



The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 5
Issue 4 July

Article 6

July 1978

Two Perspectives on Organizationally-Inspired Barriers to Innovation in Schools of Social Work: Short and Long Term Strategies to Promote National Minority Group Representation

R. Louis McNeely
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

John Oliver
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

 Part of the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

McNeely, R. Louis and Oliver, John (1978) "Two Perspectives on Organizationally-Inspired Barriers to Innovation in Schools of Social Work: Short and Long Term Strategies to Promote National Minority Group Representation," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 4 , Article 6.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol5/iss4/6>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



TWO PERSPECTIVES
ON ORGANIZATIONALLY-INSPIRED BARRIERS
TO INNOVATION IN SCHOOLS OF SOCIAL WORK:
SHORT AND LONG TERM STRATEGIES TO
PROMOTE NATIONAL MINORITY GROUP
REPRESENTATION*

by

R. Louis McNeely

and

John Oliver

School of Social Welfare
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on conditions conceived to militate against innovation and change in organizations adhering to administrative principles found often in many workplaces. While these principles are not peculiar to schools of social work, these schools are singled out along with two related problems identified often by persons employed in these schools as ones for which few effective innovations have been implemented. These problems center upon how these schools may best achieve an adequate representation among faculty members, of minority group staff, and an adequate representation of substantive course offerings focusing upon the experiences of national minority group members. The authors suggest that several administrative principles basic to the organization of most schools of social work preclude the development of an organizational milieu capable of satisfying key work related needs of staff. Elimination of these basic organizing principles results in a more satisfying work setting that promotes quality staff relationships for all staff as well as a setting viewed to enhance the willingness of non-minority faculty to respond positively to the introduction of minority staff and content. Second, the authors propose further that

*This paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper originally presented at the Council on Social Work Education, Phoenix, 1977.

immediate steps requiring little change in the organizing principles of schools may be taken to promote appropriate representation of both minority-related content and minority group staff. This latter strategy amounts to a short-range solution to solve problems associated with minority group representation through the manipulation of rewards viewed as associated with but not fundamentally related to the work satisfaction of social work faculty and staff. In contrast to the former strategy, this second strategy treats the basic organizing principles of these schools as a constant and, while requiring less time for implementation, does not move schools of social work toward humanistic organizational patterns.

Introduction

In recent years, many articles in the literature contained within social welfare journals and other professionally relevant published works have pointed to a fairly widespread and recalcitrant problem that has continued to defy ameliorative intervention attempts. Essentially, this problem involves adequately representing national minorities in staff roles and curricular offerings in schools of social work (Norton, 1970; Robinson, 1970; Turner, 1972; Gary, 1973). Points advanced in this paper suggest that this and other problems will remain largely unabated unless profound changes are made in what are depicted as inequitarian and alienating principles of administrative organization. However, a short-range approach to resolving these problems that requires no fundamental attack on basic administrative principles is included in this paper. We feel that it is likely to be the best alternative in meeting employment and curricular goals if no movement away from inequitarian organizational modes is achieved.

We decided that the best point of departure in examining this recurrent problem should focus on areas identified by working individuals as most germane to their employment satisfaction. These factors that workers themselves list as the important facilitators of individual satisfaction at work are viewed as the bases by which school organizations may dispense rewards serving as incentives for faculty members to: (1) foster their increased receptivity to the introduction and development of new minority-relevant curricular offerings; (2) facilitate their efforts to incorporate minority-relevant materials into existing curricular offerings and; (3) bolster their support of what, for most schools, are sorely needed proportionate increases in the employment of national-minority staff.

To aid our deliberations, we employed Frederick W. Herzberg's

"dual-dimensional hypothesis" of work satisfaction (Herzberg, 1959, 1966). Herzberg has suggested that the needs of workers may be dichotomized in terms of "extrinsic" and "intrinsic" factors. Extrinsic factors refer to attributes of the job such as salary, job security, quality of supervision, and other marginal properties including side payments such as fringe benefits, entitlements, etc. By contrast, the provision of intrinsic factors refers to the fundamental capacity of the work setting to provide the worker with personal esteem through challenging, meaningful, and non-static work.¹ The regulation and dispensation of rewards consistent both with one's extrinsic and intrinsic needs we view as powerful incentives when used to encourage efforts along formerly specified lines.

