77-23,179

OLSON, Miriam Meltzer, 1933-
A COURSE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE
FOR DIRECT SERVICE PRACTITIONERS.

City University of New York,
D.S.W., 1977
Social Work

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1977

MIRIAM MELTZER OLSON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PLEASE NOTE:

Pages 159-162, "Value Survey", copyright 1967 by Milton Rokeach not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at the Library of City University of New York.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

A COURSE IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE FOR DIRECT SERVICE PRACTITIONERS

by

Miriam Meltzer Olson

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Social Welfare in partial
fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare,
The City University of New York
1977

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Social Welfare in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare.

June 13, 1977
date

Harold Lewis
Chairman of Examining Committee
Harold Lewis, D.S.W.

June 13, 1977
date

Irving Weisman
Executive Officer
Irving Weisman, Ed.D

Robert Chazin

Robert Chazin, D.S.W.

Irving Weisman, Ed.D
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

For their help on this project, and throughout the course of my doctoral study, I am indebted to a number of persons. Their contributions differed, but each enriched my experience beyond expectation by their unqualified generosity.

I am grateful to the Doctoral Faculty of the Hunter College School of Social Work for having created a welcoming and stimulating environment in which to work.

The efforts of Dr. Robert Chazin, Professor, Fordham University Graduate School of Social Service; Dr. Irving Weissman, Professor and Executive Officer of the Doctor of Social Welfare Program; and Dr. Harold Lewis, Dean of Hunter College School of Social Work, who advised me on my project and gave me the benefit of their insights, suggestions, encouragement and understanding, are deeply appreciated.

It was my good fortune that Dean Lewis was my advisor not only for the project, but for my entire course of study. His energy, enthusiasm and optimism were constant sources of inspiration and support. I shall always be thankful to him.

I was fortunate, too, in my classmates, and I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Rosalind Chernesky, Phyllis Freeman and Rene Solomon for being true friends.

The students who participated in the project hold a special place in my affection and regard. Their cooperation and willingness to share their experiences with me not only helped me realize the project, but enabled me to carry forward my work on teaching organizational change practice with new and deepened understanding.

I am, above all, grateful to my husband, Toby Olson, without whose extraordinary helpfulness and sense of humor this work would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE - THE PURPOSE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. iv

INTRODUCTION. 1

CHAPTER
- I. Background. 4
  - The Problem: Social Work and Social Change 4
  - The Underlying Assumptions. 11
  - Notes 15

PART TWO - THE METHOD OF STUDY

- II. Obtaining Institutional Sanction. 18
  - Notes 28

- III. The Course Design 30
  - Structure 30
  - Target Population 32
  - System of Accountability. 35
  - Method of Conduct 37
  - Content 40
    - The Value Orientation. 41
    - The Orienting Knowledge. 45
    - The Orientation to Social Work Practice 49
  - Content Summary 56
  - Notes 64

- IV. The Conduct of the Course 71
  - Notes 79

V. The Course Evaluation. 80
Notes. 97

PART THREE - CONCLUSIONS

VI. The Evaluation Findings. 101
Values 101
Knowledge For and Of Practice.. 106
Log Observations 115
Students' Evaluation 123
Additional Findings. 127
Notes. 132

VII. Discussion and Conclusions 133
Notes. 146

APPENDICES

1. The Course Proposal. 147
2. The Course Outline 151
3. The Rokeach Value Survey 159
4. The Knowledge Test 163
5. The Guide to Scoring the Knowledge Test 166
6. The Vignettes Test 168
7. The Guide to Scoring the Vignettes Test 173
8. Student Identifying Data Form. 182
9. The Value Survey Scores. 183
10. The Knowledge Test Scores. 185

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 186

LIST OF TABLES

1. Students' Field Placements. 33

2. Scores on Equality and Freedom 102

3. Non-Political Activist Ranks on Equality and Freedom Compared with the Study Sample 104

4. Scores on Equality by Race, by Attitude Towards Blacks, and by Attitude Towards the Poor Compared with Study Sample Scores on Equality 105

5. Participants in Civil Rights Demonstrations Compared with Study Sample. 107

6. t-Test of Mean Changes on Selected Items on Knowledge Test 109

7. t-Test of Mean Changes on Knowledge Test Score Totals . . . 110

8. Median Log Scores Compared with Medians on Vignettes Posttest. 112

9. Binomial Test of Correspondence of Students' Scores on Logs and Knowledge Posttest. 113

INTRODUCTION

The project being reported here was a demonstration which sought to test the feasibility of a) using a practice course in a graduate school of social work to focus on a social change component in direct service, and b) using an operational guide to social change based on a conceptualization of the social agency service delivery system as a component of the person(s)-in-situation configuration, in the educational preparation of social work students to carry out their professional responsibility for acting to improve social conditions.

Social work education is informed by the proposition that learning by doing is crucial to the achievement of mastery of practice skills. It is guided by the principle that students ought to be provided with method courses which focus on knowledge for and about practice skill, while being provided with field experiences which focus on the utilization of practice skill. The project described here was intended to test the feasibility of implementing this principle as it applies to the role of the direct service practitioner in effecting positive change in the organization of social agencies' service delivery systems.

The demonstration was carried out in a graduate school of social work through the development, introduction, provision and evaluation of a practice course on organizational change, for second year Master of Social Work students in the Spring semester of the 1974-75 academic year.

The first section of this report describes the problem which stimulated the interest in the project to teach a practice course on organizational change for direct service students, and the assumptions on which the course was built.

The second section deals with the method employed to conduct this study of the feasibility of using a practice course on organizational change to contribute to students' ability to act on the professional responsibility toward the improvement of social conditions. It describes the process engaged in to obtain institutional sanction for introducing the course into an existing graduate school curriculum; the organizational and conceptual considerations in the course design; the conduct of the course; and the method of evaluating the effects of the course.

The third section presents the findings of the study, the conclusions drawn from them, and suggested implications for professional education and practice.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Social Work and Social Change

Stimulus for the project came from interest in a problem with which the profession has, throughout its history, continually struggled. It is the problem of the proper role of the Social Work profession, and individual social workers, in effecting positive social change.

During the 1960's this problem occupied center stage of professional discussion and debate. The Civil Rights movement and the opposition to American participation in the war in Vietnam, activities which profoundly challenged established social arrangements and the assumptions on which they rested, were important components of the social and political context out of which Social Work's renewed concern about the way it was discharging its professional obligations grew.[1]

Among the particular issues which highlighted the need for reappraisal of the profession's response to the socially disadvantaged, were the formal recognition given to the adverse affects of poverty and racism on mental health[2], and the negative conclusions drawn from studies of case work effectiveness.[3]

Briar, writing for the Encyclopedia of Social Work on the history of social casework and social group work, reflects on one of the most characteristic assessments of the profession's problem--that

> Social Work has devoted too much of its resources to direct practice with individuals and families. Such a case by case approach . . . is inefficient, since many of the problems dealt with in these cases are results of defects in the social order that might be changed if more of the profession's resources were devoted to social rather than individual change efforts.[4]

The knowledge that individuals are affected by social conditions, and the value assigned by the profession to actions to improve social conditions, were, of course, at no time absent from the profession's formulations of its goals and functions.[5] It is suggested here, that one of the problems in the realization of those goals and functions has been with the different amount and kind of attention given to an operational use of the knowledge and value at different times in the profession's history. Thus, for example, while social workers have invariably taken the person-in-situation as their unit of attention for generating professional activity, during the period just prior to the 1960's two approaches to social change characterized that activity.

One approach to social change was a division of labor between "person specialists" (direct service practitioners) and "situation specialists" (administrators, planners). Burns, a strong advocate of such a division of labor, argued that

> there are two types of professional workers who are differentiated by their professional objectives (emphasis hers). The first, the social caseworker, is concerned with bringing about change in the individual, and is essentially clinically and therapeutically oriented. The second, the social welfare specialist, is concerned with change in social institutions and is non-clinical.[6]

She held that beyond a common philosophy, history, etc.,

> it is difficult to see anything generic. The behavioral and social science basis on which both groups draw very quickly becomes highly differentiated. The skills required are different. Even the personality qualities that make for success in one or the other field of endeavor are different.[7]

The other approach to the social change role of the profession came through efforts to encourage direct service practitioners to use their knowledge of social conditions, gained through their practice, as concerned and informed citizens, and as professional cohorts, to influence policy makers, legislators and others in decision making positions.

> The history of the National Conference of Social Welfare contains repeated exhortations to address social legislation and the improvement of social welfare institutions.[8]

These efforts were based, in large part, on a set of assumptions different from Burns'--assumptions that there was not a dichotomy of professional objectives, or possibly even of professional tasks.[9] The criticism of the 1960's reflected on the limited effects these two approaches had had in providing for the profession to realize its aims in regard to improving problematic social conditions.

Briar's observation spoke to the problem with the division of labor, i.e. the uneven distribution of professional resources, with the major concentration on effecting personal change, largely through interventions aimed at the personality system. Others recognized that the enjoinders to direct service practitioners to engage in policy influencing activities went unheeded more often than not.[10]

Evidence of responses to these criticisms and to the challenge to social workers to bring greater influence to bear on problems requiring social change were to be found in all segments of the professional community. The creation of new professional organizations such as the National Association of Black Social Workers, and changes made in existing organizations such as the National Association of Social Workers, reflected in the revision of its Code of Ethics, its position statement on advocacy, its provision for minority representation, etc., spoke to a new commitment to social action, and to the effort to involve social workers more fully in action programs, and provide them with increased social action know-how.[11] Agencies, including the venerable Community Service Society of New York City, re-designed their programs to focus on social problems.[12] The Council on Social Work Education, through its revised guidelines for accreditation, provided for schools of social work to devise programs to prepare Masters of Social Work capable of contributing to the profession's renewed commitment to social change.[13]

The schools, for their part, moved in two major directions in the re-design of curricula to meet the ends identified.[14] One was the development of a two track system of graduate education. One track prepared for personal service delivery, and the other for organization, administration and policy. The primary purpose here was to increase the number of Masters of Social Work prepared to engage in "situation change" activities, and thus effect a redistribution of the profession as a whole vis-a-vis social change. The other direction taken involved a reconceptualization of the base of social work operations through orientation to generic and generalist practice which frees social workers from the limits of a single method, and prepares them to direct their efforts to a range of targets, in addition to the personality, through a variety of means.[15]

Inherent in both approaches is the continuation of the preparation of Masters in Social Work to engage in direct service activities. (There has been some movement to turn these activities over to others--Bachelors of Social Work, paraprofessionals, etc., but thus far this position has not won widespread support.)

The views which prompted this study were that a) increasing the number of situation specialists might be a necessary, but not a sufficient measure for improving the profession's participation in bringing about desired social changes, and b) there continues to be a real and vital role for professional social workers at the Master's level to play in direct service delivery.

Thursz, a leading commentator on social action, states that

> the challenge for social work educators . . . is how to provide some degree of political education and experience for clinical social work students whose primary concern will not be that particular area of practice, but who nevertheless must participate in some form of social action to be full members of the social work profession.[16]

The view taken here differs with Thursz's view, not because of a difference in belief that all students should be educated for political action, nor that some form of social action is required for all social workers. The difference is with Thursz's assumption that responsibility for social action is located outside of day to day practice responsibility. I believe that the assumption that social change activities lie primarily outside the actual practice role of direct service delivery specialists is not a sound one, and that this assumption has been a contributing factor to the problem of mobilizing practitioners to address the need for social change. It is this assumption, too, I think, which has contributed to the very awkwardness and ambiguity of the first article of the Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers--"I regard as my primary obligation the welfare of the individual or group served, which includes action for improving social conditions."[17] Thus, while it is recognized that the provision of opportunities and know-how, through professional associations, political education and other means, for direct service social workers to participate in social change endeavors is an advance over exhortation, there remains a need for consideration of the role of the direct service practitioner, as practitioner vis-a-vis social change. It is that need which prompted the effort to introduce an operational guide to "situational change" into the curriculum for graduate students preparing for social work practice in direct service.

Underlying Assumptions

The course which was designed for this project was based on an acceptance of the person(s)-in-situation as the unit of attention for generating social work activity. This basic orientation to practice informed and was informed by several assumptions central to the conception of the course. One was that direct service practice carries with it a social change component.[18] Another was that "social conditions" refers to too many and different phenomena to allow for any one approach to changing them.[19] Poverty, for example, is a problemmatic social condition which requires political action, among other actions, if it is to be eliminated. But the systematic failure of social agencies to inform parents of the legal and other implications of placing a child in foster care, and the circumstances required for a child to be returned, is also a "social condition," and one which may require something other than political action if it is to be altered. Thus, it is, that the way in which social agencies organize and deliver their services may be, and often are, necessary targets for change. Activity directed towards such targets is therefore one kind of social change endeavor. It is also a social change endeavor in which direct service practitioners can play a unique role, for they operate from a particularly advantageous position to observe the impact of the service delivery system on its intended beneficiaries.

The participation of direct service practitioners in effecting organizational change has begun receiving focused attention in the professional literature. Weissman addresses his book, Overcoming Mismanagement in the Human Service Professions to "lower level professionals" whose attention is occupied by the "bureaucratic problems of social agencies--confused procedures, unresponsiveness to clients and ritualized regulations."[20]

The book is designed to offer them an understanding of tactics which can be employed to overcome the bureaucratic problems suffered by the "administered." Patti and Resnick also suggest an operational guide to the practice of effecting organizational change.[21]

Both Weissman, and Patti and Resnick, locate the justification for organizational change efforts in the values of the profession. For Weissman the source of consideration is that professionals "desire . . . and expect a large degree of autonomy from organizational interference or confining procedures."[22] Patti and Resnick, who view practitioners as without administrative sanction for organizational change efforts, state that "The legitimization for these efforts is derived from the Practitioner's ethical obligations to place professional values above organizational allegiance . . . "[23]

The assumption which informed the project here on this matter was that sanction for organizationally directed change action is located not only in professional values, but is embedded in the practitioners' service connections to their clientele. It is their function as practitioners that requires that they promote the provision and utilization of the maximum and most effective resources for meeting clients' needs.[24]

Out of these assumptions, then, came the special content introduced through this project. It was the reconsideration of the person(s)-in-situation configuration to recognize that social agencies are, for persons in need of their services, part of their situation, and that social work practitioners must include the social agency's service delivery system in their assessment of the person(s)-in-situation, and include actions directed towards effecting changes in that system in their repertoire of professional interventions.

Inherent in this reconsideration of the person(s)-in-situation configuration which locates the specific component of organizational change as one social change component of direct practice, was the assumption that the tasks to be performed and the skills required in the enactment of this practice role are guided by principles of professional practice which can be taught and learned.[25]

NOTES

[1] For an examination of the issues of debate, views of social work leaders, etc., in an earlier period, see, Ann Hartman, Casework in Crisis 1932-1941 (unpublished D.S.W. dissertation, Columbia University School of Social Work, April, 1972).

[2] The Community Mental Health Centers Act of 1963 (PL 88-164) provided for a vastly expanded national program for mental health, and shifted the locus of service from established psychiatric institutions to geographic communities, in recognition of the relationship between social, environmental and economic conditions and mental health. It provided for the design of programs and development of manpower to deal with the community conditions affecting mental health and mental illness.

[3] For a review of some of these key studies, see, Ludwig Geisman, "Thirteen Evaluative Studies," Edward J. Mullen, James R. Dumpson and Associates, Evaluation of Social Intervention (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), 15-38.

[4] Scott Briar, "Social Case Work and Social Group Work: Historical and Social Science Foundations," Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: N.A.S.W., 1971), p. 1374.

[5] A work of seminal importance to the profession in its consideration of the responsibility for the development of technical competence and for the pursuit of social reform is, Porter R. Lee, Social Work: Cause and Function (New York: Columbia University, 1937).

[6] Eveline Burns, "Tomorrow's Social Needs and Social Work Education," Journal of Education for Social Work (Spring, 1966) p. 18.

[7] Ibid.

[8] Alvin Schorr and Edward Baumheier, "Social Policy," Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: N.A.S.W.), p. 1374.

[9] See, for example, William Schwartz, "Private Troubles and Public Issues: One Job or Two?" Social Welfare Forum (New York: Columbia University, 1969), 146-171.

[10] For a study of the activities of direct service practitioners in policy making, see: Yvonne Fraley, The Role of the Professional Social Work Practitioner in Social Policy Formation (unpublished D.S.W. dissertation, School of Social Work, University of Pennsylvania, 1966).

[11] For further discussion, see, Willard Richan, "The Social Work Profession and Organized Social Welfare," Alfred J. Kahn, ed., Shaping The New Social Work (New York: Columbia University, 1973), 147-168.

[12] See, "Social Work Unit Changes Tactics," The New York Times, January 29, 1971, p. 1.

[13] "Curriculum Policy for the Masters Degree Program in Graduate Schools of Social Work," approved November, 1969, Manual of Accrediting Standards for Graduate Professional Schools of Social Work (New York: C.S.W.E., April, 1971). For discussion of the curriculum policy change, see, Gideon Horowitz, "New Curriculum Policy Statement: Freedom and/or Regulation-I"; Arthur J. Katz, "New Curriculum Policy Statement: Freedom and/or Regulation-II"; Willard C. Richan, "New Curriculum Policy Statement: The Problem of Professional Cohesion," Journal of Education for Social Work 7 (Spring, 1971), 41-60.

[14] For a discussion of educational responses to the issues raised in the 1960's, see, Neil Gilbert and Harry Specht, "The Incomplete Profession," Social Work 19 (November, 1974), 665-674.

[15] For example, see, Allen Pincus and Anne Minahan, "Toward a Model for Teaching a Basic First Year Course in Methods of Social Work Practice," Lillian Ripple, ed., Innovations in Teaching Social Work Practice (New York: C.S.W.E., 1970), 34-57.

[16] Daniel Thursz, "Professional Education for Expected Political Action by Social Workers," Journal of Education for Social Work (Fall, 1973), p. 93.

[17] Code of Ethics, N.A.S.W., adopted by the Delegate Assembly October 13, 1960, and amended April 11, 1967.

[18] Despite views, such as those of Thursz and Burns presented earlier, this assumption is implied or made explicit in almost every major presentation of social work practice function and purpose.

[19] This assumption is supported by the range of professional literature which deals with social change activities related to policy development and implementation, program design and administration, coordination, community development, etc.

[20] Harold Weissman, Overcoming Mismanagement in the Human Service Professions (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. viii.

[21] Rino Patti and Herman Resnick, "Changing the Agency from Within," Social Work 17 (July, 1972), 48-57. For additional views on direct service practice and organizational change, see, George Brager, "Institutional Change: Perimeters of the Possible," Social Work 12 (January, 1967), 59-69; Hyman Weiner, "Social Change and Social Group Work Practice," Social Work 9 (July, 1964), 106-112.

[22] Weissman, Overcoming Mismanagement in the Human Service Professions, p. viii.

[23] Patti and Resnick, "Changing the Agency From Within," p. 48.

[24] This assumption derives from the same sources as does the assumption that direct service practice carries a social change component within it.

[25] The design of programs for professional education are based on an assumption that principles of practice can be taught, and learned, and provide the basis for assuming that the principles of the particular component of practice dealt with here could be taught and learned.

CHAPTER II

OBTAINING INSTITUTIONAL SANCTION

In order to carry out the purposes of the study, a vehicle through which the project could be realized was identified and institutional sanction for implementing it obtained; a particular course, based on the conception described and suited to the requirements of the setting, was designed and conducted; and an evaluation of the course's outcomes was undertaken.

The graduate school of social work in which I was employed was identified as a vehicle through which the project could be realized, and a plan was developed for gaining approval to introduce the course.

The plan, which did not involve alterations in the policies of the school, was guided by consideration of issues affecting a redistribution of resources within an existing organization. Thus, while innovation was involved, it was a type of innovation (e.g. a new course) for which a structure was provided. Decisions about courses was the responsibility of the school's curriculum committee, subject to the administrative approval of the Dean. The Associate Dean, the chairpersons of the various committees responsible for units of the curriculum, and two at-large members of faculty comprised the committee. The curriculum units consisted of research, social welfare policy, foundations of behavior, first year generic practice, second year "micro-level" practice, second year "mezzo-level" practice, second year "macro-level" practice, and field instruction.[1] Proposals for new courses were brought to the curriculum committee on the recommendation of the faculty committee responsible for the unit of the curriculum to which the courses were related. The second year micro-level practice committee was the unit through which the course was proposed.[2]

Utilization of the existing structure required that attention be given to curriculum and administrative policies, and that efforts be directed towards gaining the acceptance of the persons with decision making power of the feasibility of offering the course. Acceptance of feasibility, it was assumed, would be affected by the influence on the decision makers of the formal and informal structures of the school; the school's outcome and system maintenance goals. Thus, the following factors were taken into account in the effort to secure approval.

From the perspective of formal curriculum and administrative considerations, the course could be seen as a reasonable and useful addition to the school program. The thrust and organization of the curriculum supported the development of specialized elective courses which built on and extended students' repertoire of interventive skills, particularly when directed towards systems other than the personality system.[3] The introduction of an administrative decision that each faculty member teach five, rather than four courses per year, from which I had been temporarily exempted, would allow for the new course to be offered without any financial cost, or at the expense of courses I normally taught. And students having demonstrated an interest in the content of the proposed course, having expressed a desire for greater elective course options, and having in the past sought out my classes, could be expected to respond to the offering.

At the same time these factors supportive of approval were identified, potential obstacles were also noted. Persons with decision making power who, from the point of view of their formal role responsibilities might be expected to have reservations, were the Dean, the Director of Field Instruction and the Chairperson of the mezzo-level practice sequence. The Dean and the

Director of Field Instruction were expected to be alert to any possible negative impact on school-agency relationships the proposed course might have. The dependence of the school on sound cooperative relations with agencies for the maintenance of its program, heightened by cutbacks in funds for school-sponsored student field training units, made this a particularly important factor to be dealt with in presenting the course for approval. The Chairperson of the mezzo-level practice sequence was expected to be concerned with the possibility of duplication of content or competition for students interested in organizational problems.

