

ORIENTATION OF THE PRACTITIONER

IN CORRECTIONAL WORK

Continuities in the empirical study of
professionalism and the conditions
of practice

Arden Everett Melzer

1968

D.S.W. converted to
Ph.D. in 2011

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Social Welfare, School of Social
Work, Columbia University

ABSTRACT
ORIENTATION OF THE PRACTITIONER
IN CORRECTIONAL WORK

Continuities in the empirical study of professionalism
and the conditions of practice

Arden Everett Melzer

This study examines the relative influence of professional education, the conditions of practice and other factors on the social worker's orientation to the welfare of his clients.

The hypothesis, that professionally trained social workers are more oriented to the welfare of their clients than are their untrained co-workers, is tested. The relationship between the extent of perceived organizational constraints and the worker's orientation is assessed to determine if functional autonomy is related to practitioner orientation.¹

The study also examines whether professional education generates commitment to the professional norms of social work. When a worker agrees with a standardized prescription for practice, does agreement imply legitimation, or the usefulness, of the prescription--or both?

¹This part of the study is a partial replication and extension of a study by Herman Piven (Professionalism and Organizational Structure. Columbia University dissertation, 1960) predicated upon a line of investigation initiated by Lloyd Ohlin. The raw data source and the source of major research instruments for Orientation of the Practitioner in Correctional Work was the "Curriculum Evaluation Project," Herman Piven, Principal Investigator (Grant Nos. 64, 209; 63, 234; 62, 209, President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime).

Inter- and intra-positional consensus, on evaluations of the legitimacy and usefulness of practice prescriptions, is examined in order to locate formal and informal organizational sources of influence on practice orientation.

One thousand seventy-five respondents from twenty-three geographically distributed state probation and/or parole agency system populations answered a questionnaire which included instruments treating practitioner orientation, functional autonomy, and the legitimacy and utility of a set of professional prescriptions for practice which were standardized on a national sample of "transmitters" of professional norms--casework teachers.

As hypothesized, trained practitioners were more client welfare oriented than those who were not trained. When employing organization was held constant, this finding persevered in a majority, but not all, of the employing organizations. These findings held when status, tenure and experience were also held constant. Female practitioners with every type and at every level of education were more client welfare oriented than male practitioners. Sex, or its social concomitants, and professional education emerge as independent sources of client welfare orientation. Regardless of its sources,² practitioner

²Self-selection and selective recruitment into social work were not examined in the present study.

orientation was specified by organizational contingencies. Among these, two elements of caseload composition reduced differences between trained and untrained workers: (1) probation caseloads; (2) adult caseloads.

In contrast to earlier findings, the practitioner's perception of his freedom to determine case decisions is not related to his practice orientation. Functional autonomy may be a function of the practitioner's visibility, which is related to organizational complexity. Practitioners with rural caseloads perceive themselves as having greater autonomy than those with urban caseloads.

Although professional education exerts a powerful influence on the worker's orientation to the welfare of his clients, it isn't the influence which educators are likely to want. Workers who consistently agree with professional prescriptions for practice do not consistently legitimate them when they are required to consider both their legitimacy and their usefulness. When social workers must consider more than one implication of "agreement" at a time, they do not make judgements which are uniformly consistent with professional norms. Some of the evidence suggests that practitioners tend to legitimate what they believe to be useful.

There is consensus, within and among organizational positions, on evaluations of legitimacy and utility of practice prescriptions. Workers' perceptions of

supervisors' evaluations are accurate. The substantial consensus on punitive case actions includes legitimation of breaches of confidentiality, routinized forms of persecution of homosexuals, and the automatic response to initiate revocation proceedings for physically aggressive children or clients who engage in extended sexual affairs. Although professionally trained workers are differently oriented to these matters than untrained workers, a large proportion of trained practitioners contribute to the consensus on punitive case decisions.

Finally, there is a minor trend in the data indicating somewhat greater consensus among workers than between workers and supervisors. Similarly, there is a greater worker-supervisor consensus than worker-top administrator consensus. This suggests that elective relationships among organizational peers may yield more powerful influences on practice orientation than the formally defined hierarchically structured organizational relationships.

The conflict of professional and human conscience with the demand of a totalitarian regime that its civil servants not merely carry out all of its orders but that they also become apostles of its doctrines is the problem of the employed professional in its ultimate degree. But the ultimate degree of any problem is very instructive; it brings out the essential features. It does not serve any analytical purpose, however, if used merely as a horrible example. The problem of all professional codes has always been this: Whose agent is the professional? Turned around it is: Who is the client?

--Everett C. Hughes

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

These acknowledgements cannot fully express the extent of the author's personal and intellectual indebtedness to those who have influenced the undertaking of the present study or its specific contents. In expressing my appreciation to those who helped to make this study possible, I expect to add psychic income to--rather than to discharge--the debt. To Lucille Austin, who encouraged me to enter the doctoral program at Columbia University. To the Russell Sage Foundation, which made the course of study feasible. To Lee Wiggins, who served as adviser in the very earliest stage of the study and Lloyd Ohlin, who succeeded Lee Wiggins as adviser. Much of the present work is predicated on a line of investigation initiated by Lloyd Ohlin. To Robert Merton, Amatai Etzioni and Allen Barton, who, through their teaching and writings, enabled me to grasp the relevance of a sociological orientation to understanding and evaluating the ends and means of social work. To Herbert Hyman, whose course on survey design and analysis proved to be invaluable. To Irving Rosow, who, in many conversations, provided important insights. To Abraham Alcabes, Florence Parkinson and Willard Richan, whose comments stimulated additional efforts. To Al Goldwyn, Executive Director of The Center For Documentation And Communication Research, Case Western Reserve University, who virtually turned the night run of

the computer laboratory's GE 225E over to me during the summer of 1967 and to Benjamin Myers who helped to solve almost impossible data processing problems. To Bob Jacobs, former Manager of the Center's computer laboratory and to Robert Hazelton, Manager of the computer laboratory, for their constructive cooperation. To Ford Tucker, a talented student at the School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University, who helped to do many preliminary statistical computations during the summer of 1967.

Had it not been for Herman Piven, the present study would not have been possible. At his suggestion and with his cooperation, I was able to secure a substantial amount of space in one of the many questionnaires distributed in connection with a curriculum development and evaluation study for which he was the principal investigator. Complete access to the resulting raw data as well as other data was generously offered. Beyond facilitating access to the study populations surveyed in the present work, Herman Piven provided a formidable example of personal dedication and intellectual commitment in the pursuit of knowledge for social work practice. His earlier work, Professionalism and Organizational Structure (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1960) was a singularly relevant source for portions of the present work. The liabilities of the present work, however, cannot be attributed to Herman Piven as the responsibility

for the execution of present study, the data processing and analysis, is the author's alone.

To Irving Miller, the third adviser among three, fell the task of reading and evaluating the present study. His efforts are most appreciated.

Finally, to my wife and daughter, Lynn and Andrea, who were not infrequently deserted, for the uncertain favors of a computer, it is acknowledged that no acknowledgment can reflect my appreciation.

A.E.M.

March, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	THE PREPARATION OF BUREAUCRATIC FUNCTIONARIES AND THE FUNCTIONARY'S ORIENTATION TO PRACTICE: QUESTIONS FOR RESEARCH. An Introduction	1
	Educational aims and the goal of service	6
	The empirical study of practice orientation	17
	Practitioner orientation and organizational constraints	21
	Commitment to professional norms and assessments of their utility	26
	Consensus and practice orientation	35
	A summary of questions for research	37
I	TESTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND PRACTITIONER ORIENTATION	38
	The hypothesis	38
	The sample	38
	The measuring instrument	41
	The criterion population and the scoring system	42
	Tests of the hypothesis and elaborating the results	49
	Holding employing organization constant	53
	Holding organizational position constant	59
	Holding organizational tenure constant.	63
	Holding probation-parole experience constant	69

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Holding sex constant	73
	Holding age constant	78
	Variables held constant: a summary . . .	84
	The purity of variables held constant . .	85
	Recency of education and orientation . . .	91
	Conclusions of the extended replication	96
II	THE STRUCTURE OF CASELOADS AND PRACTITIONER ORIENTATION	107
	Caseload composition: probation- parole	109
	Caseload composition: juveniles-adults. .	112
	Caseload composition: size	120
III	FUNCTIONAL AUTONOMY AND PRACTITIONER ORIENTATION	125
	The measuring instrument	126
	Testing the relationship between functional autonomy and client welfare orientation	128
	Functional autonomy and visibility	143
	Functional autonomy as projection and reflection	147
IV	CONTINUITIES IN THE STUDY OF PRACTICE ORIENTATION: NORMATIVE COMMITMENT AND THE UTILITY OF PROFESSIONAL PRESCRIPTIONS	153
	The commitment-utility items	154
	Education, commitment and utility	156
	Normative commitment, the resolution of conflict and social work curricula	166

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER	PAGE
	Consistency of orientation and commitment 175
	Subscription to, and legitimation of, professional prescriptions 190
V	CONTINUITIES IN THE STUDY OF PRACTICE ORIENTATION: INTER- AND INTRA-POSITIONAL CONSENSUS 194
	Worker-supervisor perceived consensus . . . 197
	Worker-supervisor actual consensus 199
	Worker-worker and worker-administrator perceived consensus 204
VI	CORRECTIONAL FUNCTIONARIES AND CAPTIVES: OBSERVATIONS ON SOCIAL WORK 211
	A review of the findings 211
	Correctional functionaries, captives and the community 220
	Social work education 225
Appendix A	CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION ITEMS . . . 228
Appendix B	AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS ITEMS 231
Appendix C	PRACTITIONER ORIENTATION AND SUPERVISION 234
Appendix D	LEGITIMATION OF PROFESSIONAL PRESCRIPTIONS ITEMS 238
Bibliography	SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 241

LIST OF TABLES

Table

- 1.1 COMPARISON OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES OF PROBATION-PAROLE PRACTITIONERS, BY TRAINING, HOLDING AGENCY CONSTANT
- 1.2 A CLASSIFICATION OF PATTERNS OF EVALUATION OF PROFESSIONALLY PRESCRIBED CASE ACTIONS
- 2.1 NUMBER AND PER CENT OF CASEWORK FACULTY RESPONSES TO PIVEN'S RESPONSE CATEGORIES FOR ELEVEN CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION ITEMS
- 2.2 PER CENT OF RESPONSES OF THREE CASEWORK FACULTY SAMPLES TO ELEVEN CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION ITEMS
- 2.3 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE
- 2.4 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE
- 2.5 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK
- 2.6 PER CENT OF TRAINED AND UNTRAINED PRACTITIONERS BY EMPLOYING ORGANIZATIONS
- 2.7 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, WITH EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION HELD CONSTANT
- 2.8 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, WITH EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION HELD CONSTANT

Table

- 2.9 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, WITH EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION HELD CONSTANT
- 2.10 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS HELD CONSTANT
- 2.11 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS HELD CONSTANT
- 2.12 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS HELD CONSTANT
- 2.13 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION WITH EMPLOYMENT TENURE HELD CONSTANT
- 2.14 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EMPLOYMENT TENURE HELD CONSTANT

Table

- 2.15 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EMPLOYMENT TENURE HELD CONSTANT
- 2.16 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROBATION-PAROLE WORK HELD CONSTANT
- 2.17 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROBATION-PAROLE WORK HELD CONSTANT
- 2.18 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROBATION-PAROLE WORK HELD CONSTANT
- 2.19 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH SEX HELD CONSTANT

Table

- 2.20 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH SEX HELD CONSTANT
- 2.21 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUAL MAILINGS AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH SEX HELD CONSTANT
- 2.22 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE PRACTITIONERS, HOLDING LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION CONSTANT
- 2.23 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH AGE HELD CONSTANT
- 2.24 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH AGE HELD CONSTANT
- 2.25 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH AGE HELD CONSTANT
- 2.26 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS OCCUPYING DIFFERENT ORGANIZATIONAL POSITIONS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Table

- 2.27 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WITH SHORT- AND LONG-TERM TENURE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT
- 2.28 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE PRACTITIONERS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT
- 2.29 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN YOUNGER AND OLDER PRACTITIONERS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT
- 2.30 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH RECENCY OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT
- 2.31 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH RECENCY OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT
- 2.32 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH RECENCY OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Table

- 3.1 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG PRACTITIONERS CARRYING PROBATION AND/OR PAROLE CASELOADS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES
- 3.2 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG LEVELS AND TYPES OF EDUCATION, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES, WITH PAROLE AND/OR PROBATION CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT
- 3.3 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG PRACTITIONERS CARRYING ADULT AND/OR JUVENILE CASELOADS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES
- 3.4 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES, WITH JUVENILE AND/OR ADULT CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT
- 3.5 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES, WITH JUVENILE AND/OR ADULT CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT
- 3.6 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES, WITH JUVENILE AND/OR ADULT CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT

Table

- 3.7 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO CARRY SMALL CASELOADS AND THOSE WHO CARRY LARGE CASELOADS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES
- 3.8 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG LEVELS AND TYPES OF EDUCATION, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES, WITH CASELOAD SIZE HELD CONSTANT
- 4.1 SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SUMMATED ITEM SCORES FOR SELECTED SUB-POPULATIONS OF RESPONDENTS WHO RECEIVED INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES
- 4.2 SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF AUTONOMY RESTRICTIVENESS AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SUMMATED ITEM SCORES BY EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION AND MEDIAN AUTONOMY RESTRICTIVENESS SCORE
- 4.3 RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SUMMATED ITEM SCORES FOR TRAINED SOCIAL WORKERS, HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT
- 4.4 COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG PAIRS OF AUTONOMOUS AND RESTRICTIVE STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS FOR SIX MOST AUTONOMOUS AND SIX MOST RESTRICTIVE SYSTEMS
- 4.5 COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES AMONG SIX MOST AUTONOMOUS STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS
- 4.6 COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES AMONG SEVEN MODERATELY AUTONOMOUS OR MODERATELY RESTRICTIVE STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS
- 4.7 COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES AMONG SIX MOST RESTRICTIVE STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS

Table

- 4.8 COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS CARRYING CASELOADS IN URBAN AREAS AND THOSE CARRYING CASELOADS IN RURAL AREAS, WITH EDUCATION, RECENCY OF EDUCATION, TENURE, EXPERIENCE, SEX, AGE, AND WORK LOAD HELD CONSTANT
- 4.9 COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HAVE CASELOADS IN URBAN AREAS AND THOSE WHO HAVE CASELOADS IN RURAL AREAS, WITH ACCEPTANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY HELD CONSTANT
- 5.1 EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION YOU SHOULD PUT TO YOURSELF IN MAKING A DECISION ABOUT A CASE IS, 'AM I PROTECTING THE COMMUNITY NOW BY MY ACTION IN THIS CASE?'"
- 5.2 EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER SHOULD NOT MAKE HIS CASE RECORD ON THE PROBATIONER OR PAROLEE AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, EVEN IF IT IS A BRUTAL ONE."
- 5.3 EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "A PAROLEE OR PROBATIONER BEATS UP HIS MOTHER SO THAT SHE NEEDS SIX STITCHES. REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS ARE INDICATED."
- 5.4 EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "IT IS BETTER FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS FOR HOME VISITS THAN TO CALL UNEXPECTEDLY."
- 5.5 EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "IT IS PROBABLY A SOUND POLICY FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE AGENCY TO ROUTINELY SEND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT UP-TO-DATE LISTS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF PROBATIONERS OR PAROLEES WHO SHOW PATTERNS OF SEXUAL DEVIANCE."
- 5.6 CASEWORK TEACHERS' AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF FIVE CASE DECISIONS IN CORRECTIONAL PRACTICE

Table

- 5.7 COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS, HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT. CASE DECISION NO. 1.
- 5.8 COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS, HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT. CASE DECISION NO. 2.
- 5.9 COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS, HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT. CASE DECISION NO. 3.
- 5.10 COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS, HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT. CASE DECISION NO. 4.
- 5.11 COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS, HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT. CASE DECISION NO. 5.
- 5.12 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION YOU SHOULD PUT TO YOURSELF IN MAKING A DECISION ABOUT A CASE IS: 'AM I PROTECTING THE COMMUNITY NOW BY MY ACTION IN THIS CASE?'"
- 5.13 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION YOU SHOULD PUT TO YOURSELF IN MAKING A DECISION ABOUT A CASE IS: 'AM I PROTECTING THE COMMUNITY NOW BY MY ACTION IN THIS CASE?'"
- 5.14 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER SHOULD NOT MAKE HIS CASE RECORD ON THE PROBATIONER OR PAROLEE AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, EVEN IF IT IS A BRUTAL ONE."

