The training afforded by these courses in method serves a threefold purpose. It offers a general or introductory training to those who would specialize in social research; it offers to all social workers a means of analytical approach to the puzzling problems they are bound to encounter; and it serves to equip future social executives with a working knowledge of the functions of research.

There is a growing field of service for people trained in research methods who may devote all their time to research projects. The advancement of social work in this country in the last twenty years may be traced largely to the research work in all lines of activities in which social workers engage. A bibliography of the publications in social work shows that researchers have been busy. Specialists in research today are found not alone in the universities and schools of social work, but in the foundations, in government bureaus, in state departments, in clinics, and in social agencies, local, state, and national.

For all students in training for social work some training in research methods should be an imperative requirement. Social work assumes the improvement of adjustments, individual and social; it also assumes the improvement of social conditions in order that the individual or group may be adjusted to a better state of society. These things bring to the social worker a group of problems which challenge his highest intel-

ligence. Any satisfactory solution of a social problem involves a knowledge of all the facts which give rise to the problem, and a knowledge of the group of relationships in which the problem has its setting. If a social worker is a vital force in any community he must be equipped to study his own problems and analyze his own work. If he cannot do this he follows precedents and works by rule of thumb.

Courses in method give the best possible training in the development of a discriminating judgment. And who more than the social worker needs the development of this quality? He must continually exercise a discriminating judgment between the superficial and thorough in social work and in social workers, between what is transient and what is permanent, and between what is ill-advised and what is sound in social policies.

Training in social research is of great value to the social executive. All social workers should receive training to be social executives because the great majority of them should look forward to becoming either major or minor executives. Social investigation is important in training the executive to exercise administrative control over his work. It enables him (1) to analyze his problems in order to have a basis for the development of his programs and policies; (2) to evaluate the results of his programs and policies; (3) to carry on scientific experiments concerning the handling of social problems; (4) to evaluate workers through their performances; (5) to establish a fact basis for the approval of the policies of his work and his organization; and (6) to establish a fact basis for adequate publicity for his work and his organization. The problem of organizing new enterprises or developing new lines of work in his organization comes frequently to every major executive. What to do in each instance can be determined only after an adequate study.

One reason for the poor quality of much that is recognized as social work is the fact that some one under the impulse of sentiment has gotten some money together and started an activity upon the basis of some supposed need without any real knowledge of the need and without knowing whether what was being done made things better or worse. Every one knows the results of indiscriminate charity, but there are many other forms of malpractice in welfare work not so well known as this one.

One case will illustrate the necessity of a scientific approach to social problems. A banker in a village of eight hundred inhabitants died and left \$30,000 to be used for the benefit of the village. Some of the villagers wanted the money used to pave the streets of the village, others wanted a monument built near the center of the village, while the undertaker wanted the highway paved to the cemetery. The custodian of the funds employed an expert from outside the community to study his problem. The study revealed a lack of teamwork between the various groups in the village and between the people of the village and those in the country that the village was attempting to serve economically, and should have been serving socially. With all the details in mind the research worker recommended the investment of the money and the use of its proceeds to employ a community secretary or leader who would work with all the groups in the community to develop teamwork among them, and to foster a community pride and a community consciousness that would revitalize all the forces of the community.

The social executive should be able to appreciate the value of expert criticism and know where he can go to get the right kind of help. He should be studying his own activities all the time, but he may need the help of large surveys which he may not have the time nor the staff to make and which, in the nature of things, should be made

by disinterested groups outside the city. In such instances the social worker should be able to appreciate the value of such surveys and to know where to go to employ competent investigators.

In this respect the need for training of the social executive in social investigation is not unlike the need for training in business law by the student in business administration. All colleges of business administration require their students to take courses in business law, not to enable them to handle the legal problem with which the business man is confronted, but to enable them to appreciate the relationship of legal situations in their business affairs and to know when legal counsel and advice should be sought. So, too, should the social executive know when expert service in investigation should be sought and where he should go to get it.

A part of the equipment for the study of any subject is a very considerable knowledge of the subject itself, or at least of the field within which it lies. It is difficult to see how one can use any method of research without being familiar with the facts which he is using. I have seen mathematical studies made involving the plotting of curves where the investigator was innocent of the phenomena he was using, as was clearly shown by the conclusions he drew. A statistical investigator in economics should know economic phenomena and a statistical investigator in sociology and in social work should be a student of social phenomena. One of the reasons why statistics are in disrepute among many, is that the statistical method is so often used by those unfamiliar with the subject studied, in which case the conclusions drawn are usually fallacious and sometimes absurd. In a sense, therefore, all the courses offered in schools of social administration are involved in training for research, for all contribute to an understanding of the subject matter with which the student will be concerned.

Research is scientific to the extent that the methods used are adapted to the subject. In certain researches the statistical method should be used, in others the case method is best suited to the investigation, and still others lend themselves to the historical method. Most studies, involve a combination of two or even three methods. The research worker should know each method and should have the good sense to use each, as suits the purpose best. All students, therefore, should receive some training in research; (1) in the statistical method; (2) in the case method; and (3) in the historical method. In the statistical or quantitative method a large number of measurable characteristics are separated from related data and are compared. Only a few definite relationships are analyzed, and the value of the study is determined by the usefulness of the characteristics considered. The study is quantitative, since the validity of the conclusions is determined largely by the number of cases taken into account after a careful analysis has shown that the units considered are comparable. The case method is used when the relationships in the case studied are numerous and complex and when they do not lend themselves to statistical measurement. This method is used when the case studied is a type or when it is used in constructing or testing a hypothesis. The historical method is of growing importance in social research, especially in combination with the statistical, for planning necessitates prediction and prediction involves the study of past sequences. In the limited time which can be given to the teaching of research to students in training for social work, perhaps the best introduction to the historical method is through an analysis of standard historical researches with the purpose of pointing out the essential features in them.

Training in social research should be training in applied logic with the teaching of techniques a secondary matter,

for technical methods while essential are only incidental, and the acquisition of great skill and speed of performance is not the vital thing. Skills are tools of investigation and may be easily acquired. The logical method characteristic of all science is the essence of research and is not easily acquired. This method with special application to social research, together with the relationship of techniques to the method, constitutes the subject matter of the research courses.

Complete laboratories for social investigation cannot be set up on a university campus or in a school of social work. The limitations of social research occasioned by the fact that the subjects are human beings and cannot be experimented upon have often been pointed out. Social studies involve access to human material for interviews and to social agencies and other community sources for social records, and such facilities are not ordinarily available on the campus or at the school. The school may offer office facilities for the analysis of the data once gathered, but for the collection of the material field work is as necessary as in botany or geology and far more exacting, since it depends upon the cooperation of the human material involved.

To teach even the rudiments of social investigation as a curriculum requirement for all students involves the method of class projects for community purposes. In finding subjects for investigation the schools of social work are fortunate, as projects awaiting investigation are to be found in all communities where people in considerable numbers are assembled. Such projects are necessarily statistical inquiries of a simple kind, for only in this type of study, where the subject matter of the interview may be pretty fully anticipated and standardized, can each member of a large group of beginners be brought face to face with the defects in his own thinking and the natural limitations imposed by the method of the

interview, while acquiring the beginnings of skill in the process of exploring the minds of others.

This cooperative arrangement is welcome to the community because the school gives to the community a large number of hours of field work, in some cases almost as large a number of hours of office work, and not a few hours of skilled supervision, all of which in the aggregate would cost considerable sums of money if paid for on a commercial basis. Such services are, however, essential to the study of many problems involving mass phenomena. Organizations are in many cases quite willing to pay for most of the clerical work involved in the analysis of problems if the school will furnish field workers and supervision. As an illustration a recent example may be cited.

The supporters of a settlement asked that a survey be made of the population elements in a community where the settlement operated, because they were in doubt concerning the wisdom of a program. They agreed to furnish the funds necessary for materials and some office work. The settlement, established many years ago by a religious organization, was attempting to serve the needs of a foreign population group which was numerous in the locality when the settlement was founded. The survey showed that the negroes were in a great majority in the community, having displaced the foreign group which was there when the settlement was established. The study revealed also various errors in dealing with the population groups which were supposed to make use of the settlement. As a result of the survey many changes are being made in attacking the problems of the settlement. The committee at a very small expenditure of time and money had their basic questions answered. The students had their technical training and an introduction to some of the fundamentals of scientific inquiry involving the statistical method. The students worked

with energy because they were a real part of a community activity. The university furnished the expert direction of the study and the office quarters including the modern machines and equipment involved in statistical study.

The ideal teaching arrangement would be a close connection between schools of social administration and bureaus of social research equipped to furnish field work to students. In the absence of such an arrangement some of the teaching advantages may be had in return for rendering the services of such a bureau. The problems of organization and supervision are, however, more difficult than in a regularly established bureau and the teaching of such courses, like the teaching of social case work, must be in the hands of people with specialized training in the administration of research undertakings acquired in recognized research organizations. The teacher should have also a real interest in this rather complicated variety of the project method of teaching. Whether or not students do an acceptable quality of work is dependent almost entirely on the judgment of their teacher in accepting only relatively simple studies for them and in the quality of the supervision afforded them.

Such an introductory course may be followed by individual or small group undertakings of a more difficult nature. A revision of the reporting system of all Ohio tuberculosis sanatoriums recently took place as a result of the analysis of records by a senior student in social administration. In this instance the State Department of Health, the National Tuberculosis Association, and the Ohio Public Health Association contributed, with Ohio State University, to the joint undertaking. Another senior student made an analysis of the membership and attendance at several of the recent national conferences of social work as a basis for planning the conference programs. To this study both the conference and the univer-

sity contributed. Such studies offer fewer difficulties and show more results than class projects, but they are made by students who have had the initial training of the class project.

Courses in social research cannot be taught effectively without relatively high costs per student, for the supervision necessary is considerable and necessitates trained assistance. Such courses are necessary, however, if the graduates are to be equipped professionally.

CHAPTER X

SOCIAL CASE WORK TEACHING

The case method of teaching was first developed by the colleges of law. In 1871 Langdell of Harvard abandoned the method of teaching law by textbooks and endeavored to teach the principles of law from a study of selected cases. This method, which was at first thought to be revolutionary, has now become the accepted method of teaching law in all the prominent law schools of the country.

The advocates of this method of instruction claim that by it the student is given a more systematic view of the principles of law and a better idea of their historical development than he could obtain by deductive study through the use of textbooks.¹ It is, moreover, claimed that the case method is the scientific method of teaching law; that law has its own phenomena; that it should be studied first hand; and that the decision of the judge is the law in the case at the time it is made. "The case method in law is essentially a study of descriptive statements, as shown by the evidence, with a concluding decision of the judge applying the law in a given case."² In other words, it is a complete description of a situation with the reasoning for a definite solution or decision.

By the case method of teaching law, the student learns something about the social relations in which law arises and also of the facts and their relationships with which he must deal as a lawyer; he learns to reason by analogy and to see how a rule is applied to a complex set of rela-

¹ STEINER, *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 26, p. 602.

² LYONS, RONALD FORUM, *Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business*.

tionships, and in this way he learns the principles of the law; he learns that where the decision solves significant issues it becomes a rule of law; he learns, by the case method of teaching, too, the important judicial decisions that have been made; moreover, he learns the technique of legal practice, since the method pursued in studying the case indicates the method which must be followed in investigating his own cases, in collecting the factual material with which he must deal, and in reasoning from this material to the solution of the case.

In the colleges of business administration which were developed in the United States contemporaneously with schools of social administration, a case method of teaching has also developed. In the earlier colleges, the older methods of teaching prevailed, teaching from textbooks and by the quiz-and-lecture method of instruction. One college, the Harvard School of Business Administration, is now using the case method of teaching exclusively, while all the better schools are teaching some of their courses by the case method of instruction.

Appreciating that cases for a particular course must be collected before that course can be taught by the case method of instruction, the Graduate School of Business Administration of Harvard University requires its Bureau of Business Research to serve the purposes of its teaching organization by employing members of its staff in collecting and assembling business cases. These men, who are graduates of the School of Business Administration, go to all parts of the country to collect a great variety of cases, which are assembled and classified by the teacher of the subject and put in book form for classroom purposes. Before the course is given the professor is allowed practically a year's time to prepare to give it by assembling and classifying the material and publishing it.

In order that we may see one kind of problem which business students are required to workout, I have selected

one at random from Melvin T. Copeland's "Problems of Marketing," in the field of retail trade.

BURNSIDE CLOTHING COMPANY—FLAT MARK-UP

The Burnside Clothing Company owned a store situated in an industrial suburb of Chicago. This suburb had a population of about 50,000 people. Three neighboring suburbs had a population of about 12,000 each. These suburbs were located about 12 to 15 miles from the center of the city. The three smaller suburbs had electric car service to the large suburb, which in turn was connected with the city by both steam and electric lines.

The annual sales of this retail store, which sold men's shoes and men's clothing, in 1918 were about \$175,000, roughly one-third shoes and two-thirds clothing. Of the shoes sold in that year about 65 per cent retailed for \$8 per pair, about 25 per cent for less, and about 10 per cent for more than that figure. This firm sold almost exclusively shoes that bore its private brand. It was competing mainly with smaller suburban stores in medium and low price goods and with the larger city stores in medium and high price goods. The sales of the shoe department in this store yielded an average gross profit of 29.8 per cent in 1918. It turned its stock 2.1 times.