Formal efforts to deal with these potential obstacles to approval included anticipation of them in the presentation of the course proposal. For example, attention was drawn to the fact that the course would directly build on the conceptual base of the already accepted first year practice course, would emphasize conscious and purposeful use of self, and would articulate with other second year practice courses. The intent here was to capitalize on the course's relationship to courses and methods whose legitimacy had been established, in order to avert undue concern that the course would radically differ in impact on agency-school relations from other courses. In addition, by proposing the course as an elective in micro-level practice, the unique role, tasks and skills of the direct service practitioner were highlighted, and were expected to avert undue concern with duplication or competition.

Designing the proposal to minimize the potential sources of resistance did not, in this instance, require any modification of the purpose of the course as it was conceived. As with all practice courses, this one rested on the assumption that the intention to be helpful, to effect positive change, may be poorly realized or ineptly managed without principles to guide it. Since students seeking to right wrongs they observe in their field agencies can, without principles to guide them, perform ineptly and contribute to agency-school strains, and since the objective of the course was to help students pursue change through purposeful and professionally disciplined action, it was not intended that students be encouraged to foment or create havoc for themselves or others. The concern for providing students with experiences of mastery through success also was a factor weighing against the likelihood that students participating in the course would be more disruptive of agency-school relations than any other students.

(It should be noted here that it is to be expected that there are situations in which purposeful and professionally disciplined activities will expose or precipitate conflict, and that the risks to agency-school relations caused by such conflicts not only cannot be avoided, but may be necessary for dealing with a service delivery problem.[4] It should also be noted that with its curriculum changes, and the provision of students with a social change focus, conflicts between school and agencies over students' performance of their assignments had been confronted. As a result, in addition to the sensitivity to potential conflict problems, there was also some appreciation of the school's ability to deal with such conflicts.)

The issue of the relationship of the proposed course to the curriculum for majors in mezzo-level practice was similarly contained within the basic conception of the course. That is, the course was designed on the assumption that the tasks of the direct service practitioners in effecting organizational change derive from their role--their role vis-a-vis clients, and their role within the organizational structure. Hence, while the course would draw on some of the sources of orienting knowledge as courses in mezzo-level practice, the practice method itself would differ from the method taught for administration or supervision. (It was an artifact of the school's curriculum structure that in the second year, direct service practice was identified primarily with micro-level practice, while practice with communities, which was included in the first year as a component of direct service, was a specialization offered through mezzo-level practice.)

Considerations in planning were not, of course, limited to the formal aspects. Also taken into account were informal relationships which, in fact, at the time, were fraught with tensions. The not unfamiliar problems of academia--power, status and territorial prerogative--had reached sizeable proportions and had created new alignments and factions which roughly divided the faculty between "cosmopolitans" and "locals".[5] The conflicts within faculty were most vigorously played out in faculty votes on promotion and tenure. Since my own tenure at the school was to be decided upon during the year, it was expected that approval of the course proposal might be vulnerable to reactions and decisions not specifically related to the merits of the course. For example, if I were denied tenure, it might be argued that I ought not to be introducing a new course. As a result, plans included the use of the informal system to gather as much support as possible, for gaining formal approval and the use of alternatives to the formally structured means for getting approval. For instance, one alternative which was considered in the event the course failed to gain acceptance at any point in the official process, was to approach the Dean for approval to offer the course on an experimental basis. This was considered because the Dean had expressed and demonstrated his willingness to be supportive to me in my research efforts. (Other alternatives, including those for implementing the proposed project outside of the school, were also prepared). At all points, efforts were made to keep the planning flexible, and to prepare for the unanticipated.

Overall, the effort to secure sanction for offering the course clearly reflected the political complexities which affect planning and programming, as well as the place of rational planning processes and "muddling through."[6] Thus while it was possible to assess and act with regard to the forces crucial to implementation of the plan at a given moment in time, events altering the forces at play continually occured. Some could perhaps have been anticipated, but weren't. For instance, the Chairperson of the Organization and Administration sequence did not raise any questions about the course duplicating or competing with courses in his curriculum unit, and initially supported it. Subsequently, however, he maintained that the course would be useful to all students, and that because it dealt with organizations, it should be offered through his sequence. (The Chairperson of the Policy and Planning sequence proposed that because the course was concerned with social change, it be offered through his curriculum unit.) The territorial issue, then, had not been correctly anticipated, and did threaten approval of the course despite unanimity of agreement about its merits.

Other events could not have been anticipated. For instance, the Dean figured in my plans in a number of ways, including, as mentioned, as a resource for finding an alternative route to testing the proposal. I do not think I could have anticipated his leaving the school when he did, since it was predicated on factors even he could not have fully anticipated, such as who would win the election for mayor of the city. Nor could I have fully anticipated the effect his leaving would have on relations among faculty. In addition, and in my view, of no less importance, was that my reactions to the constantly changing interplay of forces, which clearly influenced my participation in the planning process, were as difficult to predict as the changes themselves.

In summary, then, the planning process was not neat and orderly, in the sense that there was a given plan, arrived at logically and rationally, and then implemented. Rather, the plan evolved out of the necessities and possibilities which were identified, as forces threatening to and supportive of the project revealed themselves over time.

NOTES

[1] The "micro-level" curriculum unit was responsible for the educational offerings in practice with individuals, families and small groups; "mezzo-level" for practice with communities and in supervision and administration; "macro-level" for practice in policy development and program planning.

[2] A copy of the proposal is in Appendix 1.

[3] The school, in its response to the issues of the 1960's described earlier, reformulated its mission to give priority to problems of racism, poverty and urban blight, and redesigned its curriculum to prepare students working at all levels of practice to deal with problematic conditions faced by the urban poor and minorities. One of the changes was a reconceptualization of the nature of service delivery practice. For a fuller discussion of practice model developed, see Chapter III, The Orientation to Practice, of this report. Another element of the redesign of the curriculum was the change and addition of course offerings facilitative of students' development of competencies in dealing with particular situational problems.

[4] For a discussion of the role of schools of social work dealing with field work agencies engaging in activities disadvantageous to clients, see, David Wineman and James Adrienne, "The Advocacy Challenge to Schools of Social Work," Social Work 14 (April, 1969), 23-32.

[5] For the construct on which this assessment was based, see Alvin Gouldner, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (December, 1957, March, 1958), 281-306, 444-480.

[6] The social work literature provides a number of models of rational planning. See, for example, Alfred J. Kahn, Theory and Practice of Social Planning (New York: Russell Sage, 1969); Robert Morris and Robert Binstock, Feasible Planning for Social Change (New York: Columbia University, 1966). For additional considerations of the planning process, see, Charles E. Lindblom, "The Science of 'Muddling Through'," Public Administration Review 19 (Spring, 1959), 79-88; Peter Marris and Martin Rein, Dilemmas of Social Reform (New York: Atherton, 1967).

CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE COURSE

As implied in the discussion of the efforts to obtain institutional sanction, the design of the course required articulation between the objectives of the program--to provide an operational guide to social change for direct service practitioners--and the objectives and organizational arrangements for meeting those objectives, of the institution under whose auspices it was to be offered. The elements of the course design, e.g. the structure, the target population, the system of accountability, the method of conduct and the content, were arrived at by this process of articulation.

Structure

To set the course in its structural context required coherence with the organization of the curriculum of the school in which it was given. The curriculum of this two-year graduate program provided for all students to take a first year generic practice sequence, and orienting courses in human behavior, social welfare policy, and research. There was also an effort to provide all students with a field placement providing for generic practice opportunities, although this objective had not yet been fully realized. The curriculum design then provided for students in the second year to specialize in one or more of six methods--practice with individuals and families, with groups, with communities, in administration and supervision, in planning, and in research--or, in a method and a field of service, e.g. practice with communities and mental health. Specialization was provided through required practice courses, such as Advanced Practice with Groups, etc., elective practice courses such as Crisis Intervention, Activity Group Practice, etc., which focused intensively on a component of practice, as well as a mix of required and elective orienting courses. In addition, field work was arranged to provide for specialization. The particular mix of courses taken by students to fulfill requirements for graduation was determined by the nature of the specialization. Administratively, as indicated earlier, all practice courses were designated as either "micro", "mezzo" or "macro" level practice.

Based on these considerations, then, the course was offered as a second year, micro-level practice elective.

Coherence with the organization of the curriculum also determined the technical arrangements of the course. That is, the course was designed to meet in a classroom, once a week, for a total of fifteen sessions of one hour and forty minutes each.

Target Population

As a second year elective course, enrollment was limited to matriculated second year graduate students, and open to such students on the basis of voluntary selection. The target population, then, was drawn from those students who had unfilled elective credits, who needed or wanted a micro-level practice course, and who, assuming the usual bases for course selection, chose to enroll for one or more of several possible reasons--convenience of the class meeting time, interest in the subject, choice of instructor, lack of availability of preferable courses, etc.

Organizational considerations also influenced the size of the target population. The educational preference for a class size of no more than fifteen was, for administrative reasons, not feasible, and twenty students enrolled in the course. All but one of the students carried practice with Individuals and Families as a method specialization. Some carried it alone, others in combination with other method specializations (See Table 1). The one student majoring in research did have direct service responsibilities in the field.

Table 1. Students' Method Specializations.

Method	Number
Individual and Family Practice/ Group Practice	11
Individual and Family Practice	5
Individual and Family Practice/ Community Organization Practice[a]	1
Community Organization Practice/ Individual and Family Practice[a]	1
Individual and Family Practice/ Administration	1
Research	1
TOTAL	20

[a] Difference reflects primary and secondary specialization related to course requirements and emphasis in field assignment.

The students' field placement experiences were in child welfare, community mental health, family services, schools, settlements, children's institutions, probation and parole, services to the aging and neighborhood councils. Five students had no pre-professional social work experience, and the others brought anywhere from one to eleven years of prior social service experiences with them. Two had considerable extra-professional organizational experiences--one with church and civic groups and the other with civil rights and local self-help groups.

There were sixteen women and four men in the class who ranged in age from twenty-three to fifty years. Nine were married, 10 single, and one divorced. Seven had children. There were four minority students--three Blacks and one Asian-American--and an approximately even distribution of Catholic, Jewish and Protestant students.

Thus, the members of the target population had in common a year and a half of professional education at a particular graduate school of social work, on the basis of which they could be expected to have shared a certain amount and kind of knowledge relevant to social work. They could also be expected to have shared certain attitudes, values and norms. For example, they could be expected to be motivated to obtain a graduate degree, to attend classes, although there were no attendance requirements, to indicate concern for the welfare of others, etc. Differences in knowledge, values, attitudes, etc., could also be expected on the basis of differences in educational programs, life experiences during and prior to graduate study, and personal characteristics.

System of Accountability

Setting the course in its institutional context required consideration of the prerogatives and obligations governing the relationships of students, instructor, school, university and profession.

In keeping with the school's responsibility to the university and the profession, participants in the course were expected to meet certain academic standards, and to perform certain activities for the purpose of demonstrating achievement. Thus students were given two assignments. One was to act upon some problem in service delivery within their field setting. The other was to maintain a log of their experience in this endeavor. The log was to include not only description, but analysis, reflections on the literature and uses made of ideas encountered through readings and class discussions.

The tradition of academic freedom provides for instructors to determine assignments and establish criteria of achievement, which are assumed to be made on the basis of considered professional judgment. The assignments chosen for this course reflected the concern that work produced by students be useful not only for providing the instructor with information on which to base an evaluation of the students' mastery of the course content, but also for aiding the students in their own learning. On the basis of prior experience teaching practice courses, assignments which called for students to study their own practice experiences and subject them to theoretical analysis were preferred. The assignment to act on a service need, and the log, as designed, were expected to serve this purpose. The log was also expected to provide data of potential use in the study of the course.

In making judgments about students' performance in relation to academic standards, consideration was given to the scope (breadth and/or depth) of students' inquiry into the literature, their critical examination of ideas, their reflections on their observations in the field and the relationship between the theoretical and the observed, their application of theoretical considerations to their practice, and their use of theoretical considerations in the evaluation of their practice activities.

In keeping with the responsibility to students, resources needed in pursuit of the objectives--course outlines, bibliographies, library and bookstore arrangements--were provided by the instructor. In addition, the course was designed to be accountable to students by providing for their ongoing review of it, for input into its actual realization, and participation in a final evaluation. Furthermore, upon successful completion of the course, students were to be granted appropriate course credit.

Method of Conduct

Contextual considerations which had bearing on the method for conducting the course included the educational value attached to concurrent class and field learning, and to the active engagement of students with course content. Also influential were the instructor's experience and method preferences.

The assumption that integration of theory and practice necessary for competent professional performance is advanced through simultaneously learning theory for and of doing, while doing, has been basic to the design of most graduate social work programs.[1] Curricula designs have reflected concern not only with concurrence of class and field work, but consonance with regard to content. To this end, field instructors have played a major role in structuring students' learning opportunities in the field and guiding them in task performance.[2]

In recent years, innovations in agency practices and graduate school curricula have made for some difficulty in achieving consonance in class and field learning. Thus, for example, many students at the school who were learning in classes about the purposes and means for providing group services had their field work in agencies which either offered them no opportunity for learning by doing social work with groups, or provided no field instruction vis-a-vis group practice tasks.

Because the direct service practitioner's responsibility for participation in organizational development was being newly considered, and because methodological guides to participation had only recently begun to be advanced through the professional literature, it could not be assumed that all of the field instructors would share the course's theoretical orientation, and be in a position to assume teaching responsibility in this area comparable to those traditionally carried for students' learning of practice skill. Although all field instructors could be expected to have developed a modus operandi for dealing with organizational problems, and to offer students guidance in the management of their interactions with other staff, their approaches might likely be more highly individualized and less consciously formulated than their approaches to, say, direct interventions with clients. As a result, the responsibility for identifying the relevant practice tasks and for locating the connections between theory and practice could be expected to fall more heavily on the students. To aid them in this, then, the course was conducted to promote students' consideration of their practice experiences in the classroom. It was designed for them to share the problems they had identified, and the efforts made to understand and deal with them. Case illustrations used in class discussions were to be selected from materials presented by students either verbally or through their logs.

The second consideration in conducting the course was the preference for the use of the discussion method. Social work educators have long been advocates of educational experiences which provide for students to be active participants in the learning process.[3] Social work also has drawn from and shared with educators, views about human experience which have promoted in both social work practice and social work education, concern for growth and learning through self-direction.[4] Recent developments in andragogy, which have been utilized especially in consideration of continuing education in social work, give further support to the value of educational experiences which allow for adults to give direction to their own learning.[5] The discussion method was chosen because it allows for students to influence the realization of the course offering, and to fashion the course's general objectives to their own sense of need for mastery and problem solving. It also allows for the use of the full range of resources available to students in their pursuit of mastery. That is, they can draw not only on the instructor's knowledge of the subject and the professional literature, but on their own and each other's knowledge, experience and insights.

Content

The content of the course was shaped by value and theoretical considerations, by a social work practice orientation, and by the educational experiences and needs of the target population.

Any effort to explain human affairs and advocate for a particular kind of behavior, as a practice course does, necessarily reflects biases. The social sciences offer many and conflicting explanations of reality. Knowledge influences values and values influence the choices made among competing theories.

The content of the course was informed by many sources. The purpose here is not to identify them all, but rather to describe the biases and preferences out of which the course was conceived.

The Value Orientation

While operating within the general framework of Social Work values, the course was especially concerned with certain values, and with their affirmation in practice.

Social Work has always affirmed the value attached in American society to the individual and to the pursuit of individual achievement, independence, and self-realization through its commitment to respect the dignity and worth of each individual, and to promote the enhancement of each individual's potential. This value is clearly reflected in the Working Definition of Social Work, which also affirms the value that "there is interdependence between individuals in this society."[6]

Gordon's critique of the Working Definition calls attention to the fact that "some of the propositions stated under 'value' . . . are not values at all, but rather generalizations, and . . . properly belong under 'knowledge.'"[7] The statement on interdependence is such a proposition. Nevertheless, the statement's appearance in the presentation of the value orientation, speaks to the fact that social work practice has sought to affirm individual worth in the context of social good, and in the affirmation of the principles of democracy.

Social Casework, long the predominant activity of the profession, most fully and clearly gave expression to the profession's commitment to the individual, and specific measures for implementing the value stance guided its practitioners. Demonstration of acceptance and a non-judgmental attitude, holding clients' communications in confidence, involving clients in decision making in their own behalf, are among the specific practice measures designed to communicate respect for difference, appreciation of the uniqueness of each individual, and of the right of each individual to self-determination.

Furthermore, the helping process, as articulated by case work theorists, was based on the value of individualization. Thus the individualization process, the core and strength of the case work method, guided practitioners in the tasks of collecting and analyzing data, and of selecting interventive measures.[8]

Casework practice theory offered less in the way of guides to behavior which would specifically affirm the value attached to the social good. The implication appears to have been that contributing to individual well being contributes to social well being. This has not proved altogether to be the case. Rather, contributing to individual well being would appear to be a necessary but not sufficient measure for affecting social well being.

Social group work, which had its origins in the settlement movement, did carry specific value commitments for contributing to the social good which went beyond consideration of individual well being. Key to these was the promotion of the value of democratic participation.[9] However, social group work theory was slower to develop than was social case work theory, and guides to the implementation of the value commitment were not well explicated.[10] Major advances which were made in group work practice-theory occurred during the period just prior to the mid 1960's and reflected a move towards greater congruence with the emphasis of social case work on individual well being.[11]

Placing the profession's responsibility for dealing directly with issues of social well being with a particular segment of the profession, e.g. social planning, community organization, etc., has proved problematic. And, of course, the dichotomization of this responsibility is specifically rejected in the basic premise on which the course dealt with here rests. Therefore, the course was concerned with a practice whose guidelines are capable of affirming values pertaining to the social good.

There are, within our societal framework, many and even conflicting views of the social good and how to achieve it. However, the issues which stimulated the profession's reappraisal of the 1960's and the concomitant changes in practice and education, were the issues of the systemic, institutionalized disadvantage and disenfranchisement of whole segments of our populace. Professional response to these issues would require then, active pursuit of the values of distributive justice and equity as essential to social well being.[12]

Direct service practice seeking to affirm the values of individual and social well-being would require responsibility, then, not only for individualization, but for generalization. Data collection, assessment and interventions would have to take into consideration not only the uniqueness of the individual, but also the commonalities which contribute to the individual's and others' unmet needs and/or disadvantaging circumstances.

It would require that practitioners demonstrate, in addition to respect for the dignity and worth of each individual, respect for the right of each individual to make a just claim on the resources of society. This, in turn, requires consideration not only of those who avail themselves of services, but with availability and accessibility of services to assure that those with just claims are provided resources. It would also require that practitioners assure that services are provided as entitlements, and that potential and actual users of services have full knowledge of the services, and the conditions that attend them.

It would further require that practitioners seek to equalize advantage, and to assure that conditions attached to the provision of service are not disadvantaging. Finally, a practice seeking to affirm values pertinent to the social good require the promotion not only of self-determination, but of empowerment of the disadvantaged in relationships of unequal power.

Orienting Knowledge

Because, as noted earlier, there are in the social sciences incomplete and even conflicting explanations of reality, the focus of discussion here is on the key preferences which were expressed in the selection and use made of data drawn from the social sciences.

Since the course was concerned with effecting organizational change, and organizational change in the final analysis comes down to changes in the behavior of participants in an organization, major sources of orienting knowledge were taken from explanations of behavior in organizations and influences on behavior in organizations.

The preferences reflected in the explanations centered on the proposition that organizations exert a major influence on the behavior their members (personnel, clientele, boards, etc.), exhibit within the organization and that understanding the dynamics of organizations is essential to the understanding of the behavior of their members, and the means for influencing them.[13] In their particulars, the explanations utilized represent a departure from those theoretical views which looked primarily to individual and small group dynamics as the basis not only for explaining, but also for influencing the behavior of individuals (viz. the Human Relations School of Management and the use of t-Groups).[14]

Among the particulars pertinent to the central proposition orienting the course are the following:

a. That change and conflict are natural conditions of organizational life arising out of the need of organizations to pursue both outcome and system maintenance goals. That conflict management, rather than its elimination and ongoing change rather than the attainment of an ideal homeostatic norm, is required in the pursuit of organizational objectives.

b. That the structures of organizations are the means by which organizational goals are pursued. Organizational structures include arrangements for decision making, the distribution of power, the exercise of authority and compliance, communications, and rewards and sanctions. These arrangements are to be found in both formal and informal systems.

c. That all structures, however "dysfunctional" from the point of view of outcome goals, serve some function, and any effort to deal with an organizational problem must take into account the benefits derived from existing structural arrangements. For example, flawed communications are commonly identified as problems in organizations with negative consequences for client service. Yet in their effects, the flaws themselves may serve such purposes as providing workers with a measure of autonomy, with a means of exercising power, etc. Disruption of these functions through an effort to alter the communication system for the benefit of clients is thus likely to evoke resistance to the change.

d. That the structures influence the behavior of the participants in organizations, and that it is through an individual's role in an organization that their effects on behavior are most directly expressed. Individual personality, knowledge, skill and values are secondary to organizational structures in determining role performance, although individuals may be sought for certain roles because of certain characteristics, and individuals may be attracted to and supportive of certain role requirements.

These particulars are drawn primarily from sociology, and from what has been called the "natural system" perspective on organizations.[15] Just as this perspective differs from the normative, prescriptive stance of, say, the Human Relations' approach, so too does it depart from the normative, prescriptive orientation of psychoanalytic psychology with which the Human Relation approach articulates.[16] Thus, key orienting assumptions drawn from psychology with which this perspective articulates, include the following:

a. That the "purposefulness" of behavior is interactive, and hence behavior is informed by the context in which it occurs.

b. That all behavior is communication, that communications not only impart information, but impose relationships, and that relationships qualify information exchanged.

c. That to understand behavior, the "what for?" meaning of the question "why?" provides a more useful focus than the "from whence?" meaning. The question "what for?"

focuses attention on the here and now context of behavior, on intent and effect and the congruence or lack of congruence between them.[17]

The Orientation to Social Work Practice

The final two influences on the content of the course were the overall orientation to service delivery practice, and the educational needs of the students. The overall orientation contributed to the conception of the role of the practitioner in organizational change, of the tasks to be performed, and of the competencies called for. The educational needs contributed to the organization and presentation of the content to provide for building on, reinforcing and extending the base of students' knowledge for and of direct service practice.