Table

- 5.15 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER SHOULD NOT MAKE HIS CASE RECORD ON THE PROBATIONER OR PAROLEE AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, EVEN IF IT IS A BRUTAL ONE."
- 5.16 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "A PAROLEE OR PROBATIONER BEATS UP HIS MOTHER SO THAT SHE NEEDS SIX STITCHES. REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS ARE INDICATED."
- 5.17 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "A PAROLEE OR PROBATIONER BEATS UP HIS MOTHER SO THAT SHE NEEDS SIX STITCHES. REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS ARE INDICATED."
- 5.18 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IT IS BETTER FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS FOR HOME VISITS THAN TO CALL UNEXPECTEDLY."
- 5.19 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IT IS BETTER FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS FOR HOME VISITS THAN TO CALL UNEXPECTEDLY."
- 5.20 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IT IS PROBABLY A SOUND POLICY FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE AGENCY TO ROUTINELY SEND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT UP-TO-DATE LISTS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF PROBATIONERS OR PAROLEES WHO SHOW PATTERNS OF SEXUAL DEVIANCE."

Table

- 5.21 CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IT IS PROBABLY A SOUND POLICY FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE AGENCY TO ROUTINELY SEND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT UP-TO-DATE LISTS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF PROBATIONERS OR PAROLEES WHO SHOW PATTERNS OF SEXUAL DEVIANCE."
- 5.22 RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS (ρ) OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AND LEGITIMATION OF PROFESSIONAL PRESCRIPTIONS SCORES, WITH EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND TYPE HELD CONSTANT
- 6.1 CROSS-TABULATION OF WORKERS' RESPONSES AND WORKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW SUPERVISORS RESPOND TO THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS
- 6.2 CROSS-TABULATION OF WORKERS' AND SUPERVISORS' RESPONSES TO THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS. (COMPOSITE POPULATION)
- 6.3 CROSS-TABULATION OF WORKERS' AND SUPERVISORS' RESPONSES TO THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS. (RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUAL MAILINGS POPULATION)
- 6.4 COMPARISONS AMONG FOUR STATE SYSTEM AGENCIES OF WORKERS' AND SUPERVISORS' CHOICES OF COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AGGREGATES OF FIVE ITEMS
- 6.5 CROSS-TABULATION OF WORKERS' RESPONSES AND WORKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW THE COLLEAGUES THEY SPEAK TO MOST OFTEN ABOUT ON-THE-JOB CONCERNS RESPOND TO COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS
- 6.6 CROSS-TABULATION OF WORKERS' RESPONSES AND WORKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW THE "TOP" ADMINISTRATORS OF THEIR EMPLOYING ORGANIZATIONS RESPOND TO THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS

Table

- 6.7 SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL TESTS ON TABLES
TREATING WORKER PERCEPTION OF CONSENSUS
WITHIN THE ROLE-SET
- A.1 COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION
SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS: (A) WHO
HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK
AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, (B)
WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER
THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A
MASTER'S DEGREE, (C) WHO HOLD A MASTER'S
DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A
MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL
WORK, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS
FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES,
WITH LENGTH OF TIME SUPERVISED BY PRESENT
SUPERVISOR HELD CONSTANT

AUTHOR'S NOTE

Although the sources of ideas, arrangements, re-
search instruments and raw data are indicated in the front-
matter, text, footnotes and references of the present work,
it is the author's intent to consolidate and condense these
credits in order to reduce the burden on those readers who
prefer not to make fastidious searches of footnotes. At
the risk of being self-indulgent, this provides the author
with another opportunity to note the singular contributions
of Herman Piven to the present work.

The source of study populations,¹ access arrange-
ments, research instruments and raw data² is the "Curric-
ulum Evaluation Project" under the direction of Herman
Piven, Principal Investigator. The Project was known by a
number of descriptive titles including "Probation and Parole

¹There is one exception and this is a brief dis-
cussion of a study population which appears in Professional-
ism and Organizational Structure (Unpublished Columbia
University dissertation, 1960), by Herman Piven.

²The raw data derived from the employment of re-
search instruments discussed in Chapters IV and V of the
present work are, primarily, the responsibility of the
present author. These instruments derived, in part, from
Piven's original instruments (discussed in the introductory
chapter and Chapters I, II and III, of the present work) and
were designed by the present author in connection with the
"Curriculum Evaluation Project," Herman Piven, Principal
Investigator. The instruments described in Chapters IV and
V were suggested, in part, by Explorations in Role Analysis
(New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958) by Neal Gross,
et al., and by a conversation with A. H. Barton, Director
of the Bureau of Applied Research, Columbia University.

Research and Training Project" as well as the title previously noted. The Project was conducted by Herman Piven, initially at New York University, under grants Nos. 64, 209; 63, 234; 62, 209--from the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. (Piven enlisted the efforts of three research associates: Abraham Alcabes, Arden E. Melzer and Florence C. Parkinson.) The Project, under Piven's direction, was initiated in order to replicate and extend Piven's earlier work, Professionalism and Organizational Structure (op. cit.). The source of ideas and raw data for the portions of Professionalism and Organizational Structure which are replicated in the present work is therefore the "Curriculum Evaluation Project" under Piven's direction. The independent analyses of the data, the interpretations and conclusions drawn therefrom are the author's.

The present work is conceived of as a continuity in and extension of Piven's Professionalism and Organizational Structure and was made possible through Piven's encouragement, suggestions and efforts as Principal Investigator for the "Curriculum Evaluation Project."

THE PREPARATION OF BUREAUCRATIC FUNCTIONARIES AND
THE FUNCTIONARY'S ORIENTATION TO PRACTICE:
QUESTIONS FOR RESEARCH

An Introduction

This study concerns the relative influence of professional education, the conditions of practice, and other factors on the social worker's orientation to the welfare of his clients. In particular, the study represents a partial replication, extension and development of an earlier study of social work practice in correctional--probation and parole--organizations.¹

Earlier related studies and the present study of this subject emerge, implicitly, from a broad, originating question:² Given theoretically derived or empirically

¹Piven, H. Professionalism and Organizational Structure. New York: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1960. (See esp. Chaps. 1, 2, 4, and 6 and Appendices A, B, and C.).

²Merton, R. K. "Notes on Problem Finding In Sociology" in Sociology Today. (Merton et al, eds.). New York: Basic Books, 1959, pp. xii-xxix.

Merton distinguishes between a general "class of questions . . . which calls for discovering a particular body of social fact" or identifies a general problem concerning the nature and type of relationship between or among classes of variables and a more precise definition of a question for research which permits the investigator to recast the initial and general problem in operational terms. The former class of questions is referred to as "originating questions" and the latter is referred to as "specifying questions." A roughly comparable but regrettably wooly discussion (which, like Merton's discussion,

established professional objectives, is professional education necessary and/or sufficient for case decisions which conform to such objectives?³

acknowledges an intellectual debt to John Dewey) is offered by Lillian Ripple ("Problem Identification and Formulation" in Social Work Research (Polansky, ed.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.). Ripple distinguishes between general problems or questions requiring solution as they are initially identified and when the question is expressed in precise form (i.e., problem formulation). "This objective is achieved if three conditions are met: (a) The hypothesis relevant to the choices or decisions to be made are specified; (b) the assumptions accepted for purposes of the investigation are stated; and (c) the major concepts to be used are explicated" (p.34). Neither Merton's treatment nor Ripple's nubilous discussion of the relationship between general and specific questions for research suggest that a formulated problem or a specifying question is the equivalent of a "working" or "operational" hypothesis or a clear statement of the design and methods to be employed in a given investigation. The distinction between a specifying question and the operational aspects of a study is a useful one because it facilitates comparisons among specifying questions which derive from different intellectual traditions as well as comparisons among different technical treatments of the same question for research. (For a discussion of the distinction between research design and research methods see Kahn, A. J., "The Design of Research" in Social Work Research. Op. cit.).

³See, for example, Herman Piven's Professionalism and Organizational Structure (Op. cit.) and Willard Cooper Richan's The Influence of Professionalization, Work Environment and Other Factors on Social Worker's Orientation Toward Clients. (New York: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1965). Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott (Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962) provide an interesting complementary treatment of problems related to those addressed by Piven and Richan (e.g., see pp. 60-74, esp. Table 5, p. 73).

Both Piven, in his study of probation and parole agencies, and Richan, in his study of child welfare agencies, are concerned with the relative influence of professional education and organizational factors on the orientation of workers to professional role obligations as these bear upon case decisions or service to clients. Blau and Scott, in their study of a single county welfare agency, identify (among a number of other concerns) a

This question may be specified in a variety of ways which make it amenable to empirical methods but virtually any investigation which is addressed to the question is likely to contain discernible, perhaps obvious, implications for educational policy in social work and manpower policy in

related issue: the association between types of orientation (assumed to be related to professional versus non-professional status) and professionally prescribed activities and attitudes towards the employing organization including policies affecting case service. Richan's attention to workers' general orientation to clients (i.e., "favorableness or unfavorableness") and Piven's focus on the extent to which workers subscribe to standardized professional prescriptions for specific types of case actions (i.e., decisions) or "client-welfare-orientation" offer an interesting counterpoint to Blau's and Scott's data which yield the following observation: Either professional training or orientation to a professional reference group is associated with particular attitudes towards or opinions about the employing organization and the service it offers. Thus professional training and reference group identification discriminates among county welfare workers. In contrast, Piven finds that although his client-welfare-orientation instrument discriminates between his samples of professionally trained and untrained workers, when employing organization is held constant (i.e., when employing organization is used as a "test variable") differences between trained and untrained workers disappear. Richan observed that certain worker attributes (e.g., "young"; "50 years and older") which are related to work experience (i.e., "new workers"; "workers approaching retirement") are likely to be linked with structural features of the employing organization such as relative insularity from organizational expectations or the extent of functional autonomy. Like Piven, Richan notes the influence of the employing organization but unlike Piven finds that patterned organizational contingencies specify the relationship between professional training and orientation to clients. The seeming lack of consistency between Blau and Scott and either Piven or Richan may be a function of the remoteness of Blau's and Scott's study from the concern-with-client or case decision level of work. It may be that Piven and Richan are somewhat closer to the level of action whereas Blau and Scott have tapped into a form of social compliance evidenced in normative professional associations which serve as a reference group for

probation-parole organizations. Such investigations, because they deal with particular relationships between a specified occupational group and complex organizations, become part of a larger, if more diffuse, concern, namely, the study of the relationships between professionalism and bureaucracy.⁴

professional employees (and some employees who have not received professional training) in welfare organizations. (Etzioni offers a discussion of compliance relationships in normative organizations in A Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961, pp. 40-67.) For example, professionally trained workers may be more active in professionally prescribed "extra-mural" activities and be more critical of agency policy than certain categories of untrained workers but both types of worker may make similar case decisions, which may or may not be consonant with professional prescriptions for case action, under specific organizational contingencies. This may point to a gap in research on the professional's orientation to work. Perhaps a distinction should be made between orientation to remunerated work activity and orientation to "voluntary" professional activity.

A key problem in comparing general outcomes of different studies concerns the measurement procedures entailed in the development of empirical evidence. Blau's and Scott's measurement procedures are consistent with Richan's (i.e., they are based upon cross-tabulations) but Piven's study employs the Mann-Whitney U Test as a basic statistic. His scored data are more powerful than either Blau's and Scott's or Richan's. Richan's χ^2 measurements are insensitive to the effects of order whereas Piven's statistic is the most powerful of order statistics for his type of data. Piven and Richan, however, use a similar logical strategy in their use of "test variables." (See, in this connection, Hyman, H., Survey Design and Analysis. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960, esp. chap. 7.)

⁴Among those who, in recent years, have been directly concerned with professional social workers in bureaucratic settings, the following writers placed their concern in an empirical context or in a theoretical context relevant to empirical research: Thomas, E. J. "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size" in American Sociological Review. February, 1959, pp. 30-37; Blau, P. M.

Almost all professionally educated social workers become incumbents of organizational statuses and enact specified bureaucratic roles. This truism is evidenced, in social work training, by enrolling students in courses which are accurately described as "field placements." But the problems which emanate from this condition of practice receive less emphasis in field instruction than therapeutic techniques and professional style. There is one notable, if curious, exception: the injunction, on therapeutic rather than administrative grounds, to "identify with the agency."⁵ In brief, the educational emphasis is on service per se rather than on the conditions of that service.

"Orientation Toward Clients in a Public Welfare Agency" in Administrative Science Quarterly. December, 1960. pp. 341-361; Morgan, R. W. "Role Performance by Social Workers in a Bureaucracy" in Social Work Practice New York: Columbia University Press, 1962. pp. 111-126; Billingsley, A. "Bureaucratic and Professional Orientation Patterns in Social Casework" in Social Service Review. December, 1964. pp. 400-407; Green, A. D. "The Professional Social Worker in the Bureaucracy" in Social Service Review. March, 1966, pp. 61-83; Varley, B. K. "Are Social Workers Dedicated to Service" in Social Work, April, 1966, pp. 84-91; Sterhinsky, N. A., Billingsley, A. and Gurgin, V. "A Study of Social Work Practice in Protective Services: It's Not What You Know, It's Where You Work" in Child Welfare, October, 1966, pp. 449-450, 471.

⁵Helen Harris Perlman states that: "Every staff member in an agency speaks and acts for some part of the agency's function, and the caseworker represents the agency in its individualized problem-solving help." These have several significances for the caseworker. First, he is not an independent professional practitioner to whom an agency has given office space. No one, to be sure, would agree that he is--yet in practice it is not unknown that a caseworker may think of his clients as 'belonging' to him, or may ally himself with his client against his agency, or in some monetary combination of zealotry and loss of perspective, may act to circumvent agency

Educational aims and the goal of service. The major, frequently stated, goal of professional education in social work has been--and continues to be--the preparation of competent practitioners to serve people who present problems of interpersonal adjustment and to serve collectives in their efforts to cope with or alter their social environment.