During 1919 the proprietors of the store considered a proposal to sell all shoes in future at a flat gross mark-up of \$1 per pair. For example, a pair of shoes costing \$5.50 would have been sold at retail in this store under the new plan for \$6.50. It was proposed to make this price policy the most conspicuous feature of the firm's advertising. If the plan were adopted, the quality of the goods was to be maintained. The mark-up on clothing was to be continued at the same rate as in preceding years.

Should the Burnside Clothing Company have adopted this policy? What was likely to be the effect of such a policy upon the patronage of the store?¹

For each case book a key is prepared by the author to be used by the teacher of the course. In each case it is

¹ COPELAND, "Problems in Marketing," p. 39.

suggested that the key be used only as an aid to the teacher and that the answers in the key should be considered only as possible solutions of the problems.

Although colleges of business administration train technicians such as accountants, statisticians, advertisers, etc., it has always been assumed that the primary purpose of the colleges is to train business executives. It is not assumed that when he graduates the young man is qualified for the job of a major executive. All large business enterprises have many minor executives of varying degrees of responsibility, and it is in such positions as these, as well as at the head of a small independent business, that the graduate may find a place. One of the first problems for the school of business administration to solve, then, is: What is the job of the business executive?

Aside from a thorough organization of the offices of the business to handle adequately its administrative problems, the business executive must solve many problems with reference to the successful administration of the business which come to him. He must analyze thoroughly every situation which arises, gather and appraise all facts which have a bearing on the question at hand, and after considering all the precedents which are available arrive at a conclusion and put into practice policies in harmony with his conclusions.

Will the case method of teaching prepare the student to do these things? The advocates of this method claim that it is possible to collect all types of cases which an executive must handle, state all the factors which enter into their solution, and make these available to the student as problems for solution. If this contention is true, the case method of teaching offers the best possible training for the student desiring to become an executive, because it gives the student all the information which an executive has when he reaches his conclusions. It has

been claimed that the case method of teaching business administration lacks the definiteness of the case method in law, since in law the solution of the problem is the decision of the judge, and the judicial decision is the law for this case until the decision is reversed. Business decisions consequently lack the authority of judicial decisions. However, in business decisions, years of application have followed decisions and it is known how well business policies based on decision have worked.

As has been indicated above, not all the work of the executive consists in the solution of business problems. He must organize his office or offices, and he must distribute office functions among many office employees. He must delegate all routine work, and reserve to himself the handling of only the major problems of the business. In this respect, many executives fail. For this reason, some claim that the most important work of the executive is the organization of the office and the distribution of the functions of the business.

In the solution of the problems of business, some principles have been so well established, like the above on the distribution of functions and the delegation of authority and responsibility, that they have all the validity of a rule of law. These can be taught to students, and they can be emphasized by requiring students to make their application in a variety of hypothetical cases.

It is becoming difficult for the student to receive training in business as an apprentice. Business is becoming too much differentiated, and the employee usually enters business in a routine job. The sort of experience he acquires here does not prepare him to be an executive. Moreover, executives do not now have the time and do not care to be bothered with the breaking in of new men into jobs.

Although doctors use the case system in the practice of medicine, the case system of teaching as it is used in law,

business administration, and in social work is not used in the medical college; laboratory and other facilities for the teaching of medicine are not available for the teaching of law, business, and social work. Laboratory methods are used in the teaching of all the foundation sciences upon which medicine is based. Clinical facilities and observation work are required in the hospitals associated with medical colleges, and now it is the practice to require graduates from medical colleges to remain a year longer in hospitals as internes assisting in medical cases before they go out to practice medicine.

CHAPTER XI

SOCIAL CASE WORK

Social-case-work teaching arose long before schools of social work were established. It began with the apprenticeship method of instruction in those agencies which dealt with family and individual problems before the social workers appreciated the true significance of social diagnosis. Societies giving family relief, especially the charity organization societies, appreciated relatively early that care should be taken in handling family problems and that a great amount of harm could be done by stupid and ignorant social workers.¹ The keeping of records, although crude, was found to be necessary wherever the family came back for help a second and a third time, and especially when some one else than the original family worker handled the case. How these records have gradually improved until now there is a very elaborate and definite technique in the handling of individual and family problems is now well known to every social worker.

Even in the early stages above described, when simple records were kept, and as soon as some system in handling individual and family problems was recognized, some apprenticeship was considered necessary before the worker was permitted to handle individual or family problems. The method of procedure usually followed

¹ The beginnings of case work are to be found in the work of the societies founded by St. Vincent De Paul in the first half of the seventeenth century. "He devised rules worked out in great detail to guard against indiscriminate giving. Before a case could be visited it had to be passed by the treasurer." See Watson, "The Charity Organization Movement in the United States," p. 17.

was to give the apprentice a number of records to read representing as great a variety of cases as possible, and these records or cases would then be discussed with an experienced worker in the office. The apprentice would also go out with an experienced case worker on his visits to observe how he approached the family, how he obtained his information from others, and how he handled the family problem. The length of the apprenticeship of this sort and the thoroughness of it depended entirely upon the agency. As the work developed in the larger cities and became more definitely organized, a longer and more thorough system of apprenticeship was required. It must not be inferred, however, that in all case-work organizations, a good system of apprenticeship or of training is required even today. In many juvenile courts and other organizations dealing with individual and family problems, members of staffs are permitted to deal with delicate individual and family problems without even the crude and elementary apprenticeship training which I have described above as representative of the beginnings of case-work teaching. When the first schools for the training of social workers were organized, however, less than thirty years ago, a definite technique had been developed for the handling of individual and family problems, and in some organizations a definite system of apprenticeship was required before the candidate became a case worker.

These organizations placed some of their better cases for teaching purposes in the hands of the apprentice, discussed them with him, and supplemented his field-work visits with the family case worker. When the schools were first organized, the case system of teaching technique was adopted by the schools wherever family and individual problems were involved.

To teach social case work successfully, the collection of a large number of typical cases representing a great

variety of conditions under which individual and family problems were handled, is necessary. At the outset, case-work teaching developed very slowly because suitable cases had not been collected and put in satisfactory form for teaching.

It is much more difficult to collect cases for the teaching of social case work than it is to collect cases for the teaching of law or business administration. Legal cases involve the decision of courts, and these are public and may be used by any one. Business cases include factors taken into consideration by business men in reaching conclusions, and in adopting business policies. There is no particular reason why secrecy should be observed in considering these cases.

In social work, the situations are very different. The cases deal with human beings and family relationships, and feelings are injured and individuals and families are often humiliated when publicity is given to their problems. Moreover, social work itself is defeated when those concerned are identified and publicity is given to a solution of their problems. For those reasons, names must be concealed, and the case must be handled where and under conditions in which the persons dealt with cannot be identified. Because of this, some cases cannot be used, and in others, only a limited publicity can be given to them. In accomplishing the latter purpose, many cases are not printed, but are typewritten and placed in the hands of teachers of social case work with the understanding that they be used cautiously and that they shall not be printed. Under these circumstances, social-case-work teachers are laboring under handicaps under which the case-work teachers of law or of business do not labor.¹

¹ Observe this from "Social Case Histories," not published and confidential, which were issued by the Charity Organization Department of the Russell Sage Foundation, New York, December, 1911.

"The attempt to print, even without publication, this first of a series of social work case histories is full of difficulty. We can easily conceal

In spite of these handicaps, case-work teaching should be the recognized method of teaching the solution of individual and family problems. Other methods, however, should be used in the teaching of social work. There is still plenty of room for the textbook-and-lecture, the textbook-and-quiz, the problem-and-question, and the case-illustration methods of teaching. Everything depends on circumstances; some methods are better for some purposes and others for other purposes. Everything favors the use of a variety of methods.

In the so-called prevocational courses, usually other methods than the social case method of instruction are used. Courses on the family should precede case courses dealing with individual and family problems. A large body of knowledge has been accumulated on the family, many volumes have been written dealing not only with the present form of the family throughout the world, but with the changes which marriage and the family have undergone. The student of family case work should have this knowledge as a prerequisite to a thorough understanding of individual and family problems. Excellent textbooks have been written on this subject, and there is every reason why the textbook coupled with some other method should be used as the most economical method of putting the student in possession of the body of knowledge which he should have on this subject.

the identity of a medical case without lessening the scientific value of the record, but, in striving to edit a few case histories that will have, it is hoped, some value for the student of social work, we are confronted at the very start by the fact that it is almost impossible to conceal the identity of a social history subject without suppressing essential data. In suppressing the name of the city in which the work is done, for instance, we dispense with a large group of facts that has a direct bearing upon the result. Again, other things being equal, recent records are more valuable because they illustrate present practice and emphasize, as in the history which follows, the importance of solving some unsolved problem. But the more recent the record, the more easy and dangerous the identification."

Courses such as those on dependent adults and child welfare, which should also precede the teaching of social-case-work courses, should be taught to a certain extent, in the interests of time economy, by the textbook, quiz, and lecture methods of teaching. The case method of instruction should be used as the highest form of teaching of social work, but before it is used, the student should be equipped with the largest possible body of knowledge to aid him in the solution of the delicate, difficult, and complex problems which he must solve in family case work. In these courses the case method of teaching can be used to a certain extent, and especially the case-illustration method, but in these courses there is a considerable body of knowledge in books and in pamphlet literature on dependent adults and the handling of their problems, and also on child welfare, and there is every reason why this literature should be thoroughly digested by students as a preparation to the solution of family problems which comes later. Consequently, in these courses reference assignments in books, pamphlet literature, and even in textbooks should be freely made.

Courses on probation and parole should be taught by the social case method. The student should have, however, much prerequisite work before he receives instruction by this method. He should study methods of legal procedure, the organization and administration of courts which handle delinquent cases, the police system and its functions, penal institutions and their history, the history and theory of punishment, the criminal, and the various causes of crime so far as they have already been analyzed and classified. A combination of the textbook, lecture, and problem methods of teaching such material can be used to great advantage in the economy of the student's time. Since both probation and parole require the use of social agencies to adjust and reclaim the delinquent,

a knowledge of community resources is absolutely essential to successful probation and parole work.

All successful probation work requires that the delinquent be reached individually. To help him to adjust himself, a thorough knowledge of his case is necessary. This involves a diagnosis which will take into account all the possible causes which have brought him to his present state of mind. Are the causes physical? A complete physical diagnosis is necessary, in which his past physical condition is gone into, including prenatal factors and the physical and mental history of his ancestors. What is his mental status? He should be thoroughly tested mentally for insanity, feeble-mindedness, psychopathy, or any other mental defects. If he does not prove to be feeble-minded it should be determined by test whether or not he is of low-grade intelligence. His mental history should also be considered. What about his social adjustments and social history? His case history should be studied. This will include his present social adjustments and his social adjustments in the past, including his home and family reactions and the influences there determining his conduct, his adjustments to the school, to the immediate community in which he lives, and to all his other relationships. It is only when he considers the case from this threefold point of view that the social worker is capable of diagnosing the causes of the delinquency of the case. When he does this, if he has a knowledge of the social forces and the various social resources near and far, he may make the adjustments for the delinquent which will in turn reclaim him as a law-abiding citizen of the community.

One of the best possible ways of getting the delinquent or any one adjusted is through the process of diagnosis. The social worker shall help the delinquent to explore his mental attitudes and mental life and by this process

bring about a change in the mental attitudes which have made him a case.

We have at the present time varied recorded experience along the above lines in handling delinquent cases. These may be made available to students who wish to study the handling of various types of cases. The student may become familiar with the technique and the principles involved in the handling of these cases. The student can study probation and parole successfully in no other way unless he is apprenticed to one of the few high-grade agencies in the country that are handling these problems scientifically and begins his work with the prerequisite background of training above described. He cannot be prepared to be a successful probation or parole officer by the textbook, lecture, or any other method of teaching.

The attitude in Great Britain toward case-work training is very different from that which prevails in this country. In comparing the social-work teaching in Great Britain and the United States, Miss Macadam in her book "The Equipment of the Social Worker" points out that the American schools are much more professional and emphasize the technique of social treatment much more than the British schools, the British schools emphasizing fundamental principles and the philosophy of social movements.

Referring to our case-work courses, this author makes the following observations:

The words "Case" and "Case work" as applied to human beings are not popular in this country, and the insistence on such subjects as "principles of case work," "case analysis" in the time-tables of American schools perhaps unreasonably exasperates the British social worker. There is something to our ideas repellent in a class of fifty students with type-written records of a life history of, say, an unmarried mother in their hands discussing minutely the diagnosis and treatment

of an unfortunate example of "social maladjustment." Such a class can be extraordinarily well conducted by an able and sympathetic teacher, but in less experienced hands may produce that mediocre uniformity and rigidity of outlook that is fatal in a social worker. The successful handling of individual human lives presents such incalculable elements that it can hardly be compared with the study of the more exact sciences. The best type of "case worker" is endowed with inborn gifts, and will gain experience in actual work, not in the classroom dissection of case papers.¹

The case method of teaching is difficult and should not be used by any one except those who have the background of training and knowledge to use it successfully. The successful handling of human lives involves problems much more complex and difficult than are met with in the more exact sciences, but since this is true, does it imply that the social worker should be less well trained than those who deal with the problems of the more exact sciences? On the contrary, is it not an argument for giving the social worker better training than is received by those who deal with the problems of the more exact sciences? Those who are receiving training to handle these intricate and difficult problems should be permitted to see all the elements which enter into the solution of difficult human situations and should have some practice under able guidance in solving problems of all sorts of complexity before they begin to deal with actual human situations where so much is at stake. We are willing to admit that "The best type of case worker is endowed with inborn gifts," but how are we to know in advance who are endowed with "inborn gifts?" The author says that those so endowed "will gain experience in actual work, not in the classroom dissection of case papers." While these favored souls are gaining experience in actual work, they may do an incalculable amount

¹ MACADAM, "The Equipment of the Social Worker," p. 189.

of harm to human lives before they become good social workers. But what about those individuals who do not have "inborn gifts" but who learn all they will ever know by doing, the bunglers in social work who go on through life doing an irretrievable amount of harm in the name of philanthropy and human welfare?