It was possible to join the two issues with relative ease because the generic first year practice courses which provided the base for students were courses I had taught and played an active role in designing, and because in its essentials, the courses' orientation was my own. Of course, there were necessarily differences in how the different instructors explicated the principles of direct service practice. Therefore, the presentation of the orientation to practice which follows represents my particular understanding, emphases, and priorities.

The practice orientation derives, first of all, from the premise that it is the function of Social Work to promote individual and social well being through mediation of the processes by which the resources of individuals and society are developed, distributed, and utilized to meet the needs of both for mutual benefit. It assumes that the needs to be met for such mutual benefit arise out of universal needs, e.g. health, protection, shelter, generativity, not deficits in persons, and that consideration of need is not limited to lack, but includes want, hope and aspiration.

This consideration of universal need supports and is reinforced by a developmental view of human behavior--a view which holds that throughout the life cycle, changing biological and social conditions require the management of different tasks, and that the behaviors exhibited in the effort to manage life tasks are a function not only of the capacities and motivations of individuals, but of the opportunities available to them for management. A social welfare system reflective of this view of behavior therefore emphasizes provision, and the maintenance of social structures supportive of competent, self, and other-enhancing behavior.[18]

This approach to practice is also informed by the view that the complexity and heterogeneity of our society, which makes necessary institutional mechanisms for overseeing the matching of needs and resources, has also made it possible for special interest groups to gain power over others in the determination of need and allocation of resources. Hence, the necessity for a practice giving priority to the task of promoting a just and equitable distribution of resources.

The role of the direct service practitioner in fulfilling the function of the profession, then, is to aid in the provision and utilization of resources to meet needs arising out of the interaction of individuals with their social environment. As presented in the first year practice course, the organizing scheme for developing this construct, was open systems theory.[19] Open systems theory was used as a model for the study of the person(s)-situation configuration, and as a model for the study of the helping process.[20]

One of the key features of the systems orientation is its focus on interactive processes. An important implication of this feature is that it directs data collection, analysis, and planning to the person-in-situation, and to the structures which inform the nature of the person-situation configuration. This represents a shift from orienting schemes which provide for consideration of the person and the situation, and allow for the collection of situational data to be used primarily as a means of understanding the "person" and aiding the individualizing process. Schemes providing for such use of situational data make it possible, then, for actions to be directed primarily, or even exclusively, at effecting changes in the person.

The importance for the organizational change course of this feature of the systems orientation is that by focusing on the structures which characterize the person(s)-in-situation, it provides a basis for acting on the requirement to generalize as well as individualize. It also clarifies the nature of the service delivery tasks which lead to consideration of agency-client relationships as targets for change.

Another key feature of the practice model that bears on the organizational change course, is its process orientation. In its departure from notions of linear causality, the systems orientation carries particular implications for the role of a worker in a change effort. That is, change is viewed as arising out of the interactions of the participants in a change effort in a particular environment. Thus, the expertise of a worker rests in the ability to assess need and participate in interactions with others--that is--to help design, create and maintain action systems with the potential for effecting change in the problem situation. The tasks of the worker follow from consideration of the problem (needs/ resource imbalance). The worker's participation in the helping process, then, does not require expertise in solutions per se but rather in the performance of problem-solving tasks. This is not to say that the performance of the tasks does not require knowledge of possible alternatives and their implications, since the selection of action systems, etc. must be purposeful. It is to suggest though, that the mobilization for a pre-determined, specific outcome is neither necessary, nor, because it can foreclose on other possibilities, or neglect the participation of others, desirable. (This view of the helping process in which the worker's actions are considered only a part of the input which effects outcomes, in no way shares the view of endeavors in which goals are unspecified because the worker's goals are different from the goals of the client, and therefore constitute a hidden agenda, or where goals are unspecified because the process is valued for its own sake.[21] The view here assumes the need addressed is the need identified by and with the client, and that both the purpose of the service effort and the division of labor in the effort are understood and agreed to by worker and client).

This process orientation is also of major importance to the course because it provides for the performance of tasks pertinent to the organizational role occupied by the direct service practitioner. That is, the direct service practitioner generally occupies a position which affords neither the full range of information nor the power needed to select and effect specific outcomes for particular organizational problems. The position does, however, afford direct encounter with the problem situation. The worker's unique vantage point for determining that change in the service delivery system is indicated, combined with limited knowledge and power over outcomes give further support to the view that change efforts can proceed from identified need and not from predetermined specified outcomes.

This view of the helping process and the worker's role in it, relates to another major feature of the practice orientation. It is that the tasks of direct service practice require both intellectual and interpersonal skills, and that basic to the exercise of these skills is the capacity for empathy.[22] "Feeling into" the situation of the members of a family, say, is as essential a guide to the collection of data for the purpose of assessing the situation as it is a guide to the development of a working relationship with the family members.

Although empathy has generally been associated with worker/client relationships, e.g. with the assumption of a non-judgmental attitude, with responsiveness to the client's perception of need, with the formation of a "therapeutic alliance", its importance is not limited to direct work with clients. Workers engaged in organizational change efforts are required to assess the situations of, and interact with others who, while not the designated beneficiaries of an action, are essential to its accomplishment. Given the assumptions about the function of behavior in organizations described earlier, "feeling into" the situation of others becomes a necessary condition for understanding and attempting to influence them, even if the strategy required for change is not a collaborative one.

In addition to selecting content for inclusion in the course to articulate with the conceptual base of the first year practice course, the organizing scheme for presenting content was also used. That is, the first year course was organized to acquaint students with generic aspects of the helping process, i.e. engagement, identification of the unit of attention, assessment (data collection and analysis), planning (target and action system selection), intervention (role enactment) and termination, as well as some of its specific applications. The course drew on this scheme to highlight the generic aspects of the helping process and their specific application to organizational change practice.

Course Content Summary

The major general considerations presented in the previous section, as well as some specific constructs used in the selection and organization of the course content, are summarized in the following:[23]

The direct service practitioner is responsible not only for individualizing, but for generalizing, and for taking action to improve social conditions--in this instance, the particular social conditions reflected in social agencies' service delivery system--affecting a class or category of potential or actual consumers of service. Actions to improve social conditions include actions to promote the dignity, worth and self-fulfillment of individuals, coupled with actions to promote the equalization of advantage and the empowerment of the disadvantaged and disenfranchised, as entitlements of a just society.

The helping process which guides practitioners in their direct activities with clients also guides their activities to effect organizational change. That is, their tasks begin with the identification of need, and proceed through collection of data about the problem situation, e.g. the scope, the contributing factors, the perceptions of others; assessment of resources for and resistances to change, e.g. the function served by the problem situation, the beneficiaries of the status quo and the potential benefits and beneficiaries of change; selection of target systems, e.g. the structural arrangements contributing to the problem; selection of action systems, e.g. others with a stake in dealing with the problem,with influence over others needed for the change effort and others with a role in the change; strategy selection, e.g. the sources of influence needed and available; and implementation, e.g. generating support, building coalitions, using existing channels of communication and creating new channels to provide information and support to others.

This use of the helping process allows for the practitioner engaging in organizational change to proceed from identified need, and not from specific, predetermined solutions which may require knowledge and power not available within the practice role. In their collection of data, workers seek evidence that the identified situational need is generalizable. They also seek to determine if the problem situation is generalizable to other problem situations. For example, a worker who finds that a learning difficulty experienced by an Hispanic child is shared by other Hispanic children in a school, would also seek to determine if the organizational contributor to that problem e.g. the lack of Spanish speaking personnel, is part of a more general problem in providing for the educational needs of Hispanic children.

In their analysis of organizational service problems, practitioners draw on knowledge that social agencies are open and changing systems. Like all organizations, they serve latent and manifest social functions. Problems which bear on service delivery, then, arise out of the need of organizations to pursue outcome goals, to interact with their environment, to differentiate and integrate their component parts, and to maintain the participation of their members. Such problems include goal displacement, as occurs, for example, when tasks related to obtaining funds divert from or conflict with tasks related to the attainment of outcome objectives; goal succession as occurs when service needs change, but not the established division of labor for providing service; goal conflict, as occurs when the goals of sub-units, such as departments or professional disciplines do not articulate with each other. An additional problem in organizations which employ professionals is the conflict between the organizational need for accountability and the need of professionals for autonomy in their practice.

Identification of the source, in terms of organizational tasks, of the service problem provides a guide to planning. For example, a worker may find the required use of an agency intake form an impediment to the engagement of clients and to the speedy provision of needed services. If the form is imposed by a state funding body, then the problem rests in the agency's relationship with its environment. Efforts at change from within, which would be suitable if the intake requirement resulted from professional influences in the agency on problem definition and methodology, would then be misplaced.

In their assessments, practitioners draw on knowledge of the effects of organizational structures on the behavior of members in the organization. They look to both formal and informal relationships to identify the structures for communication, for the exercise of power, for decision making, for the exercise of and compliance with authority, for the distribution of rewards and sanctions, and they look to the roles played by individuals in the organization to determine the effects of the structures on the participants. They bring to bear on their assessment an understanding of the need of participants in organizations to derive benefit from their participation, and an appreciation of the needs served in the maintenance of the status quo. That is, they recognize that there is a function served by the problemmatic situation, and that the beneficiaries of the status quo are likely sources of resistance. For example, the failure of workers to refer clients to suitable groups within the agency may serve to protect the workers' autonomy in their dealings with the clients.

In recognition of the influence of structures on behavior, and in the interest in promoting the institutionalization of the needed change, practitioners select organizational structures as targets of change. The targets include arrangements of policy, i.e. formal guides to task management; procedure, i.e. rules, regulations and norms which guide task management; practice, i.e. professional guides to task management; and program i.e. a combination of two or more of the preceeding. For example, a worker seeking a change to assure that patients have suitable after-care arrangements before being discharged from a hospital, would seek to affect the policy or procedural guides to discharge planning, rather than, say, the attitudes of individual doctors or nurses which would make the change vulnerable to staff turnover, individual differences among staff, the worker's leaving, etc.

In their selection of action systems practitioners recognize that their organization roles, which afford them a unique vantage point from which to view the effects of the service delivery system on its intended beneficiaries, can limit their direct knowledge of all of the organizational variables, and their power to effect specific outcomes. They therefore seek to involve others who collectively can have an impact. Peers, therefore are a primary resource, and their participation in an action system can be effected by the worker joining with those who share the view of the need, and with leaders within the peer group who can influence others. Recognizing that participation in decision making increases commitment to a decision, they also seek the participation of those who will be affected by the change. For example, a worker identifying the fragmentation of services to clients arising out of faulty interdepartmental communications might seek the participation of peers to influence the director that the problem warrants attention, and also seek the participation of those who would be called upon to implement a new communication system.

The strategies the practitioners use in selecting and mobilizing action systems follow from understanding that individuals derive benefit from their participation in an organization, and draw on knowledge that change proceeds from exchange-that is-from an improved balance between costs and rewards. They also draw on knowledge that the sources of power over inducements to change include coercive, utilitarian and normative influence. The major source of influence available to practitioners, and pertinent to horizontal relationships, is normative. That is, they can draw on liking, acceptance, shared professional and personal values to influence others. They can also use normative influence in vertical relationships by appealing to norms which inhere in specific roles. For example, they can involve supervisors in a change effort by appealing to the expectation that, in their role, supervisors assist workers in the performance of their tasks. The importance of normative influence highlights the need of practitioners to demonstrate their competence as practitioners--that is--their understanding of clients' needs and of the professional measures for responding to those needs, in order to be able to appeal to professional norms.

Practitioners can also draw on utilitarian influence. They may, for example, through extra-organizational activities such as publicity, threaten or enhance the organization's source of financial support. They can also provide or withhold information needed by others, and perform tasks which reduce or facilitate the performance of tasks by others. They can draw on these sources of influence in horizontal relationships, as well as in vertical ones, and especially in "host" or other multidiscipline settings where shared professional norms may be limited, but where it is possible to provide or withhold needed social work services.

The use of influence on vertical relationships is also of particular importance when a change effort requires the use of utilitarian influence unavailable to the practitioner e.g. influence over work assignment, working conditions, promotions.

Workers generally have less, or are less likely to use, coercive influence. They can, though, strike, sit-in, physically restrain, threaten, or even harm others.

In the overall enactment of their organizational change role, practitioners make conscious use of themselves, and differentiate for themselves and others responsibility to bear witness to problems, to raise consciousness, to garner and give support, to manage instrumental tasks and relationship tasks, to use existing mechanisms for change, and to create new ones.

NOTES

[1] Consistent with a more general trend towards diversity in graduate social work programs, there has been a growing trend towards the use of alternatives to the model of concurrent class and field instruction. See, Kurt Reichert, "Current Developments and Trends in Social Work Education in the U.S.," Journal of Education for Social Work 6 (Fall, 1970) 39-50.

[2] For consideration of the field component of the curriculum, see, Bernice Simon, "Design of Learning Experiences in Field Instruction," Social Service Review 40 (December, 1966), 397-409; Frances Dover, Field Instruction In Casework (New York: The Jewish Guild for the Blind, 1962).

[3] See, for example, Bertha C. Reynolds, Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work (New York: Rinehart, 1942); Charlotte Towle, The Learner in Education for the Professions (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1954).

[4] The work of John Dewey is of particular note here, both for its influence on education and on the development of social group work practice. See, John Dewey, Democracy and Education (New York: MacMillan, 1916; Dewey, Experience and Education (London: Collier-Mac Millan, 1938); Grace Coyle, Group Experience and Democratic Values (New York: Woman's Press, 1947). For more recent developments in education theory which provide for similar articulation of education and social work aims and methods, see, Jerome Bruner, On Knowing (New York: Atheneum, 1968); Bruner, Toward A Theory of Instruction (New York: W. W. Norton, 1968).

[5] See, for example, Malcolm Knowles, "Innovations in Teaching Styles and Approaches Based Upon Adult Learning," Journal of Education in Social Work 8 (Spring, 1972) 32-39; Louise Frey, Eunice Shatz and Edna-Ann Katz, "Continuing Education--Teaching Staff to Teach," Social Case-

work 55 (June, 1974) 360-368; Beulah Rothman, "Perspectives on Learning and Teaching in Continuing Education," Journal of Education for Social Work 9 (Spring, 1973) 39-52.

[6] "The Working Definition of Social Work Practice," is included in Harriett M. Bartlett, "Toward Clarification and Improvement of Social Work Practice," Social Work 3 (April, 1958) p. 6.

[7] William E. Gordon, "A Critique of the Working Definition," Social Work 7 (October, 1962) 8.

[8] For representatives of the predominant schools of case work thought, see, Ruth Smalley, "Social Casework: The Functional Approach," Helen Harris Perlman, "Social Casework: The Problem Solving Approach," Florence Hollis, "Social Casework: The Psychosocial Approach," The Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: N.A.S.W., 1971) V. 2, 1195-1225.

[9] Coyle, Group Experience and Democratic Values.

[10] For a discussion of group work values and limitations of theory guiding their implementation, see, William Schwartz, "Group Work and the Social Scene," Alfred J. Kahn, ed., Issues in American Social Work (New York: Columbia University, 1959) 110-137.

[11] For representatives of the predominant schools of group work thought, see, Emanuel Tropp, "Social Group Work: The Developmental Approach," William Schwartz, "Social Group Work: The Interactionist Approach," Charles Garvin and Paul Glasser, "Social Group Work: The Preventative and Rehabilitative Approach," The Encyclopedia of Social Work (New York: N.A.S.W., 1971) V. 2, 1246-1272. For a discussion of the implications of the diverse theoretical developments in group work, see, Catherine P. Pappell and Beulah Rothman, "Social Group Work: Possession and Heritage," Journal of Education for Social Work 2, (Fall, 1966) 66-77.

[12] See, for example, John Rawls, A Theory of Justice (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1972). For discussion of the implications of Rawls' theory for social work, see, Harold Lewis, "Morality and the Politics of Practice," Social Casework 53 (July, 1972) 404-417.

[13] Many sources were utilized in consideration of behavior in organizations. Among those of major importance are, Peter M. Blau and Richard W. Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach (San Francisco: Chandler, 1962); Amitai Etzioni, A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations (New York: Free Press, 1961); Amitai Etzioni, Modern Organizations (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967); Erving Goffman, Asylums (Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1961); Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure (New York: Free Press, 1968); Talcott Parsons, The Social System (New York: Free Press, 1951), Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies (New York: Free Press, 1960).

[14] For a review of differences in approaches to understanding and influencing behaviors of individuals in organizations, see Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn, "Organizational Change," The Social Psychology of Organizations (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966) Chapter 13, 390-451. For a representative view of the preferences reflected in the uses made of orienting knowledge, see, Ralf Dahrendorf, "Toward a Theory of Social Conflict," Amitai and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change (New York: Basic Books, 1964) 98-111.

[15] Alvin Gouldner, "Organizational Analysis," Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., eds., Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects (New York: Basic Books, 1959) 405-406.

[16] For a critique of the uses of normative-prescriptive psychoanalytic theory by specialists in the field of psychology, rather than sociology, see, Thomas Szasz, The Myth of Mental Illness (New York: Harper and Row, 1961); R. D. Laing and Aaron Esterson, Sanity, Madness and the Family (New York: Basic Books, 1960).

[17] The orientation here derives from an open-system perspective on individual behavior. See, for example. Paul Watzlawick, Janet Beavin Helmick and Don Jackson, Pragmatics of Human Communication (New York: W. W. Norton, 1967); Jurgen Reuch, "Social Process," Archives of General Psychiatry 15 (December, 1966) .

[18] This view of the function of social work has been characterized as an institutional, as opposed to a residual function. See, Harold L. Wilensky and Charles N. Lebeaux, Industrial Society and Social Welfare (New York: Russell Sage, 1965).

[19] See, for example, Ludwig von Bertalanff, General System Theory (Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1968). For discussion of the use of open system theory, in social work, see, William Gordon, "Basic Constructs for an Integrative and Generative Conception of Social Work," Gordon Hearn, ed., The General Systems Approach: Contributions Toward an Holistic Conception of Social Work (New York: C.S.W.E., 1969) 5-11; Sister Mary Paul Janchill, R.G.S., "Systems Concepts in Casework Theory and Practice," Social Casework 50 (February, 1969) 74-82; Carel B. Germain, "Social Study: Past and Future," Social Casework 49 (July, 1968) 403-409.

[20] Allen Pincus and Anne Minahan, "Toward a Model for Teaching a Basic First Year Course in Methods of Social Work Practice," Lillian Ripple, ed., Innovations in Teaching Social Work Practice (New York: C.S.W.E., 1970) 34-57,

[21] For a study of similarities and differences between clients' goals and caseworkers' goals, and their implications for the helping process, see, Julianna T. Schmidt, "The Use of Purpose in Casework Practice," Social Work 14 (January, 1969) 77-84.

[22] For a discussion of the uses of empathy in social work practice, see, Pauline Lide, "Dynamic Mental Representation: An Analysis of the Empathic Process," Social Casework 47 (March, 1966), 146-151.

[23] In addition to the sources identified earlier for their contribution to the development of the content of the course, the following were also used: J. Kenneth Benson,"The Analysis of Bureaucratic-Professional Conflict: Functional Versus Dialectical Approaches," *The Sociological Quarterly* 14 (Summer, 1973) 376-394; Peter M. Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York: John Wiley, 1964); George Brager, "Institutional Change: Perimeters of the Possible," *Social Work* 12 (January, 1967) 59-69; Brager , "Advocacy and Political Behavior," *Social Work* 13 (April, 1968) 5-15; Lewis Coser, *The Functions of Social Conflicts* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1956); Amitai Etzioni, "A Basis for Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations," Amitai Etzioni, ed., *A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961) 59-76; Etzioni , "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique and a Suggestion," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 5, (September, 1960) 257-278; Eliot Freidson, "Dominant Professions, Bureaucracy, and Client Services," William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton, Eds., *Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service* (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970) 71-92; Alvin Gouldner, "The Secrets of Organizations," *The Social Welfare Forum 1963* (New York: Columbia University, 1963) 161-177; George Homans, "Social Behavior as Exchange," *American Journal of Sociology* (May, 1958) 597-606; Homans , *The Human Group* (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1950); Irving Louis Horowitz, "Consensus, Conflict and Cooperation: A Sociological Inventory," *Social Forces*, 41 (December, 1962) 177-188; Ralph Kramer, "Ideology, Status and Power in Board-Executive Relationships," *Social Work* 10 (October, 1965) 107-114; Ronald Lippett, Jeanne Watson, Bruce Westley, *The Dynamics of Planned Change* (New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1958); Eugene Litwak, "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict," *American Journal of Sociology* 67 (September, 1961) 177-184; Robert Morris and Alfred Binstock, *Feasible Planning for Social Change* (New York: Columbia University, 1967); Joseph Olmstead, "Organizational Factors in the Performance

of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers," *Working Papers No. 1: National Study of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers, Work and Organizational Contexts* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, 1971); Talcott Parsons, "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1, (1956) 63-86; Rino Patti and Herman Resnick, "Changing the Agency from Within," *Social Work* 17, (July, 1972) 48-57; David Sills, "The Succession of Goals," Amitai Etzioni, Ed., *A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961), 175-187; Herbert Simon, "On the Concept of Organizational Goals," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 9, (June, 1964) 1-22; Keith Warner and Eugene Havens, "Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational Goals," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 13 (March, 1968) 539-555; Harry Wasserman, "The Professional Social Worker in a Bureaucracy," *Social Work* 16 (January, 1971) 89-95; Goodwin Watson, "Resistance to Change," *American Behavioral Scientist* 14 (May-June, 1971) 745-766; John Wax, "Power Theory and Institutional Change," *Social Service Review* 15 (September, 1971) 274-288; Hyman Weiner, "Social Change and Social Group Work Practice," *Social Work* 9 (July, 1964) 106-112; Weiner , "The Hospital, The Ward and The Patients as Clients: The Use of the Group Method," *Social Work* 4 (October, 1959) 57-64; Harold H. Weissman, *Community*

Councils and Community Control (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1970); Weissman, Overcoming Mismanagement in the Human Service Professions (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973).