This statement, of the ambitious and global goals of social work education, could stand as a relatively

policy. . . . In order to represent the agency," the caseworker "must be psychologically identified with it, at one with its purpose and policies." (Social Casework. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958, p. 50). Perlman's foreshortened view contrasts sharply with that of Gordon Hamilton's (Theory and Practice of Social Casework. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956). Hamilton also recognizes that the social functions of the agency are relevant to a discussion of worker-client relationships (e.g., ". . . so that the relationship will be used by both worker and client with reference to what the agency is equipped to do . . ." p. 28) but feels that "even structure and policy are open to discussion and criticism by client, citizen, workers, and are therefore subject to revision" (p. 65). Both Perlman and Hamilton qualify their points of view but the difference in thrust and, certainly, in flexibility, is evident. For both, however, the social functions of an agency are the manifest functions and the procedures which support specific organizational objectives. Thus, the discussions of agency functions, in the casework literature, do not come to grips with problems that are generated by the unanticipated consequences of organizational arrangements (i.e., latent problems) or the unrecognized consequences of organizational arrangements for other sub-units of the larger social system (i.e., latent functions). For a discussion of latent functions see Merton's treatment of manifest and latent functions in Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958, pp. 19-82. His discussion of manifest and latent problems appears under the title "Social Problems and Sociological Theory" in Contemporary Social Problems (Merton and Nisbet, eds.) New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961, esp. pp. 701-718.

harmless but diffuse and uninformative generality were it not for the fugitive meaning of such terms as "preparation," "competent," "adjustment," "serve" and "alter."⁶

⁶Defining one of the methods taught in professional schools of social work, Perlman states that the objective of social casework is "to help individuals to cope more effectively with their problems in social functioning" (op. cit., p. 4). Hamilton (op. cit.) identifies an often elaborated concept in the definition of social casework, namely "the interconnection of personal adaptation of the individual's and society's betterment" (p. 22). She also cites Mary Richmond's earlier definition "when she" (Mary Richmond) "spoke of 'processes which develop personality through adjustments consciously effected, individual by individual, between men and their social environment.' 'Social casework may be defined as the act of doing different things for and with different people by cooperating with them to achieve at one and the same time their own and society's betterment'" (p. 22). Florence Hollis states that "casework has always been a psychosocial treatment method. It recognizes both internal psychological and external social causes of dysfunctioning, and endeavors to enable the individual to meet his needs more fully and to function more adequately in his social relationships." (Casework, A Psychosocial Therapy. New York: Random House, 1964. p. 9). Ruth Smalley in a very recent discussion (Theory For Social Work Practice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967) summarizes a number of definitions, consonant with her views on the purpose of social work practice, as follows: "In summary, social work is characterized by its special concern with man's social relationships and opportunities, in essence with the relationship between man and his society, and by its responsibility for the furthering of a relationship that will be progressively productive for both" (p. 5). In discussing the implications of her book for social work education, Smalley states: "The core characteristic of any method in social work has been noted as being its engagement of the person or client system served in the realization of a social purpose, out of own motivation and choice, as that purpose finds congruence with the purpose of the social agency which constitutes the auspice for the service offered." (p. 287). Similar or analogous references may be offered for group work and community organization but the reader may be spared these citations because the present study primarily entails the professional norms of social work as they apply to casework in correctional settings. The foregoing references are offered in anticipation of the argument that the present author has set up a "straw man." If so, I have only reaped the harvest sown by the most eminent of caseworkers.

Ambiguity is only a stone's throw from rhetoric and just beyond rhetoric lies mischief.⁷

Consider, for example, the meaning of a social worker's "service" to "clients" who are literally captives⁸ of an organization. The economic laws of the goods and services market do not govern the transactions between worker and "client" in probation or parole agencies because there is virtually no demand for the "service" by "clients" and the unit of exchange is, by-and-large, undefined.

⁷As Kenneth Burke points out: ". . . if a social or occupational class is not too exacting in the scrutiny of identifications that flatter its interests, its very philosophy of life is a profitable malingering (profitable at least until its inaccuracies catch up with it)--and as such, it is open to either attack or analysis. This aspect of identification, whereby one can protect an interest merely by using terms not incisive enough to criticize it properly, often brings rhetoric to the edge of cunning." (A Rhetoric of Motives. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950. p. 36.)

⁸The term "captives" is usually associated with the more confining and structured circumstances of prison life. Gresham Sykes (The Society of Captives. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.) used the term in this sense and, perhaps, by implication, extended it to include the prison guards in his dedication: "This book is dedicated to the man in prison--both the prisoner and his guard." But, as Joseph Eaton's study, of the anatomy of planned administrative change, implies--although this is not the subject of his work--the physical limits of an organization are not necessarily coextensive with its social boundaries. (Stone Walls Not A Prison Make. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1962). Thus, the "offender" on probation or parole may indeed be a captive and may share that designation with the "inmate"--neither one applies for or elects his organizational status and both remain incumbents of their respective statuses at the pleasure of others over whom the captives exercise relatively little influence.

Economic analogies, as in the case of the psychoanalytic contract,⁹ do not readily yield insights into the nature

⁹Menninger, K. Theory of Psychoanalytic Technique. New York: Basic Books, 1958. pp. 15-42.

In a chapter entitled, "The Contract" and subtitled, "The Psychoanalytic Treatment Situation as a Two-Party Transaction," Menninger presses his analogy this way: "Suppose a vendor whom we shall call V, is offering for sale some apples and that he is approached by a potential customer, C. We must assume, of course, that V actually possesses some apples, and that he is at the same time relatively short of or in need of money; the purchaser, on the other hand, presumably wants apples (e.g., he is hungry). We must also assume that he possesses something to be offered in exchange for the apples in case a transaction can be established" (p. 17). The analogy is obvious, and, as one may expect, a patient offers an "interesting case" (i.e., research value) or money in exchange for the psychoanalytic apple. (A similar example is to be found in the biblical account of the price of knowledge to which Menninger, perhaps unconsciously, alludes).

Although many clients of social workers or, if one accepts Perlman's view, clients of social agencies, do not pay directly for services (i.e., a philanthropic organization may pay for clients) their approach to the agency is often thought of as being at the client's initiative. Thus Perlman (op. cit.) sets out much the same terms as Menninger in her discussion of the caseworker-client relationship: "In the problem that the client brings to the social agency, both he and the worker are involved, though very differently; the client is in need of help, and the worker is the instrument of help" (Italics not in original, p. 71). Much of the rest of Perlman's discussion concerns the conditions that will permit the development of a relationship which "develops out of the professional business the caseworker and client have to work on together" (p. 69). Thus, a professional business relationship develops out of a series of transactions which entail the clients' on-going demand for a service and the worker's on-going provision of the service. Hamilton's (op. cit.) discussion of the use of relationship likens the client's participation in the determination of "certain aspects of policy and procedure in welfare" and, therefore, in the treatment process or the receipt of service to "collective bargaining" (Italics not in original, p. 44). But it was Mary Richmond, in 1917, who explicitly linked the term "Client" with "one who employs professional service of any kind," for social workers. "The more expert the service, the more appropriate the word,"

of fundamentally involuntary or coercive relationships.¹⁰

If a "service" is neither initially demanded nor intentionally desired by a "client," the applicability of the concept of service is in doubt.

(i.e., client) "which has the advantage, moreover, of democratic implications" (i.e., voluntary implications). (Social Diagnosis. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1917. p. 38.)

¹⁰In his discussion of the "lower participants" in an organization, Etzioni suggests that commonly employed terms such as "inmates" and "clients" imply the kind of "involvement" organizational actors have in the organization. "Unless some qualifying adjectives such as 'co-operative' or 'good' are introduced, inmate implies alienative involvement. Clients designate people with alienative or calculative involvement. Customers refers to people who have a relatively more alienative orientation than clients; one speaks of the clients of professionals but not ordinarily of their customers." (op. cit., p. 17). This observation, taken together with his typology of "compliance relations" (i.e., a nominal cross-classification of "kinds of power" exerted in complex organizations and "kinds of involvement" by "lower participants") which yields three congruent types of compliance relations and six incongruent types, suggests that "clients" are not the "lower participants" within an organizational system but are actually outside of the organization's boundaries (op. cit., p. 12). In contrast, the "inmate" is a "lower participant." The study of the relations between the client system and the organization system concerns the "interface" of these systems. (See in this connection, Haberstroh, C. H., "Organization Design and Systems Analysis" in Handbook of Organizations (March, ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.) The distinction between the client system and the lowest location in the status hierarchy within an organizational system is a crucial one for the point addressed in the text. A contrasting view is offered by Talcott Parsons who, in discussing the "types of relation existing between the performer of services and the recipients of the ultimate 'product,'" identifies a pattern particularly applicable to professional services "when the recipient of the service becomes an operative member of service-providing organization." While Parsons excludes the client who employs a private practitioner, he includes students (i.e., both those undergoing compulsory education and university students) and hospital patients as examples of "customers" who are to be considered part of the

It is not uncommon to use the theoretical harness of the market place for the organizational pony but one must have a pony of the right sort.¹¹

organizational system. ("Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations" in Complex Organizations. (Etzioni, ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962, pp. 39-40). Thus, Parsons suggests, by implication, that where services are rendered through a bureaucratic organizational system, a fruitful mode of analysis might include the client or the customer within the boundaries of the system. Lefton and Rosengren in their theoretical discussion of organizations and clients treat clients as part of the organizational system but then differentiate two dimensions of the system which are focused on the relationship between client and organizational service (i.e., the "biographical interest in the client") namely the "lateral dimension" or "social space" (e.g., a short-term therapeutic hospital) and the "longitudinal dimension" or "social time" (e.g., a TB hospital). Organizations which are classified in terms of their "biographical interest" in the client may evidence both dimensions (e.g., a liberal arts college) or neither dimension (e.g., an acute general hospital) according to Lefton and Rosengren. The type of "biographical interest" in the client can then be related to "compliance problems," "difficulties over consensus" on means and ends and "modes of collaboration" among organizations with different types of "biographical interests." ("Organizations and Clients: Lateral and Longitudinal Dimensions" in American Sociological Review, Vol. 31, No. 6. Dec., 1966). In following Parsons' lead, Lefton's and Rosengren's initial formulation necessarily requires an intra-system distinction (i.e., "biographical interest") which is handled somewhat more parsimoniously by Etzioni as an inter-system concept, namely, a device which enables the organizational analyst to locate the boundaries of the organization in terms of the specific relational problem to be studied. In either case, Blau's and Scott's observation (op. cit., p. 77) that "It is perhaps a truism to say that organizations will reflect the characteristics of the publics they serve" and that "while such differences seem to be important and pervasive, there has been little attempt to relate client characteristics systematically to organizational structures" applies to the considerations raised above.

We have, perhaps, belabored the point that those who are ordinarily called the "clients" of correctional organizations do not fit the empirical referents of that term.

¹¹The style of this metaphor is attributable to the indirect influence of Gibert Ryle (Dilemmas. Oxford:

Let us therefore dispense with the misnomer, "client," and accept, for our purposes, that we are discussing captives who are dealt with, in some manner, by the correctional organization acting through specially authorized functionaries who may be called "social workers." The organization's clients are individual complainants and the community's institutionalized representatives: the police department, the board of education, the business corporation, etc., each of which, in legal metaphore, may be known as the "people" or the "state." And it is the people who pay for the services rendered by correctional organizations. That service constitutes the maintenance of specified relationships among people and culturally valued objects which is commonly called "the protection of property and persons." The maintenance of relationships is an abstract notion which is given concrete meaning by the control of individuals who deviate from enforceable legal prescriptions for desired behavior. The methods, benign or otherwise, of controlling captives, on behalf of the correctional organization's clients, is alien work for "professional altruists."¹² But such work is nevertheless

The Cambridge University Press, 1964). More important than the style, however, is Ryle's often repeated caution concerning the risks of treating conceptual problems in terms of inappropriate analogies.

¹²Roy Lubove's provocative title, The Professional Altruist (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965) alludes to the professionalization and bureaucratization of social work as an altruistic institution. The conflict addressed in the text, above, concerns professional imperatives and organizational requirements. But Lubove places

accepted by professionally trained social workers who know the script but may not understand the play. They are, after all, actors and not authors.¹³

An actor may not identify with the character he is required to portray but may have enough talent to be

the issue in an historical perspective in his chapter on agency-community relations: "Formal organization encouraged professionalism and coincided with the needs of the subculture, but the paid staff confronted serious problems of adjustment to those same organizational imperatives which constrained voluntarism" (p. 170). It is not inconceivable that the non-cognitive aspects of the conflict may be summed up by altering an old adage: He who pays the piper expects to call the tune.

¹³Ivor Kraft, in an unpublished paper entitled "Towards a New Conception of Social Work in American Society" (School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University. January, 1968) supports this point of view with an historical perspective on the author-actor relationship: "The concept of the social worker as not himself a 'philanthropist' but the agent or employee of one, is an important and revealing concept. The social worker performs a kind of moral and humane police function. He polices the social terrain of breakdown and dysfunction. 'Crisis intervention' may have a modern ring to it but it is an old version of the role of the poor law agent, the district visitor, the almoner, the caseworker, in short, the social worker. But the social worker himself does not 'name the crisis,' does not make policy, does not set down the rules of the game, does not define the larger philosophies and purposes of the philanthropic enterprise. That task is in the hands of others." (pp. 1-2).

But the most general (and venerable) statement of the author-actor relationship is to be found in Hobbes' Leviathan: A Person is he, whose words or actions are considered, either as his own, or as representing the words or actions of another man, or of any other thing to whom they are attributed, whether Truly or by Fiction. . . . The word Person is latine: instead whereof the Greeks, have Πρόσωπον, which signifies the Face as Personal in latine signifies the disguise, or outward appearance of a man, counterfeited on the Stage; and sometimes more particularly that part of it, which disguiseth the face, as a Mask or Visard: And from the Stage, hath been translated to any Representer of speech or action, as well in Tribunalls, as Theaters. So that a Person, is the same that an Actor is, both on the Stage and in common Conversation; and to

convincing. An uncharitable image of the social worker as an actor on the correctional stage and, at the risk of punning, as a performer for his captive audience is that he "may be moved to guide the conviction of his audience only as a means to other ends, having no ultimate concern in the conception that they have of him or of the situation. When the individual has no belief in his own act and no ultimate concern with the beliefs of his audience, we may call him cynical . . . It should be understood that the cynic, with all his professional disinvolvement, may obtain unprofessional pleasures from his masquerade,

Personate, is to Act, or Represent himself, or an other; and he that acteth another is said to beare his Person, or act in his name . . .

. . . And then the Person is the Actor; and he that owneth his words and actions is the AUTHOR: In which case the Actor acteth by Authority . . . So that by Authority, is alwayes understood a Right of doing any act: and done by Authority, done by Commission, or License from him whose right it is.

From hence it followeth, that when the Actor maketh a Covenant by Authority, he bindeth thereby the author, no less than if he had made it himself; and no less subjecteth him to all the consequences of the same . . .

And therefore he that maketh a Covenant with the Actor, or representer, not knowing the Authority he hath, doth it at his own perill . . .

Of Authors then be two sorts. The first simply so called; which I have before defined to be him, that owneth the Action of another simply. The second is he, that owneth an Action, or Covenant of another conditionally; that is to say, he undertaketh to do it, if the other doth it not . . . (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1950.) pp. 133-138.

Leviathan (which was originally published in London in 1651) treats the actor=author relationship within the context of rights and obligations which define social relationships. It is precisely this context which is often ignored in discussions of the correctional worker's role. In its place, one frequently finds a discussion of goals--as if the pursuit of desirable ends does not require a treatment of those particular social arrangements (i.e., means) which support the pursuit of such ends.

experiencing a kind-of gleeful spiritual aggression from the fact that he can toy at will with something his audience must take seriously."¹⁴ On the other hand, "the performer can be fully taken in by his own act; he can be sincerely convinced that the impression of reality which he stages is real."¹⁵ Thus the worker may be blissfully unaware of his part in "mortification processes"¹⁶ which are, in effect, the unrecognized consequences of the worker's fastidious adherence to administrative requirements which are therapeutically rationalized.

If the fit between the social worker's professional objectives and the correctional organization's functions is not the happiest of configurations, neither is it a totally

¹⁴Goffman, G. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959. pp. 17-18.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 17.

¹⁶Goffman's discussion of mortification processes proceeds within the context of "total institutions." Goffman identifies a class of organizations whose "character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside that is often built right into the physical plant: locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs and water, open terrain, and so forth." ("The Characteristics of Total Institutions" in Complex Organizations. (Etzioni, ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. p. 312). But the physical "symbolism" is a concomitant of social constraints upon the activities and desires of the captives; a physical counterpart of coercive compliance structures. While the most restrictive constraints may be found in "total institutions," that is, coercive organizations whose physical boundaries are approximately coextensive with their social boundaries, the total institution shares some characteristics with organizations whose physical boundaries are more permeable and whose social boundaries exhibit a strain toward totalism when considered in the light of their compliance structures.

untenable one. The question is: Can he maintain a professional orientation towards the captives or does he become another captor or, perhaps, a parasite? Implicit in this question is another: if the worker cannot prompt a genuine demand for his art among the captives, will he use his position to penalize them? To what extent can the worker and the captive to whom he is assigned create, in interaction, a small sphere of freedom within the larger context of containment?