Before he can practice medicine, a man must have a license which indicates that he has training and experience which qualify him to deal with physical disease. He should also be the possessor of "inborn traits," but no presumption of "inborn traits" entitles him to go out and murder people before he acquires the knowledge and skill which make him a skillful practitioner.

Case-work courses are particularly valuable where the formation of a judgment and the adoption of a social policy are involved. As was stated above, successful case work cannot be carried on in the so-called pre-professional courses. Nor can the case-work method be used successfully in courses on social investigation or social statistics. The methods used in the latter case are discussed elsewhere.

There are, to be sure, certain courses which cannot be taught by the case method most efficiently, but social-case-work teaching may be broadened to include objectives not generally contemplated now in the field. It is used too exclusively now in teaching the technique of social procedure, and in this respect but little advancement has been made, so far as objectives are concerned, over its use to train apprentices before the schools of social work were organized. If social case work is used simply to teach craftsmen, this method of teaching is falling far short of its possibilities. The case-method of teaching law has been adopted as the best method of teaching the principles of law. In business education, the case method is used as the best method not only of teaching business principles, but for the training of

business executives. May not the case-method be used just as successfully in teaching the principles of social work as in teaching the principles of law and of business?

Much difference in purpose and emphasis prevails in the schools of social work in this country on the teaching of case work. Some use it to teach technique; other schools use it not only to teach technique but to teach the principles of social work. Some schools offer several courses to teach technique, including elementary and advanced courses. Courses are offered not only on family case work, but child-welfare work, juvenile probation work, psychiatric social work, etc. If social-case-work courses are taught with the purpose of teaching technique, it is inconceivable to me that more than two substantial courses can be offered—one on the fundamentals of case work and another on case recording. Whatever the purpose of case-work teaching, the two above-named courses should be fundamental to all others. If case work is used to teach the principles of social work, then there is no limit to the number of case-work courses which may be offered. In the latter case the title of the course should suggest the subject matter rather than the method of teaching the course. On this account where the purpose of the course is to teach subject matter and principles, the policy of law schools and schools of business administration should be followed. It is a great mistake to designate a course as Case Work Number 1, Case Work Number 2, etc., when the purpose of the course is to teach subject matter and principles, rather than to illustrate a technique.

So far as principles of procedure and policies of social work are established as a result of the handling of individual and family problems, principles of social work may be taught by the social-case-work method. Very definite policies in handling homeless, dependent, and delinquent children have been established and are

generally accepted. These policies have grown out of the handling of individual cases. The same may be said of handling the problems of dependent families. May not the teaching of social case work be used to show how these policies and principles have been developed from the handling of specific cases, and if so, is there a better method to teach the principles of social work so far as they pertain to individuals and families? Since the social executive must deal to a certain extent with the principles and policies established in this way, should not social case work be accepted as a factor in the training of the social executive?

CHAPTER XII

CASE RECORDING

For the following reasons the importance of thoroughness in case recording cannot, on account of its serviceableness, be over-emphasized. These reasons may be briefly stated as follows: (1) its value to the social worker who handles the case; (2) its value to other social workers who may take up the case; (3) its value in the training of social workers by the case method; (4) its value as a contribution to social science.

The leading social workers of the country are not satisfied with the present methods of case recording as a basis of social diagnosis and treatment, but they are not in agreement as to the best ways of improving case records. These short-comings in case records are due chiefly to two things: (1) the majority of social case workers are uneducated and untrained; (2) funds are inadequate to carry on satisfactorily the work of societies doing case work. The majority of these societies require their case workers to carry heavy loads, and on this account the case work is not thorough and the case records are inadequate. Moreover, this situation is likely to continue for some time to come.

Some agencies are adequately financed, do a high type of case work, and keep good records. Others that are well financed are not doing good case work, and many others could be adequately financed if they appreciated the importance of good case work and of good record keeping.

If case work and case records are to be improved, how shall it be done? Professor Edwin W. Burgess, of the

University of Chicago, in an article in *Social Forces* entitled "What Social Case Records Should Contain to Be Useful for Sociological Interpretation," asks and answers the following question.

What should social case records contain to be useful for sociological interpretation? They should contain what will render them valuable for social case work, that and no more.¹

This view of Professor Burgess does not meet the approval of all social workers and perhaps would not meet the approval of many sociologists. Mr. Linton B. Swift, a social worker, in the publication *Social Forces* referred to above, says:

Professor Burgess' paper, however, carries the implication that usefulness for social case work is synonymous with usefulness for sociological interpretation, and in that I cannot agree . . . An improvement and particularly an addition of material for purposes of sociological interpretation does not necessarily meet the needs of case work. As used by the case worker, the ultimate purpose of a case record must be treatment based upon the needs of the individual case. It is according to these varying needs that the information and proportionate emphasis in the record must be determined, and these emphases are not the same as they would be for research purposes.

In spite of the illustrations which Mr. Swift gives to prove his case stated above, I cannot believe that he has established his contention.

We find the views of Miss Ada Sheffield in her pamphlet on case-study possibilities completely in harmony with the views of Professor Burgess when she says, speaking of social science and case-work study,

We find at least the foreshadowing of an agreed rationale of analysis in dealing with personality and situation. This analysis falls naturally in two main divisions: the individual's

¹ *Journal of Social Forces*, Vol. 6, p. 254.

biological endowment, and the relationships which show the interplay between this native endowment and his social milieu. The first division would cover the individual's heredity, his physical and mental make-up; the second would include his relation with his family and their neighborhood setting, his sexual life, his relation with employer and fellow employees, his recreational opportunities and choices, his church relation, and his response to efforts of rehabilitating agencies public or private. Other group associations and their settings he might have also, but these are the ones about which social case workers must commonly get information.¹

It is unnecessary to say here that this is the scope of case work as I have interpreted it to be and it indicates clearly what the case record should be. This is also precisely the information which the sociologist desires. A large part of sociology deals with the interplay of relations between the individual and the group, with the method by which the individuals form groups, and with group organization and functions. It is concerned, too, with the way in which groups mold the individual and determine his relationships and character; with the complex network of influences surrounding the individual, and with his impulses, aspirations, hopes, and plans for the future. Case work broadly conceived gives the sociologist in the case record precisely what he wants.

If it be said that social case work deals with the handicapped and underprivileged classes, and sociology deals with all classes, the normal more largely than other classes, then it must be said that human nature is very much the same among all classes, and that the maladjustment with which the social worker deals is only an exaggerated form of maladjustment which exists in all classes and which, if it goes unnoticed, produces an indefinite amount of suffering and misery.

¹ SHEFFIELD, "Case Study Possibilities," p. 10.

Observe this also from Miss Sheffield, herself a prominent social worker.

What we ordinarily think of as the personality of a client appears and is developed in the interplay of character forces between himself and others in one and in another of the various groups of people which help to create and enrich his social life, each relationship affording situations that give scope and stimulus to some special aspect of his nature. It is within these various groupings that a man's values in life take shape. The things he prizes, his guiding sentiments of love, of family dignity, of ambition, of religion, of friendship, of citizenship—sentiments which integrate his habits and give purpose to his life—are all formed by the joint activity of his mind with other minds, organized into circles that conserve and reinforce those values.

When social case records attain the ideals indicated above they will contain much that the sociologist wishes, they will be most serviceable as teaching material, and they will enable the social worker to make predictions and develop treatments which will greatly improve the adjustments of his or her clients.

In the article above referred to Dr. Burgess finds the inadequacy of case records chiefly because the client does not reveal himself in his own language in the record. The latter

. . . obtains a hearing only in the translation provided by the language of the social worker . . . To enter the interview in the words of the person signifies a revolutionary change. It is a change from the interview as an opportunity to participate in the life history of the person, in his memories, in his hopes, in his attitudes, in his own plans, in his philosophy of life.

The advantages which Dr. Burgess finds in the interview in the first person are: (1) It is democratic in that it should involve a sharing of experience; (2) it gives the social worker a better understanding of the case; (3) it

gives an accurate statement of the case undistorted by the social worker's point of view.

The critics of too implicit a reliance on the interview stated in the first person claim that the personal equation of the social worker cannot be eliminated, since her views in the case will be revealed in the questions she asks, and "her own prejudices, attitudes and mannerisms are a part of the picture." They say also that memory is too faulty to record faithfully what the client says, that the mere words of the client do not exhibit states of feeling which may be revealed in his gestures and tones, and that the setting in which the statements of the client are placed may not "mean exactly the same thing as they meant when the client uttered them."¹

Those who are familiar with the Judge Baker Foundation reports and other case records which Burgess refers to, will appreciate the value of the record in the first person, in which the social worker secures the confidence of the client and faithfully records precisely what she says. However, the record in the first person may have all the shortcomings which Bruno and Swift claim for it. At least it cannot be used exclusively but must be used to supplement the interviewer's statement in the record. The degree of perfection which a record attains will depend in the last analysis on the capacity of the social worker—on his thoroughness, on his skill in getting into completely democratic relations with his client, on his ability to size up a situation, to exclude the irrelevant, to present everything in right proportions, and to give a complete picture of the case. There can be no substitute for skill and mastery in the social case worker.

If verbatim reports are obtained, with few exceptions it is not wise to copy in the presence of the client precisely what she says. A guarded rather than a free and complete statement of the facts is nearly always made, and

¹ See BRUNO and SWIFT, *Journal of Social Forces*, pp. 532, 533, 536.

this is not what the interviewer wants. In making another kind of investigation where an exact statement of the situation was desired, I found it far better to copy nothing in the presence of the one interviewed, but, immediately after the interview and not in the presence of the one interviewed, to attempt to record faithfully precisely what was said. With practice of this kind one can develop a highly retentive memory.

It has been generally assumed that social-case-teaching cannot be used aside from the teaching of individual and family problems. Steiner, Pettit, and others have suggested a modification of its use in the teaching of community organization. I do not think that such teaching should be called case-work teaching. But the organization, administration, and policies of the settlement, community center, playground, camp, etc., can be taught very successfully by what could better be called the problem method of teaching. If studies were collected indicating the problems of organization, administration, objectives, and policies of institutions of the above classes, together with what happened in each case, giving results, it would represent a very satisfactory way of teaching many of the principles of community organization. Thus a method comparable to the case-method of teaching individual and family problems can be used in teaching wider areas of social work.

CHAPTER XIII

FIELD-WORK TRAINING

Social workers and a majority of the administrators of schools of social work give field-work training a very important place in the curriculums of schools training social workers. Treatises on social work give much attention to case work, social investigation, group work, community organization, etc., but nearly all of them are absolutely silent on the subject of field work. Why is this? The bulletins of schools announcing courses for the training of social workers are not silent in announcing field-work courses on social work; nor was the committee which recommended the requirements in training and experience for membership in the American Association of Social Workers silent on field-work training.

In the literature on social work there is some discussion of the teaching of field work which takes a form like this: Should it be taught along with other classes? Should it be taught in independent blocks of time? Should it be turned over to a social agency for supervision? Should the representative of the agency in charge of field work be given a position on the faculty of the school? Or should the students be jointly supervised by the agency and a member of the faculty of the school? The auspices under which the field work should be conducted also receive some consideration. Should the district of the city where the field work is conducted be under university or school auspices? And what portion of the curriculum of the school should be given to field work? Questions such as these receive consideration at conferences of schools of social work and at conferences and in programs where training in social work is being considered.

At conferences such as the above-named and in the literature of social work little or no attention is given to the purpose of field work and to its importance in a program of social-work training. Its place in a program of social-work-training and its importance seem to be assumed. Is the purpose of field-work training to teach the principles of social work, to make students familiar with the problems of social work, to teach the techniques of social work, or to break people into jobs of social work? Questions such as these receive no consideration.

It seems to me that the logical beginning of the study of the importance and place of field work in social-work training is inquiring into the purposes and aims of field work in such training. What is its importance as compared to other disciplines? Considerations such as these should receive attention before we consider the organization for teaching it, the methods of teaching it, and the place assigned to it in the curriculum.

It has been called a social clinic and a social work laboratory. Is field work a laboratory for the solution of problems of human association? According to Steiner, social research is a laboratory and social treatment is a clinic.¹ I accept this distinction. Social research is discussed elsewhere. Clinical experience involves investigation, diagnosis, and treatment, and this is the only field work worthy of a place in the curriculum of a training school for social work.