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CONDUCT OF THE COURSE

The course, as planned, was conducted during the Spring semester of the 1974-75 academic year. Of the fifteen class sessions scheduled, one was cancelled because of a snow storm, one was used for the administration of the Vignettes Test, and one was used for the evaluation of the course. Student attendance at classes was 90%.

The twelve actual class sessions were conducted, according to design, by proceeding through content areas as presented in the course outline,[1] with emphases and time given to consideration of particular areas influenced by student needs and interests.

During the first of the twelve class sessions an overview of the course was presented and students were asked to share information about their field experience and observations they had made of problems in the organization of service delivery. Two major themes emerged from the students' presentations which had bearing on the subsequent conduct of the course. The first was that the majority of students found serious fault with circumstances they encountered in their field work agencies, had very strong feelings about them, and appeared to have a real need to share their observations and feelings. The impact was such that at a later class a student referred to the experiences that were related as "the war stories"--an appellation that was quickly adopted by the others and used for the rest of the semester. (It should be noted that there were students, and they made their position clear, who felt their agencies were providing services well and/or working actively on the problems).

The second issue which emerged was that students tended to identify problems such as racism, and staff attitude demeaning to clients, in global terms, to feel overwhelmed by the problems, and to express feelings of hopelessness about change.

One result of the perceptions the students brought with them was that most of two class periods, as well as parts of others, were given to the principle guiding the identification of the unit of attention, with consideration given not only to generalizing from the particular, but to partializing generalities.

Contrary to the expectation that the value orientation would be identified in an early class session and then explicated through examination of specific case material throughout the semester, a full class session was spent on it, at the request of students. Stimulus for the more concentrated examination of the issues came from interest in and difficulty with Lewis' article, "Morality and the Politics of Practice."[2]

Another issue which emerged through class discussions had to do with the unevenness of familiarity amongst students with orienting knowledge about organizations, and the general tendency to look to individual personality for explanations of problems. Combined, these factors made it necessary to give a considerable amount of time to examination of organizational goals, functions and structures, and to assisting in the application of organizational theory to case-situation analysis by focusing particular attention on role determinants of individual behavior.

A total of six specific case presentations were used for illustrative purposes during the semester. Most of the requests for students to present were made in response to information shared in class, and the interest different students showed in involving the class in examination of the problem situations they were dealing with. The logs were an additional source of information on which selection was based. One presentation was used to demonstrate the process of partializing a global problem. One highlighted the problems inherent in a student's beginning efforts to produce a specific outcome, and was used to examine the implications of the process orientation which informed the course. Two student presentations were used for analyzing organizational contributors to service problems through examination of specific role influences on the behavior of the key actors in the situation including the student. One other situation illustrated compliance and reward system concepts, and the final one provided for examination of student-field instructor communication under circumstances where the field instructor was viewed as an obstacle to a change effort. In discussion of the case situations, students shared similar situations also contributed illustrative material.

The basic outline of class sessions was:

Session One--An overview of the course was presented, and students shared their observations of service delivery problems encountered in the field.

Session Two--Additional student observations were shared, and the relationship between the courses' objectives and the principle guiding the identification of the unit of attention was examined. Content on organizational goals was identified.

Session Three--The value issues presented in the Lewis article, and their relationship to the course orientation were examined.

Session Four--A student presentation was used to examine the process of partializing to identify the unit of attention, and the use of the specific case situation as a point of entry for the change effort was examined. Content on organizational functions was examined.

Session Five--A student presentation was used to examine the implications of a process which proceeded from a specific outcome objective, and the principle of proceeding from need was examined. Content on organizational structure was examined.

Session Six--Organizational goals, functions, structures and concomitant problems were reviewed, and implications for target selection examined.

Session Seven--A student presentation was used to examine the application of organizational considerations to problem analysis and identification of participants' roles.

Session Eight--Another student presentation was used for continued examination of the application of knowledge of the dynamics of organizations for assessment and planning purposes.

Session Nine--A student presentation was used to examine communication in the context of student-field instructor relationships and worker use of self.

Session Ten--Content on behavioral exchange and influence and the implications for strategy selection were examined.

Session Eleven--A presentation was used to examine the application of knowledge of exchange and influence.

Session Twelve--Differences in student and worker roles, and implications for the use of influence were examined.

Overall, more class time was given to examination of issues related to data collection and analysis than to planning and implementation of plans. In addition, in all areas, less attention was given to consideration of differentials than was anticipated. Thus, while the basic guides to organizational analysis were examined, and factors relevant to particular organizations such as medical institutions, were identified, specific implications of differentials operating in "host", interdisciplinary and social work-staffed organizations were not fully explored. Similarly, phases of organizational change were studied, but not the specific implications for worker task performance at different stages.

In addition to the content needs and interests of students which affected the conduct of the course, the high level of emotional involvement in the problems in service delivery they identified also played a significant role.

As noted in the discussion of the students' presentation of "war stories", many expressed deep distress over conditions they observed in their field placements. Some were further distressed over the reactions they had encountered when they tried to get involved with the problem early in the year. Throughout the discussions, students revealed role strains which they experienced in relation to organizational change efforts. Perceptions of vulnerability in their student role to poor evaluations or even expulsion from school, and vulnerability to their own and others' expectations of them based on race and sex-role stereotypes were revealed early in the semester. Later on, with more involvement, strain between their perception of themselves as helpers in their relationships with clients, and their role in organizational change which required them to seek out and use the help of others, emerged. Examination of these strains, their various manifestations in the students interactions with others, and the alternatives available for dealing with them became central components of the class discussions.

Using the class to help students to get or stay involved in purposeful and knowledgeable change efforts required, then, that the course provide students not only with a cognitive map for surveying the organizational terrain on which they were moving, but with acceptance of their concerns, appreciation of their struggles, and support and encouragement for their efforts, including the efforts to increase their own awareness of themselves as agents of organizational change.

All students participated to some extent in class discussions, with most contributing through comments or questions in most class sessions. Approximately half the students were very active participants who shared their own experiences freely, and consistently engaged their classmates and the instructor in dialogue. Interaction among students was high, and in general, a feeling of comraderie seemed to be present.

The newness of the course, and the research element introduced at the beginning of the semester and referred to at other points, also seemed to have contributed to a sense of special purpose, and generated a bond of good feeling between the students and instructor.

NOTES

[1] The course outline and bibliography is in Appendix 2.

[2] This article was included in the introductory section of the course bibliography.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE COURSE EVALUATION DESIGN

The final component of the project was an evaluation of the course. The design of the evaluation was that of a single case study using before and after tests to measure the effects of the course on the students who took it.[1]

The purpose of the study was essentially formative. That is, the concern was with learning if the course, as designed, could contribute to students' ability to engage in organizational change in their role as direct service practitioners. The single case study, before and after research design has been found useful for such "reconaissance" purposes in program evaluation, despite its limitations.[2] Thus, while the sample studied was not random, and therefore findings would have limited generalizability, and while the absence of control for such intervening variables as history and maturation would limit the certainty with which the outcomes could be attributed to the program, the research design was considered capable of providing a basis for determining whether further study of such a course, using an experimental design, would be indicated.

The hypothesis on which the evaluation was based, then, was that students after taking the course would demonstrate increased understanding of the practice of organizational change.

Among the considerations which guided the design of the evaluation study was the function of a practice course. That is, a practice course has as its objective the provision of guides to action in order to facilitate the development of professional skill. Skill itself can, of course, only be demonstrated in the doing.[3] Since the field, which is the arena for the exercise of skill, is such a complex variable, and measurement of its role in students' development was beyond the scope of the study, and since the effects of a course for which students are accountable are limited to understanding of the basis for professional activity, not the skill with which they execute it, the measures taken of the effects of the course were based on tests of cognition.

Also taken into consideration in the design of the evaluation was the proposition on which the design of the course itself was based, i.e. that professional practice comprises the exercise of behavioral choices with referrents in a body of knowledge and a set of values. Thus, the tests of cognition used were intended to measure the effects of the course on students' values, knowledge and practice choices. Three tests, administered to the study population before and after taking the course, were used.

The first was the Rokeach Value Survey[4] which measures values by providing for the rank ordering of 18 instrumental and 18 terminal values.[5] While this test of values was not specifically designed for use in the measurement of social work values, the Value Survey was considered to have a number of advantages over other values tests.[6] Of primary importance was the fact that it is a standardized test of known reliability and validity, which has produced findings about the values of various populations with which the study sample could be compared. In addition, it has produced information about the relationship amongst values, and between values, attitudes and behaviors of particular relevance to the value dimension with which the course was concerned. For example, Rokeach has found a significant relationship between the importance attached to the values of equality and freedom, and political ideology.
Based on the division of the rank order of the 18 terminal values into the categories of high (first to sixth in order of importance), middle (seventh to twelfth) and low (thirteenth to eighteenth) the following asso-

ciations are found: persons ranking both equality and freedom high are oriented to a socialist political ideology; those ranking equality high and freedom low, to a communist ideology; equality low and freedom high to a capitalist ideology; equality low and freedom low to a fascist ideology.[7] A relationship between the importance attached to the values of equality and freedom and political activism has also been found. Regardless of political ideology, political activism is associated with extreme scores (1, 2, 16, 17, 18) on at least one of the two values.[8] Furthermore, the importance attached to the value of equality alone has been found to be related to behaviors such as the selection of political candidates and to attitudes towards the poor and towards Blacks.[9] A final reason for using the Value Survey was that it has been used to study changes in values,[10] and hence provides a basis for the consideration of this issue. In sum, then, the Value Survey was selected for its potential for yielding information of importance on the values of the students pertinent to the objectives of the course to promote, in practice, the equalization of entitlements, advantage and power. This potential was believed to outweigh the disadvantage that of the three tests used, the

Value Survey was least capable of indicating the specific contribution of the course to any possible change.

The other two tests used in the evaluation were developed specifically for the study. One was a test of knowledge, and the other a test of the application of practice principles. Both were pre-tested on a group of six students. To avoid contamination of the study population, the pre-test group was drawn from those students at the graduate school who had not pre-registered to take the course. Because of the time limitation imposed by this consideration, the only criteria guiding selection of the pre-test sample (in addition to non-inclusion in the course) were that like the class sample, it comprise, direct practice students, who were entering their fourth semester of graduate study.

As a result of the pre-test, ambiguities and other problems in the questions and instructions were identified, and modifications were made. Information about the amount of time needed for the tests was also obtained, and guided the administration of the tests.

The knowledge test, a short answer test, consisted of twenty questions intended to determine students' familiarity with content to be covered in the course.[11]

Questions such as:

"Agencies are organized to meet various goals. These include:" were used to elicit information about students' familiarity with orienting knowledge drawn from the social sciences. Questions such as: "Justification for direct service practitioners to engage in organizational change derives from:" were used to elicit information about students' familiarity with the helping process which oriented the course.

Questions were weighted uniformly, on a scale of 0 and one, with a point scored if the information sought was included in the response to the question. Since a principle which guided the design of the course was that it should build on an existing knowledge base, it was assumed that students would have some familiarity with content areas covered in the course. Open ended questions which allowed for inclusiveness of response were therefore used. Responses on the before-test were of some assistance, then, to the conduct of the course by providing clues to the instructor on the strengths and weaknesses in students' shared knowledge base. For the purposes of the evaluation however, responses were scored for evidence of inclusion of content considerations specific to the course. Thus, for example, an answer to the question about the justification for direct service practitioners to engage in organizational change efforts was given a score of 1 only if it contained reference to the worker's practice role, even though an answer containing reference to ethical obligations was no less "correct."[12]

A Practice Vignettes Test was designed for the study of practice choices.[13] The test consisted of a written description of five practice situations, taken from actual experiences of other students, in which organizational problems impinging upon service delivery were revealed. Through a series of open ended questions students were called upon to indicate the guides to action they would use to deal with the problems, were they in these situations. These simulated practice situations were intended to call out students knowledge of how they should proceed to effect organizational change in various circumstances.[14]

The five situations were selected for a number of reasons. First, as situations confronted by students who had been in positions comparable to those of the group in the class, they reflected conditions with which any student in the study population might be expected to deal. Second, the situations reflected a mix of representative practice circumstances.[15]

That is, they were drawn from different fields of service, e.g., child welfare, health, family, community mental health, corrections. They included agencies under public, private and mixed auspice and sectarian and non-sectarian sanction. There were "host", interdisciplinary and social work-staffed agencies. The service assignments of the workers involved them with individual, group and community practice. Finally, the vignettes chosen reflected major features of organizational life which impinge on service delivery, e.g. problems of internal integration, goal displacement and conflict between professional autonomy and organizational accountability.

The Vignettes Test responses were scored on ten dimensions of practice reflective of the course's orientation to practice. Three concerned problem identification, three concerned change activities, and four concerned underlying consideration. The dimensions were:

1. Identification of the unit of attention
   (locating the generalizable situational problem)
2. Data Collection
   (Supporting the generality)

3. Data Analysis
   (Identifying the organizational contributor to the problem)
4. Target Selection
   (Seeking to effect structural change)
5. Strategy selection
   (Making selective use of influence systems)
6. Action Selection
   (Selectively involving others)
7. Role Relatedness
   (Demonstrating expertise in direct service)
8. Process Orientation
   (Proceeding from need)
9. Empathy
   (Appreciating the "other side")
10. Promotion of Social Good
    (Affirming the values of justice and equity)

The first six items, which dealt with problem assessment and intervention, reflected on both generic and specific application of practice principles, and responses to these items were scored on a three point scale--0-for no application, 1 for generic application and 2 for specific application.

For example, on Vignette one, which presents the problem of a doctor's refusal to sign a patients' medicare form, the item data analysis (identifying the organization contributor) would be given a score of

2 if the response indicated awareness of a problem in the system of physician accountability within the hospital. A score of 1 would be given if accountability were not specifically identified, but if there were indication of awareness of a problem in the arrangements to assure that the forms were filled out. A score of 0 would be given if no organizational variable were identified as contributing to the problem, i.e. if consideration were limited to the doctor's ideosyncracies and/or to doctors' attitudes. The last four items were scored 0 to 1 for absence or presence of the information sought. The maximum score for any Vignette was sixteen.[16]

In developing the questionnaire and scoring the responses to the Vignettes, attention was given to the variable of student skill in written communication. The expectation that professional activity involves the application of principles of practice carries the implicit assumption that the ability to deal in abstractions --to conceptualize-- is a prerequisite of professional performance. It was possible, though, that differences in ability to communicate conceptual understanding in writing could give a distorted view of students understanding. To minimize possible distortion, the

Vignettes Test instrument was constructed so that information could be provided through more than one question. For example, information about the actors the student would select for involvement in the change effort could be provided through the question on the actions which would be taken, as well as through the question on the knowledge the student would draw on the change effort. In addition, in scoring, evidence used to assign a value to a particular item was not restricted to the response to the particular question dealing with that item. Regardless of where in the students' response it appeared, any statement relevant to a question posed was taken as evidence of a response to that question. Thus, if a value affirmation appeared in response to a question on knowledge, it was nevertheless scored on the value dimension.

As a result of the experience with the students who pretested the instruments, it was determined that three vignettes was the optimal number for students to respond to within the amount of time available during a class period, and before fatigue or boredom were likely to have an affect on the responses. The pretest also suggested that because of their variations, it would be useful to keep all five vignettes. Therefore, three of the 5 vignettes, in different combinations, were distributed without regard for which student received which combination. There were ten combinations possible, allowing, for a class of twenty, an equal distribution of combinations, an equal number of responses to each vignette, and a total of 60 responses.[17]

A panel, consisting of the investigator and two other instructors of social work practice at two different graduate schools of social work, was used in the scoring of the Vignettes Test. The two other panelists served in a number of ways. First, as consultants, they confirmed the appropriateness of the practice situations presented in the vignettes, i.e. that each represented a practice situation with which a second year student could reasonably be expected to deal, and confirmed the use of the ten dimensions of practice on which the vignette responses were scored. Second, they contributed to the refinement of the indicators used in scoring. That is, given the narrative form of response and the variations in writing, judgment was required to establish the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable responses. For example, a student making reference to agency rules might be judged within the context of response to be referring to policies.

After consensus among the panelists was reached on a random sample of 15 responses, all of the remaining responses were scored by the investigator, and one third of them, selected at random, scored by another panelist. Eighty to one hundred percent agreement on the matching sets of scores was found.[18]

The Value Survey, The Knowledge Test and the Vignettes Test were all distributed to the students on the first day of class.[19] Students were informed that the research on the course was being undertaken because of the newness of the course, and the desire to learn as much as possible about it because of growing interest not only in their school, but more widely in schools of social work, for the inclusion of practice content on social change for direct service workers. The rationale for using the particular tests was also shared.

Because approximately three hours was required for the completion of the three tests, the decision was made to administer the Vignettes Test during the first class session and have the students complete the other two on their own time and return them the following week. Spending two class periods on tests was rejected as too costly in terms of the amount of time available for the course. Asking students to spend three hours of their own time on the tests, as well as to prepare by reading for the next class session, was rejected as a disadvantageous way to begin a working relationship. In addition, even though students were told that their answers would have no bearing on their grades for the course, and that the only reason for having them identify themselves on coded cards (not the tests themselves) was to be able to locate them should tests not be returned, or should questions arise, it was decided to administer the Vignettes Test during class time so that any indication of undue anxiety on students' part might be dealt with.

Written instructions which accompanied all three tests were reviewed in class, and questions about them answered. No course content was dealt with during the first class, and students were encouraged not to make any effort, beyond drawing on knowledge they already had, to search out answers to questions on the Knowledge Test.

As it turned out, considerable anxiety was manifest during the taking of the Vignettes Test, and efforts were made to assure students that the interest was in learning from the responses to the tests, not in evaluating them as students.

As requested, all Value Survey and Knowledge Tests were returned the following week.[20]

On the assumption that nothing further in the way of assuring students that their test responses would not affect their grades, besides repeating that assurance, was indicated for the administration of the post-course tests, and out of the preference of all involved to use the last class for evaluation rather than test taking, all of the tests were given to students on the last day, for them to complete on their own time, and return the following week. With the exception of two students who mistakenly received each other's packets of tests, all students received the same three vignettes for the after test as they had before. All tests, again, were returned.

In addition to data on the effects of the course on students who took it, sought in the three before and after tests, other sources of data were used to learn about the course, and issues--anticipated and unanticipated--of concern in evaluating the project. These sources included the logs maintained by students reflecting their participation in organizational change efforts in their field work settings, class discussions, for which a log was maintained by the instructor, students' evaluation of the course.

The logs, which were initially intended, for the purpose of the study, to be used to gain information about students' experiences as they attempted to engage in organizational change activities in the field, were later also used to measure students ability to apply principles of organizational change practice.[21]

The findings of the Vignettes Test provided little evidence of change, particularly in ability to apply specific, rather than general principles of practice. For this, and other reasons described in the chapter on the evaluation findings, the usefulness of the Vignettes Test seemed questionable, and the logs were analyzed according to the same ten dimensions of practice used in scoring the Vignettes Test. While it was not possible to compare the activities reflected in the logs with activities students engaged in before taking the course, nor to account for such variations in field setting as supervisory support, agency type, etc., the logs did prove capable of yielding useful information about students knowledge for and of organizational change practice.

All of the data collected from the Value Survey, the Knowledge and Vignettes Tests and the logs were analyzed through the use of descriptive statistics for the purpose of gross comparison of the before and after tests. Measures of central tendency and variability were used. Two types of tests of significance were then used in the analysis of change. For the Knowledge Test, which used a ratio scale, it was possible to apply a parametric test. The t-Test, which is applicable to data where the population variance is not known and with a sample the size of the one in this study, was used.[22] For the Value Survey and the Vignettes Test, the use of non-parametric statistical tests were more appropriate. Non-parametric tests are free of assumptions about the characteristic or the form of the distribution of the population of the sample and can be applied to data drawn from small samples and using ordinal scales.[23] The Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks which uses information about both the direction and relative magnitude of difference was applied.

NOTES

[1] For discussion of research design, see Claire Sellitz, Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutch and Stuart W. Cook, _Research Methods in Social Relations_ (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964).

[2] For discussion of program evaluation see, Carol H. Weiss, _Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness_ (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972). For discussion of formative study purposes and methods, see pp. 66-75.

[3] Skill is, by definition, "the ability to use one's knowledge effectively and readily in execution or performance." _Webster's Third New International Dictionary, Unabridged_, (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriam Co., Publishers, 1966) 2133.

[4] The Rokeach Value Survey, its development and application, are presented in Milton Rokeach, _The Nature of Human Values_ (New York: The Free Press, 1973).

[5] The Value Survey instrument is in Appendix 3.

[6] The Social Values Test, for example, which was designed specifically for the measure of values pertinent to social work was nevertheless considered to be less capable of providing information pertinent to the value orientation of the course. In addition, findings on that test was limited to comparison of social workers and educators. See, Henry J. Meyer and Donna L. McLeod, "A Study of the Values of Social Workers," Edwin Thomas, ed., _Behavioral Science for Social Workers_ (New York: The Free Press, 1967). A subsequent study of traditional and accelerated graduate social work education, using the Social Values test found no significant positive differences in students' values at different stages of their education, and suggests the instrument may not be capable of making such discriminations. See, Aaron Rosenblatt, Marianne Welter

and Sophie Wojciechowski, The Adelphi Experiment: Accelerating Social Work Education (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976) p. 48.

[7] Rokeach, The Nature of Human Values, pp. 165-188.

[8] Ibid., pp. 189-211.

[9] Ibid., pp. 180-181 and 97-105.

[10] Ibid., pp. 235-311.

[11] The Knowledge Test is in Appendix 4.

[12] The Guide to scoring the Knowledge Test is in Appendix 5.

[13] The Vignettes Test is in Appendix 6.