The empirical answer to this depends on the extent to which professional norms are binding upon the professional as these are translated into actual case decisions and the extent to which organizational constraints are effective in delimiting the activity of workers. In one sense, the outcome is a test of the relative influence of professional education and agency structure (i.e., as an organizational expression of social institutions.)¹⁷

¹⁷The assumption, here, is that agency structure is not purely fortuitous. Some relation between organizational structure or the anatomy of a particular set of institutionalized relations among socially selected actors and the functional prerequisites of the larger social system is assumed to be discoverable. Talcott Parsons states that "a social system cannot be so structured as to be radically incompatible with the conditions of functioning of its component individual actors as biological organisms and as personalities, or of the relatively stable integration of a cultural system." (The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: the Free Press, 1959. p. 27). This assumption should not be construed as a teleological proposition. If "form follows function" then all that has been stated is that the form (structure) is compatible with a set of logically deduced or empirically established conditions. Moreover, it is the general structure, rather than the organizational

The question is somewhat different than whether or not organizational requirements and professional imperatives yield cognitive dilemmas¹⁸ and role conflicts;¹⁹ the question, here, concerns whether or not the professionally trained worker and his similarly located untrained colleagues will be differentially oriented to their work.

The task for research, then, is to discover whether or not trained²⁰ and untrained workers are differentially oriented and, if they are, whether professional education or other variables account for the observed difference.

The empirical study of practice orientation. A prior study, by Herman Piven, yields the observations that professional beliefs do not govern the practice orientation of professionally trained workers employed in probation and parole agencies and that organizational factors exert a powerful influence on practice orientation.²¹

chart, of the correctional organization which is perhaps (sufficiently but not necessarily) compatible with the maintenance of social patterns or the assumed inertial tendencies of social systems.

¹⁸Ohlin, L. E. "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole" in National Probation and Parole Association Journal. July, 1956. pp. 211-225.

¹⁹Gross, N., Mason, W. S., and McEachorn, A. W. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958. See especially pp. 281-318.

²⁰"Trained worker" is synonymous, in the present work, with "a worker who holds a Master's degree in social work."

²¹Piven, H. Professionalism and Agency Structure. Op. cit.

While professionally trained social workers, as a whole, were more oriented to the welfare of their clients than were their untrained colleagues, this statistically established difference disappeared when employing organization was held constant, with some organizations evidencing a more client welfare oriented central tendency than others.

To study practitioner orientation, Piven constructed a "client-welfare-orientation" (CWO) instrument (i.e., questionnaire items) "using guides from earlier depth interview research on significant correctional practice issues. The appropriate professional norm for each question was established by deduction from social work literature and empirically tested by questionnaire response from casework faculty in four schools of social work" (i.e., Piven employed a known group of "norm transmitters" as a criterion population).²²

The CWO instrument²³ "was administered . . . to male practitioners supervising adult male clients in five metropolitan probation-parole agencies. As hypothesized, "social work personnel were far more positively oriented to" client

²²This quotation is Piven's own succinct summary as it appears in a copy of an abstract submitted with the unpublished "manuscript" of Professionalism and Agency Structure (op. cit.).

²³The Measuring instrument" was a set of 32 scored questionnaire items with a three point response scale (i.e., "Agree"; "Indifferent or Can't decide"; "Disagree"). Each item constituted a prescriptive statement incorporated into or following a brief description of an event in the client's life or a requested or contemplated worker action (e.g. "The Probation or Parole officer should make all his records available to the police when they are investigating a crime, particularly if it is a brutal one.")

service and treatment "than practitioners without such training; this difference disappeared, however, when the employing agency was held constant."²⁴ (See Table 1.1, below).

Table 1.1 suggests that Piven's conclusions do not fully encompass his findings. The relevant comparisons could be made in three out of the five agencies studied and, in one of these, statistical differences between trained and untrained workers approached the confidence level accepted for the study. Of the agencies in which orientational differences between trained and untrained workers were virtually absent, two were federal agencies. The one agency in which differences between trained and untrained workers approached statistical significance was a state agency. When only trained workers are taken into account, the difference between the one state agency and one of the federal agencies on median client welfare orientation score was less than the corresponding difference between the two federal agencies. In terms of the statistical conventions adopted by Piven, his interpretation of his findings (i.e., the initially found orientational differences between trained and untrained workers disappear when employing agency is held constant) is, by definition, in accord with the statistical analysis. But, given the

²⁴This quotation, too, is Piven's own summary as it appears in a copy of an abstract (p. 2) of Professionalism and Agency Structure. Op. cit.

TABLE 1.1^a

COMPARISON OF CLIENT-WELFARE-ORIENTATION SCORES OF
PROBATION-PAROLE PRACTITIONERS, BY TRAINING,
HOLDING AGENCY CONSTANT

Agency	Median Scores		d (Mdn. 1- Mdn. 2)	C.R. or U.***	Chance Probability
	Social Workers (Mdn. 1)	Non-Social Workers (Mdn. 2)			
"A"	50 (15)	50 (6)	0		1.00
"B"	40 (5)	42 (8)	-2		1.00
"X"	34 (12)	30 (5)	+4	U=15.5	>.05 <.10
"Z"*	(0)	28.5 (25)			
"Y"**	(0)	23 (14)			
Totals	41.5 (32)	29 (58)			

^aThis table (designated in the original as "Table 2"; see Piven, H. *op. cit.*, p. 34) is, with the exception just noted, a faithful reproduction of the contents of the original including the use of all symbols and footnotes. The enclosing of the sample size in parentheses (rather than the median scores as appears to be suggested by the column headings) similarly follows the original.

*Training of three additional respondents unknown and not included in this analysis.

**Training reliably estimated.

***Mann-Whitney test for differences, hypothesizing social workers as more client-welfare-oriented than non-social workers; $\alpha = .05$.

purposive sampling technique and the relatively small sets of observations (i.e., see the size of the obtained samples of trained and untrained workers in each agency and the near differences between categories of workers in state agencies in contrast to the federal agencies) one cannot help but wonder if Piven's findings are stable.

This, then, constitutes the present study's first question: Are Piven's findings regarding client welfare orientation stable? Because there is room for doubt, the operational equivalent of Piven's hypothesis is tested in the present study. The hypothesis may be formally stated as follows:

Probation and parole practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work are more client welfare oriented (i.e., achieve significantly higher CWO scores) than probation and parole practitioners without such training.

The test of this hypothesis and the elaborations of the test which, taken together, constitute a near replication and refinement of Piven's test, is examined in Chapter I. An extension of the elaboration of the tests of the hypothesis, which concerns the structure of case-loads and practitioner orientation is treated in Chapter II.

Practitioner orientation and organizational constraints.

In reviewing Piven's findings it was noted that when employing organization was held constant, while testing for orientational differences between professionally trained workers and those who were not professionally trained, initially observed differences between trained and

untrained workers disappeared. Further, some of the probation-parole agencies evidenced a more client welfare oriented central tendency than others. Piven also observed, as hypothesized, that large variations in the extent of perceived constraints on practitioner autonomy emerged among employing organizations and that these variations appeared to be associated with the extent of diffuseness of administrative control.²⁵ Thus federal agency systems emerged as providing more practitioner autonomy than state agency systems. Piven observed that the more autonomous organizations also evidenced a more client-welfare-oriented central tendency than the more restrictive organizations.²⁶

The degree of functional autonomy therefore emerges as an explanatory variable in Piven's study.

His argument is compelling but the distribution of professional personnel among the five agencies studied is such that the immediate evidence for the observed relationship is not fully convincing: three out of five agencies employed professional personnel and two, of these three, were federal agency systems. Examination of Piven's data also reveals that the relationship between practitioner orientation and functional autonomy is not a uniform relationship. When only professionally trained workers are taken into account (i.e., when professional training is held

²⁵Piven, H. op. cit., pp. 83-118.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 149-188.

constant) there are no statistically significant orientational differences between one federal agency system and the one state agency system which had trained workers on its staff. In contrast, a parallel comparison between the same state agency and the remaining federal agency evidences a statistically significant difference (See Piven, pp. 159-160).

Piven's actual data, rather than his conclusions, suggest further study of "autonomy-restrictiveness" and of the relationship between functional autonomy and practitioner orientation. There is no reason to suppose that patterned differences among state level agencies are negligible.²⁷ The possible relationship between the degree of functional autonomy perceived by the workers in an agency and their orientation to practice warrants further study.

The second question, therefore, to be addressed by this study concerns the relationship between workers perceptions of organizational constraints (i.e., the degree of functional autonomy) and client welfare orientation.

In Chapter III this relationship is examined in a number of ways including the assessment of rank order correlations between a form of Piven's "Client-Welfare-Orienta- tion Instrument" (CWO) and an abbreviated version of his

²⁷In a footnote to Piven's hypothesis that "members of federal probation-parole agencies are systematically provided greater autonomy for making case decisions than are members of state probation-parole agencies" (op. cit., p. 93) he states that "It was also anticipated that some differences in the extent of practitioner autonomy existed among agencies on the same level of government . . . It was not possible, however, to specify those local and historical factors which might make for differences and hence predict

"Autonomy-Restrictiveness Instrument" (AR) while holding specified sub-populations, among the total respondent population, constant. Further comparisons, employing the AR and CWO Instruments, are made among a set of pairs of autonomous and restrictive state agency systems in order to determine if these instruments discriminate among agencies in a similar way.

Employing Piven's theoretical argument that the organization which yields greater functional autonomy²⁸ for practitioners is less "visible" (i.e., administrative control is more diffuse) and that the lack of visibility is one of the sources of autonomy, it is suggested, in Chapter III, that the argument may be extended.²⁹ Practitioners

their direction." It would have been possible for Piven to recast his hypothesis so that it concerned the discovery of whether inter- or intra-governmental level differences accounted for more of the score variations but the ordinal level of measurement placed some restrictions on this approach. In the present study, all of the agency systems included are on the same government level (i.e., level of administrative accountability). Thus, that question is not addressed in the present work.

²⁸The measure of agency autonomy is derived from the central tendency (i.e., median AR Score) of respondent AR scores. Thus, the designation of an agency as "autonomous" reflects practitioners' perceptions of organizational constraints. Agency autonomy is, therefore, the central tendency of practitioner evaluations of the extent of organizational constraints.

²⁹In discussing variations in federal and state structures, Piven identifies five structural conditions which conduce to greater organizational autonomy at the federal level (op. cit., pp. 85-85) which concern the accountability of administrators within the sub-units (i.e., agencies) of the system and the extra-mural constraints on agency operations. Responsibility for administrative control of the system is divided among three centers

in large urban systems may be part of a more regulated system in contrast to their counterparts in smaller rural systems. The latter, assumed to be

of power which are geographically and organizationally separate from each other. Two of the non-legislative centers of power--the federal judiciary and the federal parole board--are neither appointed by nor responsible to individuals or collective bodies which can exert local pressure. Agencies in the system are geographically dispersed and district administrators do not participate in those negotiations which are the prelude to federal laws affecting agency funds and caseloads. The relationship between these conditions which conduce to agency--or, more concretely, sub-unit administrative--autonomy and practitioner autonomy is rather obscure. Piven attempts to relate these two analytically distinct problems by relying on Merton's discussion of social mechanisms for the articulation of roles in the role-set. (See Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958, pp. 371-379). But Piven's discussion is elusive since it is not clear how the diffusion of administrative accountability (i.e., differential intensity of involvement among those in the sub-unit administrator's role set) is transferred to the incumbents of non-administrative statuses. Similarly, lack of "visibility" of the agency is not the equivalent of the lack of visibility for the practitioner. This suggests that the conditions which conduce to agency autonomy may have no systematic effect on practitioner autonomy. But the analysis of conditions which conduce to practitioner autonomy can be subjected to a parallel analysis. Thus Merton's discussion is of central relevance even though it does not provide an explanation of the link between "agency" autonomy and practitioner autonomy. (In the last analysis, Piven's empirical measure of autonomy concerns practitioners' perceptions of organizational constraints).

For practitioners who are "in the field" part of their time and in the office the remainder of the time, one of the salient conditions which affects practitioners' autonomy is just as likely to be their literal visibility as their social visibility. Also, the amount of time they interact with organizational role-partners and the number of partners with whom they are required to interact in a routine manner is apt to be important. Thus, organizational size or complexity very likely affects practitioners' evaluations of the extent to which they are constrained by the employing organization.

less visible, are hypothesized to perceive themselves as having more autonomy than their urban counterparts.

Thus, the hypothesis suggests that the practitioner's visibility rather than the structure of administrative accountability is a source of perceived constraints.

Commitment to professional norms and assessments of their utility. Examination of Piven's findings in the light of the response scale for the CWO Instrument reveals that practice orientation is to be interpreted as the extent of agreement with standardized practice prescriptions. Professional education in social work requires more than assent to its prescriptions for practice; it requires commitment to its belief in the "uniqueness" of individuals. The inculcation of professional values and the assimilation of psychoanalytic precepts and ideology³⁰ has been--and

³⁰ Hamilton (*op. cit.*) refers to psychiatry as a "'permeating' subject" (p. 294). "Casework itself, more generally perhaps than medicine, was deeply influenced by the point of view of psychiatry, particularly of 'dynamic' or psychoanalytic psychiatry, so that caseworkers from any accredited school of social work enter upon practice . . . attuned to the emotional responses of patients to physical or mental illness" (p. 295). The historical theoretical biases of casework are not evidence, in themselves, that ideology operates as a functional substitute for empirically supported theory. It is only when one examines Hamilton's strictures on the role of the intellect in learning casework, that one becomes aware of an unwitting ideologically oriented punning on the word "intellect": "While the social worker who relies wholly on intuition to understand another person may become lost in mysticism, it is also possible to overestimate the intellectual approach to life as yielding real meaning. This truth (!) the social caseworker learns the moment he tries to 'treat' another human being. The highly intellectualized person may make a good research worker, but rarely a good clinician, because the

continues to be--a core part of the casework curriculum.

With the exception of some remarkable current

intellectual quality itself inhibits him from a direct experiencing of relationship which is the surest touch with living reality." (Hamilton G. op. cit., p. 41; emphases added). One must suppose that Freud--one of the great intellectuals of modern times--was somehow exempt from the liabilities which are generated by the intellect. Apparently, the social worker must experience the substance of the insights supported by psychoanalytic theory (or its casework derivative) rather than rely too much on the written word or didactic courses. Further, the implications for recruitment to accredited schools of social social work are clear: don't admit anyone suspected of being "intellectual." Within social work curricula, the "direct experiencing of relationship" therefore receives greater attention (i.e., proportionately more course time is allocated to "field instruction" than to more formally designed and theoretical-oriented courses). The vocational thrust (i.e., skills development) is wedded to the inculcation of a prescribed set of "professional" values. At the risk of belaboring what is well-known, Hamilton's statement, which is not atypical, is noted: "Social work rests ultimately on certain assumptions which cannot be proved, but without which its methods and goals have no meaning. These axioms are, for example: human betterment is the goal of any society; so far as economic and cultural resources can be developed the general standard of living should be progressively improved; education for physical and mental health and welfare should be widely promoted; the social bond between man and men should lead to the realization of the age-old dream of universal brotherhood. The ethic derived from these and similar axioms leads to two nuclear ideas which distinguish social work as one of the humanistic professions. The first is that the human event consists of person and situation, or subjective and objective reality, which constantly interact, and the second that the characteristic method of social work incorporates within its processes both scientific knowledge and social values in order to achieve its ends" (op. cit., p. 3). Florence Hollis, in a section entitled "The Basic Values of Casework" (Casework A Psychosocial Therapy op. cit., pp. 12-13) in a somewhat more logically coherent but not too dissimilar vein identifies a "concern for the well-being of the individual," "belief in the innate worth of the individual," "acceptance" and "a belief in the value of self-determination" as basic values of casework and as necessary conditions for the establishment of "the relationship of trust that is so essential for effective treatment." The logical problems involved in predicating scientific knowledge on an ethic derived from

efforts³¹ in social work education, the emphasis on ideology fills the vacuum of a largely absent technology. The logical test of educational success, therefore, is the extent of moral commitment to the profession's dominant ideology. For this reason, the meaning of "agree" or "disagree" with a given prescription for practice requires further exploration. For example, if a worker agrees with the prescription,

After discussion between officer and parolee, the officer should let the offender make all formal decisions about himself and his activities unless a violation of the law is involved.

does it mean that he legitimates the stated case action or that he finds it expedient in a given situation?³² If differences between workers in the nature of agreement with a given practice prescription exist, are such differences associated with differences in educational background? Are

"axioms" (Hamilton) or of predicating the necessary conditions of effective treatment on a humanistic belief system (Hollis) is not at issue here. The point is, learning the "theory" and practice of social casework entails: (a) the assimilation of psychoanalytic precepts (i.e., exposure to psychoanalytic or empirical methods of proof of psychoanalytic propositions are not required for social workers); (b) the development of a set of skills (i.e., vocational training); (c) subscription to a prescribed set of normative beliefs.