On first glance, it should be clear that many factors relevant to one's extrinsic needs are those that easily may be regulated by organizational decision-makers. Thus, their provision can be treated as straightforward incentives that serve as rewards to faculty members whose efforts complement that aspect of the school's mission to include minority content and to attract and retain minority faculty. On the other hand, the regulation and dispensation of rewards by organizational decision-makers compatible with meeting the intrinsic needs of individual faculty members obviously is a far more difficult quest since these latter needs cannot be met in the absence of some rather dramatic changes in the way most schools of social work--or any schools within university settings for that matter--are organized.

Our proposition--that changes in the organizing principles of most schools can themselves constitute incentives--is based on the contention that such changes would result in a milieu more favorable to the inclusion of minority content and staff. Actually implementing these might

¹Herzberg's thesis, as employed in this discussion, serves only as a conceptual guide and an organizing framework utilized for the presentation of our ideas. Use of this framework by no means should infer that we subscribe to all of Herzberg's ideas, nor to all implications logically derived from his framework. For example, Herzberg proposes that satisfaction with work is a function of meeting intrinsic needs while dissatisfaction results from the failure to meet the extrinsic needs of workers. In other words, failure to meet one's intrinsic needs does not result in dissatisfaction but merely an absence of satisfaction. This proposition seems to us to constitute a conceptual trap. For example, taking Herzberg's thesis to its logical conclusion could allow a worker to be described as both satisfied and dissatisfied with his work, if his intrinsic needs were met while his extrinsic needs were not. The value of Herzberg's thesis, with respect to our discussion is

be more difficult than implementation of straightforward and pragmatic extrinsic rewards, such as reasonable class schedules, class and advising loads, etc. That is because the dispensation of these rewards may be provided relatively easily by so-inclined administrative personnel and/or faculty committees empowered to grant them, while the former rewards inevitably amount to challenges against existing privilege patterns. Specifically, implementation of the former rewards requires the abolition of extant organizing principles on which existing privilege patterns are based. These points will become more self-evident as the text of the paper unfolds.

As a final introductory remark, we would like briefly to point out that in our consideration of means to promote the equitable representation of both minority faculty and minority content we endeavored to develop bases for action which fell outside the realm of arguments resting strictly or essentially on moral or ethical grounds. Second, our attention has been directed solely to how incentives may be used to promote these objectives, and not to whether or not relevant actors will or should adopt these procedures. Thus, there is no discussion here of how to persuade or lobby effectively for the implementation of these procedures. We feel such discussion best takes place within the context of the particular political realities of individual schools.

Perspective One

Meeting Intrinsic Work Needs as an Incentive

The basic concern to which this first portion of our discussion is directed is the consideration of organizational milieus that, at least theoretically, are likely to promote responsiveness among school personnel to the employment and curricular objectives previously noted. Our conjecture is based on the conviction that in order to provide incentives that meet intrinsic needs of staff employed in schools of social

¹(Continued) that it allows the identification of two discrete conceptual domains that have a bearing on a worker's satisfaction with his job, or lack thereof. For a good summary of studies that both support and reject Herzberg's thesis, see: Valerie Bockman, "The Herzberg Controversy," Personnel Psychology, 24, No. 2 (1971). For a more detailed critique of Herzberg's thesis see: Roger McNeely, "An Examination of the Relationship of Work Satisfaction Correlates to the Worker's Conception of the Organizational Style of the Work Setting," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, Univ. M-Films, No. 76-16, 255.

work, dramatic changes must occur with respect to the basic organizing principles to which most of these schools adhere.

The essential tenets underlying this conviction we can specify succinctly. We believe, and some social science literature undergirds this speculation, that persons employed in settings emphasizing collaboration and mutual support rather than competition and hierarchial decision-making are more likely to respond favorably to innovations that constitute departures from status-quo operating modes. That is with specific reference to the concerns addressed in this paper, they are less likely to be intimidated by the introduction of minority faculty who arrive on a basis of equal footing and less likely to be threatened when called upon to include content in their classes alien to their own experience as members of the national-majority population. The point that schools of social work tend to be organized, as are other institutions, in accord with principles stressing competition and inegalitarian decision-making modes is a truism we do not feel it necessary to belabor. Further, and without belaboring the point, we should state that we are not implying that every majority group faculty member employed under these conditions is cosmologically narrow and intolerant. What we are suggesting is simply that such structures tend to be in themselves both hostile to innovation and reinforcing of intolerant attitudes among staff. Thus, producing appropriate changes in the administrative styles of those schools that may be characterized as competitive and inegalitarian conceivably might militate against intolerance, barriers to innovation and, in fact, enhance the potential receptiveness of faculty members to changes along employment and curricular lines.