Much social experience necessarily precedes the work of a social-work clinic. This experience is acquired in all sorts of ways. There is the experience of childhood in the home, in the school, in the neighborhood, on the playground, in the give-and-take relations which are within the experience of every normal child. Through this experience children learn to stand for their rights, to make concessions, to get along together, and to cooperate

¹ See STEINER, "Education for Social Work," p. 72.

for common ends. In the study of sociology in the university, the experience of the student is always appealed to to enable him to appreciate and to understand social phenomena. In courses in applied sociology visits are made to welfare institutions, such as penal, reformatory, and child-welfare institutions, homes for the aged, institutions for the deaf and blind, for the feeble-minded, and hospitals for the insane, etc. These trips are usually made in connection with the preprofessional and other courses.

Each social science has its own methods of bringing its students to an appreciation of the phenomena of its subject matter. Applied psychology has methods of teaching peculiar to its subject matter, such as clinics on the abnormal and the delinquent. Economics and political science have their methods of observation and analysis. The purpose of these methods peculiar to each social science is to enable students to appreciate the real significance of social phenomena, to know and understand people and the impulses which move them—in short, to understand more thoroughly the laws of human association. One cannot study and appreciate the real significance of the phenomena of the social sciences and be a recluse. He must be on the firing line at least a part of the time.

Some students are so constituted that they can never become social scientists because they cannot appreciate and understand social phenomena. Such students, of course, can never become social workers. I know of a student who made good grades in her academic work but who failed completely in her field-work course because she could not understand the impulses which led people to certain forms of behavior. This grasp of things is, of course, of first importance to the social worker. Many years ago I went with an experienced and well-trained case worker in a large city, among the dependent

families of a race whose characteristics I had reasons to know thoroughly but which the investigator did not understand. I have since appreciated the wisdom of the policy of family-case-work societies, which whenever possible, send an Italian worker to work among the Italians, an Irish worker to work among the Irish, a German worker to work among the Germans, and a Negro worker to work among the Negroes.

In the family-case-work field, field work should consist of investigation, social diagnosis, and treatment. Social-case-work courses should precede and prepare definitely for field-work courses. The case record is a statement of the facts entering into the case, the diagnosis of the case, the prognosis or the suggested treatment, and the follow-up to measure the results of treatment. Sometimes some field work is required in case-work courses. In his study of the case, the student learns the various methods of collecting evidence, the basis for reaching a decision, the prognosis, and the outcome of the treatment. A case-work course in any field will consider as great a variety of problem cases as is possible in that field. The case-work courses here considered are in family case work, such as dependency, delinquency, child welfare, psychiatric social work, and in health social work. In any one of these fields, a good case-work course will present not only the most representative cases in the field (if such a thing is possible) but as many types of cases as is possible within that field. Legal education at the present time does not assume the necessity of going any farther than this in preparing students for the practice of the law.

Schools of social work give clinical experience beyond this to prepare students for the practice of social work. As stated before, field work in family case work is clinical experience which includes investigation, diagnosis, prognosis, and treatment. In other forms of social work,

field work, although different, gives actual experience in social work comparable to that given in family case work. In other words field work in social work is practice in investigating, in diagnosing, and in handling the social problems with which the social worker must actually deal. This should be done under competent supervision. The student should have practice in as great a variety of cases as is possible, and it is only the experience and the training conducted in this way which is worthy of university credit.

If this is what field work is in the family-case-work field, why should it take this form? And what are its limitations? The fundamental purpose of field work in the family-case-work field is to establish definitely the principles of social work in the family field. As the principles of social work can be established more definitely by the case method of teaching than by the lecture, textbook, or problem method of teaching, the principles of social work can be established more definitely by the field-work or clinical method of teaching than by the case method of teaching.

Wherein is the field-work method of teaching superior to the case method of teaching? The problem before the social worker in the case method is more theoretical than in the field-work method. In the former method all the facts have been gathered by some one else. The student studies the case as it has been handled by some one else, thoroughly going into the diagnosis, the prognosis, the treatment, and the results of the treatment. Or, the case may be presented to him as a problem for him to diagnose and suggest a treatment for, after doing which he must check his solution with the one already proposed, including whatever success may have attended the treatment. In the field work assumed he gathers the facts, acquires some experience in doing so, comes face to face with those who contribute the information and with those

whose problem he is assisting to solve, has an opportunity to suggest a treatment, follows the treatment decided on with the definite human elements in mind, and has an opportunity to appraise the results. In his personal contacts he will get something he has not obtained by the case method of teaching. Great difficulty is experienced in putting down all the facts in the record. The personalities before him may reveal many elements not contained in the record. This is usually the case. Moreover, he is dealing with personal material, and is helping to control policies which he cannot do in the case method; and principles are more vividly and accurately established in his mind when he is dealing with human equations in his problem than when he is giving theoretical consideration to a case.

Certain points of view are sometimes established in the actual handling of cases under supervision which may be missed entirely by the case method of teaching; and these points of view the student may never see established on the job after he graduates from school. These points of view center chiefly around the relationship between client and case worker.

The kind of relationship established between the case worker and client cannot be foreseen and can be known only as the student is closely supervised while these relationships are being established. One illustration furnished me by a very successful field-work teacher will be sufficient to illustrate this point. A wholesome, generous, open-minded girl, who had worked her way through college, was confronted with the handling of the case of an adolescent girl who refused to give a portion of her earnings to the family support. The classroom responses of this young woman with reference to the underprivileged groups had been wholesome, she had proved to be human and well balanced in her discussion of cases, and she had displayed excellent initiative in

figuring out ways in which a case worker could be most helpful. But in this instance the girl client wept, and dramatically portrayed the freedom and fun she was missing because of insufficient funds. The student case worker realized that from the point of view of family income the mother was not making an unfair demand upon her daughter, but recalling vividly her own deprivations she sympathized with the daughter in resisting the demands of the mother.

The field supervisor takes note of the whole situation and is confronted with the problem of bringing the student around to a more wholesome attitude toward this form of family situation. The student load should be so planned as to give the student worker none of these situations until she is prepared to solve them. It should be planned, if possible, to give an adequate number of counteracting situations in order that the student may be led gradually to a more wholesome point of view, not only with reference to this situation, but to as many others as she meets. This can be done only when the student has a wise field-work teacher who becomes familiar with all the important student-client reactions.

We have lawyers who should never have been admitted to the bar, physicians who should never have been permitted to practice medicine, and teachers who should never have been permitted to teach. By the use of the field-work method of teaching, schools of social work may apply an acid test to students and eliminate those who have no right ever to become social workers.

Those who are receiving training to do group work may prepare for work in one or more of the following types of institutions or activities: social settlements, community centers, recreation centers, playgrounds, camps, boys' and girls' clubs, Young Men's Christian Associations, Young Women's Christian Associations, boy scouts, girl scouts, camp-fire activities, etc. It is sometimes

claimed that social work in these activities is very elementary, so elementary as not to require any field-work training. Whether this is true or false depends entirely on circumstances.

One important distinction should be made between training for family case work and training for group work. The organization in which family case work is done is concerned primarily with the one activity—family case work. The group-work organizations are usually concerned with a variety of activities. The settlement, which is perhaps the most conspicuous illustration of this, is concerned with a great variety of activities. For some of these activities no professional training is presumed to be necessary. Some of its activities may need professional training. None of the individual activities of the settlement or of any other group requires the extent and intensity of training required for case work in any of the family-case-work agencies. I do not care to go into an analysis of the kinds of individual activities in each of the so-called group activities to determine which ones require professional training and of these the kinds and amounts of training required.

When we speak of training for group activities we do not ordinarily have in mind the sort of training for the specific activities of the group comparable to training for family case work, but training in the organization and management of group activities, which is really training for executive work. Employment in a settlement, on a playground, or in a Y. M. C. A., is not necessarily field work or clinical work in the group activity. If a student is doing field work in a settlement, either he should work in some individual activity of the settlement that has difficult problems to solve and that will require technical knowledge and skill, which will require time to acquire, or he should be set to work out settlement problems which

will give him the experience and knowledge that will enable him to organize and operate a settlement. So, also, field work in a camp should give the student practice in some one aspect of the camp which requires skill and knowledge; or else he should be given practice in working out the many problems which arise and have been successfully worked out in the conduct of a camp, so that it will be possible for him to organize and conduct a camp successfully. His activities should be carried on under the guidance of some competent supervisor who appreciates the significance of university credit and the importance of practice work in training, and who is a real teacher.

The field work in community organization is intended primarily to train social executives. In the successful management of councils of social agencies or the community chests of our larger cities, executive ability of a high order is required, and consequently the field work here should be very difficult. Unfortunately, the schools of social work have given but little attention to the training of executives, and consequently the use of field work for such training has been almost entirely ignored. As the councils of social agencies and community chests are concerned with the coordination and teamwork of all the social institutions and agencies in cities, both public and private, it is necessary that a comprehensive knowledge of these agencies be had with reference to the organization, functions, and efficiency of each and the need for each. This information is of especial importance to community chests, since these organizations must collect funds for all the private agencies and budget each in proportion to its relative needs. A far-reaching publicity campaign must be carried on to keep givers and prospective givers adequately informed on the value and needs of social agencies and a business organization of great proportions must

be set up to secure, collect, and distribute annually millions of dollars in the larger cities.

A brief statement of some of the work and the functions of these organizations suggests at once the need of executive ability of a high order to manage these institutions. In smaller cities which have community chests or councils of social agencies, an organization not quite so far-reaching as that in larger cities is necessary. A rather definite technique has been developed, however, for the community-fund cities large or small. There are great possibilities for the training of executives in these community-fund cities in that they may be trained to do under adequate supervision the things which all successful heads of councils of social agencies or community chests must do.

In the family-case-work societies there is a neglected field of training, that is, the training of executives for the family-case-work agencies. Much attention is given in case-work courses and in field-work courses to training students to be family case workers. Training for executive positions in these societies has been generally ignored. Why? Do not the executives of these societies need training? Or do they come to their positions by the grace of God? I plead for training for those who hold the higher positions in social work as well as for those who hold positions in the ranks.

Field-work training cannot be given to each student for all possible positions in social work. Each case should be dealt with on its merits. Some in the family-case-work field think that their technique is fundamental and should be taught to all students in training even if they are not expected to become family case workers. I agree with them in this respect, that some training—such, for example, as is offered in a family-case-work course—should be given to all students in training to be social workers in family case work. These students need not be given

family-field-work training, but a student who is receiving training to become an executive of a family-case-work society certainly should have some field-work training in a family-case-work society.

The purpose and character of courses in field-work training having been considered; there remain for our attention the place of field-work teaching, the amount of time devoted to it, and the conditions under which field work should be taught. Since it has been established that the purpose of field work is to teach the principles of social work, the other possible purposes, to make students familiar with the problems of social work, to teach the techniques of social work, or to break students into jobs of social work, are eliminated from major consideration in the purposes of field-work training. Students are made familiar with the problems of social work in field-work teaching, but this is only incidental to the chief purpose of field-work teaching. So, also, some of the techniques of social work are taught in field-work teaching, but if the purpose of field-work teaching were restricted to this, the schools of social work would be trade schools and not entitled to a place in a university organization. In the apprenticeship period of training, we found that prospective social workers were broken into jobs; but while preparation for the job may be the chief function of some of the schools of social work at present, not one of them will admit that this is what it is doing.

How much time should be given field work in the schools of social work? That from one-half to one-third of all the work offered by the school should be given to field work is the recommendation of the National Association of Schools of Social Work. Suppose it were suggested to the national association of schools on legal education or to the national association of schools on medical education that from one-half to one-third of

all the work offered in their schools leading to their degree should be in field work, what would the reply be? If the purpose of field work is restricted to the teaching of the principles of social work, there can be no possible excuse for giving from one-third to one-half of the time of the school to teaching field work.

At the Ohio State University in the undergraduate course in social administration, the junior and senior years, or six quarters' work, is devoted to education in social work and one-quarter out of six, or one-sixth of the time of the school, is devoted to field work. Approximately one-half of one semester or one-twelfth of the time is given to laboratory work or social investigation. In the graduate work for the training of social executives, one of the four quarters' work leading to the master's degree in social administration is devoted to field work. Those in charge of the school see no reason to increase the relative amount of work devoted to field work in either the undergraduate or the graduate areas.

It is maintained by some that the school should have charge of its field work, and in some instances schools have taken charge of areas of cities to conduct the social work and supervise by their own staff the work of their students. In some instances this may be the better way of handling field work. However, much depends on local conditions and circumstances. Where satisfactory arrangements are made with agencies and the agency assigns a good teacher to supervise the field work of the students with the cooperation of the case-work teacher of the school, the field-work courses may be taught as well as or even better than they are where the school has charge of an area of the city.

The experience of most schools has shown that it is better to concentrate on the field work at a particular time in the course, as there is a great loss of time in going back and forth from field work to classroom; that it is difficult

to make the field work dovetail into the classroom work; and that while the student is engaged on cases he should be permitted to follow these through to their solution a thing which cannot be done conveniently if he is going back and forth from field work to classroom. The courses should not end with the field-work course. Since the purpose of the field-work training is to establish principles of social work, the case-work teacher should be permitted to meet the field-work students with the purpose of relating definitely the field-work training with the case-work teaching.

CHAPTER XIV

WHAT IS A PROFESSION?