³¹See, for example, Thomas, E. J. and Goodman, E., Socio-Behavioral Theory and Interpersonal Helping In Social Work. Ann Arbor: Campus Publishers, 1965.

³²In a discussion of role conflict resolution, Gross, Mason and McEachorn (Explorations In Role Analysis: Studies of The School Superintendency Role. New York: John Wiley, 1958) distinguish between a moral and an expedient orientation to social expectations. The authors "assume that actors are predisposed to conform to expectations they perceive as legitimate, perceived obligations,

professionally trained workers more likely to legitimate a professional prescription they agree with than untrained workers who also agree with such a prescription? Different

and are predisposed to avoid conforming to expectations which they perceive as illegitimate, perceived pressures." Under conditions of competing expectations, which may be variously weighted with anticipated negative sanctions, an actor "who gives priority to the sanctions dimension over the legitimacy dimension of the expectations perceived as held by others," may be described as expedient (p. 291). An analagous classification may be made of actors or orientations of those actors who give priority to, or those responses which evidence an emphasis on the legitimacy dimension (i.e., a "moral" orientation). But differing orientations to the same expectation can be associated with unlike evaluations of the legitimacy of that expectation. In contrast to Gross' concern with competing expectations (taken two at a time, yielding four possible combinations with respect to one dimension) which focuses on role conflict as a function of competing expectations, the present author addresses a complementary problem: Holding professional expectations constant (i.e., standardized prescriptions for case decisions), are different patterns of evaluation of what are, in effect, the coordinates of two dimensions--legitimacy and usefulness or utility--a function of specified respondent attributes and/or organizational factors? Differences in specified respondent attributes such as the difference between correctional workers with a Master's degree in social work and those without such a degree can be understood in terms of differential normative commitments, loyalties and expectations. But competing expectations, in that context, concerns differences between sets of actors who operate in the same behavioral field rather than differences between sets of expectations which are thought of as being in the same cognitive field. Gross, in one sense, is concerned with how an administrator manages, or responds to, the expectations of a number of distinct publics who relate to the object of his administrative concerns. In Gross' structural terms, this matter concerns relations between a "focal position" and a number of "counter positions" or a "position-centric model" (p. 52) which is not unlike Merton's concept of the "role-set" discussed earlier.

commitments to and assessments of utility of the same practice prescription may underlie the same "agree" or "disagree" response. One practitioner, for example, may agree with a prescription because it is legitimated by professional norms while another practitioner may agree because the prescription constitutes a useful guide for practice.

The actual case situations which require action are not apt to pose cognitively simple questions such as: "Is this case decision right?" or "Is this decision useful?" More likely, both of these dimensions--legitimacy and utility--underlie case decisions and, at times, the actual referents of these conceptual dimensions may compete with one another so that a worker may have to confront decisions which are "not useful but right" or "useful but wrong."³³

³³In summarizing a discussion of "Analyzing Stimulus Information," James Bieri (Measurement in Personality and Cognition. (Messie and Ross, eds.) New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962, p. 238), suggests that: ". . . varying modes of judgment resolution of conflicting information can be observed both as a function of the behavior being judged and as a function of the subjects who are doing the judging." Bieri is concerned with the "cognitive system or the construct system of the perceiver" (p. 230), and, in this connection, he points out, in effect, that stimulus information (or the inferences concerning stimulus information) is mediated by the construct system of the perceiver or judge of the information. In the case of prescriptive information (e.g., the standardized prescriptive statements which respondents who participated in the present study judged as right or wrong and useful or not useful) the information, conceived of as stimuli, may not be inherently contradictory but the opportunity to evaluate the information in contradictory terms (i.e., response categories which provide a choice) approaches a

If professional education were effective in its inculcation of the professional belief system, then professionally trained workers should be able to distinguish between expedient and professionally prescribed case actions in cognitively complex case situations where the expedient action may not be consistent with the professionally prescribed action. One would anticipate that the untrained worker would either be less able to distinguish among the dimensions of legitimacy and utility and, therefore, would exhibit a less consistent response pattern than the trained worker, or would legitimate case actions which are not client welfare oriented and would find such actions to be useful.³⁴ A third alternative exists for the

functional equivalent of conflicting stimulus information. In order to effect a test of particular judgment resolutions as a function of specified attributes of the judge rather than the information judged per se, the anticipated response patterns should be identified in advance of presenting the conflicting stimulus information. Not all of the logically deducible patterns of judgment (based on a given number of judgment options) are necessarily associated with distinct behavioral outcomes. Thus, the range of orientations may be broader than the range of relevant performances. Similarly, the empirical range of orientations may be narrower than the logically constructed classification of orientations.

³⁴One can distinguish two related, but analytically distinct issues: (a) competing requirements for, or expectations about, role-performance which are articulated with an operative sanction system; (b) Competing requirements for, or expectations about, role-performance which are not articulated or tenuously articulated with an operative sanction system. There seems little doubt that a discussion of modes of conflict resolution are directly relevant to the former issue. But a discussion of modes of conflict resolution in the context of the latter necessarily assumes that there is a strain toward

TABLE 1.2
 A CLASSIFICATION OF PATTERNS OF EVALUATION
 OF PROFESSIONALLY PRESCRIBED
 CASE ACTIONS

Type of Decision	Evaluations of Professionally Prescribed Case Actions	
	Useful ^a	Legitimate ^b
Professionally Oriented	+	+
Morally Oriented	-	+
Welfare Oriented	+	(<u>+</u>)
Control Oriented	-	(<u>+</u>)
Expediently Oriented	+	-
Punitively Oriented	-	-

^aA "+" represents an evaluation of "useful"; a "-" represents an evaluation of "not useful."

^bA "+" represents an evaluation of "right"; a "-" represents an evaluation of "not right"; "(+)" indicates that the action is evaluated "apart from right or wrong."

untrained worker: he may not consider the dimension of legitimacy to be relevant at all. Thus, one can pose an ideal-type classification of patterns of case decisions.

It should be noted that the classification of types of decisions, listed in Table 1.2, is not logically exhaustive insofar as two categories--"right apart from useful or not useful" and "not right apart from useful or not useful"--are not included. Since the typology is relevant to practice decisions or case actions, the exclusion of a reference to utility is substantively meaningless and, in all probability, operationally negligible.

There is no compelling reason to project, empirically, six types of respondents (i.e., consistent response patterns). What is suggested by the implicit hypothesis is that trained workers will evaluate a professionally prescribed case action in a professionally oriented manner more often than untrained workers. The evaluations of untrained workers are anticipated to be less consistent, with respect to the type of decision,

cognitive consistency and, therefore, that most actors have relatively little tolerance for inconsistency under most situations. This is a matter for empirical investigation rather than assumption. It is possible that in the absence of relatively powerful sanctions--whether external or internal--that tolerance for cognitive inconsistency or dissonance may be relatively high over a long period of time. In this connection, see Pepitone, A. "Some Conceptual and Empirical Problems of Consistency Models" in Cognitive Consistency. (Feldman, ed.) New York: Academic Press, 1966, pp. 258-295).

than trained workers. There may be a sub-population of untrained workers who exhibit a consistent punitively oriented pattern and trained workers may evidence, in addition to a dominant tendency toward professionally oriented decisions, more morally oriented, welfare oriented and expediently oriented decisions than control oriented and punitively oriented decisions.

It is possible, therefore, that Piven's response scale for his CWO items inadvertently yields a series of disjunctive response classes which may obscure certain orientational differences which bear upon the effectiveness of professional education and the extent to which professional education is a necessary and/or sufficient condition of professionally desired case decisions. A number of different orientations may lead to the same decision outcomes. The extent to which a given organization exhibits a client welfare oriented central tendency (i.e., high median CWO score) may be a function of the aggregate of differently oriented decisions which constitute a sympathetic set of decisions insofar as particular outcomes on Piven's response scale are concerned. In brief, it is the central tendency of the aggregate of case decisions from which the agency orientation may be derived rather than the consistent and dominant response tendency of a set of agency practitioners.

In Chapter IV, the relationship between CWO responses and evaluations of legitimacy and utility are

explored. The extent to which consistent patterns of response to the CWO instrument are reflected in the responses to the "Commitment-Utility" (CU) items is examined in an effort to assess the substantive meaning of subscription to professional prescriptions and to determine whether professional education induces a higher level of normative commitment than can be observed among untrained practitioners. (The effects of simple and compound response categories are also examined in this chapter).

Consensus and practice orientation. The final question addressed in the present study concerns the extent of perceived and actual consensus among practitioners who hold similar and different positions in probation-parole organizations.

If the employing organization specifies the relationship between education and practice orientation and if the organizational influence on orientation is not, as hypothesized earlier, purely a matter of the extent to which it is restrictive, then what accounts for the organization's impact on orientation?

One way of approaching the study of practice orientation is by conceiving of the employing organization as a system of role expectations. The formal structure of that system may be viewed as being co-extensive with the status hierarchy so that the practitioner's intra-organizational role-set may constitute a useful focus for

the analysis of organizational expectations.³⁵ Thus the study of the structure of expectations, the substance of which concerns case decisions, becomes the study of inter- and intra-positional consensus.

Marked, perceived orientational discrepancies among members of the role-set yield strategic clues to the structurally defined sources of organizational influence. Similarly, discrepancies between perceived and actual consensus may shed light on the insularity within, or visibility of, the segments of the role-set. Further, differences between intra- and inter-positional consensus--for example, greater consensus among practitioners than between practitioners and supervisors--helps to locate the sources of expectations concerning case actions and to determine if "informal" expectations rather than expectations flowing from formally defined sources of authority contribute significantly to dominant orientational

³⁵In this connection, Parsons (The Social System, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959) sums up a part of his discussion of the situational role-specification of orientations as follows: "Every society then has the mechanisms which have been called situational specifications of role-orientations . . . Through them are learned the specific role-values and symbol-systems of that particular society or sub-system of it, the level of expectations which are to be concretely implemented in the actual role. Relative to the orientations of basic personality structure these are much more specific. But they are generalized in another sense in that they inculcate definitions of expectations which apply to all incumbents of the type of role in question in the particular social system. Thus this set of mechanisms has two primary functions. First is the specification of the more generalized motivational orientation patterns to the point where they connect up with the sufficiently concrete definition

tendencies. In Chapter V, inter- and intra-positional consensus is studied.

A summary of questions for research. In the follow-

ing four chapters each of the questions, identified above, is examined. Beginning with a reappraisal of Piven's ground-breaking study, a few salient (but far from exhaustive) questions, concerning the orientation of practitioners to correctional work, are addressed. In summary, the present study examines: (1) the relative influence of professional education and the conditions of practice on client welfare orientation; (2) the relationship between functional autonomy and client welfare orientation; (3) the relationship between professional orientation or normative commitment and client welfare orientation; (4) the relationship of inter- and intra-positional consensus to professional orientation. The study, conceived as a continuity of earlier efforts, attempts to provide an empirical perspective on the general relationship between social work education and practice and a view of professionals' orientation to practice in a particular bureaucratic setting--the probation-parole agency system.

of the situation in the actual social system actually to motivate conformity with concrete role-expectations. The second is, in combination with the system of sanctions and mechanisms of social control, to counterbalance the variability of basic personality structure, so that a level of uniformity emerges which would not be possible were concrete adult role-orientations a simple and direct manifestation of the basic personality structure." (pp. 238-239).

CHAPTER I
TESTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL
TRAINING AND PRACTITIONER ORIENTATION

The hypothesis. The first major hypothesis to be examined may be formally stated: Probation and parole practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work are more client welfare oriented (i.e., achieve significantly higher CWO scores) than probation and parole practitioners without such training.

The sample. State probation and parole system administrators, who attended the April 1964 National Parole Institute in Austin, Texas, were invited to participate in a curriculum development and evaluation project conducted at New York University.¹ Of the 33 state systems administrators attending, 23 agreed to supply the following information: (a) the number of practitioners including supervisors and administrators employed by the agency; (b) the preferred number of agency personnel to be included in the project survey and an individual mailing

¹The project was sponsored by the now defunct "President's Committee On Juvenile Delinquency." At the suggestion, and with the cooperation of Dr. Herman Piven, Project Director, the author was able to secure a substantial amount of space in one of the project's many questionnaires. Complete access to the resulting data as well as other raw data was granted by the Director. All of the data processing and analyses were undertaken independently and cannot be attributed to the efforts of project personnel. The present author takes full responsibility for the treatment and interpretations of the data presented herein but gratefully acknowledges Dr. Piven's encouragement, suggestions and cooperation. See Author's Note.

list of those to be included. Of the 23 cooperating state system agencies, ten elected to identify fewer than 100% of their respective practitioner populations.

An analysis of the geographic locations of practitioners to be included in the survey and of some exclusions of known personnel in administrative positions led to the conclusion that of the ten agencies which elected to include less than the total practitioner population, three excluded only the top echelon of administrators. There was suggestive evidence that an additional three agencies excluded top and second echelon administrators. In two agencies, the reverse practice was adopted and district administrators or branch chiefs were selected by the agency for participation in the project. Of the remaining two agencies, 5 out of 39 practitioners were excluded in one (for unknown reasons) and missing and unlocated addresses accounted for the loss of approximately 8 practitioners out of 134 in the other agency.

Two additional agencies, out of the 23, required that distribution (but not returns) be undertaken by the agency. One agency turned the sampling over to its own research personnel and a one-third stratified sample, representing one-third administrative personnel (including supervisors) and two-thirds case-load carrying personnel, was selected. The other agency requesting group distribution provided no information on its procedures. For this reason the returns from individual mailings--the more

reliably sampled portion of the composite population--were analyzed separately.

The 23 cooperating agencies yielded 1,078 returns, 1,075 of which were sufficiently complete to use. The average response rate for the 23 cooperating agencies was 67% with the individual state system response rates varying from 15% (one agency) to 100% (one agency). Sixteen agencies evidenced return rates at or above the mean rate and ten of these evidenced a return rate of at or above 75%. Seven agencies evidenced return rates lower than the mean and of these seven, four evidenced return rates of less than 50%. (i.e., 44%; 43%; 42%; 15%.)

Nineteen of the 23 cooperating agencies provided a sufficient number of returns for intra-agency analyses. The average return rate for these 19 state system agencies was 68% with return rates ranging from 42% to 95%.

Usable returns come from about 32% of the state probation-parole agency systems and the agencies are geographically well-distributed. They represent, in the aggregate, a composite of agency populations rather than a sample of all of the country's agencies. Thus, the penalty of "opportunity research," in this case, is a limiting of the general applicability of the findings. Nevertheless, findings which apply to about one-third of the state probation-parole systems are probably useful enough so that the study may be of more than parochial interest.