As we continue our preliminary discussion of theoretical perspectives, we hasten to point out that we do not share the view that university settings are profoundly less alienating than other U.S. work-places in which one might be employed. That is because the organizational structure of social work schools tends to conform to administrative principles we view to be inherently alienating and thus deficient in their capacity to grant rewards compatible with needs one may characterize as "human work-needs". These needs are the "intrinsic" needs specified by Herzberg's classification schemata. Fulfillment of intrinsic needs purportedly provides individuals with strong feelings of self-worth that are requisite to good health and social functioning while failure to meet these needs often results in less than satisfying and possibly alienating outcomes. Individuals dissatisfied or alienated from their work have reduced chances for good social and health functioning and we propose correspondingly that their responsiveness to new forms of experience and different points of view is lessened.

We have developed the conviction that most schools of social work

are socially repressive organizations because they tend to conform, never absolutely but in varying degrees, to salient organizing principles associated with the "weberian" or "rationalistic" organizational model.² These terms are used synonymously and salient administrative dimensions associated with this model include: hierarchical decision-making; impersonal relations between staff members; and a division of labor one well may argue is in conflict with one's desire to achieve excellence at work. In schools of social work, this division of labor may be characterized best as "overgeneralization". We will define and discuss this term later.

Hierarchical decision-making in schools of social work refers mainly to the fact that great power tends to be held by a relatively small and select group of faculty members who comprise the major power bloc (s). This bloc generally consists of strong tenured faculty who sit in judgment over incoming or non-tenured staff as well as the weaker tenured staff. While faculty meetings that presumably allow input from all staff are held during which decisions made at committee level are sanctioned or rejected, it is at great potential risk that faculty members not belonging to this bloc express their disapproval or opposition to the former's stated views. This is particularly so for non-tenured faculty. Thus, policy and decision-making may be described best in social work schools as oligarchical rather than collegial in character. In short, "collegial" input into decision-making boils down to one's having the right to offer one's input at the risk of losing one's source of livelihood--depending on the extent to which one's views clash with the stated preferences of the more powerful faculty actors. Genuine collaboration to meet school objectives occurs rarely with respect to the really important decisions in such a context, and the collaboration that does occur is generally superficial, at best.

Arguments made by those with contrasting views to the points above generally include:

- (1) that the quality of decisions made by a select few is likely to be superior to those made by the entire staff, and;
- (2) that it is unreasonable to assume within the context of formal organizations that everyone can be made to be satisfied with their working conditions and that given this reality, at least

²For reference purposes see: Eugene Litwak, and Henry Meyer, "The Administrative Style of the School and Organizational Tasks," Strategies of Community Organization, edited by Fred Cox, et al., Itasca, Ill.: Peacock Publishers, 1974.

the power-wielding few do not suffer what negative effects result from the absence of power.

It is probable that those making the first point base these remarks on the assumption that decision-making is likely to be more consistent if made by a single or select few decision-makers. Since consistency in decision-making is an objective to be valued, then perhaps existing power patterns are justified as they result in superior policy choices, or so the argument goes. This is simply not so, particularly when one takes into account the nature of tasks confronting schools of social work. As with all schools, and especially with those dealing with producing expertise related to the amelioration of complex human problems, the tasks that must be addressed are myriad and ambiguous. Even the provision of educational experiences for students--the task to which faculty members presumably are principally devoted--is an ambiguous event. Is anyone really certain as how to proceed best with this task? In an ambiguous context, single or select few decision-makers are likely to break down. This is due simply to the complexity, ambiguity, and unpredictability of events for which decisions must be made. Only when one works in a setting where tasks are routine and predictable are a select few likely to make the best decisions consistently. In other words, they do not buckle under the overload of a melange of diverse, complicated, and constantly occurring new problems. In ambiguous contexts decisions are made best by all actors since such decisions are more likely to promote staff conformance to agreed-upon policies while the process serves to reduce through collaboration, the stress associated with making decisions in such contexts. Thus, in schools of social work, the best decisions are likely to be those based on the broadest participation.

With respect to the point that everyone cannot be made to be satisfied, we simply retort that while this may be so, at least we can promote structures that enhance the potential for everyone to be satisfied. Clearly, structures emphasizing collegial rather than oligarchical decision-making modes are likely to accomplish this. Finally, we flatly reject the point that those occupying top rungs in the organizational hierarchy suffer no debilitating effects because they hold power. We believe that holding power in this context is alienating because it sets one apart from many other potential colleagues and, further, requires constant vigilance for its maintenance. Indeed, the so-called "powerful" faculty are practically powerless to do anything else within the context of the existing politics most often played out within the corridors and committee-rooms of the university.