Since the custom of attempting to dignify an occupation or calling by claiming it to be a profession has prevailed for many years, no word perhaps, is more loosely used at the present time than profession. According to the adherents of each, we have a legal profession, a medical profession, an engineering profession (even a great variety of brands of engineering professions), a teaching profession, an accounting profession, a banking profession, a nursing profession, an artists' profession, a dancing profession, a veterinary medicine profession, a journalists' profession, a musicians' profession, etc. If all these and perhaps many others were seriously considered professions, there would be no point to the present quest: Is social work a profession?

A distinction is sometimes made between learned professions and others. If a profession has any significance for our purposes, it is a learned profession. It is of no significance at all to say that a calling is a profession only in so far as that designation means that it has met certain standards and that when the term profession is used with reference to the calling it connotes certain standards which dignify the calling. If any calling or occupation is a profession, then what are the standards? The standards may be so low as to let nearly everything in, in which case the term profession does not mean anything; or they may be so high as to dignify groups designated as professional.

It is not my purpose in this chapter to determine what callings are and what callings are not professions, but

to determine whether social work is a profession when that term is used in the best sense; and if it is not a profession to give the reasons which keep it from being a profession. I shall not attempt to say whether the ministry, teaching, engineering, architecture, etc., are professions or not. I shall leave this for others to determine. By common consent two lines of activity, law and medicine, are considered professions in the best sense. What are the determining factors which, according to the leading representatives of each, make law and medicine professions?

Some of the fundamental principles avowed by the influential members of these professions are as follows: (1) that the professions should be under democratic control and that they should be organized so as to be self-disciplining; (2) that the fundamental data of the professions are based on science and that for each there is a systematic body of knowledge and a definite technique which may be taught; (3) that there are standards of education and of professional education which should be required of the members as a condition to admission to the professions and of practice in the professions; (4) that serious violations of fundamental principles should be investigated and should be punished by the professions; (5) that the professions should prescribe the ethical standards of its members and that these standards should concern the relations of the members to their clients, to each other, to the public, and to their professions.

In their relationships to their clients it is required that they shall serve their clients faithfully, that they shall be reasonable in their charges, and that they shall protect the interests of their clients by keeping their confidence. In their relationship to each other a set of principles has developed to protect each in his practice through agreement not to injure the professional reputation of another, not to supplant another in his practice, and not

to compete by lowering charges for services. The services required in the interest of the public in general are to promote social welfare by the services rendered, to administer justice in the case of the lawyer, and to prevent disease and promote public health in the case of the physician. The relation of the individual to his profession is concerned chiefly in his advancing the dignity of the profession and in promoting its standards by the character of the service he renders to his client and to the public. The profession in an organized capacity assumes it to be its prerogative to protect its members from unjust laws and to promote legislation advancing the interests of the profession and its members.

LEGAL TRAINING

Professor Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School in his address on "Social Work and Professional Training" before the National Conference of Charities and Correction at Baltimore in 1915 made this significant statement, "As a lawyer I belong to a profession which has behind it the experience of eight hundred years." However, "There was no university law school worthy the name in the United States until Judge Story went to Harvard in 1829."¹ This school prospered, others were established, and at the outbreak of the Civil War there were in the United States 22 degree-conferring law schools. By 1920 there were 142 and nearly 25,000 law students in attendance at American schools.

The better lawyers complained that the educational standards for admission to the law schools in the period from 1890 to 1920 which was a period of the multiplication of law schools, was very low. The general requirements were no more than a high-school training, and in many states there was no general educational require-

¹ WOODWARD, F. C. "Ways in Which Professional Schools Are Elevating Education Standards," Conference on Social Work, Cleveland, 1926.

ment at all. The law student was, moreover, everywhere permitted to receive his technical education in a law office. As late as 1908 the Association of American Law Schools expressed the hope that all schools in the association would require two years of college work of their students. However, by 1920 only thirty-one schools, which was less than one-half of the university law schools, actually required two years of college training as a condition to entrance in the school.¹

In 1921 the American Bar Association appointed Elihu Root chairman of a special committee on education and this committee brought in a report which was adopted after a long and vigorous debate. This report was as follows:

1. The American Bar Association is of the opinion that every candidate for admission to the bar should give evidence of graduation from a law school complying with the following standards:

a. It shall require as a condition of admission at least two years of study in a college.

b. It shall require its students to pursue a course of three years' duration if they devote substantially all of their working time to their studies, and a longer course, equivalent in the number of working hours, if they devote only part of their working time to their studies.

c. The Law College shall provide an adequate library available for the use of the students.

d. It shall have among its teachers sufficient numbers giving their entire time to the school to insure actual personal acquaintance and influence with the whole student body.

2. The American Bar Association is of the opinion that graduation from school should not confer the right of admission to the bar, and that every candidate should be subjected to an examination by public authority to determine his fitness.

¹ See Woodward, same article, for these facts.

3. The Council on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar is directed to publish from time to time the names of those law schools which comply with the above standards and of those which do not, and to make such publications available so far as possible to intending law students.¹

4. The President of the Association and the Council on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar are directed to cooperate with the state and local bar associations to urge upon the duly constituted authorities of the several states the adoption of the above requirements for admission to the bar.

5. The Council on Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar is directed to call a conference on Legal Education in the name of the American Bar Association, to which the state and local bar associations shall be invited to send delegates, for the purpose of uniting the bodies represented in an effort to create conditions favorable to the adoption of the principles above set forth."

The chief opponents of this report were the old lawyers who had received their legal training in a lawyer's office or in a mediocre law school, and who had very little general education. In this debate the name of Abraham Lincoln was frequently summoned to do service on the negative side of the question. Chief Justice Taft and Mr. Root spoke vigorously for the adoption of the resolutions. An increasing number of lawyers by this time had received a college education and their influence was on the side of high standards for the legal profession. Moreover, many of those whose general and legal education had been irregular had come to appreciate that the conditions of legal practice were different at the close of the first quarter of the twentieth century from those that prevailed in Lincoln's day.

Following the adoption of this report the Association of Law Schools voted that after 1925 all the members of the

¹ This was done, with commendable results.

association should require two years of college work. Progress toward higher standards in legal education has been steady. An increasing number of law schools are requiring three and four years of college training instead of two, and some of them are adding a fourth year to the law-school curriculum.

MEDICAL EDUCATION

The medical profession is well organized. The American Medical Association was organized in 1847 and reorganized in 1901. According to its constitution,

The object of the association shall be to federate into one compact organization the medical profession of the United States, for the purpose of fostering the growth and diffusion of medical knowledge, of promoting friendly intercourse among American physicians, of safeguarding the material interests of the medical profession, of elevating the standard of medical education, of securing the enactment and enforcement of medical laws, of enlightening and directing public opinion in regard to the broad problems of state medicine, and of representing to the world the practical accomplishments of scientific medicine, with power to acquire and hold property, publish journals, etc.¹

County medical societies are local divisions of state societies and the American Medical Association is limited to state societies with their local affiliated societies. Membership in the national association is obtained on application and the application must be accompanied by a certificate of good standing in a county society signed by the president and secretary of the organization. The control of the association rests with a house of delegates who are chosen in a delegate capacity. The general management of the association is under a board of trustees. There are five standing committees and several

¹ *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 101, 1922, p. 54.

special committees. Of these committees, that most important is the committee on medical education and hospitals, established in 1904, which exercises a great influence on entrance requirements and courses given in medical colleges. Aside from improving the entrance requirements and the character of the teaching in medical colleges this committee has driven out of existence a large number of low-grade medical colleges.

After years of study and inspection of medical schools this committee has classified all the medical colleges of the country. Information concerning each school is grouped under four heads to which equal importance is attached, as follows: the faculty, the product, the administration and supervision, and the buildings and equipment. Each group is given 25 per cent. Schools having 70 per cent or above of these requirements are classed as A, those between 50 per cent and 70 per cent, B, and those having less than 50 per cent, C. This published classification is a constant pressure on the schools of lower grade to improve so that they may enter a higher classification.

Under "product" are placed the qualification of students admitted to the medical college, the premedical courses, etc. The admission to the medical profession is of course under state law. In 1921 six states required a preliminary education of four years in high school of students entering the medical colleges, four required a one-year college course, and thirty-seven required a two-year college course. Many medical colleges have higher requirements than those demanded by the states. Of the eighty-eight medical colleges rated by the American Medical Association in 1921, seventy were classified as A, eight as B, and eight as C, and two were unclassified.¹

¹ For above information see *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 101, p. 57.

The standard medical course in college is four years. Many medical colleges have now added a fifth year which the candidate must spend in an approved hospital before the degree of M.D. is granted him. Where medical colleges require two years of college work as prerequisite to registration, as a rule definite subjects and courses are required in what is designated as a premedical course.

In 1912 the American Medical Association adopted principles of medical ethics covering the duties of physicians to their patients, the duties of physicians to each other and to the profession at large, and the duties of the profession to the public. In the latter case is stressed the obligations of the physicians concerning measures to prevent epidemics and contagious diseases and concerning cooperation with public authorities in enforcing sanitary laws and regulations.

EDUCATION FOR SOCIAL WORK

If there is a professional organization among social workers it is the American Association of Social Workers organized in 1922 at Providence. The views of this organization with reference to standards of social workers may be inferred from the requirements for full membership in this organization. Two classes of membership are provided, a junior membership and a senior membership. Since junior members are not full members in the organization, no attention will be given here to the requirements for junior membership. The by-laws of the organization were recently changed for both junior and senior membership, the changed conditions for senior membership to go into effect July 1, 1933.

The present conditions for senior membership, stated in Section 4 of the by-laws, are as follows:

A member shall hereafter at the time of his admittance meet the following qualifications:

He must have had four years of practical experience in

social organizations of recognized standing and have demonstrated that he possesses an educational background warranting expectation of success and progress in the profession of social work. He must not be less than twenty-five years of age.

Graduation from a two year course in an approved school of social work and one year of experience may be accepted in lieu of four years' experience; completion of one year in an approved school of social work in lieu of one year of experience; completion of one year or more of graduate work in social science in an accredited college or university in lieu of one year's experience; two or more years' experience in a closely related profession in lieu of one year's experience. In no case shall a member have had at the time of his admittance less than one year of practical experience in social work.

As evidence of educational background warranting expectation of success and progress in the profession of social work, consideration shall be given to such facts as graduation from college or university; completion of special courses in colleges, universities, or schools of social work, individual study, papers prepared for conferences or other proceedings, and any special achievements in social work.

It must be obvious to any one that the requirements for admission to the designated profession of social work are simple and easily met. From the first paragraph one infers that experience is the all-important desideratum. Four years of experience of a certain kind and an educational background are sufficient. The last paragraph states the qualifications which constitute evidence of educational background. These constitute such qualifications "as graduation from college or university, completion of special courses in colleges, universities, or schools of social work, individual study, papers prepared for conference or other proceedings, and any special achievements in social work." It is inconceivable that the educational requirements for admission to a profession could be less. Much freedom is given the committee

to determine when the educational requirements have been met. Graduation from a college or university would apparently meet the requirements regardless of the college or university or the course of study pursued. Would graduation from a veterinary college or a college of pharmacy meet the requirements? Completion of special courses in colleges or universities without designating the courses would seem to meet the requirements. Moreover, individual study or preparation of papers for conferences of some sort by the applicant without his ever having been in a college or university or even a high school would seem to meet the necessary requirements. Any special achievement in social work which would satisfy the committee on applications for membership would also meet the educational requirements for admission to this profession.

The substitutions for the four years of experience in social work are carefully safeguarded. Under any circumstances the applicant must have had at least one year's experience in social work. Graduation from a two-year course in a school of social work may take the place of three years of experience and one year of graduate work in social science, and two or more years of experience in a closely related profession may be a substitute for one year of experience.

It is not stated what the closely related professions are which are considered valuable experience for the social worker. Although the experience required may be cut short by training in a school of social work, training in a school of social work is not a prerequisite to admission to the profession of social work. Nor is any particular educational requirement stipulated as a condition for admission to this profession. These are the standards which are imposed upon applicants for admission to the profession of social work until July 1, 1933.

According to the amended by-laws, applicants for membership after July 1, 1933, must meet the following requirements:

1. Completion of at least two years' work in an approved college.

2. Five additional years of general education, technical training or employment in an approved agency. This requirement may be satisfied in either one of the two following ways:

a. Graduation from an approved college plus one year in an approved school of social work, plus two years of employment in an approved agency.

b. Five years spent in some combination of: attendance at an approved school of social work, or employment in an approved agency, provided, however, that the applicant has satisfactorily completed: twenty semester hours of social and biological science in an approved college or school of social work; twenty-four semester hours of approved technical social work courses; three hundred hours of supervised field work in connection with the technical social work courses; two years of employment in an approved agency.

3. (Substitute for requirements 1 and 2.) Graduation from a four-year college plus completion of a two year graduate course in an approved school of social work shall be regarded as fulfilling requirements 1 and 2.

And Section 6 states:

that the National Membership committee with the approval of the executive committee may in exceptional circumstances elect to membership persons who do not technically meet the requirements specified above.

If it is the intention of the American Association of Social Workers to maintain standards of the profession, why did it insert Section 6, giving to the membership and the executive committees power to admit members to the association who had not met the standards it imposed?