The measuring instrument. The Client Welfare Orientation (CWO) instrument employed in the present study consisted of those eleven of Piven's 30 scored items (see Appendix A) which had the highest per cent agreement with total test scores.² The number of items included was a function of the maximum size of the questionnaire package. Piven's 3-point response scale (i.e., "Agree"; "Indifferent or Can't Decide"; "Disagree") was expanded to five points which included "Tend to Agree" and "Tend to Disagree" categories. The decision to alter the response scale was predicated on interviews with students enrolled in a graduate school of social work and professionally trained social workers employed in a state parole agency not included in the present study. One of the dominant responses to a flat prescription for treatment of cases, when interviewees were asked to respond in terms of Piven's categories, was "it depends. . . ." When asked whether they tended to agree (or disagree) with a prescription, this approach frequently induced an alteration of the initial response. The interviews were exploratory in nature, and the impressions gleaned from them are not offered as evidence of the superiority of extended response

²The item reflecting the highest per cent agreement and the item which was 11th in the order of agreement were not included on substantive grounds. Thus the eleven items selected were the second through the tenth and the twelfth in the order of agreement.

scales. The possibility of reducing "neutral" category responses was a sufficient rationale for employing the 5-point scale but, for purposes of analytic comparability, the scales were scored as a 3-point scale. Thus, no analytic distinction was made between "Strongly Agree" and "Tend to Agree" responses.

The criterion population and the scoring system. Because Piven's scoring system was evaluative, that is, the higher the sum of the item scores the more it reflected a professionally prescribed response, the method of establishing the professionally prescribed response is of central importance to the test of the hypothesis. Piven employed four approaches: (a) induction from interviews to determine salient issues; (b) deduction from the casework literature to determine the professional stance to a variety of practices; (c) heuristic argument in the design of specific items; (d) statistical analyses of the responses of a known group of "transmitters" of professional norms (i.e., casework faculty). The available criteria for judging the first three approaches may be subsumed under the general concepts of empirical plausibility and logical validity. The fourth approach hinges on an implicit measure of reliability. Below, is an adaptation of Piven's table entitled, "Distribution of Responses of 22 Casework Faculty Members From Four Schools of Social Work To Initial Pool of 47 Client-Welfare-Oriented Items."

TABLE 2.1
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF CASEWORK FACULTY RESPONSES TO PIVEN'S RESPONSE
CATEGORIES FOR ELEVEN CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION ITEMS^a
(n = 22)

Item	Agree		Response Category Disagree		Indifferent		Client Welfare Orientation Item Number ^b
	n	%	n	%	n	%	
2	20	91.0	0	0.0	1.		
1	21	95.5	0	0.0	2.		
3	15	68.0	9	18.0	3.		
1	21	95.5	0	0.0	4.		
2	19	86.5	1	4.5	5.		
20	0	0.0	0	0.0	6.		
14	5	23.0	3	14.0	7.		
1	20	91.0	1	4.5	8.		
2	18	82.0	2	9.0	9.		
5	16	72.5	1	9.5	10.		
5	13	59.0	9	18.0	11.		

^aThe wording of the items is taken from the 11-item form of the CWO instrument which, with minor exception (as noted elsewhere) conforms to the comparable original items.

^bThe item numbers and order are taken from the 11-item form rather than from Piven's table. Appendix A may be consulted for the wording of the items.

It is evident that there is a substantial core of agreement (i.e., inter-rater reliability) on most of the items. The consensus on the appropriate response category is better than .85 for six of the items and close to or better than .70 for eight items. Somewhat under three-fifths of the respondents agree on the selection of a response category in one of the two remaining items and somewhat more than three-fifths agree on the other item. The response prescribed by the professionals in the criterion population is clear for most of the items. The two items which produced the most ambivalence for the respondent group as a whole concerned, respectively, potential idleness and violation of a sexual norm. This may provide a clue to a potential disparity between professional norms per se and the views of those whose formal obligation consists in transmitting professional norms (i.e., casework faculty) when such norms profoundly conflict with powerful popular attitudes. A further indication of this is provided by examining items which have a relatively high proportion of "indifferent responses." Eighteen per cent of the respondents become ambivalent when confronted with the spectre of overt physical aggression within the family. A smaller per cent become ambivalent when having to decide what to do with someone involved in illicit sexual activity and 19% may be concerned with potential idleness.

It may be that these percentage fluctuations in so small and purposive a sample are not indicative of the

degree of consonance between professional norms evidenced in the literature and the views held by the norm transmitters.

In order to ascertain the stability of Piven's criterion measure the hitherto unanalyzed results³ of the second wave⁴ of a panel study of casework faculty drawn from nearly all of the accredited⁵ schools of social work and departments of social work were examined. Three hundred and nine questionnaires were mailed to casework faculty at 59 schools of social work. Of these, 149 questionnaires were sent to individual faculty members of 27 schools. The remaining 160 questionnaires were mailed in 32 sets to the remaining 32 schools for distribution by the Deans of the schools. The number of questionnaires in each set was based on incomplete listings of faculty members and represented a number of forms in excess of the faculty populations in those schools. Thus the per cent returns (51%) for the group mailings is an underestimate of the actual per cent of returns. The per cent returns from 149 individual mailings was

³The survey was undertaken by Herman Piven, Abraham Alcabes, Arden E. Melzer and Florence C. Parkinson in connection with a curriculum development and evaluation project funded by the now defunct President's Committee On Youth Crime and Juvenile Delinquency.

⁴The second wave most closely approximates the time of the present study of probation and parole practitioners conducted in late 1964 and early 1965.

⁵This statement is based on the Council On Social Work Education list of accredited schools in 1964.

reliably calculated as 59%. Two forms of the CWO instrument were administered. One of them contained the same number of items as in Piven's original faculty questionnaire (long-form) while the other contained the eleven items (short-form) which had the highest per cent agreement with the long-form. About 60% of the long-form respondent group returned questionnaires and 50% of the short-form respondent group returned questionnaires. The total (conservatively estimated) return per cent was 55%.

Table 2.2 lists the per cent of responses of three faculty samples (i.e., Piven's original sample; long-form respondents; short-form respondents) to the comparable eleven items in each form of the Client Welfare Orientation instrument.

The most cursory inspection of Table 2.2 reveals that the order of choice of response category is consistent for all three samples and that items on which there was relatively less consensus on a dominant response category in Piven's sample continue to elicit ambivalent responses from the two new samples. Relatively more respondents in the new samples chose the neutral response categories in these items. Another aspect of the data is that with the larger and more representative sample, the choice of the neutral category occurs more frequently for all items than in Piven's sample. This is especially noteworthy since respondents to the new forms of the CWO instrument actually could choose among 5 response categories (i.e., four rather than two categories were not neutral). In the new sample,

TABLE 2.2

PER CENT OF RESPONSES OF THREE CASEWORK FACULTY SAMPLES
TO ELEVEN CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION ITEMS

Item Number	Piven's Sample (n = 22)			New Long Form Sample (n = 93)			New Short Form Sample (n = 77)		
	Agree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Disagree	Indifferent	Agree	Disagree	Indifferent
1	9.00	91.00	0.00	15.06	78.49	6.45	11.69	83.11	5.19
2	4.50	95.50	0.00	5.38	92.47	2.15	2.60	94.81	2.60
3	14.00	68.00	18.00	13.98	48.39	37.63	40.25	38.96	20.78
4 ^a	4.50	95.50	0.00	53.76	36.56	9.68	46.75	41.55	11.69
5	9.00	86.50	4.50	9.68	78.50	11.83	22.08	72.73	5.19
6	100.00	0.00	0.00	94.63	1.08	4.30	90.91	5.20	3.90
7 ^a	63.00	23.00	14.00	18.28	69.89	11.83	19.48	75.32	5.19
8	4.50	91.00	4.50	10.76	70.96	18.28	6.50	84.92	9.09
9	9.00	82.00	9.00	7.53	73.12	19.35	5.20	88.31	6.49
10	23.00	72.50	4.50	16.13	66.67	17.20	15.59	70.13	14.29
11	23.00	59.00	18.00	10.76	67.74	21.51	35.07	45.45	19.48

^aThe rank order of the magnitude of the per cent response to each of the response categories of this item is actually the same for all of the indicated populations. The apparent difference between Piven's original sample and the other samples is attributable to the wording of the original item in a directionally opposite manner.

casework faculty depart from professional norms, as deduced from the literature, by adopting a punitive stance toward a child who "beats up his mother so that she needs six stitches." This departure is quite in keeping with that noted for Piven's sample. The norm of confidentiality elicits surprisingly little support from respondents in new samples.

Although the values of casework faculty tend to be consonant with the normative prescriptions Piven deduced from the casework literature, the more divergent a professional prescription is from what may, with reasonable safety, be assumed to be popular attitudes, the smaller the degree of consensus among the faculty.

It is regrettable that the data yield an interpretation which blurs the distinction between professionals' commitment to professional norms and what are assumed to be "lay" attitudes if for no other reason than it militates against the firmest empirical base for Piven's evaluative scoring system. Nevertheless, the empirical support for his logical argument is sufficient to provide us with an index of professional orientation. The criterion measure has, in general, stood the test of consistency over time and is relatively stable (i.e., cross-validation), yielding the interpretation that the criterion measure is valid.

In brief, when a respondent's choice of response category agrees with the dominant response of the criterion population, he is scored "+2" for that item; a disagreement with the dominant response is scored "0" and all other responses are scored "+1." The summated score is the CWO score.

Tests of the hypothesis and elaborating the results. As predicted, correctional workers who hold Master's degrees in social work are significantly more client welfare oriented than those who do not hold such degrees (Tables 2.3 and 2.5).

For the composite population, practitioners with a Master's degree in a field other than social work are not more client welfare oriented than their non-Master's degree counterparts. For the more reliably sampled aggregate of agency populations of the composite population, they are significantly more client welfare oriented (Table 2.4). This suggests that the level of education has an impact on practice orientation but the results indicated in Tables 2.3 and 2.5 demonstrate that practitioners holding Masters' degrees in Social Work are significantly more client welfare oriented than those holding other types of degrees. Although level of education may affect practice orientation, practitioners who have completed graduate training in social work are more client welfare oriented than all other practitioners. The results, thus far, are consonant with Piven's original findings.

TABLE 2.3

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE

Sample	Practitioners with A Master's Degree In Social Work		Practitioners Without A Master's Degree		Z or U ^a Scores	
	n	Mdn ^c	n	Mdn ^c	Z ^b	U
Composite Population	72	11	790	8	5.18	
Returns From Individually Mailed Questionnaires ^d	67	11	595	8	4.78	

^aThe Mann Whitney U Test was the most powerful test which was consonant with the ordinal nature of CWO Scores. Piven employed this test in assessing his original data and both of these reasons compelled the use of this test in this presentation and related material.

^bA Z score of 1.59 is the minimum score at which the null hypothesis may be rejected at the .05 level of confidence (in a one-tailed test) accepted for this study. (The Z score is a transformed value for large samples.)

^cThe Median scores provide an indication of the respective central tendencies of the scores of different practitioner groups.

^dIt was indicated, earlier, that problems in assessing the sample dictated the segregation of individual from group mailings.

TABLE 2.4

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE

Sample	Practitioners With A Non-Social Work Master's Degree		Practitioners Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	79	8	740	8	N.S. ^a	
Returns From Individually Mailed Questionnaires	64	9	595	8	1.79	

^aNo statistically significant differences. The .05 level of difference was accepted as the minimal level at which the null hypothesis would be rejected.

TABLE 2.5

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK

Sample	Practitioners With A Social Work Master's Degree		Practitioners With Non-Social Work Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	72	11	79	8	3.25	
Returns From Individually Mailed Questionnaires	67	11	64	9	2.47	

Piven interpreted the relationship between training and orientation as a spurious one because, according to his assessment of his data, differences between trained and untrained workers disappeared when employing organization was held constant. Of the 23 agencies in the present composite sample, 19 yielded a sufficient number of returns for the purposes of intra-agency analyses. Of these 19, four agencies employ virtually all of the practitioners who hold Masters' degrees in social work (see Table 2.6). Thus, an analysis parallel to Piven's can be performed on four of the state system agencies.

Holding the employing organization constant. The net results (listed in Tables 2.7 through 2.9) do not sustain Piven's findings concerning the relationship between social work training and client welfare orientation when employing organizations are held constant. Although the agency variable interprets the relationship, it specifies the relationship rather than demonstrating it to be spurious. In three out of the four agencies, practitioners trained in social work prove to be the most client welfare oriented practitioners. In the one agency where practitioners trained in social work constitute a substantial portion of the agency's personnel, the lack of statistically significant differences cannot be attributed to the "professionalization" of the total work force because, as the Median scores show, the central tendency of CWO scores is lower for professionally trained workers in this agency than in the three other

TABLE 2.6
 PER CENT OF TRAINED AND UNTRAINED PRACTITIONERS BY
 EMPLOYING ORGANIZATIONS

Employing Organization	Trained (n = 72) %	Untrained (n = 1003) %	Number In Agency Sample
Agency A	68	8	120
Agency B	22	15	165
Agency C	6	9	95
Agency D	4	8	83
Other	0	60	612
Totals	100%	100%	1075

TABLE 2.7

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE WITH EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION HELD CONSTANT

Employing Organization	Practitioners With A Master's Degree In Social Work		Practitioners Without A Master's Degree		Z Score
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z
Agency A	44	10	60	10	N.S.
Agency B	16	14	123	10	4.57
Agency C	5	11	75	6	1.72
Agency D	3	13	63	9	2.01

TABLE 2.8

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, WITH EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION HELD CONSTANT

Employing Organization ^a	Practitioners With A Master's Degree In Fields Other Than Social Work		Practitioners Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Agency A	6	9	60	10	N.S.	
Agency B	21	11	123	10	N.S.	
Agency C	9	6	75	6	N.S.	
Agency D	4	5	63	9	1.78 ^b	

^aThere are 9 other state system agencies in which this particular comparison could be made. The null hypothesis is accepted for all of these agencies.

^bThis significant finding is opposite to the direction predicted in the implied hypothesis.

TABLE 2.9

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, WITH EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION HELD CONSTANT

Employing Organization	Practitioners With A Master's Degree In Social Work		Practitioners with A Master's Degree In Fields Other Than Social Work		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Agency A	44	10	6	9	N.S.	
Agency B	16	14	21	11	3.15	
Agency C	5	11	9	6	9.0 ^a	
Agency D	3	13	4	5	0.0 ^b	

^a_p = .05

^b_p = .03

agencies included in this analysis. Nor can one argue, from the data, that there is a convergence of professional and non-professional orientations because in the other three agencies, where trained respondents constitute a minority, trained practitioners evidence a professional orientation in contrast to the relatively punitive orientation of the untrained practitioners.

These results depart from the earlier study in a very striking way. While the criterion measure was demonstrated to be stable, a somewhat more extensive sample at the same administrative level (i.e., state system level) yields the interpretation that practice orientation is not merely a function of agency-linked factors.

In Piven's intra-agency analyses, organizational status and tenure (i.e., "experience") were also held constant in order to ascertain the influence of structural features and, perhaps, to indirectly assess aspects of interaction within the organization in relation to practice orientation. Although the present format is somewhat different from Piven's the same comparisons are, in effect, made. In addition to the intra-agency analyses of differences between practitioners trained in social work and those not so trained, holding organizational status and tenure constant, the parallel results for the composite population and the total returns from individual mailings population (i.e., a sub-population of the composite) are listed. Further, comparisons between practitioners with a Master's

degree in social work and those who do not hold a Master's degree are paralleled by comparisons between those who hold a Master's degree in fields other than social work and practitioners who do not have a Master's degree. Finally, practitioners holding a Master's degree in social work are compared with those holding a Master's degree in other fields while organizational status and tenure are respectively held constant.