It is not surprising that superficially amicable and thinly veiled competition among "contestants" takes place in such settings. A "social

isolation" of sorts results. The real potential for faculty members to work together on a genuinely collaborative basis is sharply circumscribed, though all appears well on the surface. This reality results in staff often tackling tough and ambiguous problems alone, if such work falls outside the context of relationships established by contract. Staff who are often confronted with ambiguous work assignments, that often require collaboration to achieve the most productive outcome, are thus forced to work in settings that may be described aptly as socially fragmenting.

Another factor that places sharp constraints on one's productivity --and here we speak mainly to the level of scholarship of work undertaken in contemporary graduate school settings--has to do with what we refer to as "overgeneralization" in the division of labor. This term we use to describe the diverse and demanding work load which most must assume when employed in these settings. Admittedly, these demands vary by school and rank. However, diverse committee responsibilities at both school or department as well as at the broader university level, teaching preparation for the unremitting evolution of new courses, community service, consulting, publication demands and solicitation of funds to carry out research, etc., constitute a veritable barrage of tasks to which all, in some degree, are subjected. Exacerbating the obvious demands of a work load including these myriad tasks is the fact that all of these tasks are ambiguous rather than routine in character.

At first glance, such a workload might be viewed as far superior to the routine nature of most work in contemporary industrial society. Specifically, many theorists have proposed that employment in work settings stressing specialization is far less desirable than those stressing generalization in the division of labor. Theodore Lowi captures this position with the following remarks:

"Specialization reduces a man's chances of developing a whole personality - men become alienated from themselves as well as their families, friends and community . . . work can become so divided and subdivided that one loses the human meaning of living." (Lowi, 1969:25)

Victor Thompson, another critic of specialization, introduces greater conceptual clarity through his use of a term he refers to as the "specialization of task". Specialization of task refers to making work activities more specific. This term allows distinction between (1) the kind of specialization of function--an inevitable concomitant of industrialization--to which Lowi's remarks are directed, (2) the conventional meaning ascribed to the term referring to specialized work roles such as neuro-surgeon, clinical psychologist, aircraft engineer,

etc., and (3) task specialization which ". . . moves in the direction of the micro-division of labor, as for example, tightening bolts on an assembly line". (Thompson, 1961:26) It is this last form of specialization that is relevant here.

Task specialization may be viewed as alienating because it results in a proliferation of tasks that are too simple for the worker's abilities. It is personally limiting because such work does not advance the worker's human need to engage in a process of systematic and substantive development of an expanding repertory of skills. The development of such a repertory fosters the sense of having exerted mastery over one's environment. Inevitably, task specialization results in the narrowing of work to the point where it provides little or no meaning to the worker.

We believe that overgeneralization in the division of labor similarly tends to produce feelings of meaninglessness among workers. First, the myriad tasks which must be addressed by graduate level instructors often preclude the development of a skill repertory that is truly substantive, i.e., embodying a profound conceptual grip on the essence of matters under "scholarly" consideration. Instead, time demands imposed by too many varied activities often relegate one's efforts to a cursory and superficial status. From such work can be derived few personal rewards with which to satisfy one's intrinsic needs.

Two factors worsen this problem. First, these tasks often tend to be ambiguous yet occur within contexts that are unlikely to provide meaningful collegial support. Such support reduces stress associated with ambiguous work tasks. Second, the strong emphasis placed on generating publications and securing funds for research purposes often results in work assignments that are viewed by staff as strictly instrumental in character. In essence, what you have are faculty-based entrepreneurs competing for funds around projects that often are tangential to their true research interests. We suggest that this sort of entrepreneurship heightens the potential for staff to view the work to which their energies are directed as relatively meaningless.³

³An article, "Fraud in Research is a Rising Problem in Science," which appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times, draws attention to the scope of one outcome we believe results in part from the conditions outlined above. This article implicitly details the personal destruction of some academicians who have yielded to institutionally inspired pressures, impelling the production, in the shortest time, of rapid processions of publications fit for scholarly journals, etc. The author points out:

The above points and arguments, taken in sum, provide the bases on which we suggest that work milieus in graduate university settings may often produce work alienation among staff. Specifically, inegalitarian decision-making modes are seen to produce feelings of powerlessness; superficially personalized relations--more accurately described as competitive relations--are seen to produce a sense of social isolation, particularly at work; and overgeneralization in the division of labor is seen to result in perceived meaninglessness. The fact that the great bulk of work in university settings is ambiguous enhances the potential outcome of dissatisfaction and/or alienation since such settings fail to encourage non-contract based mutual support. These three dimensions--powerlessness, isolation, and meaninglessness--are the principal dimensions of work alienation as defined by Robert Blauner, one of our leading social theorists (Blauner, 1964).