[14] Several studies point to the difference between what people say they would or should do in situations, and what they actually do. La Piere, for example, found that when surveyed, over 90% of restaurants, hotels, etc., which had accommodated Chinese guests, said they would not do so. See, Richard T. La Piere, "Attitudes vs. Actions," Dennis P. Forcese and Stephen Richer, eds., Stages of Social Research Contemporary Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970). Of more immediate relevance to this study is the finding of significant difference between physicians' responses to simulated Patient Management problems and actual clinical performance. See, Michael J. Goran, John W. Williamson and Joseph S. Gonnells, "The Validity of Patient Management Problems," Journal of Medical Education 48 (February, 1973) 171-177. However, the purpose of the study was to determine students' understanding of the principles of organizational change practice, not the implementation of those guides in the field. Therefore the fact that what they would do might differ from what they reported they should do was not an issue, and not considered to alter the validity of using simulations.

[15] The mix was representative of the settings used for field placement in particular locality in which the study was set. The mix might not be representative of circumstances in, say, a rural area.

[16] The Guide to scoring the Vignettes Test is in Appendix 7.

[17] Because changes could occur between preregistration and actual enrollment, more than twenty packets of tests were prepared. In fact, 21 students attended the first class. One did not remain in the class, and the effect of her initial presence was that there was not actually an equal distribution of combinations of Vignettes, so that instead of twelve responses for each, there were eleven for one, and thirteen for another.

[18] On the basis of the results on the fifteen vignette responses scored by the entire panel, the additional forty scored by two of the panelists, and the remainder scored by the investigator, the Vignette Test instrument was considered to have limited usefulness, and therefore no additional scoring was done by the other two panelists. A fuller discussion of the instruments use is in Chapter Five.

[19] A personal data questionnaire was also distributed at this time. The Questionnaire is in Appendix 8.

[20] One student reported finding the Value Survey alien to her frame of reference and did not complete it.

[21] The log assignment called for students to maintain an ongoing record which described and analyzed the activities they engaged in in pursuit of organizational change. The logs were turned in to the instructor after the fourth week of class and returned the following week with comments. Comments typically directed the students to focus on a single situation if they were concerned with several problems; to make greater use of the literature; to broaden the scope of their consideration of the problem. No specific directions about how to proceed in their particular efforts were given.

[22] For discussion of descriptive statistics and the t Distribution, see, Paul A. Games and George R. Klare, Elementary Statistics Data Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967) pp. 24-149 and pp. 168-312.

[23] For discussion of non-parametric tests, see, Sidney Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956).

CHAPTER VI

THE EVALUATION FINDINGS

In undertaking to evaluate the effects of the course on the students who took it, the concern was to determine what students could gain from a practice course on organizational change, and what factors facilitated or obstructed achieving the objectives of the course.

Values

The course originated with the value proposition that social workers should act to improve social conditions, and incorporated a particular value set having to do with the promotion of justice and equity. The use of the Rokeach Value Survey allowed for the testing of the value orientation of the study sample, and particularly for examination of those values relevant to the course's orientation.

Medians and cumulative ranks were computed for the purpose of comparison with other population samples described by Rokeach. The Wilcoxon Matched-Pair Signed-Ranks were computed for measurement of change in values before and after the course[1] Because the test calls for respondents to arrange the 18 terminal and 18 instrumental values in order of their importance, the smaller the median and rank figures, the greater the preference reflected. For example, a median score of 4 on a value item reflects greater importance attached to that value than one for which the median is 12.

The most crucial findings in terms of the course orientation about the values of the students who took the course, related to the values of equality and freedom. No significant change occurred in the importance given by the class to these values. As reflected in Table 2 both values were ranked in the upper half of the value hierarchy, but only Freedom ranked in the upper third. Based on the relationship between the importance given to Equality

Table 2. Scores on Equality and Freedom.

	Pre-test	Post-test
Equality	8.0 (8)	8.250 (8)
Freedom	4.0 (3)	4.750 (4)

Figures are for median scores--figures in parentheses are for cumulative ranks.

and Freedom, and political ideologies of facism, capitalism, socialism and communism, the students' political orientation falls somewhere between capitalism and socialism (high on freedom, but neither high nor low on equality when three categories of rank are considered. If only two categories of rank are used for high and low, the study sample reflects a socialist ideology--high on both equality and freedom[2]).

The relative importance the study sample gives to these two key variables corresponds with Rokeach's findings that the majority of Americans value freedom highly, with 60% ranking it in the upper third of the value hierarchy, and less than 10% ranking it in the bottom third. Americans vary considerably in the importance they attach to equality. Two-thirds rank freedom ahead of equality, only about one third rank equality in the upper third of their value hierarchy, and 30% rank it at the bottom third.[3]

In addition to their relationship to political ideology, equality and freedom have been found to relate to political activism. Regardless of political ideology, activism has been found to be associated with an extreme rank (e.g. 1, 2, 16, 17, 18) on at least one of the two values. Compared with various populations of political activists and non-activists, the study sample most closely resembles non-politically active Americans, and non-activists who identify themselves as Independents.[4]

Table 3. Non-political—activist Ranks on Equality and Freedom Compared with Study Sample.

	Equality	Freedom
Non-politically active adult Americans	7	3
Non-politically active Democrats	6	3
Non-politically active Republicans	10	3
Non-politically active Independents	7	3
The study sample, pretest	8	3
The study sample, posttest	8	4

In addition to the association found between the values of equality and freedom and political ideology and political activism, the importance assigned to the value of equality alone has been found to be significantly related to specific attitudes and behaviors such as selection of political candidates, attitude towards Blacks, and attitude towards the poor. The importance attached to equality has also been found to vary significantly between Blacks and whites.[5] In the importance they attach to equality, the study group most closely resembles all Americans and the pro-poor. They resemble least Black Americans[6] who attach high importance to equality and racists who attach it low importance.

Table 4. Scores on Equality by Race, by Attitude Towards Blacks and by Attitude Towards the Poor Compared with Study Sample Scores on Equality.

Study Sample	Scores	
Pretest	8.0 (8)	
Posttest	8.25 (8)	
Comparable Scores For:		
All Americans	White Americans	Black Americans
8.5 (7)	9.6 (11)	4.6 (2)
Racist	In-between	Anti-racist
12.6 (14)	9.6 (12)	6.0 (4)
Anti-poor	In-between	Pro-poor
11.1 (13)	9.5 (10)	7.5 (5)

Figures are for median scores--figures in parentheses are for cumulative ranks.

In addition to their ratings of the values of equality and freedom, another useful comparison was found to a group of college students who were surveyed in 1967 for their participation in civil rights demonstrations. The study of this group of students found significant differences on five terminal and eight instrumental values between those who had participated, those who had not participated, but were sympathetic, and those who were unsympathetic.[7] Comparing on the same thirteen values, the study sample was more like the sympathizers and participants than the non-sympathizers both before and after the course. However, after the course it was more unlike the non-sympathizers, and even more like the sympathizers and participants (See Table 5). This comparison suggests that while no change occurred in values related to political ideology or political activism, some change did occur in values associated with participation in social change activity consonent with the profession's objectives.

Knowledge For and Of Practice

While the course originated in a value stance, its purpose was to provide a guide for operationalizing the value, and a body of knowledge and a theory of practice also informed that guide. The short answer Knowledge Test and the Practice Vignettes Test were the instruments designed to elicit information about the effects of the course on students' knowledge and practice choices. The Knowledge Test provided a number of indications that gains in students' knowledge had been made. While there was wide variation among students

Table 5. Participants in Civil Rights Demonstration Compared with Study Sample.

	Participants	Non-Participant Sympathizers	Non-Sympathizers	Sample Pretest	Sample Posttest
Terminal Values					
A Comfortable Life	15.3 (18)	12.4 (4)	9.9 (10)	14.3 (16)	14.3 (15)
A World of Beauty	12.6 (13)	13.5 (14)	15.5 (18)	14.1 (14)	11.7 (11)[a]
Equality	6.8 (5)	9.6 (11)	14.1 (17)	8.0 (8)	8.3 (8)
Mature Love	7.8 (7)	6.9 (5)	10.5 (11)	5.6 (4)	4.4 (3)
National Security	14.3 (17)	14.0 (17)	12.5 (14)	16.7 (17)	16.7 (17)
Instrumental Values					
Broadminded	4.3 (1)	6.5 (3)	7.5 (4)	4.7 (3)	4.5 (3)
Capable	11.9 (14)	9.7 (11)	7.5 (5)	6.3 (7)	8.0 (8)[a]
Clean	16.0 (18)	14.7 (17)	11.3 (13)	15.6 (16)	16.0 (16)
Forgiving	8.3 (7)	9.4 (10)	11.5 (14)	11.0 (12)	10.3 (11)[a]
Helpful	10.3 (11)	10.0 (12)	13.3 (17)	7.0 (9)	9.0 (6)[a]
Loving	7.3 (4)	7.3 (5)	9.2 (9)	2.3 (1)	4.3 (2)[a]
Polite	13.9 (16)	13.4 (16)	11.2 (12)	15.0 (15)	15.0 (15)
Responsible	9.3 (9)	6.3 (2)	5.0 (2)	6.0 (4)	6.6 (7)[a]

Figures are for median scores--figures in parentheses are for cumulative ranks.

[a] Value items for which change in median and rank are in the direction of increased similarity to civil rights sympathizers and participants.

in the knowledge pertinent to the course which they brought with them, the before test indicated that knowledge about organizations and organizational change generally was limited. Eighty-five percent of the students answered fewer than half of the questions. Using the t Test, a statistically significant increase in mean scores after taking the course was found (See Table 7). Significant increases were also found for selected items on the Knowledge Test (See Table 6).

The ability of the Knowledge Test to discriminate for specific areas of content was further indicated by the fact that out of the seven lowest scoring items (0 - 4 students with correct responses) 4 were among the items on which the significant gains had been made, and three showed no gain. These latter three items dealt with differentials related to organizational change which had, in fact, not been covered in the course as planned. Mean changes in Knowledge Test score totals, adjusted to exclude those items dealing with content not covered in the course, are included in Table 7.

The Vignettes Test, designed to elicit information about students' ability to apply principles of organizational change practice proved less discriminating than the Knowledge Test, and provided little evidence of positive change. Thus, for example, while variation

Table 6. t Test of Mean Changes on Selected Items of the Knowledge Test.

N = 20

Item #	Item[a]	Pretest	Posttest	P
1	Organizational Goals	.400	.900	.010
2	Professional's Role Strain	.200	.500	.05
4	Organization Change Justification	.600	.900	.010
9	Time Phases	.100	.450	.005
11	Organizational Structures	.200	.600	.005
12	Role of Peers	.450	.750	.030
20	Goal Displacement	.150	.900	.001
6	Tactics Differential (Exception to the Rule)	.100	.000	NS
14	Action System Differential (Role of Consumers in Relationship to Environment Problem)	.000	.000	NS
15	Setting Differential ("Host" Setting Tactic)	.100	.000	NS

[a] Content area to which the Knowledge Test item was directed is presented. For exact wording of item, see Appendix 4.

Table 7. t-Test of Means Changes in Knowledge Test Score Totals.

N = 20

	Pretest Mean Score	Posttest Mean Score	P
20 item test	6.75	9.60	.001
17 item test	7.70	11.29	.001

among students was evident on the before test, the range of difference was considerably narrower than on the Knowledge Test, with students scoring totals between 8 and 22 out of a possible score of 48, compared with totals between 1 and 12 out of a possible score of 20 on the Knowledge Test, and with 75% of the Vignettes Test totals clustered between the scores of 16 and 22.

Although increased scores were evident on the Vignettes after test, and there were increased differences between them, the amount of significant change was minimal, particularly if responses are examined for evidence of application of specific rather than general or generic practice principles. These findings suggest that the course did not contribute to students ability to apply specific principles of organizational change practice, and that what little contribution it made was to the ability to apply generic principles. The findings also suggested that question could be raised about the usefulness of the instrument. Since the Vignettes Test had been pre-tested only on students who had not taken a course on organizational change practice, the instrument's reliability with regard to eliciting information about application of specific principles had not been tested.

To explore the issue of the Vignettes Test's usefulness, the students' logs were scored on the same ten dimensions of practice used for scoring the Vignettes Test responses. The data obtained from the logs did prove capable of greater discrimination, and evidence of some application of specific principles was found on all of the six dimensions reflective of steps in the helping process, with differences discernible among them (see Table 8).

The major limitations in the use of the log as a measure of the effects of the course were that comparison of actions taken by students with actions taken prior to enrollment in the course could not be made, nor could differences in students' agency situations be accounted for. However, comparison of students' log scores and Knowledge posttest scores did provide further support to the use of the logs. No student received a score of 10 or more on the Vignettes posttest. Dividing students

Table 8. Median Log Scores Compared with Median Scores on Vignettes Posttest.[a]

Item #	Item	Log Median	Vignettes Median[b]
1	Unit of Attention	1.250	.515
2	Data Collection	1.278	.586
3	Data Analysis	1.731	.882
4	Target Selection	1.278	.732
5	Action Selection	1.389	.818
6	Strategy Selection	1.278	.932
7	Role Relatedness	.938	.685
8	Process Orientation	.786	.810
9	Empathy	.833	.255
10	Social Good	.591	.424

[a] Medians on items 1-6 are based on scores of 0-2. Medians on items 7-10 are based on scores of 0-1.

[b] Median scores are based on 5 Vignettes.

into the categories of those who did score 10 or above on the logs, and those who scored 9 or below, and dividing them into the categories on the Knowledge posttest of those who scored above the mean (9.6) and those who scored below, provided evidence of a statistically significant difference between students who scored in corresponding categories and those who didn't (see Table 9).

Table 9. Binomial Test of Correspondence of Students' Scores on Logs and Knowledge Posttest.

Corresponding Scores			Non-Corresponding Scores		
	N	%		N	%
High Log + High Knowledge	12	60	High Log + Low Knowledge	2	10
Low Log + Low Knowledge	3	15	Low Log + High Knowledge	3	15
TOTALS	15	75		5	25
p = .021					

In addition to providing data indicative of the greater usefulness of the log over the Vignettes Test instrument, the findings on the correspondence between log and Knowledge posttest scores also suggest that the course did contribute to students' understanding of organizational change practice principles.

The most striking of the log findings was that data analysis (identifying the organizational contributor to the service delivery problem) was the practice dimension on which students not only scored the highest, but for which the mode was 2 (specific application). Although neither medians nor modes were as high, data analysis was also the dimension of practice on which significant change occurred on three of the vignettes. Coupled with the findings from the Knowledge Test, the course would appear to have contributed most to students' knowledge of organizational dynamics and to their ability to apply that knowledge in the analysis of problem situations. This conclusion corresponds with the observation on the conduct of the course that because of the generally limited knowledge students brought with them of organizations, considerable class time was needed to help them acquire the tools for organizational analysis. The predisposition of many students to look to individual personality dynamics for understanding of agency obstacles to service delivery also required that more time than was anticipated be spent on helping students apply knowledge about organizations to specific problem situations.

Other trends suggested by the test results and classroom observations are that students gained in knowledge of the roles played by individuals in organizations and were able to apply this knowledge with some specificity to the selection of actors relevant to the change effort, and gained in knowledge of the bases for behavioral change in organizations, but were less able to apply this knowledge in the selection of specific strategies for change. Students seem to have gained least in their knowledge of differentials guiding interventions--e.g. implications of different types of settings, of different time phases.

In sum, then, the evidence suggests that the course did contribute to students' knowledge for and of organizational change practice, and that the attention given to orienting students to organizational dynamics and organizational influences on behavior limited the contribution of the course to students' knowledge of differentially determined interventions.

Log Observations

Although the logs were used for the purpose of measuring students' ability to apply principles of organizational change practice according to the guide developed for the Vignettes Test, the log's primary purpose, from the point of view of the study, was to provide information about the nature of the experience students had as they attempted to act upon some organizational obstacle to service delivery.

In giving the assignment to engage in an organizational change effort, an attempt was made to deal with the fact that as 4th semester students, the participants in the class would have a brief period of time left to them for such an effort, and that for a part of the semester at least, energies would have to be given to preparing to leave their agencies. The mechanism used in the attempt was to have the students undertake their effort as a means of leaving a legacy. The notion of leaving a legacy, combined with the view that workers need not proceed towards a predetermined outcome objective, was expected to make it possible for students to direct their efforts to such achievements as gaining recognition for the problem situation, gaining a place for consideration of the problem on an agency agenda, leaving a structure in place capable of dealing with the problem, etc., and not necessarily achieving resolution of the problem.

The reflections and observations recorded in students' logs proved a rich source of information about the experience of participating in organizational change.

1. Problem identification and values

Many of the students' early log entries reflected on more than one problem, and presentations were comparable to early class presentations of global concerns. Students were then directed to select a single problem for consideration and action. The problems selected included:

Nine situations identified as discriminatory and disadvantaging to groups of potential or actual clients. For example, there were a number of situations in which bias towards the provision of counseling focused on intrapsychic conflicts was identified as disadvantaging to clients in need of economic assistance, assistance with housing, etc., through the failure of staff to respond to those needs, through the maintenance of long waiting lists, through the refusal of staff to make home or other agency visits, etc.

Two situations identified as impeding the empowerment of clients. For example, the dependence of a community action agency on the management of a subsidized housing facility was identified as an obstacle to the mobilization of the tenants group to act in their own behalf on housing problems they were confronting.

Three situations identified as disrespectful of clients' dignity and worth. For example, several instances of staff rudeness, of lack of confidentiality, of lack of privacy for interviews were identified as indignities to which clients were subjected.

The remaining 6 did not reflect the specific value orientation which prompted consideration of the problem. Since the problems dealt with--the creation of coordinated team efforts and the institutionalization of program innovations--could aid clients without necessarily dealing with issues of advantage, power, etc., it does not seem unreasonable to assume that these situations may have been oriented more by considerations related to individuality, dignity and worth than to entitlement, empowerment and/or equalization of advantage.

2. Problem identification and the role of the Field Instructor.

The logs revealed only four instances in which the problem identified was one to which the student was specifically assigned, and/or was one identified for the purpose of taking action by a person other than the student. Of the remaining 16, ten reflected field instructors positively disposed to students' initiatives. Positive disposition included a range of responses from offering no opposition to the student's interest in engaging the problem (the most common) through encouragement, to active assistance (the least common). Five students identified field instructors as unsupportive and/or "a part of the problem." Two students, for example, one Black and one white, identified situations as disadvantaging to poor Black clients. Both students experienced difficulty engaging clients. One, placed in an agency dealing with problems of alcohol abuse, perceived her difficulty as a function of the requirement that she limit her involvements to consideration of psychological needs. The other, placed in a family agency, perceived her difficulty as a function of clients' having been kept waiting weeks and even months for service. Both students reported having their perceptions about the disadvantaging effects of agency practices and procedures discredited by their field instructors, who perceived the difficulty the students had engaging clients as a function of their incompetence as practitioners.

3. Actions taken on problems

The activities most universally engaged in were data collection and analysis. Students used observations, informal interchanges, formal interviews and specifically designed research instruments to collect information about the scope of the problem and about others' perceptions of it. They drew heavily on organizational theory to locate sources of problems and to identify resistances and resources to change. This observation is, of course, consistent with the findings on the log scores, which revealed that 14 of the twenty students gave consideration to specific organizational contributors to the service delivery problem they identified.

Interventions designed to effect change varied more widely. There were students who felt constrained to act because of negative experiences and relationships which developed during their first semester in the agency. Some among these, and a number of other students, focused their activities primarily on trying new ways of relating in order to have an impact on specific target individuals--usually a field instructor or some other person in authority.

Some activities were limited to dealing with specific case situations, not the generalizable circumstance, although some students purposefully gave visibility to their case management activities as a means of demonstrating alternative behaviors to those contributing to the problem. For example, one student made a point of sharing her experiences in making home visits.

Several students, whose activities centered primarily on data gathering, purposefully utilized these to bring attention to the problem as a means of beginning the mobilization of an action system.

A total of nine students engaged in additional activities as part of their change effort. Their interventions included the use of informal and existing formal staff meetings to present issues and mobilize others, the instigation of formal meetings designed specifically to address the problem, the creation of alliances with others, the design of proposals for effecting change, the use of training programs, and the creation of new systems of communication (this last was not in one of those instances where coordination was the target for the change effort). Of these, seven sufficiently identified and involved relevant others so that continued activity on the problem after the student left the field placement could be anticipated. In the two other situations, continued action could be anticipated. However the change effort, which had proceeded from a particular solution, had not adequately provided for the participation of those who would be required to implement the change, and erosion of the plans had begun to occur.

4. The change effort and student/agency/school relations.

No student's log revealed activities related to change efforts which threatened either the students' own status or the relationship between the field agency and the school. Two of the students who had been a part of such a conflict during the prior semester used their assignment in the course to reexamine their earlier experiences and develop new approaches to dealing with others in order to address the identified problem. A third one chose not to attempt a structural change, but included the bases for her choice as part of her very thorough and insightful analysis of the organizational problem and the conditions required for change. A fourth side-stepped the conflict and directed her efforts to assisting in the development of a new unit capable of responding to those clients whose unmet needs had been the focus of her conflict.

The fact that relationships were not threatened does not mean that students were not involved in conflict situations. The range of their activities necessarily brought them into arenas of conflict. However, the students did not create conflict, nor did any of them choose to employ a conflict strategy. Rather, their actions grew out of and often drew focused attention to, existing, if unacknowledged, conflict. In doing so they demonstrated that as students they could take initiative for identifying organizational problems and mobilizing actions to address those problems without placing their own or agency/school relationships in jeopardy.

The implications are not clear, but it would appear to be worth noting that few logs revealed activities designed to utilize resources of the school in the students' change efforts, although specific attention was given to the influences in agency-school relationships in analyses done in class. (Class discussions, as noted elsewhere, did reveal that students tended not to look to their faculty advisors--those with formal role responsibility for students' field experiences--as major sources of support in their educational program.)

Only in those instances, then, where students deliberately used the fact that they had an assignment related to organizational change to gain access to information, garner support, etc., was there evidence of the use of their student status as a source of influence.

Students' Evaluation

In addition to the tests of measurement and the logs, students' evaluations of the course also provided data on its effects.

In their evaluation, students reported a high degree of satisfaction with the course. The major criticism expressed had to do with timing, particularly at the beginning of the semester. Many students indicated that they had not known what to expect from the course and did not perceive the framework early enough.

The observation which received almost universal affirmation was that the course served the students as a consciousness raising experience, and as a source of empowerment to them in their roles as social workers. The contribution the course made to them in this regard was highly valued.