When it is stipulated that twenty semester hours of social and biological science in an approved college or school of social work are required, a footnote states that:

Any courses in sociology, economics, political science, psychology and psychiatry, anthropology and biology, may be submitted as social and biological sciences. Special courses in education, such as educational psychology and educational sociology and special courses in home economics, such as nutrition and dietetics, home nursing and household budgets may be submitted. Applicant should also submit any other courses which she thinks should be included in social and biological science.

After requiring only twenty semester hours of both social and biological sciences combined and listing a group of subjects so comprehensive that scarcely any reputable university would regard them as included under social and biological science, why does the association append the additional statement that the applicant "should also submit any other courses which she thinks should be included in social and biological sciences"? The only answer to this question is that the association makes the educational requirements for admission so easy that any one with a little education could make the grade. As a matter of fact there is no reason for not making a definite amount of several of the social sciences an absolute requirement for admission to an association of social workers which claims the right of social work to be a profession.

CHAPTER XV

IS SOCIAL WORK A PROFESSION?

Mr. Abraham Flexner, then assistant secretary, General Education Board, New York City, appeared before the National Conference of Charities and Corrections at its Baltimore meeting in 1915 with an epoch-making paper entitled "Is Social Work a Profession?" It may seem strange that I should go back fifteen years to discuss a paper of this sort especially since I criticise certain features of it, for the author may have changed his views radically since writing the paper. My defense of this course of procedure is that this discussion of Mr. Flexner's is the best I have found anywhere on professions and especially on the claims of social work to be a profession.

Mr. Flexner claims that there are six criteria by which professions are determined.¹

(1) Professions involve essentially intellectual operations with large individual responsibility; (2) they derive their raw material from science and learning; (3) this material they work up to a practical and definite end; (4) they possess an educationally communicable technique; (5) they tend to self organization; (6) they are becoming increasingly altruistic in motivation.

No one will quarrel with the conclusion that intellectuality is a mark of a profession. While manual labor is not necessarily excluded, the activity should not be exclusively manual. "A free resourceful, and unhampered intelligence applied to problems and seeking to

¹ National Conference of Charities and Correction, 1915 Baltimore, p. 581.

understand and master them, that is in the first instance characteristic of a profession."¹ Moreover, according to Flexner the responsibility is largely personal. The professional man should be free, and while he may and should cooperate with others, he should be free in his choices and in his procedure.

That the data of the professional man should be drawn from science few will question. If the information used is drawn largely from general knowledge or experience, the occupation can lay little claim to be professional. The usual sources of scientific knowledge, such as the laboratory, seminary, and other scientific sources of information, should be used.

That professions should have definite, practical ends is also a matter of common observation. "The professions of law, medicine, architecture, and engineering, for example, operate within definite fields and strive toward objects, capable of clear, unambiguous, and concrete formulations,"²

All professions have a technique which may be communicated. A definite purpose or object granted, recognized skills or methods of procedure are necessary to attain the objects. These skills and methods of procedure may be complex or highly involved and are based upon fundamental subjects of discipline. The acquisition of these skills and fundamental knowledge requires time and intelligence and consequently a considerable period of study and learning is necessary to the attainment of professional standing.

A profession differentiates itself from other professions, occupations, or callings in its objects, its techniques, its responsibilities, etc. Because of this the members of a profession tend to develop a definite status. They form a clique, a group, or a brotherhood, and they accept the

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 579.

² *Ibid.*

responsibility of defining their status and responsibilities and in a democratic way control their relationships.

In accomplishing the above purposes, professions are confronted with the problems of defining the various relationships of their members and especially the relationships of the members and the group to the public. The interests of the organization and of individual members often conflict with the public interest, and consequently to maintain the dignity of the organization and to make obvious its usefulness, care is taken to define and to urge the public responsibility of the professions and of the members of the professions. To an increasing extent, professions are invested with a public interest. The extent to which different professions are invested with a public interest varies greatly. This factor will be discussed later.

Having carefully defined a profession, Mr. Flexner then proceeds to discuss such callings as plumbing, banking, pharmacy, and nursing to show why they are not professions.

Recurring to our criteria I should say that pharmacy has definiteness of purpose, possesses a communicable technique, and derives at least part of its essential material from science. On the other hand, the activity is not predominantly intellectual in character and the responsibility is not original or primary. The physician thinks, decides, and orders; the pharmacist obeys—obeys, of course, with discretion, intelligence, and skill—yet in the end obeys and does not originate.¹

Referring to the nursing situation he says:

It is the physician who observes, reflects, and decides. The trained nurse plays into his hands, carries out his orders; summons him like a sentinel in fresh emergencies; subordi-

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 582.

nates loyally her intelligence to his theory, to his policy, and is effective in precise proportion to her ability thus to second his efforts.¹

Although the author does not express an absolute conviction, it is clear that he does not consider nursing in general a profession. The author then calls attention to the public-health nurse, who is a sanitary official and who works in a field largely on her own responsibility rather than under orders, and wonders whether a differentiation in training and in terminology is not likely to develop with reference to her.

Having prepared the groundwork, the author then takes up the thesis of his paper, "Is Social Work a Profession in the Technical and Strict Sense of the Term?"

The worker must possess fine powers of analysis and discrimination, breadth of view and flexibility of sympathy, sound judgment, skill in utilizing whatever resources are available, facility in devising new combinations. These operations are assuredly of intellectual quality.²

The author then raises the question as to whether this . . . responsibility is not that of a mediating than an original agency.

The social worker takes hold of a case, that of a disintegrating family, a wrecked individual, or an unsocialized industry. Having localized his problem, having decided on its particular nature, is he not usually driven to invoke the specialized agency, professional or other, best equipped to handle it? There is illness to be dealt with—the doctor is needed; ignorance requires the school; poverty calls for the legislator, organized charity, and so on. To the extent that the social worker mediates the intervention of the particular agent or agency best fitted to deal with the specific emergency which he has encountered, is the social worker himself a professional or is he the intelligence that brings this or that

¹ *Ibid*, p. 583.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 584–585.

profession or other activity into action? The responsibility for specific action thus rests upon the power he has invoked. The very variety of the situations he encounters compels him to be not a professional agent so much as the mediator invoking this or that professional agency.¹

If the social worker is simply a mediator carrying out the instruction of a principal who has diagnosed the case, then the conclusions of the writer are sound. But this is not the case. The social worker himself diagnoses the case. The cases with which the social worker deals are often complex and sometimes need in their solution the services of a number of experts. These the social worker summons. He always contributes one class of expert service himself, that of diagnosis. In the great majority of instances he contributes other expert service directly himself. Take the case of the delinquent child. The social worker may summon the physician who will determine if the child is ill or physically defective. He may summon the psychologist to learn if the child is feeble-minded or otherwise abnormal. If the child is ill or physically defective, the physician may be called on to cure its illness or to correct physical defects in so far as he can. If mental conflicts prevail, the appropriate expert should be called in the case to bring about mental improvement. If the case is negative in health or mentality or both, the social worker's task is not at an end. What is there in the family, the neighborhood, and the school relationship which may be changed to improve the conduct of the case? All these things must be considered together with the past history of the case in working out a better adjustment of it, and these factors the social worker usually handles himself. If, on the other hand, the delinquent has no physical or mental defects, other causes of delinquency must be sought by the social worker and these he usually seeks himself. In

¹*Ibid.*, p. 585.

working out a solution to the case he usually uses mediators, but they, rather than he, take orders. It would be exceedingly difficult to find a situation in social case work where, after the diagnosis is made by the social worker, the case was rehabilitated exclusively by mediators without a contribution of the social worker himself in which he uses expert knowledge.

There is no possible analogy between the work of the social worker as mediator and that of the pharmacist who fills out prescriptions written by physicians or of nurses at the bedside of the sick who faithfully carry out the orders of physicians. The social case worker is a diagnostician who renders other expert service and summons experts and others to supplement his activity in working out a complete solution for his case.

Mr. Flexner makes this further comment,

In speaking of social work as mediating, I do not intend to say that other professions are mutually independent and act independently. Indeed, the collaboration of different professions in the doing of specific tasks is a characteristic feature of latter-day organization. Architects, engineers, sanitarians, lawyers, and educators cooperate in the building of a school or a tenement. But it is to be noted that this is a division of labor among equals, each party having, subject to general consent, primary responsibility for his particular function and responsibility; differing, I take it from the function and responsibility of the social worker under similar conditions.¹

What the writer describes here as the strength of the professions is at the same time their weakness. Real cooperation is hindered by the disposition of professional men to stand on their prerogatives, and their unwillingness to cooperate whole-heartedly with others in enterprises in the responsibility of which several professions or groups should be sharers. The social worker at this point is making a real contribution. His success is

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 585.

determined largely by his willingness to cooperate and his capacity to secure cooperation. He is perfectly willing to stand aside and satisfy some professional man's egotism if by doing so he can accomplish his purpose. His retiring nature and his diplomacy are already accomplishing something in reforming members of the older professions.

Another failure of social work to meet the requirements of a profession according to the author is the absence of definiteness of purpose. On this point Mr. Flexner says:

I have made the point that all the established and recognized professions have definite and specific ends: medicine, law, architecture, engineering—one can draw a clear line of demarcation about their specific fields. This is not true of social work. It does not appear to be so much a definite field as an aspect of work in many fields. An aspect of medicine belongs to social work, as do certain aspects of law, education, architecture, etc. . . . The field of employment is indeed so vast that delimitation is impossible. We observed that professions need to be limited and definite in scope, in order that practitioners may themselves act; but the high degree of specialized competency required for action and conditioned on limitation of area can not possibly go with the width of scope characteristic of social work. A certain superficiality of attainment, a certain lack of practical ability, necessarily characterize such breadth of endeavor.¹

I doubt if there is anything unique in the objects of social work distinct from medicine and law. The purpose of social work is to improve individual and social adjustments and to improve social organization and procedure in the interests of social welfare. The purpose of medicine is to cure disease and to prevent sickness by removing the conditions which cause disease. While it is true that the field of employment in social work is vast, including such occupations as family-welfare worker,

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 585, 586.

child-welfare worker, hospital social worker, industrial welfare worker, psychiatric social worker, probation officer, parole officer, civic secretary, visiting school teacher, settlement worker, recreation director, community organizer, research worker, statistician, etc., it is also true that the field of employment in medicine is vast, including such occupations as the general practitioner, the eye, ear, nose, and throat specialists, the nerve specialist, the heart specialist, the stomach specialist, the skin specialist, the lung specialist, etc. A great variety of specialists are to be found also at the present time in the legal profession.

Whatever his specialty the fundamental training of the physician is the same. He is first trained to be a physician and when he becomes a specialist the training in his specialty comes after his training as physician. A similar statement of the case can be made with equal accuracy of the legal specialist. The training of the social worker cannot be so closely defined as is the training of the physician and the lawyer. But the conditions of training should be similar. All social workers should have the same fundamental training, and the training of the specialist should be based upon fundamental training which all social workers should receive.

Of less significance than his other criticisms is the contention of Mr. Flexner that social work simply supplements existing professions. He says:

A good deal of what is called social work might perhaps be accounted for on the ground that the recognized professions have developed too slowly on the social side. Suppose medicine were fully socialized; would not medical men, medical institutions and medical organizations look after certain interests that the social worker must care for just because medical practice now falls short? The shortcomings of law create a similar need in another direction. Thus viewed, social work is, in part at least, not so much a separate pro-

fession, as an endeavor to supplement certain existing professions pending their completed development.¹

No doubt much would be gained if law and medicine were broadened in the direction of the social aspects of each profession. However, law and medicine would have to be very greatly broadened to include what social work is now doing to supplement each, and the members of each of these professions would have to do a very different sort of thing from what they are doing now. It is inconceivable that either of them will ever be broadened to include the sort of things social work is now doing to supplement them. If law, medicine, the ministry, education, the state, etc., each functioned perfectly, there would be much less need for social work than at present. However, is it not short-sighted to assume the absence of the need of a profession on the theory that other institutions and agencies function perfectly? All this is too much to expect of human institutions. Moreover if we had a perfect society otherwise, we might assume that there would be no need for either a legal or medical profession. We are all familiar with the assumption of the anarchist with reference to the need for organized government; the contentions of Mr. Flexner with reference to the need for social work are practically the same as the contentions of the anarchist concerning the need for organized government.

If Mr. Flexner's conclusion that social work is not a profession are unsatisfactory, are there other reasons why social work is not a profession? I believe that there are other and valid reasons for concluding that social work is not a profession.

From a study made by the Russell Sage Foundation of 1258 social workers representing 677 organizations in 221 cities of the United States it was found that only about 44 per cent of them were college graduates, only 14 per

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 586.

cent of them had one year or more of a course in a school of social work, and only 7 per cent of them had had a full college course and a full course in a school of social education.¹ A study of 740 social workers in Philadelphia agencies showed that 60.1 per cent had high-school education or less; 42 per cent did not finish high school; 6.2 per cent had only grammar-school education; and only 10 per cent had completed courses in schools of social work.²

The completion of a college course has no significance as education for social work. All it indicates is mental equipment and general education. Unless the right group of courses was selected in the college course no professional courses in social work are taken.

Miss Walker says in "Social Work and the Training of the Social Worker":

No reliable figures are available as to the number entering social work training. However, the four hundred produced annually by the schools can not supply more than one-fifth of the positions open in social work—if the conservative estimate of an annual turnover of 10 per cent among 20,000 social workers is accepted.³

The older of the social workers of the United States have not received training in the schools except through brief courses in summer schools in some instances. It is safe to conclude that the great majority of social workers of the United States never received any training for the work they are now doing, and of those who have received training a great majority have never had a college education, and a considerable percentage of them not even a high-school education. What most of the social workers

¹ Quoted from Sydnor H. Walker, "Social Work and the Training of Social Workers," pp. 105, 116.