As stated previously, the objective to which this portion of our discussion is directed is to speculate on ways that the employment setting itself may be made to become an incentive. We have identified three problem areas which we feel are most pertinent with respect to this quest. Attention to these areas we theorize will increase the capacity of the institution to meet the intrinsic needs of staff. We now focus our deliberations to why we believe meeting intrinsic needs is one way to enhance the possibility of achieving the employment and curricular objectives to which this overall discussion is directed.

Studies have repeatedly shown that failure to meet the needs of workers is associated with serious social and health functioning pathologies. Such problems include impaired social interaction, reduced civic participation, work-related suicide (Kornhauser, 1965), substance abuse (Roman and Trice, 1969), peptic ulcers (Susser, 1967) heart disease (Theorell and Rahe, 1972), myriad psychosomatic disorders (Gardell, 1972), and reduced life spans (Palmore, 1969). Some writers have advanced the notion that parents who are dissatisfied with their work roles are more likely to produce children who are juvenile delinquents (Tolmach, 1972). Further, some research data supports the contentions

³(Continued) "Scientists who cheat by faking their results or by selecting only those data that support their theories represent a phenomenon that often goes unrecognized . . . Some scientific leaders suspect the number of dishonest scientists is growing as a result of the increasingly fierce competition for grant money, which tends to go to researchers who can produce, or assert they can produce, the most impressive new findings in the shortest time." (Rensberger, 1977:44)

of writers that familial violence is associated with job-related frustrations (O'Brien, 1971; Steinmetz, 1974; Bednarik, 1970), and some theorists have even proposed that the burgeoning violence so prevalent in contemporary American society is often work-related (Fromm, 1972). Clearly, the sentiments of workers with respect to their work is related to a plethora of potential problem areas.

While the above cited studies provide an empirical basis on which to demonstrate the debilitating effects of socially repressive and unfulfilling work organizations, what, one might ask with reference to this discussion, are the positive outcomes associated with work structures more capable of meeting intrinsic needs? William Torbert and Malcolm Rogers have developed a framework that purports to answer this question. The ideas of these two theorists, upon which much of this portion of the discussion is based, evolve around a central concept they refer to as "play". Essentially, though the authors emphasize the salience of work activities, "play" is any activity that is self-developing in nature and serves to develop a mature understanding of one's self in relation to one's world (Torbert and Rogers, 1973). Embodied in this definition of play is a somewhat elaborate theoretical framework-- Torbert and Rogers require several chapters to develop it. We employ the Torbert and Rogers framework to provide the basis for our conclusions as they relate to promoting responsiveness on the part of existing majority-group faculty members to the introduction both of minority-group staff and curricular offerings focused positively upon the experience of national minorities. For this purpose, it will be sufficient to outline the framework though the reader is cautioned that some aspects of the theory are omitted.

Torbert and Rogers posit that the lack of play ultimately leads to limited self-development, particularly as such development relates to one's individuality and behavioral maturity, and a lack of understanding, obviously, of one's environment. Thus, the lack of play imposes sharp constraints on the parameters of one's potential to achieve profound personal fulfillment through what some writers describe as self-actualization. What exactly is it that causes this to occur? In adult life, repressive work organizations that block one's playful impulses and coerce, shape, and encourage conformance to shallow social roles are one answer. Such organizations are seen to reinforce the dual techniques of accommodation and assimilation as modes of dealing with one's environment. Accommodation requires the person to change himself to fit the environment rather than to engage in a self-developing interplay with that environment. Assimilation requires, as Lazarus points out, that a person ". . . assimilate the world to his own requirements, using people and social situations about him for attaining his own ends"

(Lazarus, 1963:10-11). Play, as a self-developing mode stands in stark contrast to accommodation and assimilation.⁴

The relevance of Torbert and Rogers' thesis with respect to this discussion has to do with the social impairment likely to result when one's existence becomes dominated by repressive work organizations characterized by hierarchical decision-making, social isolation, and over-generalization in the division of labor. Persons working under such conditions are those for whom the drive for "playful" exploration is stifled or otherwise impeded. Torbert and Rogers suggest that such persons are much more likely to be constrained to narrow and rigid views of their world, their community, and themselves, and that they are much more likely to maintain cosmological frameworks that are contrary to the common good. They are less likely to be active in developing relationships with persons of diverse backgrounds who have differing views, philosophies, and orientations to life. These ideas, as advanced by Torbert and Rogers, often find both direct and indirect support in the writings of many theorists including notables such as Herbert Gans, William Kornhauser, Seymour Lipset, Harold Lasswell, and Alex Inkeles.⁵