The factors which were identified as having contributed to these outcomes were:

1. Knowledge. Students found the theoretical constructs which provided them with tools for analyzing social agencies most useful. Some of the specifically identified content areas were those dealing with organizational goals and functions, and with exchange in organizational behavior.

2. Expectations. Students found the process orientation on which the course was based especially meaningful. The assumption that they did not have to have a solution in order to take action on a problem was experienced as a highly liberating idea, and one which inspired confidence and increased motivation. The course's focus on a target of change within the immediate range of every worker--the social agency--was also found to be liberating. For many students, the phrase "changing the system," which had such currency, and the shift to conceptualize the social worker as a change agent, had stimulated or added to their concern with the need for "big systems change", but had not reduced

their feelings of powerlessness to effect such change as social workers. The expectation, then, that it was their expertise in problem identification and in the creation and maintenance of action systems that provided the basis for participations in change, together with the identification of a manageable focus for change activities, contributed to their sense of greater power.

3. Support. The students found the opportunity to give voice to negative perceptions about their agencies to a person in authority, and to have their concerns given legitimacy, of considerable help. Many students believed that faculty generally were not open to hearing and/or acting upon students' questions about agency activity. While it remained unclear what the basis for this belief was, and while many students acknowledged that they had not, in fact, tested their belief directly, the acceptance they experienced in the course was perceived as atypical. In addition to acceptance of negatives, the students also found helpful the encouragement they received. Students perceived a variety of risks associated with organizational change activity. Some risks related to their student status, others to long established patterns of interaction based on sex and race stereotyping. The recognition of the vulnerabilities

felt by students and the encouragement to share and examine them, and to explore in detail alternatives for managing them, freed students to evaluate their own role behavior and make changes. This in turn increased their hopefulness about their ability to be effective agents of social change.

In addition to its consciousness raising and empowering effects, some students also found the course helpful to them in their job searches. Students reported having a much better idea of the types of questions to ask in an interview in order to find out the kind of experiences they might expect to have in an agency. They also reported getting very favorable reactions to their questions about the agency's organization, and one student said her interest in the agency's operations so impressed the interviewer, she was offered the job.

Another contribution which the course was felt to have made was to students' knowledge of direct practice with clients. The identification of the relationship of principles of organizational change practice to generic components of the helping process, and the examination of issues related to empowerment, right to know, etc., were seen as significant in this regard.

Based on their own positive experience with the course, the students recommended its continuation. Providing the course as a requirement was also suggested, as was the inclusion of more organizational theory in the required behavioral science courses.

Finally, students recommended that the course be offered in the third, rather than the fourth semester. They believed the course would aid students with the task of locating themselves in a new agency system. Students who had encountered difficulty in their field setting during the third semester also felt that having the course in the third semester might have helped them handle their situations differently. Helping the students to locate and understand their role in the agency and their use of themselves, it was thought, would enable students to enter more quickly and effectively into organizational change efforts and also afford them a longer period of time for participations in the change process.

Additional Findings

Although the evidence was drawn from sources discussed earlier--the tests of measurement, the logs, classroom discussion and students' evaluations--it seemed useful to consider separately the findings about the four constructs which gave the course its particular focus on organizational change practice.

1. Role Relatedness (organizational change requires demonstrated expertise in direct service). This was the most frequently observed of the four constructs, and students clearly made effective use of it. Although it was necessary to assist students initially to partialize global concerns and to identify the relationship between their generalized dissatisfactions and their service responsibilities, the emphasis on the direct service encounter as a point of entry for organizational change activity did prove useful. It was the basis of the change efforts of the majority of students, and almost all did demonstrate, in these efforts, their special competence as practitioners in need assessment and their knowledge of issues in the delivery of service. Thus students were influenced in problem selection by awareness of conditions necessary for the establishment of relationships of trust, of the relationship between accessibility and utilization of service, of crisis and crisis intervention, of the uses of group services, of their own roles as brokers, mediators, and advocates, etc., and made use of their awareness of these issues in their interactions with others.

2. Process Orientation (organizational change

efforts of direct service practitioners proceed from identification of need). The application of the orientation to the helping process which guides direct work with clients to organizational change was a new, apparently unexpected, and, according to the students' evaluation, especially useful contribution of the course to their practice. Although not all of them adopted in their actual change efforts, the majority did, and demonstrated that they were able, by proceeding from identified need, and without a specific outcome objective established, to play an instrumental role in promoting organizational change in their agencies.

3. Empathy (Change efforts require appreciation of the "other side"). The log scores and even some of the Vignettes Test scores suggest that most of the students were able to use this construct. Early log entries and class discussion revealed that empathizing with those persons whose behavior was viewed as contributory to the service delivery problem was difficult for many students. Identification of the problem behavior with personality, without regard for role, organizational constraints, etc. contributed to the difficulty. Fear of losing anger felt necessary to the mobilization of a change effort was also identified by students as an obstacle to consideration of the other side, and increased

knowledge about the functions served by organizational problems, the need of organizations to meet maintenance needs, the need of individuals to derive benefit from participation in organizations was initially used in the same way that knowledge about personality dynamics had been used--to label and blame.

In this regard, the difficulty in separating intent from effect in order to gauge the exchange necessary for change to occur, appeared quite similar to the difficulties students working with children identified as troubled have been observed to have in engaging parents. The tendency for students to use their diagnostic understanding to label and blame parents for their contribution to the childrens' difficulty interferes with the ability to appreciate the parents' experience of the problem situation, and to develop plans which take the parents' stake in the change effort into account.

Inclusion of considerations of the "other side" in case analyses in class, with specific attention given to implications for planning and intervention, would appear to have helped the students to appreciate the position of others without losing their motivation to act on the problemmatic effects of the situation.

4. Promotion of Social Good (practice should seek

to affirm the values of justice and equity). As reflected in their logs, fewer students than made use of the other constructs made use of the value construct, insofar as they sought to promote entitlement, advantage and/or empowerment. The value construct was dealt with in class discussion and there was no evidence that any students rejected it, or otherwise had difficulty with it. If it is possible to associate the promotion of dignity, worth and regard for the uniqueness of the individual with the value of Freedom on Rokeach's Value Survey, and entitlement, advantage and empowerment with Equality, then it may be that there was some relationship between the students preference for freedom over equality and the more limited use made by the class of the value construct which oriented the course.

NOTES

[1] Total Value Survey scores are in Appendix 9.

[2] Rokeach uses both categories in his reports of different populations. He has also identified a sample of Americans who rank equality and/or freedom in the middle third of the value hierarchy, and designates them, in the terms of political ideology, as "Middle Americans." See Rokeach, The Nature of Human Values, pp. 192-193.

[3] Ibid., pp. 191-192.

[4] Ibid., p. 208.

[5] Ibid., pp. 180-181; 101; 105; 67.

[6] No significant difference is found when only the while students' scores on equality are used.

[7] Rokeach, The Nature of Human Values, p. 125.

[8] Total Knowledge Test scores are in Appendix 10.

CHAPTER VII

DISCUSSION

The project which has been described in this report was undertaken to determine the feasibility of using a practice course, with a particular conceptual orientation, to contribute to the ability of direct service practitioners to carry out their responsibility for taking action to improve social conditions.

On the basis of the fact that a practice course in organizational change for direct service social work students was designed, proposed and accepted into the curriculum of a graduate school of social work, taught, and found to have had a positive affect on students' knowledge for and of organizational change practice, it can be concluded that feasibility was demonstrated.

The questions to be addressed here, then, have to do with what was learned in the process of conducting this single-case demonstration about the outcomes that were achieved, and what implications can be drawn for consideration of future study.

Because it was not a specifically anticipated outcome, and because for the students it was so highly valued, the fact that they experienced the course as consciousness raising and empowering bears examination.

The assumption is generally made that knowledge increases power, and the students did identify gains in specific content areas as contributory to their increased sense of power to effect situational change. But the additional factors they identified as contributory, and the importance they attached to it as an outcome of the course also speak to questions of interest in educating for social changes.

One question has to do with the students' perception of their power prior to taking the course. That is, what accounted for the fact that after completing three semesters of graduate education, and of being oriented to a practice model which called for the performance of tasks related to the improvement of opportunities for meeting needs, and for the enactment not only of enabling, but of mediating, brokering and advocating roles, the students felt sufficiently lacking in power to identify its contribution to their empowerment as the most important effect of the course?

One answer would seem to be found in the discrepancy between what students were taught in their practice courses about expected role performance, and the supports they received and/or perceived for acting on those expectations. As indicated in their logs, the majority of students were not assigned, as part of their field learning experience, tasks related to the enhancement of service provision. While most students had identified areas in which client needs could be better served, and some had initiated efforts to call attention to and/or act on the problems, few received direction from their field instructors on how to proceed. And while some students met with approval for their initiatives, others encountered serious obstacles.

The perception that many faculty advisors were not likely sources of support to them in their consideration of organizational problems also seemed to contribute to the conflict of expected role performance.

Students did not make it clear what their expectations of their faculty advisors were based on, and many had not tested their perceptions directly. However, one possible influence may have been the fact that probably the most visible response within the school when problem situations in field work were identified, was the replacement of students to different agencies. Although replacement was not a frequent occurrence, might have been the students' preference, educationally advantageous, etc. its effects may have been to communicate to students at large that efforts were not expended on working problems through in situ. To the extent that some of the situations resulting in replacement reflected organizational problems, and any action taken by faculty to engage with agency staff on those problems was not visible to students, faculty may have been perceived as unresponsive to organizational change needs.

An additional contributor to students' perceptions of faculty advisor support may have been the fact that in the organization of the school, there were fewer rewards for energies expended on faculty advisement than other academic activities, and that therefore, the availability of advisors as a resource generally, not just in relation to organizational issues, was highly variable. The fact that the course was a part of the structure of the school, and that the students found in it a source of support, and were able to use it, suggests the importance of the provision of structures which promote the performance of expected behavior.

Another area of conflicting expectation which seems to have affected students feelings of powerlessness had to do with the definition of social change. To the extent that the mission of the school was reflected in students' educational experience, the students were influenced in their appreciation of the need for social change to eliminate the problems of racism, poverty and urban decay. The means at their disposal to effect such social change as social work practitioners seemed less apparent and again created a gap between expected performance and the provision of adequate supports for meeting the expectations.

The identification of organizational change as one component of social change, and the presentation of a practice model which recognized the limits of the power of direct service practitioners to effect specific outcomes, and provided for them to engage organizational issues by building on their direct service responsibility and expertise, appears to have aided in bridging that gap. It also appears to have helped students to locate and experience sources of power they had not known were available to them in their service role.

Another issues which emerged as significant to students' perception of their own power was behavioral expectations based on race and sex role stereotyping. To the extent that most students' field assignments did not call for them to engage organizational problems, participation in organizational change efforts required that they take the initiative. Their efforts also, in many instances, involved difference with authority. The behaviors involved in organizational change required then, many which might be characterized as instrumental rather than expressive, as assertive rather than compliant--that is--behaviors which traditionally have not been considered the prerogative of Blacks and women.[1]

Here again, the expectations were problematic. On the one hand students confronted the stated professional aspirations for them to become agents of social change, and their own aspirations to be freed from race and sex-role constraints. On the other hand, they encountered racism and sexism in the profession, the school and the social agencies, and in their own patterns of behavior based on internalized traditional race and sex-based norms.

While the course, no doubt, was less capable of helping students resolve these conflicting role expectations than those mentioned earlier, it would appear to have been of some use. The fact that the conflicts were identified when they were reflected in students' presentations, that the difficulties students were experiencing because of them were acknowledged, that measures for dealing with them were examined, and that students were supportive of each others attempts to manage in new ways, seem to have been helpful contributions the course made. One other contributing factor may have been the fact that the instructor of the course was a woman, one clearly identified with direct service practice, whose tasks have been traditionally viewed as "expressive," and one clearly supportive of the students' efforts to overcome race and sex-role stereotyping.[2]

Overall, then, for the group of students who took the course, it would appear that the provision, through the formal structure of the school, of a course which articulated with the expectations set that students participate in social change endeavors, that specified a sample of change objectives which seemed to be within the range of possible attainment, that presented a guide to action which capitalized on competencies students' had already had an opportunity to develop, that increased their knowledge, and that gave recognition to impediments to self-actualization in prescribed professional roles, enabled the students to perceive, test out, and increase their confidence in their capacity to carry out their responsibility for acting to improve social conditions.

The significance of the provision of structures to promote particular behaviors would seem to warrant further study. The finding that the sample of students who took the course were able to make use of it suggests in contrast with Burns' proposition that success in casework and success in social change activities requires different personality characteristics,[3] that situational arrangements can affect the actions taken by direct service practitioners. To promote students' participation in social change activities, consideration should be given, then, to the opportunities made available for students to, for example, have field work assignments in organizational development, to receive field instruction to meet their learning needs in this area, to receive faculty advisement related to their education for organizational change, and to be evaluated and credited for their skill development in this area of practice.

A second area for consideration, based on the evaluation findings, is the students' values.

One issue which emerged from the study of their values, was that the students who took the course were disposed towards a socialist ideology, which attaches relatively high importance to the values of freedom and equality, which suggests consonance with the aims of the social work profession. They also showed in their value preferences that they were not inclined towards political activism, but appeared like, and after the course, were even more like, persons inclined to support or participate in a social change activity which had an aim consonent with the aims of the profession. This suggests that the course was consonent with the students' social change inclinations. Further study would seem indicated to determine the extent to which this sample of students is like other students and other professional social workers in their social change orientation, and to determine, given an orientation like the one evidenced in this sample, if it would be preferable to educate for social change activities consonent with existing values, or to attempt to effect a change in orientation toward political activism.

Another value issue has to do with the fact that no change occurred in the importance students attached to the crucial values of freedom and equality. Rosenblatt et. al., using a different value test, found no change in students' values at different stages of their graduate social work education, and suggests the reason is that students bring the preferred values with them. However, the fact that the sample in this study did not rank equality as highly as freedom, nor even rank equality in the upper third of their values hierarchy raises some questions. Rokeach's findings about the importance attached to equality, and its relationship such variables as attitude toward Blacks and towards the poor[4] have significance for social work. Assuming that the findings on the students' values have some generalizability, then further study would be indicated to determine the extent to which it is known what the profession's preferred values are, and if students, either before, or as a result of their education, do share them. The fact that only a little more than one half of the students selected situations which bore on the problems of disadvantage and/or disenfranchisement for their change effort would appear to suggest the need for further study of means for promoting in students a preference for equality comparable to the preference for freedom, in order to meet the professions' commitment to social change to equalize opportunity.

A third area for consideration has to do with the content of the course, and the course's location in the curriculum.

The findings of the evaluation suggest that the greatest gains in knowledge related to organizational dynamics and their influence on behavior, and that gains were less in knowledge related to differentials guiding intervention. The gains reflected the emphasis given in the course due to students' lack of familiarity with necessary orienting knowledge and preference for explaining behavior in organizations in terms of individual personality dynamics.

One question which these findings raise has to do with the proper location in the curriculum of content on organizations. There would appear to be advantage to having such content located in the behavioral sciences sequence, and in fact some of content drawn on in the course had been. However, it might be that even with a more solid foundation in orienting theory, considerable class time would still be required to help students use their knowledge in performing the tasks of data analysis and assessment. The question of the role of the practice course in helping students to acquire and/or integrate various content requirements has long occupied social work educators, and remains to be further examined.[6]

The question about the course's location in the curriculum stems from the students' recommendation that the course be offered in the third semester. They recognized that a major beginning task for students in a new field setting, is becoming oriented to the service delivery system, and found the course provided them with tools for locating themselves within the organization. Those who had encountered serious difficulties in the efforts they had made in the third semester to deal with organizational problems felt they would have handled their situations differently and more effectively if they had been taking the course then. Finally, although students were able to make use of the assignment to "leave a legacy," being directed earlier in the year to participate in an organizational change effort would allow for a fuller opportunity to move through various phases of the process.

In summary, then the findings suggest that a practice course on organizational change for direct service social work students, based on the conception that social agencies are, for persons in need of their services, a part of their situation, did contribute to the educational preparation of students to meet their professional responsibility to take action to improve social conditions. The findings also suggest justification for further investigation into education for social change with particular attention focused on the structures needed to promote students' development of competence in social change activities, on the values relevant to the realization of professions' commitment to a just society, and on the relationship between the content and purposes of such a course to the total graduate curriculum, and finally on the relationship between educational preparation for social change activity, and actual performance of students after graduation.

NOTES

[1] For a study of sex-role socialization, and the dichotomization of male and female behavioral expectations, see, Orville Brim, Jr., "Family Structure and Sex-Role Learning by Children," Norman Bell and Ezra Vogel, Eds., A Modern Introduction to the Family (New York: The Free Press, 1968) 526-540. For discussion of influences on differential expectations of the behavior of whites and Blacks, see, Louis Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt, eds., Institutional Racism in America (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969).

[2] For a study reflecting an assumed dichotomy of professional tasks, see, George Brager and John Michael, "The Sex Distribution in Social Work: Causes and Consequences," Social Casework 50 (December, 1969), 591-597. My differences with traditional sex and race stereotypes were communicated to students directly. They also had included on their course bibliography a paper I had written on sexism and social work. See, Miriam Meltzer Olson, "The Role of Women: Implications for Social Work." Paper presented at the 19th Annual Program Meeting of the Council on Social Work Education, San Francisco, California, February 1973.

[3] Eveline Burns, "Tomorrow's Social Needs and Social Work Education," Journal of Education for Social Work, (Spring, 1966).

[4] Aaron Rosenblatt, Marianne Welter and Sophie Wojciechowski, The Adelphi Experiment (New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976) p. 48.

[5] Milton Rokeach, The Nature of Human Values (New York: The Free Press, 1973) pp. 189-205.

[6] See, for example, Helen Harris Perlman, "The Charge to the Casework Sequence," Social Work 9 (July, 1964) 47-55.

APPENDIX 1

Course Proposal: The Role of the Social Work Practitioner in Organizational Change.

Miriam Olson October, 1974

Rationale

I. Professional: As reflected in the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics, all social workers are bound by a commitment to "action to improve social conditions." Historically, the social change role of direct service practitioners was carried largely outside of the practice role -- through professional association, through actions taken as informed and concerned citizens, etc. The course proposed here derives from the reconceptualizations of direct service delivery which include action to improve social conditions as a component of practice.

II. Theoretical: The proposed course is based on the following assumptions:

a. "Social conditions" refers to too much to assume any particular approach to improving them. For example, poverty is social condition which requires political action if it is to be eliminated. But a six-month wait at a child guidance clinic to have a troubled younster evaluated, is also a social condition, and one which may require something other than legislative action if it is to be changed.

b. The person(s)-in-situation is the primary unit of attention of micro-system practitioners. Because social agencies are, for persons in need of their services, part of their situation (social conditions), it is necessary for practitioners to include the organization of the service delivery system in their assessments, and to intervene with any component of that system which impinges on the welfare of the person(s) when indicated.

c. Social institutions, like all social systems, are dynamic and ever changing, despite features of organizational life which promote stasis. Direct service practitioners occupy a unique position from which to view the utility of the organization of service delivery to the intended beneficiaries, and can contribute to the processes of change to improve the conditions of service delivery within the context of their particular role and location in the system.

d. Self-awareness is a basic tool for social work practice. Microsystem practitioners need to make conscious use of themselves not only in their relationships with clients, but in all professional activities, including their role in organization and interorganizational life.

III. Relationship to Curriculum

The proposed course is to be offered as a specialized elective in advanced practice for microsystem majors. It builds on the base of the first year through use of a content drawn from Social Work Practice, Behavioral Science, Social Welfare Policy and Research sequences. For example, it utilizes the systems model and practice processes (identification of unit of attention, data collection and analysis, etc.) introduced in Social Work Practice; as well as such specific orienting content as role theory, communication theory, social values, evaluation, etc.

In common with other specialized courses such as Crisis Intervention, Family Oriented Treatment, Activity Group Practice, the proposed course also seeks to reinforce, deepen and enlarge students' knowledge of practice components developed in the Advanced Practice with Individuals and Families and Advanced Practice with Groups courses.

The following situation may serve as an example of the type of problems and processes students in this course would explore:

A student, placed in a Child Welfare Agency, has been working with a natural mother toward the **return** of her son who is in foster care. The work has gone very well and return is expected to be effected around the first of the year, when the apartment the mother has located will become available. The mother states her wish to have the child - aged 9 - spend the Thanksgiving weekend with her. She currently resides with her parents, with whom she has come to enjoy a satisfying, mutually accepting relationship. Her parents would also like to have the child stay for Thanksgiving. Agency policy does not allow for pre-return visits unless the mother is residing in the home to which the child will return. Based on an assessment that from all other perspectives, the proposed Thanksgiving visit would be feasible and desirable, the student is faced with a decision. She might explain to the mother that such a visit is not possible, giving the agency's reasons; or she might decide the policy is not useful in this situation and therefore ought to be changed. If she decides the second, she would have another series of decisions to make. Should she involve the client in attempting to effect the policy change or not? If so, in what way? What facets of their working relationship would effect and be effected by the client's involvement? If she does not involve the client, how should she proceed? She should attempt to have an exception made in this case or attempt a change that would have broader applicability, or both? Each decision would have to be based on an assessment and require the preformance of specific tasks. She might have to prepare a written communication for the administrator, she might have to tap the concern of her peers and involve them in presenting the problem for discussion at a staff meeting, etc., etc.

The example can, of course, be extended. Clearly, though, practice in this area, as in others, will call out cognitive, analytic, decision making, communication and relationship skills. The purpose of this course, then, is to contribute to students' knowledge, skill and self-awareness to enhance their ability to:

1. assess the utility of the service delivery system in which they operate to the intended beneficiaries
2. locate generalizable issues of service delivery utility from specific case situations
3. identify the origins of practices of problemmatic utility, the theoretical and value positions which support them, and the organizational supports for their retention
4. identify the theoretical and value positions for alternative practices, and the resources for making alterations
5. select and utilize differential strategies for effecting organizational change
6. respond purposefully to changes initiated by others

7. differentiate problems and processes for intra-organizational change activities from those for extra-organizational activities

In addition to the cognitive, analytic and decision making skills derived from the orienting knowledge, the course will also examine such specific interventive skills as:

-demonstrating and communicating case competence, establishing functional legitimacy and service identification
-utilizing appropriate channels of communication and feedback mechanisms for information gathering and dissemination
-illuminating issues in problems, generalizing from the particular; partializing from the universal
-identifying and engaging differentially, significant others
-tapping the stake of others
-contributing to the development of cohorts
-mobilizing forces of mutual aid
-creating agendas
-developing proposals
-converting deficits into creative opportunities
-collaborating with other - lending support, reinforcement
-shifting roles through different time phases.