Holding organizational position constant. The net results listed in Tables 2.10 through 2.12 demonstrate that practitioners who have completed graduate training in social work continue to be the most client welfare oriented group of practitioners when organizational status (i.e., position) is held constant. But, when organizational status and employing organization are simultaneously held constant, the relationship between education and practice orientation varies according to agency. A full comparison is possible in only two agencies. The interpretation of the U score is not unequivocal because one of the sample sizes for each U test is very small and the addition of only one observation, with the same U value, could produce an opposite interpretation.

The Median scores are, in general, directionally consistent with the initial hypothesis. In most cases the hypothesis is sustained by the outcome of Mann-Whitney U tests. The initial hypotheses is, thus far, supported by the findings qualified by the observation that

TABLE 2.10

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Supervisors and Above				Z or U Scores		Below Supervisors				Z or U Scores	
	With A Master's Degree In Social Work		Without A Master's Degree				With A Master's Degree In Social Work		Without A Master's Degree			
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	25	12	166	8	3.79 ^a		44	10	520	8	3.74	
Individual Returns	22	12	88	9	3.62 ^b		42	10	464	8	3.39	
Agency A	12	10	4	10		21.0 ^d	30	10	54	9	N.S.	
Agency B	9	14	23	10	3.02 ^c		6	16	92	9	3.21	
Agency C ^e	3	11	13	6		12.0 ^d	2	10	56	7		
Agency D ^e	1		7				2	12	52	8		

^aA comparable test for supervisors only (S. W. Master's n = 16; Mdn. = 12; non-Master's n = 320; Mdn. = 8) yields a Z score of 4.12.

^bThe parallel test for supervisors only (S. W. Master's n = 13; Mdn. = 13; non-Master's n = 68; Mdn. = 9) yields a Z score of 4.11.

^cThe parallel test for supervisors only (S. W. Master's n = 8; Mdn. = 14; non-Master's n = 21; Mdn. = 10) yielding a Z score of 3.10.

^dN. S.

^eMedian scores and statistical tests were omitted in this and the following tables when n_1 or $n_2 \leq 2$.

TABLE 2.11

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Supervisors and Above				Z or U		Below Supervisors				Z or U	
	With Master's Degree in Fields other Than Social Work		Without Master's Degree		Z	U	With Master's Degree in Fields other Than Social Work		Without Master's Degree		Z	U
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn			n	Mdn	n	Mdn		
Composite Population	25	8	166	8	N.S. ^a		52	8	520	8	N.S.	
Individual Returns	16	10	88	9	N.S. ^a		48	8	464	8	N.S.	
Agency A	1		4				5	9	54	9	N.S.	
Agency B	6	11	23	10	N.S. ^a		15	10	92	9	N.S.	
Agency C	3	7	13	6	18.0 ^b		6	5	56	7	N.S.	
Agency D	1		7				2	7	52	8		

^aThe parallel test for supervisors only similarly does not yield statistically significant differences.

^bN.S.

TABLE 2.12

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH ORGANIZATIONAL STATUS HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Supervisors and Above				Z or U Scores		Below Supervisors				Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	25	12	25	8	2.33 ^a		44	10	52	8	2.40	
Individual Returns	22	12	16	10	1.72 ^a		42	10	46	8	1.80	
Agency A	12		1				30	10	5	9	1.73	
Agency B	9	14	6	11		11.5 ^b	6	16	15	10		11.5 ^d
Agency C	3	11	3	7		3.0 ^c	2	10	6	5		1.0 ^e
Agency D	1		1				2	12	2	7		

^aThe comparable test for supervisors only is similarly significant.

^b $p < .05$ The comparable test for supervisors only (S. W. Master's n = 8; Mdn. = 14; non-S. W. Master's n = 2.; Mdn = 11) yields a U score of 4.5.

^cN.S. No comparable test for supervisors only was possible.

^d $p < .05$

^e $p = .07$ (N.S.)

organizational variables specify the relationship between education and orientation. It is evident from the results that agency position, by itself, does not account for the variation among agencies and the evidence for variation among agencies, if the median scores offer a clue, is not conclusive.

Another variable held constant by Piven was "experience" which is here referred to as "tenure" in order to distinguish between the number of years employed in the same agency (tenure) and the number of years a practitioner has functioned in the field of corrections (experience).⁶

Holding organizational tenure constant. Tabel 2.13 lists data providing further support for the interpretation that the agency variable specifies the relationship between education and practice orientation and that practitioners trained in social work are more client-welfare-oriented than practitioners who are not so trained and who do not have Master's degrees. In those cases where statistical

⁶Piven defined "experienced" (i.e., long-term tenure) "agents" (i.e., practitioners) as "personnel with 3 or more years of employment in the agency." The item, employed in the present study to ascertain the tenure of employment, offered the respondents 4 response categories: "Less than 6 months"; "Six months to 1 year"; "Between 1 and 3 years"; "More than 3 years." In order to approach consistency with Piven's item, the tenure variable was broken at ≤ 3 years vs. > 3 years. The items are not, therefore, strictly comparable. The tenure variable, when held constant, did not alter Piven's intra-agency finding of no significant differences between trained and untrained personnel.

TABLE 2.13

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EMPLOYMENT TENURE HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Have											
	Short-Term Tenure,						Long-Term Tenure,					
	With A Master's Degree In Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores		With A Master's Degree In Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	13	13	322	8	2.80		59	11	414	8	4.60	
Individual Returns	13	13	244	8	2.63		54	11	347	8	4.27	
Agency A	9	13	32	10	N.S.		35	10	27	9	N.S.	
Agency B	2	13	42	10			14	14	80	9	4.46	
Agency C	0		35				5	11	40	6	1.71	
Agency D	2	14	29	10			1		34			

tests could not be performed, the evidence is adduced from the Median scores which are uniformly directionally consistent with the interpretation. Holding employing organization and tenure simultaneously constant does not yield a different interpretation than when employing organization, alone, is held constant. The Mann-Whitney U test's inherent insensitivity to differences in variance limits the discovery of the extent to which tenure may account for some of the variation among agencies.

Table 2.14, which compares the CWO scores of practitioners who have completed graduate education in fields other than social work with those who have not received graduate education, lists data which are consistent with previous findings: When employing organization is held constant, there are no statistically significant differences between these populations.

Table 2.15, however, shows that for the largest most reliably sampled portion of the composite population (i.e., returns from individually mailed questionnaires) the tenure variable interprets the relationship between education and practice orientation: initially observed differences between practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work and those holding a Master's degree in other fields disappear for practitioners with long-term agency tenure. But when tenure and employing organization are simultaneously held constant, the three-way relationship between education, practice orientation and tenure is further specified by

TABLE 2.14

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EMPLOYMENT TENURE HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Have											
	Short-Term Tenure, With A Master's Degree In Fields Other Than Social Work						Long-Term Tenure, With A Master's Degree In Fields Other Than Social Work					
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z or U Scores ^a		n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z or U Scores ^a	
Composite Population	32	8	322	8	N.S.		47	8	414	8	1.83	
Individual Returns	25	8	244	8	N.S.		39	10	347	8	2.20	
Agency A	3	9	32	10	N.S.		3	10	27	9	N.S.	
Agency B	7	11	43	10	N.S.		14	10	80	9	N.S.	
Agency C	4	5	35	8	N.S.		5	7	40	6	N.S.	
Agency D	0		29				4	5	34	8	1.56 ^b	

^aIn those agencies, of the remaining 15, where the sample sizes were sufficient to run comparable tests, Z scores did not indicate statistically significant differences.

^b.05 < p < .06 (N.S.) Direction opposite to that implicitly hypothesized.

TABLE 2.15

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION WITH EMPLOYMENT TENURE HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Have											
	Short-term Tenure, With A Master's Degree In Social Work				Long-term Tenure, With A Master's Degree In Social Work				Z or U Scores			
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	13	13	32	8	2.51		59	11	47	8	2.11	
Individual Returns	13	13	25	8	2.13		54	11	39	10	N.S.	
Agency A	9	13	3	9	6.0 ^a		35	10	3	10	N.S.	
Agency B	2	13	7	11	4.50 ^a		14	14	14	10	38.0 ^b	
Agency C	0		4				5	11	5	7	6.0 ^c	
Agency D	2		0				1		4			

^aN.S.

^b.001 < p < .01

^cN.S.

employing organization. While this interpretation of the data satisfies the statistical outcomes, it is also evident that limitations in the number of observations for two of the agencies militates against full acceptance of such an interpretation. Consider, for example, that the Median scores are almost uniformly consistent with previous findings and that the U score values are too high to yield statistically significant differences at the level of confidence accepted for this study only when the number of observations in one or both samples is relatively small (i.e., one additional observation for the same U value could yield an opposite finding).

Given the evidence in Tables 2.13 and 2.14 it is not unlikely that the conjunction of somewhat higher but not significantly different CWO scores, for practitioners with a Master's degree in fields other than social work, than for practitioners without a Master's degree (among practitioners with long-term tenure) and the relatively small number of observations in many of the cells of these tables, yields the conclusion that tenure enters into the specification of the relationship between education and practice orientation. But this result is probably an artifact of the method of analyzing the data in conjunction with the size of the samples compared when several variables are, in effect, simultaneously held constant.

Taken together, Tables 2.13 through 2.15 favor an interpretation consistent with that based on the initial

findings, namely, that practitioners who have completed graduate training in social work are more client welfare oriented than practitioners who have not received such training but the relationship between education and practice orientation is specified by or is affected by organizational variables. It has also been demonstrated that formal status or agency position is not one of these variables.

What emerges from the data listed in Tables 2.13 through 2.15 is the suggestion that tenure is probably not one of the variables which crucially affects the observed relationship between education and practice orientation.

Holding probation-parole experience constant. In Tables 2.16 through 2.18, the relationship between education and orientation to practice is examined holding experience in (or total number of years of exposure to) probation and parole organizations constant.⁷

Tables 2.16 through 2.18 indicate that, for the composite population, experience does not affect the observed relationship between education and practice orientation. For the largest reliably sampled sub-population of the composite population, differences among inexperienced practitioners who have completed graduate education are marginal, with Median scores favoring social

⁷As in the case of "tenure," responses to this question concerning experience were dichotomized into ≤ 3 years and > 3 years.

TABLE 2.16

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROBATION-PAROLE WORK HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are											
	Inexperienced,				Z or U Scores		Experienced,				Z or U Scores	
	With A Master's Degree in Social Work		Without A Master's Degree				With A Master's Degree in Social Work		Without A Master's Degree			
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	13	10	285	8	1.97	57	11	437	8	4.62		
Individual Returns	13	10	221	8	1.86	53	11	361	8	4.33		
Agency A	11	10	28	10	N.S.	33	10	30	8	N.S.		
Agency B	1		34			14	14	86	9	4.55		
Agency C	0		20			4	9	53	6	N.S.		
Agency D	0		28			2	15	35	9	1.69		

TABLE 2.17

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROBATION-PAROLE WORK HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are											
	Inexperienced,				Experienced,				Z or U Scores ^a			
	With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Without A Master's Degree					
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	29	8	285	8	N.S.		44	8	437	8	N.S.	
Individual Returns	24	8	221	8	N.S.		35	9	361	8	N.S.	
Agency A	3	9	28	10	N.S.		3	10	30	8	N.S.	
Agency B	7	12	34	10	N.S.		13	10	86	9	N.S.	
Agency C	3	5	20	8		12.5 ^b	6	6	53	6	N.S.	
Agency D	0		28				3	4	35	9	2.29 ^c	

^aOf the remaining 15 agencies in which the comparable tests could be performed none of the differences emerged as being statistically significant.

^bN.S.

^cThis statistically significant difference favors a finding opposite to the direction of the alternate hypothesis.

TABLE 2.18

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROBATION-PAROLE WORK HELD CONSTANT

Sample	<u>Practitioners Who Are</u>											
	Inexperienced				Experienced							
	With A Master's Degree in Social Work		With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Z or U Scores		With A Master's Degree in Social Work		With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	13	10	29	8	1.92		57	11	44	8	2.56	
Individual Returns	13	10	24	8	N.S.		53	11	35	9	1.93	
Agency A	11	10	3	9		16.5 ^a	33	10	3	10	N.S.	
Agency B	1		7				14	14	13	10	24.5 ^b	
Agency C	0		3				4	9	6	6	7.0 ^a	
Agency D	1		0				2	15	3	4	0.0 ^c	

^aN.S.

^b $p < .001$

^c $p = .10$ (A U score < 0 is not possible given these sample sizes. Therefore this statistically insignificant finding is purely a function of sample size).

work graduates. The lack of statistically significant differences between practitioners who hold a Master's degree in fields other than social work and those who do not hold a Master's degree, in conjunction with the significant differences between practitioners with Masters' degrees in social work and those without Masters' degrees suggests that experience does not substantially affect orientation within the population as a whole.

When employing organization is held constant, it is evident that this variable continues to specify the relationship between education and orientation but the small number of inexperienced practitioners who have completed a course of graduate education does not permit statistical testing within the inexperienced category.

Neither tenure nor experience are crucial determinants of orientation.

The impact of graduate education in social work, according to the data presented thus far, is more substantial than would have been supposed on either theoretical or empirical grounds previous to the present study.

Holding sex constant. In Piven's study, all of the practitioners were men and, because of the widespread practice of sex segregation in correctional work, so were the caseloads carried by the practitioners he surveyed. Thus sexual attributes per se and, implicitly, the social concomitants of sexual attributes were held constant through the method of sampling. Similarly, the ages of the practitioners

among the employing organizations sampled were asserted to be "held reasonably constant"⁸ presumably as a consequence of the actual ages of practitioners in the five agency populations which Piven sampled.

Because these uniformities do not exist in the present sample, the replication of those aspects of Piven's study requires that the present results be re-examined holding sex and age, respectively, constant.

For the composite population, tables 2.20 and 2.21, taken together, favor the interpretation that among practitioners who hold a graduate degree, completion of graduate education in social work tends to have greater impact on male practitioners, than on female practitioners. But the initially observed relationship between social work training and practice orientation perseveres when sex, alone, is held constant and this relationship continues to be specified by the agency variable (i.e., employing organization) when sex and employing organization are simultaneously held constant (see Table 2.19). As in the case of the tenure variable, the interpretation in several instances is predicated on a small number of observations (and the Median scores) and is, therefore, something less than unequivocal.

There is, however, a very marked trend in the CWO scores, evidenced by the Median scores, which suggests that, within levels of education, females are more client welfare

⁸Professionalism and Organizational Structure. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Columbia University. 1960. p. 27.

TABLE 2.19

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH SEX HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are											
	Males,						Females,					
	With A Master's Degree in Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores		With A Master's Degree in Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	63	10	661	8	4.31	8	13	56	10	2.86		
Individual Returns	59	10	529	8	4.08	8	13	50	10	2.68		
Agency A	40	10	49	8	N.S.	4	12	10	11		10.5 ^a	
Agency B	13	14	102	9	4.23	3	13	18	10		11.0 ^a	
Agency C	4	9	64	6	N.S.	0		6				
Agency D	2	12	56	9		1		6				

^aN.S.

TABLE 2.20

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH SEX HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are											
	Males ^a ,						Females ^c ,					
	With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores		With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	75	8	661	8	N.S.	3	12	56	10	N.S.		
Individual Returns	61	8	529	8	1.78 ^b	3	12	50	10	N.S.		
Agency A	5	9	49	8	N.S.	1		10				
Agency B	19	10	102	9	N.S.	2	14	18	10		6.5 ^d	
Agency C	9	6	64	6	N.S.	0		6				
Agency D	4	5	56	9	1.83 ^b	0		6				

^aOf the remaining agencies where comparable tests could be performed, the statistical results were consistent with those reported for male practitioners in the agencies listed above.

^bAlthough these Z scores yield statistically significant differences on a one-tailed test, the direction of the differences is opposite to that hypothesized.

^cThere were not a sufficient number of female practitioners in any of the remaining agencies to permit comparable statistical tests.

^dN.S.