⁴According to Torbert and Rogers: "When people do not understand themselves in relation to the world, they are pushed here and there by internal whims and external pressures. They are led to strive for goals which do not express their exploratory impulse--goals to which they are related, not by their selves, but by their pseudo-selves, their personalities (accommodation and assimilation are manifested through one's personality) . . . Play is the phenomena of fully conscious self-world exchange, in which the full interdependence--mutual feeling--of self and world is recognized . . . (it is self-accepting and self-developing, not self-rejecting . . . if either self or world appear dominant, as in assimilation or accommodation, or if conflict occurs, it is a sign of incomplete play . . . When people do not understand themselves in relation to the world, they experience themselves as separated from the world. They and the world appear without common cause. The world becomes something 'out there' to manipulate if possible, or from which to endure manipulation." W. R. Torbert, M. P. Rogers, Being for the Most Part Puppets, Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1973. pp. 63,64,54.

⁵See for example:
Herbert Gans, "Barriers to Equality," Psychology Today, Vol. 7, no. 7, December, 1973 (esp. pg. 67).
William Kornhauser, The Politics of Mass Society, (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1959) (esp. pg. 32).

Direct statements made by these writers or inferences drawn from their work suggest that non-democratic impulses characterize "non-playful" persons who, trapped as they are in their own narrow and rigid views of the world, are also alienated from their fellowmen. Specifically, work organizations that foster competitive, superficial, and shallow social relations while emphasizing instrumental labor rather than self-developing playful work limits diverse involvements and thus impedes personal growth. The consequences of these conditions can only be the rigidification of narrow and factional cosmologies that militate against quality interaction and meaningful dialogue between staff stratified along racial lines.

By contrast, according to Torbert and Rogers, the characteristics of those employed under less alienating work conditions more likely include the following:

- (1) self-acceptance
- (2) acceptance of others
- (3) self-direction
- (4) openness; seeking to understand differences
- (5) search for the values in others rather than the subordination of others

(Torbert & Rogers, 1973:55)

In short, such persons presumably are more likely to maintain a belief in the dignity and worth of one's self and others, stress personal autonomy, be open to change and diversity, and pursue many values rather than to subordinate diverse interests to a single goal. In sum, the person who plays is more likely to express concern for the common good rather than the factional good, is less likely to be involved in strictly instrumental or non-self-developing recreational activities, and is more likely to prefer active pursuits to those that are passive or expressive of accommodation and assimilation as the principal modes that govern one's interaction with other actors within his social universe.

Based on this theoretical discussion, our recommendations and

⁵(Continued)

Seymour Lipset, Political Man, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1963). (esp. pg. 74).

Harold Lasswell, "Democratic Character," The Political Writings of Harold D. Lasswell, (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951).

Alex Inkeles, "National Character and Modern Political Systems," Psychological Anthropology, ed. by Francis Hsu (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1961).

conclusions may be stated forthrightly. If the intrinsic needs of staff in schools of social work are to be met, the structure of these work settings must themselves be changed to reflect a commitment towards organizational egalitarianism. Simultaneously, such settings must allow and encourage scholarly activity directed along lines that are dictated by social welfare interests individually determined rather than the flow and ebb of federal and other grant monies. To respond willy-nilly to this flow and ebb is to reduce the work of professors and therefore the professors, themselves, to the status of social work entrepreneurs. The shallow social interaction that results from the competitive relations necessary within a hierarchical context, along with the inevitable meaninglessness associated with this kind of entrepreneurship, necessarily results in conditions that tend to exacerbate rather than mitigate existing differences between staff of diverse backgrounds. Settings that allow relatively equal participation, foster genuinely cooperative rather than competitive or superficially collaborative relations, and encourage personally meaningful scholarly activity, can both meet intrinsic needs and serve as a reinforcing incentive.

In conclusion, we propose that such conditions promote not only the fluid introduction of minority staff and content, but result in self-developing places of work for all.

Perspective Two

Meeting Extrinsic Work Needs as an Incentive

Factors identified in the preceding section that militate against the inclusion of minority faculty and content obviously will require more than simple short-range strategies aimed at bringing about their elimination. By contrast, straightforward and pragmatic incentives focusing upon the extrinsic work needs of staff, comparatively speaking, easily may be manipulated to encourage the responsiveness of majority-group faculty to include relevant content into their class offerings and to allocate some portion of their time to recruiting minority-group members for faculty and staff positions. There are a number of rewards that could be dispensed based on priorities in line with the introduction of minority staff and content. However, the implementation of such an incentive structure will require some changes in conventional notions of what generally is considered by faculty members of schools of social work to constitute sound curricular and manpower practices.