DEARDORF, "Education for Social Workers," *Annals of the American Academy*, September, 1925.

² Quoted from Deardorf, *op. cit.*

³ WALKER, *op. cit.*, p. 117.

of the country learned about what they are now doing they learned on the job. Where such a situation as that above described prevails can social work be considered a profession? Whatever may be its development in the future, as long as it is in the apprenticeship stage of development social work is not a profession.

Sydnor Walker makes some very interesting comments apropos of our present problems:

There appears no basis for the claim to a general technique in personality adjustments, so long as the social worker states that his skill is acquired from "doing" and this "doing" is limited to a certain section of the population whose problems represent only a portion of the problems of society.

It seems relatively unimportant to emphasize the fact that social work cannot establish professional status by offering the technique of case work as proof that it has an exclusive field. What can be accomplished by good case work is of great social value; first, the solution of problems of individuals who may be suffering or who may be causing injury to society; and second, the development of a scientific attitude towards individual problems, which will ultimately produce a technique capable of being analyzed for the enlightenment of all interested in problems of human behavior. This technique will be created through developing scientific methods of careful observation and of collection of data, through planning based on inductive analysis of pertinent facts, and through systematizing and generalizing procedure. Social workers in the natural course of their jobs have access to material of great potential value to the social sciences; putting this material into form which would meet the needs of the social sciences should be an important function of social work.

Social case work is not conceded, therefore, to have any unique quality. The technique that has been built up is apparently not the product of any educational discipline to which social workers have submitted, but is based upon experience with certain types of social problems.¹

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 108-109.

The great majority of social case workers today have not received training in the fundamentals of the social sciences and of course do not appreciate the value of this training in the work they have to do. A much larger number of them have not received training in the so-called preprofessional courses of study and consequently cannot appraise their importance to the social worker. When social workers become thoroughly grounded not only in the fundamentals of the social sciences but also in preprofessional courses for social workers, it will be possible for them to make a real contribution to the social sciences from the rich laboratories in which they are working, and a general technique in personality adjustments will be developed, "capable of being analyzed for the enlightenment of all interested in problems of human behavior."¹ When this is attained social work will have a literature and a technique which will have claims for professional status.

If the great majority of social workers of the United States have neither the education nor the training which should qualify them to be considered professional men and women, what about their views with reference to the training which the social workers of the future should receive? Here again the situation is rather discouraging. Reference has already been made in the last chapter to the standards of admission to the American Association of Social Workers and to those adopted by the association to go into effect July 1, 1933.

At the present time the applicant for membership in the American Association of Social Workers must be twenty-five years of age and must have had four years of experience. The amount of experience required speaks emphatically for the apprenticeship stage of social work in which the American Association of Social Workers finds itself. No practical experience is required of the young

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

lawyer as a condition of admission to the bar, and the best medical schools require only one year of internship in a hospital as a condition of admission to the medical profession.

But the experience above referred to may be reduced to one year if the applicant graduated from a two-year course in an approved school of social work; or, it may be reduced to three years if the applicant has completed one year in an approved school of social work or one year or more of graduate work in social science, or has had two or more years experience in some closely related profession.

The applicant may be a graduate of a college but this is not necessary. He need not be a graduate of a high school or even have attended high school if he had made some individual study or prepared papers for a conference which have met the approval of the committee on membership.

If a man or woman is twenty-five years of age and has had four years of experience in a social organization, he may be at the present time admitted to this professional body of social workers without having had any training in a school of social work, or without having graduated from a college, university, or even high school. The only requirement of any significance is age. Can an organization with no standards of professional training, or even of education, claim to be a professional organization worthy of the name?

The standards set up by the American Association of Social Workers for a period beginning July 1, 1933 are higher than those in vogue at present. Yet even these standards are very disappointing. The first item required is two years' work in an approved college. In addition to this five more years are required in some combination of attendance at an approved college, attendance at an approved school of social work, or

employment in an approved agency. A number of provisions, however, enter into this combination:

(1) 20 semester hours of social and biological science in an approved college or school of social work; (2) 24 semester hours of approved technical social work courses; (3) 300 hours of field work in connection with the technical social work courses; (4) two years of employment in an approved agency

Some features of these requirements of the five years stand out conspicuously. Two years in employment and three hundred hours in field work are required. This again suggests the apprenticeship phase of social work and the trade-school conception of education. As stated before, the legal profession emphasizes professional training and does not require any experience, and the medical college requires only one year of internship before the medical degree is given.

Twenty-four hours of approved technical social-work courses is a very low requirement of professional work for admission to a profession. Twenty semester hours of social and biological science in an approved college or school of social work is likewise an exceedingly low requirement for very valuable fundamental courses. This becomes more apparent when one sees the list of social and biological sciences in the footnote which are mentioned as acceptable; not only sociology, economics, political science, psychology and biology, but psychiatry, anthropology, educational psychology, educational sociology, home economics, nutrition and dietetics, home nursing and household budgets. I do not wish to be understood as claiming that the latter group of courses is not important for the social worker. Some of them are very important for certain social workers. But it would be possible for an applicant to offer twenty semester hours of social and biological science without offering any sociology, psychology, economics, or biology

at all, all of which are very important to the social worker; or it would be possible to offer some of these and omit others.

As a substitution for all that has preceded, including the two years of college work and the five additional years, there may be substituted "graduation from a four year college plus completion of a two year graduate course in an approved school of social work." This statement makes no requirement whatever of social and biological sciences either in the undergraduate or graduate work, nor is there any requirement whatever of the professional, preprofessional or field-work courses required in the graduate school. The applicant who holds an A.B. degree from some college and who studies two years after that in some school of social work which has the approval of the membership committee will be admitted to full standing in the American Association of Social Workers as a professional social worker.

According to the statistics taken from women students who graduated from liberal arts courses of representative colleges of central Ohio, heretofore given, in one school those having less than six semester hours in sociology numbered 90 out of 106; in another 109 out of 195; in another, 58 out of 105; in another, 34 out of 89; and in another, 88 out of 106.

In one of the same institutions, the graduates having less than six semester hours in psychology numbered 27 out of 106; in another, 175 out of 195; in another, 58 out of 105; in another, 19 out of 89; and in another 40 out of 106.

In one of these institutions 96 out of 106 graduates had less than six credit hours of work in economics. In another, the number was 178 out of 195; in another, 95 out of 105; in another, 75 out of 89; and in another, 94 out of 106.

Sixty-five out of 106 graduates of one of these institutions had less than six credit hours in biology, 165 out of

195 in another; 78 out of 105 in another; 66 out of 89 in another; and 77 out of 106 in another. Six semester credit hours is taken as the dividing line as six credit hours is the usual requirement in fundamental courses in these subjects in all the leading universities of the country.

If these colleges and universities are typical of those throughout the country from which graduates go to take social-work training, it is obvious that the majority of them will not have had the fundamental training which social workers should have. A glance at the catalogues of the private schools of social work or of those having only nominal affiliation with universities, or of others associated with universities whose curriculums are dictated by social workers, will show clearly that students will seldom receive training in the fundamentals of the social sciences, or even training in the preprofessional courses, if they did not have this training before they entered these schools. There are social workers and representatives of the schools of social work who claim that social workers do not need training in the social sciences, but they are usually those who have never had such training and do not appreciate the significance of the social sciences in social work.

Professor Edward S. Robinson, Professor of Psychology at Yale University, disposed of this matter in a pertinent way at the recent Boston conference of the National Conference on Social Work in a paper, "The Place of Psychology in the Education of the Social Worker." He said:

In the case of these professions which are discovering the impossibility of a practically complete vocational education it is important that the solution is being sought neither in the old practice of reliance on apprenticeship in the field nor in the other old idea that one type of general training is as good as any other so long as it is strenuous enough to put a premium

on industry and native intelligence. There is a search for a general type of training, but a type which is, nevertheless, of fundamental relevance for the profession in question. There is little disposition to assume that the courses which furnish the most secure ground work for engineering also furnish its most secure ground work for medicine. It seems to me that those who are considering the education of the social worker may well enter upon a similar line of thought. The multiplication of the more highly specialized courses has limits and so have the absorption capacity of students. Yet there must be among the basic natural and social sciences certain methods of inquiry, certain ways of thinking about human nature, which are capable of a crucial role in the practice of social service.

It may be claimed that social work is so variable that its problems are not to be solved by the devices of science. In this connection one will do well to remember that science is more than a collection of tricks and devices. A science is, in its most significant phase, a manner of looking at and thinking about a complex group of natural phenomena. And nowhere do we need keen and orderly thinking more than in this social field.

The committee on membership of the American Association of Social Workers of which Frank J. Bruno of the department of social work of Washington University, St. Louis, was chairman, submitted a report requiring much higher and more specific standards of membership than those finally adopted. This report specified that the training courses which students should have should be "divided into three parts; namely, (a) background (b) technical, (c) field work." The report states that when a "two years' course in an approved school of social work" and a one-year course in an approved school of social work are referred to, it means technical and field-work courses and not background courses. The report recommends thirty semester hours in background sciences such as biology, psychology, economics,

political science, and sociology. It will be recalled that the report finally adopted in one form called for only twenty semester hours in social and biological sciences and stipulated a much larger list of social and biological sciences than those listed above, from which elections should be made. Even this standard of the social and biological sciences was cast aside when the report adopted offered as a substitute for this, as well as other requirements, graduation from a college or university and two years of "graduate" work in an approved school.

To an increasing extent social workers believe in training for their work. However, many of them do not believe that training is necessary and feel any suggestion of high standards of training is regarded as a reflection on them. It will be recalled that a similar situation prevailed when members of the legal profession attempted to raise the standards of training for that profession. Lincoln's name was often used when questions of standards were under discussion. We have no Abraham Lincolns in social work, but we have many little Lincolns who are rendering yeoman's service whenever raising standards of training for social workers is sought.

The original Bruno report further suggested that the balance of requirements in the three divisions should be 40 per cent background courses, 40 per cent technical courses, and 20 per cent field-work courses. This feature was also rejected, as was the recommendation that not more than $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent of the work of the student should be in field work. Social work is too near the apprenticeship and trade-school conception of social work for social workers to accept the latter feature.

The associations of schools and colleges have always taken the lead in advocating higher standards of professional education in the medical and legal professions. One would naturally think that the association of schools of social work would also contend for higher standards

of professional education in social work than the regular practitioners, the social workers of the country. This we do not find to be the case. The Bruno report above referred to came before the National Association of Schools of Social Work at its Washington meeting in December, 1927. It was apparent that the representatives of the so-called graduate schools of social work felt that thirty semester hours in the social and biological sciences was too rigid a requirement and one which those holding an A.B. degree entering their schools could not meet. The requirement in the report that not over 33 per cent of the work of the school should be in field work was very unsatisfactory to some of the schools. Some features of this report were adopted at this meeting and the executive committee was instructed to present the balance of the report at the meeting which was held at Memphis in June, 1928. By this time the executive committee had changed its mind about what should go into the report. When the report was finally presented at the Chicago meeting in December, 1928, it recommended low standards for schools admitted to the association.

The setting up of standards by the Association of Schools was primarily for the purpose of guiding the executive committee in determining what schools should be admitted to the Association. Although it was generally understood and specifically stated that the standards adopted would not affect the status of the schools already in the association, the standards adopted for the schools were much lower than those adopted by the American Association of Social Workers for individual members to be admitted into the Association after July 1, 1933.

As a matter of fact it is rather difficult to find any definite standards in this report. One in particular states that

At least 90 per cent of students accepted for subjects in the professional curriculum for which credit is given toward a degree or a diploma, must have secured two years of academic credit beyond high school. Normal schools and schools of nursing may be considered in this connection.

At least two years of school work beyond the high school is required as prerequisite to the professional curriculum. The school must then offer a curriculum covering two full academic years.

The courses offered in the curriculum of the school must include the following four divisions of the subject matter of social work.

A.

1. Fundamental techniques.
2. Adaptations of scientific material to the needs of social work.
3. Courses in the practice of social work.
4. Orientation courses.

That the committee had more definitely in mind the teaching of field work than anything else may be inferred from the special consideration given it.

B. Field Work

1. The school to be eligible for admission must present a program of field work under the educational control of the school.
2. Field work is planned and supervised experience in the practice of social work as social work is carried on by recognized social agencies.
3. Not less than one-third or more than one-half of the time provided by the curriculum shall be given to field work.

The curriculum of the school must consist of one-third field work and may consist of one-half of it. Imagine a law school requiring legal practice of from one-third to one-half of its work leading to a legal degree, or a medical

college requiring for a medical degree practice work of its students for from one-third to one-half of their credits. Practice work is the easiest thing a school can provide, and if it is not equipped to do a high-grade class of work it can turn its students over to agencies for one-half of their work with a minimum of supervision from the school.

In the preliminary report of the committee in which it offers general observations, the only feature about which it seems to have definite convictions is field work. After defining field work the committee states:

. . . that field work is indispensable in professional education for social work. We are convinced that field experience to be of constructive value, must be given a substantial share of the time occupied by a given curriculum. Under present conditions we feel that approximately one-half of the total period and not less than one-third may easily be given to field work.