APPENDIX 2

THE ROLE OF THE DIRECT SERVICE SOCIAL WORKER IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE 64026

Prof. M. Olson
Spring 1975

This course seeks to examine an operational guide to one aspect of the social change function of social workers - organizational change. It operates from the assumption that social agencies are, for persons in need of their services, part of their situation. Social workers, therefore, must include the social agency service delivery system in their assessments of the person(s)-in-situation and must include actions to affect that system in their repertoire of interventions. It also assumes that social agencies, like all institutions, are dynamic social systems and that change in them can affect and be affected by staff at every level. Therefore understanding of the agency system can aid social workers in making purposeful use of themselves as participants in the change processes to enhance service delivery to clients.

The purpose of this course is to contribute students' knowledge and skill for practice in effecting positive organizational change.

Orienting knowledge will be drawn from social change, organization, group, role, communication and personality theories. Practice principles based on professional and role responsibilities, and on tasks related to role and setting differentials, as well as skills necessary for task performance, will be explored.

Students will be responsible for maintaining a log of their activities related to participation in organizational change efforts and for presenting illustrations of their activity for class discussion.

COURSE OUTLINE

I. Introduction and Overview

Social Work and Social Change--historic and value context.

II. Identification of the Unit of Attention--the person(s)-in-situation problem, the generalizable situational problem.

III. Assessment
  A. Data Collection and Analysis
    Dynamics of Organizations--goals, functions, structures.
    Professionals in Organizations
    Contextual Differentials--social work, interdisciplinary, "host" settings
    Dynamics of Behavior in Organizations--role and task performance, group dynamics
  B. Assessment--resources and resistance to change.
  C. Target Selection
    Structural determinants
    Time phase determinants

IV. Planning
  A. Action System Selection
    Differential roles of clients, peers supervisors, administrators, boards.
  B. Strategy Selection
    Influence Systems--exchange, authority-compliance.
    Use of Existing Influence Systems
    Creation of New Systems
  C. Use of Self
    Role Differentials--initiator, information resource, supporter, "witness," task manager, relationship manager, educator.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Introduction and Background

Applebaum, Richard, Theories of Social Change Chicago: Markham Pub. 1970.

Chambers, Clarke, "Social Service and Social Reform: A Historical Essay" Social Service Review, 36, March, 1963, pp. 76-90.

Danstedt, Rudolph, "Political Action Versus Individualized Treatment in Social Welfare Work," Current Issues in Social Work Seen in Historical Perspective N.Y.: Council on Social Work Education, 1962, pp. 45-50.

NASW, Code of Ethics

Lewis, Harold, "Morality and the Politics of Practice," Social Casework, July 1972, v. 53, No. 7, pp. 404-417.

Morris, Robert and Binstock, Alfred, Feasible Planning for Social Change N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1967.

Reissman, Frank and Miller, S.M., "Social Change Versus the Psychiatric World View," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 34 January, 1964, pp. 29-38.

Wineman, David and Adrienne, James, "The Advocacy Challenge to Schools of Social Work," Social Work, 14, April, 1969, pp. 23-32.

Etzioni, Amitai, "Toward a Theory of Guided Societal Change," Social Casework, 49, June, 1968, pp. 335-338.

II. The "Unit of Attention"

Foster, Zelda Leader, "How Social Work Can Influence Hospital Management of Fatal Illness," Social Work, V. 10, No. 4, October, 1965.

Pincus, Alan and Minihan, Anne, "Toward a Model for Teaching a Basic First Year Course in Methods of Social Work Practice," Innovations in Teaching Social Work Practice, Ed. Ripple, Lillian, N.Y.: Council on Social Work Education, 1969.

Schwartz, William "Private Troubles and Public Issues: One Job or Two?", Social Welfare Forum, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1970.

Stanton, Alfred and Schwartz, Morris, The Mental Hospital N.Y.: Basic Books, 1954.

Weiner, Human, "The Hospital, the Ward and the Patients as Clients: Use of the Group Method," Social Work, V. 4, No. 4, October, 1959, pp. 57-64.

Weissman, Harold, Overcoming Mismanagement in the Human Service Professions San Francisco, Calif.: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

III. Theoretical Guides to Data Collection and Analysis

Bavelas, Alex, "Leadership: Man and Function," Administrative Science Quarterly 4, 1960, pp. 491-498.

Bennis, Warren, Benne, Kenneth and Chin, Robert, The Planning of Change N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962, 2nd edition, 1969.

Blau, Peter, Exchange and Power in Social Life, N.Y. John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Blau, Peter and Scott, Richard, Formal Organizations, San Francisco, Chandler, 1962.

Bucher, Rue and Stelling, Joan, "Characteristics of Professional Organizations," Journal of Health and Social Behavior March, 1969.

Etzioni, Amitai, Modern Organizations, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.

Freidson, Eliot, "Dominant Professions, Bureaucracy, and Client Services," Rosengren, William and Lefton, Mark, eds., Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1971, pp. 71-92.

Goffman, Erving, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.

Goffman, Erving, Asylums, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961.

Gouldner, Alvin, "The Secrets of Oranizations," Readings in Community Organization Practice, Ed. Kramer, Ralph and Specht, Harry Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969.

Homans, George, The Human Group, N.Y.: Harcourt-Brace and Co., 1950.

Homans, George, "Social Behavior as Exchange," American Journal of Sociology, May, 1958, pp. 597-606.

Horowitz, Irving Louis, "Consensus, Conflict and Cooperation: A Sociological Inventory," Social Forces, 41, December, 1962.

Hume, P.B. and Bondurant, J.V., "The Significance of the Unasked Question in the Study of Conflict," Inquiry, 7, 1964.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert, The Social Psychology of Organizations N.Y.: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Kramer, Ralph, "Ideology, Status and Power in Board-Executive Relationships," Readings in Community Organization Practice Ed. Kramer, Ralph and Specht, Harry, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1969.

Leibinger, Otto and Sullivan, Albert, Information, Influence and Communication N.Y.: Basic Books, 1965.

Moore, W. E. and Tumin, M. M., "Some Social Functions of Ignorance," American Sociological Review, 14, 1949, pp. 787-795.

Olson, Miriam Meltzer, "The Role of Women: Implications For Social Work," Paper presented, Annual Program Meeting, CSWE, 1973 (Mimeo).

Parsons, Talcott, "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization," Administrative Science Quarterly 1, 1956, pp. 63-86.

Smelser, Neil, Theory of Collective Behavior, N.Y.: The Free Press, 1963.

Thompson, J.D. and Tuden, A., "Strategies, Structures and Processes of Organizational Decisions," Comparative Studies in Administration, Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, Ed. Thompson, J.D. et al.

Watson, Goodwin, "Resistance to Change," American Behavioral Scientist 14, May-June, 1971, pp. 745-766.

Watzlawick, Paul, Beavin, Janet Helmick and Jackson, Don, Pragmatics of Human Communication, N.Y.: W. W. Norton and Co. , 1967.

IV. Guides to Action.

Brager, George, "Institutional Change: Perimeters of the Possible," Social Work, Vol. 12, No. 1, January, 1967, pp. 59-69.

Brager, George, "Advocacy and Political Behavior," Social Work, Vol. 13, No. 2, April, 1968, pp. 5-15.

Brager, George and Jorrin, Valerie, "Bargaining and Community Change," Social Work, 14, October, 1969, pp. 73-83.

Family Service Society of America, "Family Advocacy Program: A Working Paper," N.Y.: FSAA, 1969.

Frey, Louise, Use of Groups in the Health Field, N.Y.: N.A.S.W., 1966.

Hayes, Ronald, "Social Action in Catholic Charities," Catholic Charities Review, 51, September, 1967, pp. 16-22.

Mechanic, David, "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly 7 (December, 1962), 349-364.

N.A.S.W., Ad Hoc Committee on Advocacy, "The Social Worker as Advocate," Social Work, 14, April, 1969, pp. 16-22.

Patti, Rino and Resnick, Herman, "Changing the Agency from Within," Social Work, Vol. 17, No. 4, July, 1972, pp. 48-57.

Rothman, Jack, "Three Models of Community Organization," Strategies of Community Organization, Ed. Cox, Fred et. al., Itasca, Ill.: P.E. Peacock Publishers, 1970, pp. 350-358.

Schatz, Harry, Social Work Administration, N.Y.: C.S.W.E., 1970.

Schneiderman, Leonard, "A Social Action Model for The Social Work Practitioner," Social Casework, 46, October, 1965, pp. 490-493.

Thursz, Daniel, "The Arsenal of Social Action Strategies: Options for Social Workers," Social Work, 16, January, 1971, pp. 27-34.

Wax, John, "Power Theory and Institutional Change," Social Service Review, 45, September, 1971, pp. 274-288.

Weiner, Hyman, "Social Change and Social Group Work Practice," _Social Work_, Vol. 9, No. 3, July, 1964, pp. 106-112.

Zimbardo, Philip and Ebbeson, Ebbe, _Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior_, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

APPENDIX 4

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS TO THE BEST OF YOUR ABILITY. IF YOU CANNOT ANSWER A QUESTION, LEAVE IT BLANK. IF YOU DO NOT UNDERSTAND A QUESTION, PLEASE SAY SO, AND IF POSSIBLE, EXPLAIN WHY.

1. Agencies are organized to meet various goals. These include:

2. Sources of strain for professionals in organizations include:

3. Processes by which social change may be brought about include:

4. Justification for direct service practitioners to engage in organizational change activities derives from:

5. A direct service practitioner seeking to effect organizational change should be especially expert in:

6. "Exception to the rule" tactics are useful for:

7. Administrators and supervisors are most likely to respond favorably to a change effort initiated by a worker if:

8. Staff are most likely to implement an organizational change if:

9. Organizational changes proceed through different time phases. These phases include:

10. It is usually easier to change rules than policies in an agency because:

11. An intra-organizational analysis should take into account the operation of various systems. These include:

12. Persons who are particularly important potential resources to workers seeking to effect organizational change include:

13. Workers with solid data about an agency problem will be in an advantageous position to effect some action if they have demonstrated:

14. The involvement of consumers in a change effort has particular advantage for dealing with certain organizational problems. These problems include:

15. In "host" settings (hospital, school) social workers can use certain measures for effecting change which workers in a social work agency are less likely to be able to use. These include:

16. Guides to the activity of social agency staff which may be targets of organizational change include:

17. Direct service workers trying to effect organizational change are faced with particular limitations. These include:

18. Workers seeking to generate support among fellow staff for a change effort should begin with:

19. Efforts to affect the behavior of an administrator should be guided by understanding of the administrators:

20. What dynamics of organizational life are most likely to account for a child welfare agency placing its primary emphasis on providing services to foster parents?

APPENDIX 5

Guide to Scoring the Knowledge Test

The Knowledge Test is used to determine students' familiarity with particular constructs used in the course.

Responses to items on the Knowledge Test are scored 0 or 1 for the absence or presence of indications of familiarity with the construct.

The following are the content areas to be included in the responses to the Knowledge Test items for a score of 1 to be assigned to a response.

1. content about both outcome goals and system maintenance goals.
2. content about the conflict between professional autonomy and organizational accountability needs.
3. content about incremental-fundamental and/or evolutionary-revolutionary social change.
4. content about the role and/or function of the direct service practitioner.
5. content about need identification and/or problem assessment.
6. content about setting precedents.
7. content about tapping the stake and/or appealing to role expectations.
8. content about participation in decision making and/or planning.
9. content about initiation, implementation and institutionalization (Institutionalization is the key element, and must be included for response to be scored 1).

10. content about rules having less likelihood of being attached to values.

11. content about formal and informal systems and/or communications, decision making, authority and rewards (at least two of the latter group must be included for a response to be scored 1).

12. content about peers.

13. content about competence in direct service with clients and/or identification with service.

14. content about problems located in the agency's relationship with the environment.

15. content about refusal to participate and/or withholding of service.

16. content about policy, procedure, professional practice and/or program (at least two must be included for response to be scored 1).

17. content about lack of power in role over outcomes.

18. content about group leaders and/or staff who share concern.

19. content about organizational role.

20. content about goal displacement.

APPENDIX 6

PLEASE READ THE PRACTICE VIGNETTES WHICH FOLLOW, AND RESPOND TO EACH ONE AS IF YOU WERE THE WORKER IN THE SITUATION, AND IDENTIFY:

1: The issue involved.
2: The practice principles (directives to action) you would select as having relevance to the situation.
3: The knowledge about people, organizations, the profession, yourself, etc., which you would draw on to understand and deal with the situation.
4: The professional values your actions would affirm.

Explanation:

1. Each vignette assumes there is some problem in service delivery. It is defined as a problem because it is a specific instance or manifestation of a more general social welfare concern. The issue is a statement of the problem related to the general concern. For example, a cardiac clinic patient may be rushed through his examinations so that he doesn't get to ask the doctor any questions. The patient has a great deal of anxiety about his heart condition. The problem may involve appointment scheduling, insufficient personnel, lack of awareness on the doctors' part of the patient's concern about his condition, etc. The issue might be identified as follows: The clinic structure does not provide for meeting the need and the right of patients to have information which would enhance their ability to cope with their situation.

2: A practice principle, or directive to action, is an informed statement which implies intention. It guides a worker in determing what to do as a professional in a service situation, i.e. what behaviors to employ, with whom, to what end, etc. The following are examples of practice principles which a worker might (or might not) select as relevant to the situation described above:

-- the worker should try to enhance the clients ability to communicate with the doctors,

-- the worker should reach out informally to all clinic personnel to elicit their views of the problem,

-- the worker should use his/her relationship with the doctors to educate them to the psycho-social needs of patients,

-- the worker should formally communicate the service problem to the chief of the service,

-- the worker should develop an alternate schedule arrangement to propose at a staff meeting, etc.

In answering this questions, please be as specific as possible about the principles you would select at different steps along the way to effecting a change.

3: Knowledge derives from theory, i.e. personality theory, role theory, communication theory, etc., and informs a worker's judgments. Again using the above illustration, a worker might draw on such knowledge as:

-- anxiety can interfere with people's ability to make rational choices and decisions, and information can reduce anxiety,

- -- patients and doctors, both, often do not recognize the patient's right to have information,
- -- clinics are often organized to meet the needs of staff and not of patients,
- -- clinics allow doctors a great deal of autonomy, etc.

4: The choice of action a worker makes implies certain value orientations. In the above example the worker might be influenced by such values as:

- -- the right of a client to be treated with respect for his worth,
- -- the importance of treating the "whole person," etc.

NOTE: The examples used throughout the explanation are not necessarily "correct" answers. They are offered for illustrative purposes only.

I. You are a worker in a voluntary, non-sectarian hospital which serves a complete cross-section of the population of New York--old, young, very rich, very poor, etc. A patient with whom you are working is eligible for Medicaid, and you ask the doctor to fill in and sign the necessary forms. He says he doesn't believe in Welfare, and walks away.

II. You are a worker in a Federally funded community mental health center where it has been recognized that one particular ethnic group in the catchment area is not making use of the agency's services. You are assigned to 1) survey the population to identify the attitudes towards mental health and illness which are contributing to the residents' not using the center, and 2) form a group of leaders of that ethnic group who could educate and influence the others to avail themselves of the agency's services. In your survey you find people have concerns about "mental health" problems, i.e. a depressed relative, a child who doesn't get along well at school, etc. You also find that some people had come to the center and were turned off by actions of clerical and professional staff which violated their cultural norms and values. There was also indication that because this group observed the Sabbath on Saturday, the time available for them to use the agency was very limited.

III. You are a worker in a child welfare agency under sectarian auspices with a service contract with the city. You are working with Ms. Bowen towards the return of her 8 year old son who is in foster care. You and Ms. Bowen have been working very effectively together. Visits between Ms. Bowen and Freddie go very well and both mother and child are looking forward to reuniting. The plan is for Freddie to be returned after May 1, when an apartment Ms. Bowen has located will become available. Ms. Bowen now resides with her parents with whom she has come to enjoy a comfortable, mutually satisfying relationship. Ms. Bowen would like to have Freddie spend Easter weekend with her. Her parents also would like him to spend the weekend. Agency policy does not allow for pre-return visits unless the mother is residing in the home to which the child will be returned.

IV. You are a worker in a family service agency in a community with very few service resources. You are assigned to pick up on persons on the waiting list. You find that only one of the first ten persons you call is interested in an appointment. All of the others report that since their initial contact with the agency, six to eight months ago, the situation which prompted the contact has passed, or they have decided to try to make do on their own, or they searched around and found some other source of help. In all of the conversations you sense feelings of animosity towards the agency.

V. You are a worker in a city department of probation and parole. You are working with a group of adolescents on probation to help them understand and deal with some of the circumstances related to their getting into trouble with the law.

At almost every meeting you arrive to find someone you didn't except in the group, who says, "my probation officer told me I had to come here."

APPENDIX 7

Guide to Scoring Vignettes Test

The Vignettes Test was designed to elicit information about the respondents' application of principles of organizational change practice to problemmatic service delivery situations.

Responses are scored on ten dimensions of practice which reflect the particular conception of the helping process to which students were introduced through the course.

Six of the dimensions deal with elements of the helping process generic to practice, and specific to organizational change practice. These, the first six dimensions, are scored as follows:

0--if there is no evidence of attention to the particular element in the process
1--if there is evidence of attention to the element of a generic or general nature
2--if there is evidence of attention to the element with reference to the specifics of organizational change.

The remaining four dimensions deal with the underlying conception of the helping process. These dimensions are scored as follows:

0--if there is no evidence of consideration of the element
1--if there is evidence that the element is taken into consideration.

In scoring, the value assigned to each item is taken from evidence appearing anywhere in the response. Thus, a response giving evidence of a value affirmation receives a score of 1 on the appropriate item even if the affirmation is presented as orienting knowledge.

The elements, the practice principles they concern, and the indicators used for scoring are:

Item 1: Identification of the unit of attention (locating the generalizable situational problem)

The principle underlying this item is that workers should attend not just to what is unique in the client(s)-situation, but to what organizational problem situation is generalizable to other client-situations.

Indication of generalization from the particular reflective of generic application is located in responses which give evidence of attention to the effects of the problem situation on clients in like circumstances in the individual (or group of individuals) whose situation is presented in the Vignette.

Specific application is indicated in responses which not only generalize from a case to a class of clients, but from the particular situational problem to the general situational problem

Generic Application examples:

V I--all patients potentially disadvantaged
V II--all unreached populations
V III--all families potentially disadvantaged
V IV--all unserved clients
V V--all ill-referred clients

Specific application examples:

V I--all potentials for discretionary abuse of patients rights
V II--all arrangements promoting inaccessibility of service
V III--all policies limiting individualization
V IV--all arrangements limiting availability of service
V V--all potentials for abuse of coordination needs

Item 2: Data Collection (Supporting the Generality)

The principle underlying this item is that workers should seek information to determine the generality of the problem.

Indication of determination of the gnerality reflective of generic application is located in responses which give evidence that information is sought about the scope of the problem. For example, the response indicates that other workers are surveyed to determine if they have had experience with the problem situation.

Indication of specific application is located in responses which give evidence not only of a search for information about the scope of the problem, but the range of others' perceptions of the problem as well. For example, the response indicates other staff's opinions about the situation are sought. (Indicators are of the same order for all vignettes).

Items 3, 4, 5 and 6 call for the making of choices in applying generic components of the helping process to the specifics of organizational change practice based on differences reflected in the different vignettes. The bases for the choices derive from particular constructs utilized in the course, as indicated in the following:

Item 3: Data Analysis (identifying the organizational contributor to the problem)

The principle underlying this item is that workers should draw on knowledge of organizational contributors to behavior in order to understand problems in organizations. The Parsonian view of systems tasks was used to orient students to the location of organizational problems. Thus problems in service delivery were viewed as problems in task management within or between the four functional spheres of activity--goal attainment, pattern maintenance, internal integration and interaction with the environment.

Indication of data analysis reflective of specific application is found in responses which give evidence of the particular organizational problem reflected in each vignette.

V I--conflict between integration and pattern maintenance functions reflected in the inappropriate exercise of autonomy by physicians and the need for a system of accountability.

V II--pattern maintenance (norms of professional and staff behavior) and internal integration (time and place of service delivery) displacing goal attainment function.

V III--conflict within internal integration function reflected in system of accountability limiting the exercise of appropriate professional autonomy.

V IV--pattern maintenance/integration and/or relationship to environment displacing goal attainment.

V V--conflict within internal integration reflected in absence of structure for necessary communication.

Indication of data analysis reflective of generic application is found in responses which give evidence of consideration of some organizational contributor to the situational problem. For example, in V I, a response lacking consideration of the accountability-autonomy conflict, but including a consideration of the absence of some systematic measure for assuring patients' entitlements, and not attributing the problem to the attitude, behavior, idiocyncracies, etc. of individual doctors, would reflect generic application.

Item 4: Target Selection (seeking to effect structural change)

The principle underlying this item is that workers should seek to effect change in the structures of an organization in order to deal with impediments to service delivery.

The guide that was used here was that to effect change in the organizational impact on service delivery requires change in a) policy, i.e. formal guides to task management, b) procedure, i.e. rules, regulations and norms which influence task management, c) practice, i.e. professional influences on task management, or d) program, i.e. a combination of two or more of the preceeding.

Indication of target selection reflective of specific application is found in responses which give evidence of selection of the target relevant to the particular situation reflected in a given vignette.

Specific application examples:

V I--procedure-to assure accountability

V II--program-for altering both procedural and practice responses to clients

V III--policy-to maximize capability for individualization

V IV --program-to alter policy, procedure and/or practice for meeting unmet service needs

V V--procedure-to assure an appropriate system of referral.