A point requiring little elaboration is that the manner in which schools allocate human and monetary resources attests directly to the importance assigned to a particular objective. The notion that a relationship exists between an organization's view of what is important and

its budgetary allocations is captured by the oft-quoted saying among disenfranchised people: "Put your money where your mouth is." The manipulation of salary increases through variable merit raises clearly is salient here; aside from the obvious benefits, income helps satisfy one's need for security. This is particularly so when discussed within the context of tenure since future income flow is guaranteed beyond short-term employment contracts. The manner in which merit increases and base salaries are set and distributed could constitute strong incentives in encouraging the efforts of faculty members to develop, teach, and conduct research on topics relevant to the experience of the national minority population.

A second category of manipulatable pragmatic rewards involves various nuances of faculty assignments. A delineation of specifics that fall under the category of "faculty assignments" includes responsibilities such as the number of courses taught per semester; the number of such courses requiring entirely new preparation or that represent very large student-classroom loads; advising loads; and committee responsibilities that, given their scope and the time they require, are directly related to career or personal development. The point we raise is that heavy assignments in these areas tend to minimize the chances of those overburdened with these assignments to achieve tenured status in most universities. If priorities are strongly set to underscore the importance of such things as the development of minority content in curricular offerings, etc., junior faculty unwilling to conform to these priorities may be unevenly burdened with these tasks to make it extraordinarily difficult for them to achieve tenured rank. Unwilling faculty in the tenured ranks may simply be made to suffer the uneven burden.

Career development supports encompass extrinsic rewards that permit faculty members to spend more time engaged in tasks related to personal as well as career development. Teaching and research support opportunities to expand technical skills, and professional exposure, are examples of rewards that could provide powerful incentives for faculty to invest time in performing minority-relevant tasks. Career development supports such as student help (teaching, research and project assistants), and efficient easily accessible secretarial help can free faculty members from many routine activities that sap creativity, and steal time from participation in scholarly endeavors. Administrative willingness to selectively dispense these rewards to faculty for performing needed organizational tasks related to minority concerns is a must, given concurrence with objectives as previously noted.

Research support guaranteed by the administration for faculty members who help the school to accomplish its objectives is another way of encouraging faculty responsiveness. Computer time and programming

assistance are examples of rewards that are valued by faculty members. The persuasive potential of these rewards, given their relatedness to scholarly productivity, is considerable. By selectively dispensing rewards that facilitate faculty research efforts, school administrations and faculties will have greater assurance that minority-related objectives will be accomplished.

Another group of important extrinsic rewards is related to expanding technical skills and opportunities for professional exposure. Release time can be given to select faculty desirous of attending specialized institutes, training sessions, or to enroll in technical courses. Release time also can be granted to faculty to facilitate the preparation of scholarly papers on minority-related topics for presentation at professional conferences. In that both skill acquisition and professional exposure are directly related to personal and career development, the general appeal of these rewards to faculty members is self-evident.

Movement by schools of social work in the direction of achieving minority faculty and curricular goals are supported by the organized profession's Code of Ethics; The Council on Social Work Education's accrediting standards; and various federal and state laws. For example, an excerpt from the Council on Social Work Education's Manual of Accrediting Standards states that "A school is expected to demonstrate the special effort it is making to enrich its program by providing racial and cultural diversity in its student body, faculty and staff". (Council on Social Work Education, 1971:6). In the same vein, it is significant to note that a Federal Executive Order (11246) issued in 1966 prohibits federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of race, creed or color in their employment practices. Schools contract with the federal government through grants awarded these schools by various governmental departments. These factors (Code of Ethics, Accreditation Manual Standards, Federal and State Fair Employment Laws) represent an adequate degree of support for schools desirous of establishing and attaining minority related objectives. Thus, given the existence of these policy statements, it is reasonable to both assume and maintain that the lack of success must be directly attributed to poor, perhaps racist, faculty attitudes that spawn limited or no commitment to the employment and retention of minority staff. The manipulation of various "benefits" to satisfy work needs can be used to this aim of fostering staff conformance to policies related to the introduction, promotion, and retention of minority staff, and to a fair representation of minority content in curricular offerings. We firmly believe that deploying benefits in ways previously specified will result in substantive progress along these lines.