The extreme of indefiniteness with reference to the role of the social sciences is best expressed by the committee:

Much more study is required before the following questions can be satisfactorily answered.

1. What constitutes preparation for entrance to a professional school of social work?
2. Since the curriculum we have outlined presupposes some work in the social sciences, how shall this work be defined as to amount and content, and how accomplished?

If these views represent the best thought of the national teaching organization promoting the training of social workers, and if these views represent the social workers of the country, we should confess at once that social work is not a profession but a craft in which expertness is acquired chiefly through practice, supplemented by some schooling concerning the character of which social workers have vague and indefinite ideas.

APPENDIX

TABLE I.—NUMBER OF WOMEN GRADUATES IN LIBERAL ARTS CREDITED WITH THE SPECIFIED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS OF SOCIOLOGY

Number of credit hours	Ohio State, 1929	Ohio, 1928-1929	Ohio Wesleyan, 1929	Otterbein, 1928-1929	Denison, 1928	Wittenberg, 1928-1929	Total
	Number of Graduates						
None.....	10	42	52	31	15	26	176
Under 6.....	2	48	57	27	19	62	215
6 to 11.....	55	15	42	40	42	13	207
12 to 17.....	10	1	23	6	8	4	52
18 to 23.....	5	...	2	1	3	1	12
24 or more.....	7	...	19	...	2	...	28
Total.....	89	106	195	105	89	106	690
	Percentage Distribution						
None.....	11.2	39.6	26.7	29.5	16.9	24.5	25.5
Under 6.....	2.2	45.3	29.2	25.7	21.3	58.5	31.2
6 to 11.....	61.8	14.2	21.5	38.1	47.2	12.3	30.0
12 to 17.....	11.2	0.9	11.8	5.7	9.0	3.8	7.5
18 to 23.....	5.6	1.0	1.0	3.4	0.9	1.7
24 or more.....	7.9	9.7	2.2	4.1
Total.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE II.—NUMBER OF WOMEN GRADUATES IN LIBERAL ARTS
CREDITED WITH THE SPECIFIED NUMBER OF SEMESTER HOURS
OF PSYCHOLOGY

Number of credit hours	Ohio State, 1929	Ohio, 1929	Ohio Wesleyan, 1928	Otterbein, 1928-1929	Denison, 1929	Wittenberg	Total
	Number of Graduates						
None	2	6	55	7	4	2	76
Under 6	3	21	120	51	15	38	248
6 to 11	50	73	13	47	67	56	306
12 to 17	18	5	2		2	10	37
18 to 23	8	1	2		1		12
24 or more	8		3				11
Total	89	106	195	105	89	106	690
	Percentage Distribution						
None	2.2	5.7	28.2	6.7	4.5	1.9	11.0
Under 6	3.4	19.8	61.5	48.6	16.9	35.8	35.9
6 to 11	56.2	68.9	6.7	44.8	75.3	52.8	44.3
12 to 17	20.2	4.7	1.0		2.2	9.4	5.4
18 to 23	9.0	0.9	1.0		1.1		5.7
24 or more	9.0		1.5				1.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

INDEX

A

Accountants, 99, 129
Accounting, 49
Actuaries, 99
Administrators, 149
Advertisers, 129
American Association of Social
Workers, 169, 172, 185, 186,
188, 190, 192
American Bar Association, 165,
166
American Medical Association, 79,
167-169
Anthropology, 173, 187
Applied sociology, 61, 151
Apprentice, 133
Architects, 179
Architecture, 175
Art, 7
Association American Law Schools,
165
Association American Colleges, 74
Autocratic administration, 105, 106

B

Background courses, 84
Biology, 56, 73, 75, 76, 78, 85, 88,
108, 173, 187, 190
Boy Scouts, 155
Boys' clubs, 155
Brackett, Jeffrey R., 42
Breckinridge, Sophonisba, 43
Bruno, Frank J., 147, 190-192
Bureau of Business Research, 127
Bureau of Educational Research,
107
Bureau of Social Research, 124

Burgess, E. W., 143, 144, 146
Business, 100
Business administration, 80-82,
130, 131, 134

C

Cabot, Dr., 6, 16
Campfire clubs, 155
Camps, 155
Case illustration method, 135
Case method, 126, 129, 130, 136,
139, 148, 154
Case records, 143
Case work, 31, 45, 50, 145
Case work courses, 95, 140, 152
Case work society, 111
Case workers, 99
Charters, W. W., 107
Charities and corrections, 3, 22, 23
Charity organization, 22
Charity Organization Society, 64,
32
Chicago commons, 43
Chicago Institute of Social Service,
43
Chicago School of Civics and
Philanthropy, 22, 43, 51, 53
Child welfare clinics, 69, 70, 72
Child welfare work, 141
Child welfare worker, 181
Church, 31, 32
Civic secretary, 181
Clergymen, 26
Clinical experience, 150, 152
Clinics, 39
College education, 183
College of Law, 79
Community centers, 72, 111, 155

Community Fund, 111
 Community organization, 24
 Community organizer, 181
 Competitive system, 11
 Copeland, Melvin T., 128
 Council on Legal Education, 166
 Council of Social Agencies, 111
 Crime, 23
 Criminal, 136
 Criminal courts, 20
 Criminal law, 108
 Criminology, 49, 50, 86, 108

D

Darrant, Douglas, 67, 68, 69
 Delinquency, 8, 19, 25
 Delinquent, 9, 19, 20, 21
 Denison University, 73-75, 77
 Devine, Edward, T., 27, 30, 42, 62
 70
 Diagnosis, 137, 152, 153, 179
 Dietetics, 173
 Dry goods jobber, 109

E

Economics, 62, 73, 75-78, 85, 87,
 108, 151, 173, 187, 190
 Education, 39
 General Education Board, 174
 medical, 167
 professional, 46, 50, 56
 Educators, 179
 Ellwood, Dr. C. A., 43
 Engineering, 39, 175
 Engineers, 179
 Executives, 99, 103, 106, 109, 110-
 112, 115, 116, 118, 129, 141
 social, 99, 100, 102, 105, 108, 112,
 114, 115, 118, 119, 142

F

Family, 31
 Family case work, 141, 152, 153,
 156, 158, 159

Family case workers, 63
 Family welfare worker, 180
 Federation executive, 71
 Feeble-mindedness, 137
 Field supervisor, 155
 Field work, 93, 94, 157, 189, 190,
 193, 194
 Field work course, 151
 Field work training, 149, 150, 159,
 161
 Flexner, Abram, 174-176, 179-182
 Foundation, Judge Baker, 67, 147
 Foundation, Russell Sage, 182
 Frankfurter, Felix, 164

G

George, Henry, 71
 Gilbert Acts, 3
 Girl Scouts, 158
 Gladden, Dr. Washington, 32
 Graduate schools, 78, 79, 81, 83, 84,
 86, 97, 98
 Graduate work, 84, 85, 98
 Great Britain, 95, 138

H

Haines, Dr. T. H., 3
 Halbert, 3
 Handicapped, 9-11, 63, 70, 71
 Hartford Theological Seminary, 47
 Harvard Law School, 164
 Harvard University, 79, 126, 164
 Health, 14, 15
 Health clinics, 70, 72
 Health nurse, 70
 Health social service, 14
 Health social worker, 15
 Health work, 24
 Health workers, 99
 Henderson, C. R., 22, 48
 Hibbs, Dr. H. H., Jr., 44
 Historical method, 121
 Home, 31
 Home economics, 173
 Hospital, 15

Hospital social work, 181
Household budgets, 173, 187

I

Industrial welfare, 181
Insanity, 137
Interview, 123
Irish, 34

J

Jews, 34
Joint university council of social statistics, 95
Juvenile court, 19, 69, 133
Juvenile delinquent, 20, 21
Juvenile probation work, 141

K

Kelso, Robert W., 113

L

Laboratories, 39
Langdell, 126
Lathrop, Julia, C., 43
Law, 39, 100, 164, 175
Law college, 165
Lawyer, 40, 126, 179
Legal profession, 27-29, 39
Legal training, 164
Liberal Arts college, 82
Liberal electives, 80
Logical method, 122

M

Macadam, Mrs., 96, 138
Maladjustment, 24
Medical college, 39, 169, 186
Medicine, 39, 175
Menger, Antone, 17
Mental problem cases, 24
Methodist Episcopal Church, 73
Minimum wages, 12, 65
Ministry, 100
Mussolini, 100

N

National Association of Schools of Social Work, 159, 192
National Bureau of Economic Research, 33
National Children's Bureau, 17
National Conference Charities and Corrections, 40, 164
National Tuberculosis Association, 124
New basis of civilization, 65
New York Charity Organization Society, 42
New York School of Philanthropy, 23
New York School of Social Work, 45, 51, 53, 96
North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 74
Nurses, 15, 26
Nutrition, 173, 187

O

Office administration, 104
Ohio Conference Charities and Corrections, 22
Ohio College Association, 74
Ohio Public Health Association, 124
Ohio State University, 48, 49, 73, 74, 76, 77, 86-88, 90, 94, 124, 160
Ohio University, 73, 75, 77
Ohio Wesleyan University, 73, 75, 77
Organizing ability, 104
Otterbein University, 73-75

P

Parole, 20, 21, 136, 181
Patten, Simeon N., 65
Penal institutions, 20
Penology, 108
Pennsylvania School for Social Work, 44, 67

Pettit, 148
 Pharmacy, 83
 Philadelphia Training School, 43
 Philanthropy, 4, 29, 37, 39, 49
 Playgrounds, 72, 111, 155
 Political science, 73, 75, 76, 85, 108,
 151, 173, 187, 191
 Politics, 100
 Poverty, 7, 9, 10-13, 23, 35, 37, 50
 Preprofessional courses, 46, 47, 56,
 78, 80, 86, 88, 108, 135, 188
 Preventive philanthropy, 65, 66
 Private schools of social work, 62
 Probation, 19, 20, 70, 99, 109, 136,
 137, 181
 Profession, 162-164, 171, 173, 175,
 177, 178, 188
 Professional courses, 47, 80, 87
 Professional education, 39, 89, 156
 Professional school, 47, 81
 Professional social worker, 20
 Psychiatric social worker, 24, 99,
 141, 181
 Psychiatry, 173, 187
 Psychology, 47, 50, 56, 78, 80, 86,
 88, 108, 135, 188

Q

Queen, Dr. Stuart A., 44

R

Recreation centers, 155
 Recreation director, 181
 Red Cross, 25, 26, 51
 Research, 117, 118, 120-122, 125
 Research worker, 181
 Richmond, Miss Mary E., 40, 41
 Richmond School of Social Work
 and Public Health, 44, 51, 53
 Riley, Dr. Thomas J., 43
 Robinson, Dr. Edward S., 189
 Root, Elihu, 165, 166

S

St. Louis School of Social Work, 52,
 53, 56
 St. Vincent de Paul, 13

School of Applied Philanthropy, 41
 Schools, undergraduate, 80, 83, 86,
 90
 Schools of commerce, 80, 84, 99,
 100, 127, 129
 Schools of education, 80, 84
 Schools of nurses, 70
 Schools of social administration,
 83, 85, 89, 101, 117, 120, 124
 Science and scientific method, 8
 Science, 72
 Sheffield, Mrs. Ada, 144, 146
 Simmons College, 42
 Settlements, 22, 24, 30, 72, 123, 155
 Social clinic, 150
 Social settlement workers, 63, 99,
 181
 Social work, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30-
 32, 45
 Social work laboratory, 150
 Sociology, 50, 61, 73, 75, 78, 84,
 85, 87, 145, 173, 187, 191
 Spencer, Herbert, 37, 38
 Standardization, 28
 Standards of living, 86
 State boards of charities, 26
 State departments of public health,
 124
 Statistical investigator, 120
 Statistical method, 123
 Statisticians, 99, 129, 183
 Statistics, 49, 87, 108
 Steiner, Jessie F., 148, 150
 Story, Judge, 164
 Survey, 123
 Swint, Linton B., 144, 147

T

Taft, Chief Justice, 166
 Taylor, Graham, 43
 Technical methods, 122
 Technical training, 123
 Techniques, 24, 27, 45, 50, 70, 93,
 95, 121, 138, 175, 190
 Texas School of Civics and Philan-
 thropy, 44
 Trade School, 47, 93

Tuberculosis society, 26
 Tufts, Professor, 54, 55, 57

U

Undergraduate courses, 82, 92, 93
 Undergraduate training, 91, 97
 Underprivileged, 9, 16, 17, 18
 University of Chicago, 55, 144
 University of Cincinnati, 92
 University of Minnesota, 87
 University of Missouri, 43
 Unskilled workers, 12

V

Veterinary college, 171
 Veterinary medicine, 83
 Visiting nurse, 70
 Visiting school teacher, 181
 Vocational guidance, 12

W

Walker, Miss Sydnor, 90, 91, 183,
 184
 Warner's, American Charities, 22
 Washington University, 43, 87, 190
 Welfare work, 23, 24, 36
 William and Mary College, 44, 53,
 87
 Wittenberg College, 73, 74, 75

Y

Yale University, 189
 Young Men's Christian Associa-
 tion, 155
 Young Women's Christian Associa-
 tion, 155

Z

Zoology, 87