Indication of generic application is found in responses which give evidence of consideration of some organizational target. For example, in V III a response lacking consideration of policy change to maximize individualization, but seeking an alteration of criteria for home visits, and not seeking only an exception for the particular client, would reflect generic application.

Item 5: Strategy Selection (making selective use of influence systems)

The principle underlying this item is that workers should pursue organizational change activities through the selective use of influence systems.

The major consideration underlying strategy selection was that change is based on exchange, and that the tokens of exchange fall into three essential categories--the coercive, (physical sanctions, threats, deprivations), the utilitarian (material resources, tangible and in-kind rewards such as salary and fringe-benefits) and the normative (symbolic rewards and sanctions such as esteem, prestige and acceptance). The view was also taken that generally, the source of influence most available to direct service practitioners is normative. That is, they can contribute to the satisfaction of the need of others for prestige, liking, etc. through appeals to professional values and norms, to expected role behaviors and to personal norms and values. Coercive influence, generally the least used, is available through striking, sitting-in, physically restraining or otherwise doing harm to others.

Utilitarian influence exists in such activities as publicity which would generate or threaten financial or other material support, and in the performance of tasks which would reduce the work load or otherwise improve the working conditions of others, and in the provision or withholding of information needed by others.

Indication of specific application of the selective use of influence is found in responses which give evidence of drawing on sources of influence available to the worker and involving others with other sources of influence needed in the particular situation.

Specific application examples:

- V I--appeals to role responsibility of hospital administrators with sources of utilitarian influence on physicians
- V II--appeals to role responsibility of administrators with utilitarian influence on working conditions (e.g. hours) and appeals to professionals' and other staff's values and norms.
- V III--appeals to professional values and norms of social work administrators
- V IV--appeals to role responsibility of administrator for generating and/or maintaining community support, and appeals to professional norms and values of social work staff
- V V--provides for performance of tasks to reduce burden of work on referrers and/or provides for satisfaction of need of probation officers for respect in decision making.

Indication of generic application of strategy selection is found in responses which give evidence of some consideration of the use of influence. For example, in V II, a response not giving evidence of the use of both utilitarian and normative influence, but calling for the use of community experts to educate the staff to the mores of the unserved population, and not expecting that identifying the problem, and/or proposing that staff be more sensitive and available would produce change, would reflect generic application.

Item 6: Action selection (selectively involving others)

The principle underlying this item is that in attempting to take action to deal with an organizational problem, workers should selectively involve others.

The guide used to the involvement of others was that based on the position of the direct service practitioner in an organization, and the exchange process involved in effecting change, three categories of actors needed to be considered--a) those with knowledge of the problem, b) those with power to act on the target, and c) those with responsibility for implementation of a change.

Indication of specific application of action selection is found in responses which give evidence of involvement of others essential to the circumstances reflected in each vignette.

Specific application examples:

V I--peers and administrators
V II--professional and clerical staff and administrator
V III--peers, supervisor and administrators
V IV--peers and administrator
V V--social workers and probation officers.

The final four dimensions, which deal with the underlying conceptual orientation to practice, are scored 0 or 1, for absence or presence of indicators of the item.

Item 7: Role Relatedness (demonstrating experise in direct service practice)

The conceptual orientation here is that it is out of the practitioner's role responsibility for understanding and acting to meet clients' needs that organizational change activities are generated, and that therefore workers should demonstrate their competence in need assessment and professional activities response to those needs.

Indicators of demonstrated role relatedness are found in responses which include recognition of factors such as the following:

V I--that patient recovery and physical well-being are affected by economic, psychologic and social factors
V II--that minimal conditions of trust are required for clients to enter into service relationships, and violation of cultural norms, which show a lack of respect for the individual, prevent the establishment of trust.

V III--that provision of services to individuals requires individualization of response
V IV--that requests for service often reflect crisis situations, and that persons in crises are most likely to benefit from help provided during the first six weeks
V V--that coercion and lack of preparation militate against the use of any social work service, and unplanned, unstructured entry in groups militates against effectuve use of group service.

Item 8: Process Orientation (proceeding from need)

The conceptual orientation here is that direct service worker actions to effect organizational, as any other, change, proceed from the problem identified, not from specified outcomes or "solutions".

Indicators of a process orientation are of the same order for all vignettes, and are found in responses which reflect that actions are directed by the identified need, and not by a predetermined solution.

Item 9: Empathy (appreciating the "other side")

The conceptual orientation here is that there is a basis for and/or benefit derived from maintenance of the status quo, and that workers should have an appreciation of the stake held in the status quo to gauge the effects of change efforts.

Indicators of empathy are found in responses such as the following:

V I --doctors have been professionally socialized for highly autonomous activity
V II--Staff have personal needs which may make weekend or evening work undesirable or difficult;
professionals often have deep value commitments to their own ways of practicing
V III--administrators require mechanisms to assure some standard of uniformity of performance;
legal guardianship of children requires stringency in the protection of their interests

V IV--increasing services often creates increased demand for service which communities are hard pressed to meet

V V--staff often have procedures imposed on them with little regard for the effect they will have.

Item 10: Promotion of Social Good (affirming the values of justice and equity)

The conceptual orientation here is that workers, in their practice, should go beyond the affirmation of the values pertaining to the dignity and worth of the individual, and act to affirm values contributing to the social good through the promotion of justice and equity.

Indicators of promotion of the social good are of the same order for all vignettes, and are found in responses which reflect consideration of entitlement, equalization of advantage, extension of opportunity, and empowerment.

APPENDIX 8

THE ROLE OF THE DIRECT SERVICE SOCIAL WORKER IN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE - 64026

Prof. M. Olson
Spring, 1975

AGE __________ SEX __________ MARITAL STATUS __________

NO. OF CHILDREN __________ RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION _______

ETHNIC IDENTIFICATION __________

DATE OF COLLEGE GRADUATION __________
NO. OF YEARS OF PRE-PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE __________
TYPE OF PRE-PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (METHOD AND SETTING)

EXTRA-PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE (ORGANIZATIONAL, VOLUNTEER, ETC.)

FIRST YEAR FIELD PLACEMENT (AGENCY AND TYPE OF ACTIVITY)

SECOND YEAR FIELD PLACEMENT (AGENCY AND TYPE OF ACTIVITY)

APPENDIX 9

VALUE SURVEY
N = 19

TERMINAL VALUES	PRE-TEST		POSTTEST	
A comfortable life	14.250	(16)	14.333	(15)
An exciting life	12.625	(13)	12.750	(14)
A sense of accomplishment	7.625	(6)	8.500	(9)
A world at peace	9.750	(11)	11.667	(12)
A world of beauty	14.125	(14)	11.650	(11)
Equality	8.000	(8)	8.250	(8)
Family Security	8.500	(9)	10.000	(10)
Freedom	4.000	(3)	4.750	(4)
Happiness	9.000	(10)	7.000	(6)
Inner harmony	2.750	(2)	3.875	(2)
Mature love	5.550	(4)	4.400	(3)
National security	16.583	(17)	16.688	(17)
Pleasure	14.200	(15)	14.375	(16)
Salvation	17.550	(18)	17.636	(18)
Self-respect	2.417	(1)	2.429	(1)
Social recognition	12.250	(12)	11.750	(13)
True friendship	5.667	(5)	6.333	(5)
Wisdom	7.750	(7)	7.000	(7)

Figures are for median scores--figures in parentheses are for cumulative ranks.

VALUE SURVEY
N = 19

INSTRUMENTAL VALUES	PRE-TEST		POSTTEST	
1. Ambitious	12.333	(14)	12.250	(13)
2. Broadminded	4.667	(3)	4.500	(3)
3. Capable	6.333	(7)	8.000	(8)
4. Cheerful	10.200	(11)	11.500	(12)
5. Clean	15.625	(16)	16.000	(16)
6. Courageous	6.125	(5)	6.125	(5)
7. Forgiving	11.000	(12)	10.250	(11)
8. Helpful	7.000	(9)	6.250	(6)
9. Honest	2.667	(2)	1.450	(1)
10. Imaginative	9.750	(10)	9.333	(9)
11. Independent	6.875	(8)	5.625	(4)
12. Intellectual	6.250	(6)	9.667	(10)
13. Logical	12.000	(13)	13.000	(14)
14. Loving	2.286	(1)	4.250	(2)
15. Obedient	17.000	(18)	16.750	(18)
16. Polite	14.915	(15)	15.000	(15)
17. Responsible	6.000	(4)	6.625	(7)
18. Self-controlled	16.125	(17)	16.625	(17)

Figures are for median scores--figures in parentheses are for cumulative ranks.

APPENDIX 10

KNOWLEDGE TEST ITEMS-MEAN SCORES

N = 20

ITEM #	PRE-TEST	POSTTEST
1	.400	.900
2	.200	.500
3	.350	.400
4	.600	.900
5	.350	.400
6	.100	.000
7	.500	.450
8	.250	.400
9	.100	.450
10	.250	.300
11	.200	.600
12	.450	.750
13	.500	.750
14	.000	.000
15	.050	.000
16	.350	.350
17	.500	.450
18	.550	.700
19	.700	.700
20	.150	.900

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Applebaum, Richard. Theories of Social Change. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Bartlett, Harriett M. "Toward Clarification and Improvement of Social Work Practice." Social Work 3 (April 1958): 3-8.

Bavelas, Alex. "Leadership: Man and Function." Administrative Science Quarterly 4 (1960): 491-498.

Bennis, Warren; Benne, Kenneth; and Chin, Robert. The Planning of Change. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

Benson, J. Kenneth. "The Analysis of Bureaucratic-Professional Conflict: Functional Versus Dialectical Approaches." The Sociological Quarterly 14 (Summer 1973): 376-394.

Blau, Peter. Exchange and Power in Social Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

__________, and Scott, Richard W. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Brager, George. "Institutional Change: Perimeters of the Possible." Social Work 12 (January 1967): 59-69.

__________. "Advocacy and Political Behavior." Social Work 13 (April 1968): 5-15.

__________, and Jorrin, Valerie. "Bargaining and Community Change." Social Work 14 (October 1969): 73-83.

__________, and Michael, John. "Sex Distribution in Social Work: Causes and Consequences." Social Casework 50 (December 1969): 591-597.

Briar, Scott. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Casework and Social Group Work: Historical and Social Science Foundations."

Bruner, Jerome. On Knowing. New York: Atheneum, 1968.

__________. Toward A Theory of Instruction. New York: W. W. Norton, 1968.

Burns, Eveline. "Tomorrow's Social Needs and Social Work Education." Journal of Education for Social Work (Spring 1966): 10-20.

Chambers, Clarke. "Social Service and Social Reform: A Historical Essay." Social Service Review 36 (March 1963): 76-90.

Coser, Lewis. The Functions of Social Conflicts. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956.

Coyle, Grace. Group Experience and Democratic Values. New York: Woman's Press, 1947.

Dahrendorf, Ralf. "Toward A Theory of Social Conflict." In Social Change, pp. 98-111. Edited by Amitai and Eva Etzioni. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Danstedt, Rudolph. "Political Action Versus Individualized Treatment in Social Welfare Work." Current Issues in Social Work Seen in Historical Perspective. New York: Council on Social Work Education (1962): 35-50.

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education. New York: MacMillan, 1916.

__________. Experience and Education. London: Collier-MacMillan, 1938.

Dover, Frances. Field Instruction in Casework. New York: The Jewish Guild for the Blind, 1962.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Toward a Theory of Guided Societal Change." Social Casework 49 (June 1968): 335-338.

__________. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.

__________. A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1961.

________. "A Basis for Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations." In A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations, pp. 59-76. Edited by Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

________. "Two Approaches to Organizational Analysis: A Critique and A Suggestion." Administrative Science Quarterly 5 (September 1960): 257-278.

Family Service Society of America. "Family Advocacy Program: A Working Paper." New York: Family Service Society of America, 1969.

Fraley, Yvonne. The Role of the Professional Social Work Practitioner in Social Policy Formation. D.S.W. Dissertation University of Pennsylvania, 1966.

Freidson, Eliot. Profession of Medicine. New York: Dodd & Mead, 1970.

________. "Dominant Professions, Bureaucracy, and Client Services." In Organizations and Clients: Essays in the Sociology of Service, pp. 71-92. Edited by William R. Rosengren and Mark Lefton. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1970.

Frey, Louise. Use of Groups in the Health Field. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1966.

________, Shatz, Eunice; and Katz, Edna-Ann. "Continuing Education-Teaching Staff to Teach." Social Casework 55 (June 1974): 360-368.

Foster, Zelda Leader. "How Social Work Can Influence Hospital Management of Fatal Illness." Social Work 10 (October 1965): 30-45.

Games, Paul A. and Klare, George R. Elementary Statistics Data Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.

Garvin, Charles and Glasser, Paul. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Group Work: The Preventive and Rehabilitative Approach."

Geisman, Ludwig. "Thirteen Evaluation Studies." In Evaluation of Social Intervention, pp. 15-38. Edited by Edward J. Mullen, James R. Dumpson and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1972.

Gilbert, Neil and Specht, Harry. "The Incomplete Profession." Social Work 19 (November 1974): 665-674.

Goffman, Erving. Asylums. Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1961.

Goran, Michael J; Williamson, John W.; and Gonnells, Joseph S. "The Validity of Patient Management Problems." Journal of Medical Education 48 (February 1973): 171-177.

Gordon, William. "Basic Constructs for an Integrative and Generative Conception of Social Work." In The General Systems Approach: Contributions Towards an Holistic Conception of Social Work, pp. 5-11. Edited by Gordon Hearn. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1969.

__________. "A Critique of the Working Definition." Social Work 7 (October 1962): 3-13.

Gouldner, Alvin. The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Avon, 1970.

__________. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles." Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (December 1957): 281-306, 444-480.

__________. "The Secrets of Organizations." In Social Welfare Forum 1963, pp. 161-177. New York: Columbia University, 1963.

__________. "Organizational Analysis." In Sociology Today: Problems and Prospects, pp. 405-406. Edited by Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Hartman, Ann. Casework in Crisis 1932-1941. D.S.W. Dissertation Columbia University, 1972.

Hayes, Ronald. "Social Action in Catholic Charities." Catholic Charities Review 51 (September 1967): 16-22.

Hollis, Florence. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Casework: The Psychosocial Approach."

Homans, George. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1950.

__________. "Social Behavior as Exchange." American Journal of Psychology 64 (May 1958): 597-606.

Horowitz, Irving L. "Consensus, Conflict and Cooperation: A Sociological Inventory." Social Forces 41 (December 1962): 177-188.

Janchill, Sister Mary Paul. "Systems Concepts in Casework Theory and Practice." Social Casework 50 (February 1969): 74-82.

Kahn, Alfred J. Theory and Practice of Social Planning. New York: Russell Sage, 1969.

Katz, Daniel and Kahn, Robert. The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Knowles, Louis and Prewitt, Kenneth, Eds. Institutional Racism in America. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Knowles, Malcolm. "Innovations in Teaching Styles and Approaches Based Upon Adult Learning." Journal of Education in Social Work 8 (Spring 1972): 32-39.

Kramer, Ralph. "Ideology, Status and Power in Board-Executive Relationships." Social Work 10 (October 1965): 107-114.

Laing, Ronald D. and Esterson, Aaron. Sanity, Madness and the Family. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

La Piere, Richard T. "Attitudes vs. Actions." In Stages of Social Research Contemporary Perspectives. Edited by Dennis P. Forcese and Stephen Richer. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Lee, Porter R. Social Work: Cause and Function. New York: Columbia University, 1937.

Leiblinger, Otto and Sullivan, Albert. Information, Influence and Communication. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Lewis, Harold. "Morality and the Politics of Practice." Casework (July 1972): 404-417.

Lide, Pauline. "Dynamic Mental Representation: An Analysis of the Empathic Process." Social Casework 47 (March 1966): 146-151.

Lindblom, Charles E. "The Science of 'Muddling Through'." Public Administration Review 19 (Spring, 1959): 79-88.

Lippett, Ronald; Watson, Jeanne; and Westley, Bruce. The Dynamics of Planned Change. New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1958.

Litwak, Eugene. "Models of Bureaucracy Which Permit Conflict." American Journal of Sociology 67 (September 1961): 177-184.

Marris, Peter and Rein, Martin. Dilemmas of Social Reform. New York: Atherton, 1967.

Merton, Robert. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1968.

Meyer, Henry J. and McLeod, Donna L. "A Study of the Values of Social Workers." In Behavioral Science for Social Workers. Edited by Edwin Thomas. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Morris, Robert and Binstock, Alfred. Feasible Planning for Social Change. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.

National Association of Social Workers Ad Hoc Committee on Advocacy. "The Social Worker as Advocate." Social Work 14 (April 1969): 16-22.

Olmstead, Joseph. "Organizational Factors in the Performance of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers." Working Papers No. 1: National Study of Social Welfare and Rehabilitation Workers, Work and Organizational Contexts. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social and Rehabilitation Service, 1971.

Olson, Miriam Meltzer. "The Role of Women: Implications for Social Work." Paper presented at the Annual Program Meeting, Council on Social Work Education. San Francisco, February, 1973.

Pappell, Catherine and Rothman, Beulah. "Social Group Work Models: Possession and Heritage." Journal of Education for Social Work 2 (Fall 1966): 66-77.

Parsons, Talcott. "A Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organization." Administrative Science Quarterly 1 (1956): 63-86.

________. The Social System. New York: Free Press, 1951.

________. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. New York: Free Press, 1960.

Patti, Rino and Resnick, Herman. "Changing the Agency from Within." Social Work 17 (July 1972): 48-57.

Perlman, Helen Harris. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Casework: The Problem Solving Approach."

________. "The Charge to the Casework Sequence." Social Work 9 (July 1964): 47-55.

Pincus, Allen and Minahan, Anne. "Toward a Model for Teaching a Basic First Year Course in Methods of Social Work Practice." In Innovations in Teaching Social Work Practice, pp. 34-57. Edited by Lillian Ripple. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970.

Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1972.

Reichert, Kurt. "Current Developments and Trends in Social Work Education in the U.S." Journal of Education for Social Work 6 (Fall 1970) : 39-50.

Reissman, Frank and Miller, S.M. "Social Change Versus the Psychiatric World View." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 34 (January 1964): 29-38.

Richan, Willard. "The Social Work Profession and Organized Social Welfare." In Shaping the New Social Work, pp. 147-168. Edited by Alfred J. Kahn. New York: Columbia University, 1973.

Reynolds, Bertha C. Learning and Teaching in the Practice of Social Work. New York: Rinehart, 1942.

Rokeach, Milton. The Nature of Human Values. New York: The Free Press, 1973.

Rosenblatt, Aaron; Welter, Marianne; and Wojciechowski, Sophie. The Adelphi Experiment: Accelerating Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1976.

Rothman, Jack. "Three Models of Community Organization." In Strategies of Community Organization, pp. 350-358. Edited by Fred Cox, John·Erlich, Jack Rothman, and John Tropman. Itasca, Ill.: F. E. Peacock, 1970.

Schatz, Harry. Social Work Administration. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970.

Schmidt, Julianna T. "The Use of Purpose in Casework Practice." Social Work 14 (January 1969): 77-84.

Schneiderman, Leonard. "A Social Action Model for the Social Work Practitioner." Social Casework 46 (October 1965): 490-493.

Schorr, Alvin and Baumheier, Edward. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Policy."

Schwartz, William. "Private Troubles and Public Issues: One Job or Two?" In Social Welfare Forum, pp. 146-171. New York: Columbia University Press, 1970.

_________. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Groupwork: The Interactionist Approach."

_________. "Group Work and the Social Scene." In Issues in American Social Work, pp. 110-137. Edited by Kahn, Alfred J. New York: Columbia University, 1959.

Sellitz, Clair; Jahoda, Marie; Deutsch, Morton; and Cook, Stuart W. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Sills, David. "The Succession of Goals." In A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations, pp. 175-187. Edited by Amitai Etzioni. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

Simon, Bernice. "Design of Learning Experiences in Field Instruction." Social Service Review 40 (December 1966): 397-409.

Smalley, Ruth. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Casework: The Functional Approach."

Smelser, Neil. Theory of Collective Behavior. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Stanton, Alfred and Schwartz, Morris. The Mental Hospital. New York: Basic Books, 1954.

Szasz, Thomas. The Myth of Mental Illness. New York: Harper and Row, 1961.

Thursz, Daniel. "The Arsenal of Social Action Strategies: Options for Social Workers." Social Work 16 (January 1971): 27-34.

Towle, Charlotte. The Learner in Education for the Professions. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1954.

Tropp, Emanuel. Encyclopedia of Social Work. New York: National Association of Social Workers, 1971. s.v. "Social Group Work: The Developmental Approach."

von Bertalanffy, Ludwig. General System Theory. Hammondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1968.

Warner, Keith and Ravens, Eugene. "Goal Displacement and the Intangibility of Organizational Goals." Administrative Science Quarterly 13 (March 1968): 539-555.

Wasserman, Harry. "The Professional Social Worker in a Bureaucracy." Social Work 16 (January 1971): 89-95.

Watson, Goodwin. "Resistance to Change." American Behavioral Scientist 14 (May-June 1971): 745-766.

Watzlawick, Paul; Beavin, Janet Helmick; and Jackson, Don. Pragmatics of Human Communication. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1967.

Wax, John. "Power Theory and Institutional Change." Social Service Review (September 1971): 274-288.

Weiner, Hyman. "The Hospital, The Ward and The Patients as Clients: Use of the Group Method." Social Work 4 (October 1959): 57-64.

_________. "Social Change and Social Group Work Practice." Social Work 9 (July 1964): 106-112.

Weiss, Carol H. Evaluation Research: Methods of Assessing Program Effectiveness. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Weissman, Harold H. Community Councils and Community Control. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 1970.

__________. Overcoming Mismanagement in the Human Service Professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Wilensky, Harold L. and Lebeaux, Charles N. Industrial Society and Social Welfare. New York: Russell Sage, 1965.

Wineman, David and Adrienne, James. "The Advocacy Challenge to Schools of Social Work." Social Work 14 (April 1969): 23-32.

Zimbardo, Philip and Ebbeson, Ebbe. Influencing Attitudes and Changing Behavior. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.