We have identified manipulatable extrinsic organizational rewards

that we believe could provide the means for facilitating efforts to increase minority faculty and minority-relevant curricular content. As they are the primary actors that determine the scope of change within schools we strongly believe that chief administrators and policy setting bodies must be intimately involved in the process of developing mechanisms to increase proportions of minority faculty and minority relevant course offerings. Their leadership and commitment to substantive minority-related improvements serve a particular and especially important function. The image painted by school units, or individuals in control of organizational prerogatives to make policy decisions, provides the screen through which determinations are made as they relate to the encouragement of individual responsiveness. Faculty members can be expected to wonder what the relationship is between their participation in the curricular change effort and their capability to pursue, augmented by the provision of organizational resources, some of their own individually determined interests. They can be expected to wonder what the relationship is between their responsiveness to minority-relevant concerns and their receipt of promotions and administratively orchestrated prestige, esteem, etc. These are important personal considerations. Affirmative answers to these questions are, in large measure, the prerequisites for individual commitment and long-term involvement, if the organizing principles to which schools of social work adhere remain unchanged.

REFERENCES

- Bednarik, Karl. The Male in Crisis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. Inc. 1970.
- Blauner, Robert. Alienation and Freedom. Chicago. The University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Bockman, Valerie. "The Herzberg Controversy," Personnel Psychology, 24, No. 2, (1971).
- Council on Social Work Education. Manual of Accrediting Standards for Graduate Professional Schools of Social Work. New York: CSWE, 1971.
- Fromm, Erich. "The Erich Fromm Theory of Aggression," New York Times Magazine. February 27, 1972.
- Gans, Herbert. "Barriers to Equality." Psychology Today, Vol. 7, No. 7, (December, 1973).
- Gardill, Bertil. "Health and the Work Setting--A Sociological Perspective." Psychologist News, Vol. 7, No 18, Stockholm, 1972.
- Gary, Lawrence E. "Social Work Education and the Black Community: A Proposal for Curricular Revisions," in James A. Goodman (editor), Dynamics of Racism in Social Work Practice. Washington, D.C.:

- National Association of Social Workers, 1973.
- Herzberg, Frederick. The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.
- Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. New York; World Publishing, 1966.
- Kornhauser, Arthur. Mental Health of the Industrial Worker. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1965.
- Kornhauser, William. The Politics of Mass Society. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.
- Lasswell, Harold. "Democratic Character," The Political Writings of Harold D. Lasswell. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1951.
- Lazarus, Richard. Personality and Adjustment. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Lipset, Seymour. Political Man. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1963.
- Lowi, Theodore. The End of Liberalism. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1969.
- McNeely, Roger. "An Examination of the Relationship of Work Satisfaction Correlates to the Worker's Conception of the Organizational Style of the Work Setting," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brandeis University, Univ. M-Films, No. 76-10, 255.
- Norton, Delores G. "Toward a Rationale and Guidelines for the Study of Minority Groups and Communities in Social Work Education." New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970.
- O'Brien, John. "Violence in Divorce-Prone Families," Journal of Marriage and Family, Vol. 33, (1971).
- Palmore, Erdman. "Predicting Longevity: A Follow-Up Controlling for Age." Gerontology (Winter, 1969).
- Rensberger, Boyce. "Fraud in Research is a Rising Problem in Science," The New York Times, January 23, 1977.
- Robinson, Mary Ella. "Inclusion of Content on Ethnic Minorities in the Social Work Curriculum," in Carl Scott (editor) Ethnic Minorities in Social Work Education. New York: Council on Social Work Education, 1970.
- Roman, P. M. and Trice, H. M. "The Development of Deviant Drinking Behavior," Archives of Environmental Health, Vol. 19, 1969.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne. "Occupational Environment in Relation to Physical Punishment and Dogmatism," in Violence in the Family, Ed. by Suzanne Steinmetz and Richard Strauss, New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1974.
- Susser, M. "Causes of Peptic Ulcer: A Selective Epidemiological Review," Journal of Chronic Diseases, Vol. 20, (June, 1967).
- Theorell, Tores and Richard Rahe. "Behavior and Life Satisfaction Characteristics of Swedish Subjects with Myocardial Infarction," Journal of Chronic Diseases, 25, No. 3 (1972).
- Thompson, Victor. Modern Organizations. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

- Tolmach, Judith. "Crumbling Families and the Generation Factor," Washington Post Potomac Magazine, June 25, 1972.
- Torbert, W. R., and M. P. Rogers. Being for the Most Part Puppets.
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1973.
- Turner, John B. "Education for Practice with Minorities," Social Work,
Vol. 17, No. 3, (May, 1972).