TABLE 2.21

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH SEX HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are											
	Males,				Females,							
	With A Master's Degree in Social Work		With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Z or U Scores		With A Master's Degree in Social Work		With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	63	10	75	8	2.59		8	13	3	12	8.5 ^c	
Individual Returns	59	10	61	8	1.99		8	13	3	12	8.5 ^d	
Agency A	40	10	5	9	N.S.		4		1			
Agency B	13	14	19	10	38.5 ^a		3	13	2	14	3.0 ^d	
Agency C	4	9	9	6	9.0 ^b		0		0			
Agency D	2	12	4	5	0.0		1		0			

^a_p < .001

^bN.S.

^c_p = .06 (N.S.)

^dN.S.

oriented than males and that untrained females may be more client welfare oriented than males of any category considered thus far. Social work education may, therefore, have a reinforcing effect upon attitudes which are linked to social concomitants of sex. This suggests that culturally prescribed feminine attitudes may overlap the normative prescriptions of professional social work. Orientation differences between the sexes, holding education constant, were therefore tested and the results listed in Table 2.22.

Table 2.22 demonstrates that, within all levels and types of education, female practitioners are significantly more client welfare oriented than male practitioners and the Median score trend continues to suggest that sex (or its social concomitants) is an independent source of variation in client welfare orientation scores.

Holding age constant. Tables 2.23 through 2.25 treat the relationship between education and orientation while holding age constant.

As indicated by the Median scores in Tables 2.23 and 2.25, CWO scores of practitioners trained in social work are uniformly higher than any other group of practitioners but the same tests which yield this observation also favor older trained practitioners. The age variable completely interprets differences between practitioners who hold a Master's degree in fields other than social work and those who do not hold a Master's degree, yielding no statistically significant difference for the younger

TABLE 2.22

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES
 BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE PRACTITIONERS HOLDING
 LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners				Z or U Scores	
	Males		Females		Z	U
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn		
Aggregate ^a	761	8	71	10	3.66	
Master's Degree In Social Work	59	10	8	13	2.25	
Master's Degree In Fields Other Than Social Work	61	8	3	12	1.57 ^b	
Lower Levels of Education	529	8	50	10	3.33	

^aVirtually all of the female practitioners were included in the returns to individual mailings population. The results for the composite population are, therefore, not included here. (Cf. Table 2.28.)

^b $p \approx .05$

TABLE 2.23

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH AGE^a HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are											
	At or Below the Mdn Age, ^b				Above the Mdn Age,				Z or U Scores			
	With A Master's Degree in Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		With A Master's Degree in Social Work		Without A Master's Degree		Z		U	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	41	10	372	8	2.60		31	12	356	8	4.72	
Individual Returns	41	10	289	9	2.10		26	12	295	8	4.59	
Agency A	31	10	35	10	N.S.		13	11	25	10	N.S.	
Agency B	7	14	69	9	2.96		9	14	50	10	3.51	
Agency C	0		31				5	11	43	8	N.S.	
Agency D	2	12	51	9			1		11			

^aThe Median age for the composite population is 36.

^bThe Median age for the composite population is held constant rather than the Median age for agencies on the following grounds: (a) since age is an attribute of the individual rather than the employing organization, relative age differences within an organization (i.e., using the Median age of each organization's personnel) concerns some variable other than age per se or its more general social concomitants; (b) the use of age as a "test variable" (i.e., potential independent variable) requires that it be defined independently of agency-related variables.

TABLE 2.24

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO DO NOT HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH AGE HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are ^a											
	At or Below the Mdn Age,						Above the Mdn Age,					
	With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores		With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social work		Without A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	33	8	372	8	N.S.	46	8	356	8	1.87		
Individual Returns	24	8	289	9	N.S.	40	9	295	8	2.06		
Agency A	2	6	35	10	N.S.	4	9	25	10	N.S.		
Agency B	6	13	69	9	1.90	15	10	50	10	N.S.		
Agency C	6	6	31	6	N.S.	3	5	43	8	N.S.		
Agency D	2	7	51	9		2	5	11	8		6.5 ^b	

^aThe results of comparable tests for those remaining agency populations where the tests could be performed were consistent with the results listed. One test yielded statistically significant differences but in the direction opposite to that hypothesized.

^bN.S.

TABLE 2.25

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH AGE HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Are											
	At or Below the Mdn Age,				Above the Mdn Age,				Z or U Scores			
	With a Master's Degree in Social Work		With a Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		With a Master's Degree in Social Work		With a Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work		Z or U Scores		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	41	10	33	8	1.96		31	12	46	8	2.84	
Individual Returns	41	10	24	8	N.S.		26	12	40	9	2.78	
Agency A	31	10	2	6	N.S.		13	11	4	9	23.0 ^b	
Agency B	7	14	6	13	14.5 ^a		9	14	15	10	18.5 ^c	
Agency C	0		6				5	11	3	5	2.0 ^d	
Agency D	2	12	2	7			1		2			

^aN.S.

^bN.S.

^c.001 < p < .01

^dp = .07 (N.S.)

respondents in the composite population. Tables 2.23 through 2.25, taken together, indicate that the agency variable (i.e., employing organization) specifies the relationship of the scores of practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work to the scores of other practitioners: (a) comparing those with a social work Master's degree to those without a Master's degree, the employing organization--in the two organizations where the relevant tests could be performed--specifies whether or not the former is more client welfare oriented when age is held constant; (b) comparing those with a social work Master's degree to those holding a non-social work Master's degree, the age variable appears to specify the relationship, that is, statistically significant differences are observed only among older practitioners. Within the category of older practitioners, the agency variable specifies whether or not practitioners trained in social work constitute the more client welfare oriented group.

The results, with employing organization held constant, may be an artifact of the age break within the total population which may arbitrarily (but not randomly) "assign" observations to the separate employing organizations. It is worth noting that the employing organization still affects the results. This "unknown"--how the age break "assigns" observations to the employing organization--dictates a cautious interpretation of the data: the findings concerning the three-way relationship among the variables of

education, employing organization and age, can at best be regarded as tentative. The relationship between orientation and age, holding education constant, warrants further testing.

Variables held constant: a summary. In order to test the observed relationship between education and practice orientation, level and type of education were segregated in order to avoid contamination of type of education by level and the relationship was then statistically assessed by means of a test sensitive to the location and central tendency of location of scores (i.e., the Mann-Whitney U test). The extent to which the central tendency of scores conformed to the direction of the hypothesis (i.e., that practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work are more client welfare oriented than practitioners who do not hold such a degree) was evidenced by Median CWO scores. To test the outcome, which confirmed the hypothesis, a number of "control" or "test" variables (i.e., variables held constant) were introduced. One of these concerned the reliability of the sampling procedure itself. Thus, returns from individually mailed questionnaires were examined as a subset of the total returns. Other control variables, selected on substantive rather than methodological grounds, included: (a) employing organization; (b) organizational status or position; (c) organizational tenure or duration of employment in the present state system agency; (d) probation-parole experience; (e) sex; (f) age. The initially observed relationship was re-examined with each of these variables

held constant and with each one held constant while simultaneously holding employing organization constant. The double control or two variables held constant at a time ("simultaneously") was dictated by the nature of the total sample which was a composite of agency populations.

The purity of variables held constant. Interpretive problems and emerging trends suggested the examination of the control variables in order to ascertain the extent of their statistical independence from the variables they controlled. Accordingly, the results are indicated in Tables 2.26 through 2.29.

Of the two organizational variables employed as control variables (i.e., status and tenure) neither variable affects orientation when educational level and type are held constant and these findings are fully consistent with the interpretation of results reported earlier. It is now clear that the tenure variable has no independent effect on orientation and that the relationship between tenure and orientation is completely interpreted by the educational variable. Two substantively important organizational measures prove not to significantly affect the relationship between education and practice orientation. Variations among employing organizations are to be accounted for by other variables.

Two other control variables--sex and age--which, properly regarded, should be considered complex (or compound) variables or crude indicators of a number of relevant variables (e.g., recency of education, exposure to

TABLE 2.26

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PR
 ORGANIZATIONAL POSITIONS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, R
 MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZAI
 TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTA

Sample	With Social Work Master's Degree				Z or U Scores Z U	Practitioners With non-Social Work Master's Degree ^a				
	Supervisor and Above		Below Supervisor			Supervisor and Above		Below Supervis		
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn			n	Mdn	n	M
Composite Population	25	12	44	10	N.S.		25	8	52	
Individual Returns	22	12	42	10	N.S.		16	10	42	
Agency A	12	10	30	10	N.S.		1		5	
Agency B	9	14	6	16		16.5 ^c	6	11	15	
Agency C	3	11	2	10		3.0 ^c	3	7	6	
Agency D	1		2				1		2	

^aOf the remaining 15 agencies in the composite population, only one permit a test of differences the results of which was not statistically sig

^bOf those agencies in the remaining 15, when the parallel tests cou similarly not statistically significant.

^cN.S.

TABLE 2.26

PERFORMANCE SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS OCCUPYING DIFFERENT
 BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY
 EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH LEVEL AND
 TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Practitioners															
With non-Social Work Master's Degree ^a						Without Master's Degree ^b									
Supervisor and Above			Below Supervisor			Z or U Scores		Supervisor and Above			Below Supervisor			Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U				
25	8	52	8	N.S.		166	8	520	8	N.S.					
16	10	42	8	N.S.		88	9	464	8	N.S.					
1		5				4	10	59	9	N.S.					
5 ^c	6	15	10		38.5 ^c	23	10	92	9	N.S.					
0 ^c	3	6	5		6.0 ^c	13	6	56	7	N.S.					
1	7	2				7	9	52	8	N.S.					

Composite population, only one had a sufficient number of observations to
 was not statistically significant.

When the parallel tests could be performed, the results were

TABLE 2.27

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS
BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QU
ORGANIZATION WITH LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION

Sample	With Social Work Master's Degree					Practitioners With non-Social Work Master's ^a Degree				
	Short Term Tenure		Long Term Tenure		Z or U Scores	Short Term Tenure		Long Term Tenure		
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn		Z	U	n	Mdn	n
Composite Population	13	13	59	11	N.S.		32	8	47	8
Individual Returns	13	13	54	11	N.S.		25	8	39	10
Agency A	9	13	35	10	N.S.		3	9	3	10
Agency B	2	13	14	14	13.0 ^c		7	11	14	10
Agency C	0		5				4	5	5	7
Agency D	2		1				0		4	

^aResults for the remaining 15 agencies were consistent with those list

^bOf the remaining 15 agencies, statistically significant differences e
tenure in one and long-term tenure in the other.

^cN.S.

^dPrevious tables were concerned with one-tailed tests. Since the impl
variable is not directional, a two-tailed test is appropriate. A Z score ≥ 1
erroneously accepting the null hypothesis not more than five times out of 100.

TABLE 2.27

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WITH SHORT- AND LONG-TERM TENURE
 INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING
 AND TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Practitioners

Short Term	With non-Social Work Master's ^a Degree			Without Master's ^b Degree			Z or U Scores		
	Tenure		Mdn	Tenure		Mdn	Z or U Scores		
	Short	Long		Short	Long		Z	U	
2	8	47	8	322	8	414	8	1.83(N.S.) ^d	
5	8	39	10	244	8	347	8	1.69(N.S.) ^d	
3	9	3	10	32	10	27	9	N.S.	
7	11	14	10	43	10	80	9	N.S.	
4	5	5	7	35	8	40	6	N.S.	
0		4		29	10	34	8	N.S.	

consistent with those listed above.

Significant differences emerged in two with median scores favoring short-term

tests. Since the implied hypotheses for the tests of this control
 are appropriate. A Z score ≥ 1.96 is required for a probability of
 five times out of 100.

TABLE 2.28

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES FROM 15 AGENCIES, ORGANIZATION, WITH LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION

Sample	With Social Work Master's Degree				Z or U Scores Z U	Practitioners With non-Social Work Master's ^a Degree					
	Male		Female			Male		Female			
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn		n	Mdn	n	Mdn		
Composite Population	63	10	8	13	2.31		75	8	3	12	1.0
Individual Returns	59	10	8	13	2.25		61	8	3	12	1.0
Agency A	40	10	4	12	2.10		5		1		
Agency B	13	14	3	13		17.5 ^d	19	10	2	14	
Agency C	4		0				9		0		
Agency D	2		1				4		0		

^aTests could not be performed in any of the remaining 15 agencies because

^bOf the 15 remaining agencies, tests could be performed in 3 with significant

^cOne-tailed test. $p \approx .05$.

^dN.S.

TABLE 2.28

SCORES BETWEEN MALE AND FEMALE PRACTITIONERS BY COMPOSITE
 INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING
 LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Practitioners													
With non-Social Work Master's ^a Degree					Z or U Scores		Without A Master's ^b Degree					Z or U Scores	
Male n	Mdn	Female n	Mdn		Z	U	Male n	Mdn	Female n	Mdn		Z	U
75	8	3	12		1.71		661	8	56	10		3.12	
61	8	3	12		1.57 ^c		529	8	50	10		3.33	
5		1					49	8	10	11		2.22	
19	10	2	14		6.0 ^d		102	9	18	10		N.S.	
9		0					64	6	6	7		N.S.	
4		0					56	9	6	9		N.S.	

remaining 15 agencies because of an insufficient number of observations.
 be performed in 3 with significant differences emerging in one.

TABLE 2.29

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN YOUNGER AND OLDER POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES FROM A PRACTITIONER ORGANIZATION, WITH LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION

Sample	With A Master's Degree in Social Work				Z or U Scores		Practitioners With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than SW ^a				Z or U Scores
	Younger		Older		Z	U	Younger		Older		
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn			n	Mdn	n	Mdn	
Composite Population	41	10	31	12	N.S.		33	8	46	8	N.S.
Individual Returns	41	10	26	12	N.S.		24	8	40	9	N.S.
Agency A	31	10	13	11	N.S.		2	6	4	9	
Agency B	7	14	9	14	29.0 ^b		6	13	15	10	
Agency C	0		5				6	6	3	5	
Agency D	2		1				2	7	2	5	

^aThere were no statistically significant results in any of the remaining comparisons that were performed.

^bN.S.

^c $p \leq .05$

^d $p = .02$

TABLE 2.29

ION SCORES BETWEEN YOUNGER AND OLDER PRACTITIONERS BY COMPOSITE INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING LEVEL AND TYPE OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Practitioners											
With A Master's Degree in Fields Other than SW ^a				Z or U Scores		Without A Master's Degree ^a				Z or U Scores	
Younger n	Mdn	n	Older Mdn	Z	U	Younger n	Mdn	n	Older Mdn	Z	U
33	8	46	8	N.S.		372	8	356	8	3.31	
24	8	40	9	N.S.		289	9	295	8	3.65	
2	6	4	9		2.5 ^b	35	10	25	10	N.S.	
6	13	15	10		22.0 ^c	69	9	50	10	N.S.	
6	6	3	5		1.0 ^d	31	6	43	8	N.S.	
2	7	2	5			51	9	11	8	N.S.	

results in any of the remaining 15 agencies where the parallel tests could

correctional practice, etc., are probably concomitants of age).

When educational level and type are held constant differences in the orientations of male and female practitioners persist but these differences may be specified by the agency variable. Since sex is, logically, a prior variable to agency employment, the substantive interpretation of this outcome would be that agency factors specify practice orientation irrespective of the non-agency sources of orientation. The stringency of the U test, for the given small sample sizes in three of the state system agencies, does not readily yield conclusive statistical support for the conditional substantive interpretation. It is evident that sex or the social concomitants of sex operate independently upon orientation but may be specified, in its operation, by organizational factors. Graduate education in social work or the other graduate fields represented in the population do not eliminate orientational differences attributable to sex or its social concomitants.

The data listed in Table 2.29 indicate that education specifies the way in which age operates on orientation (i.e., that the former operates on the latter only in the case of practitioners who do not hold a Master's degree). But the operation of the agency variable indicates that this apparent specification may be spurious.

Age, like sex, is logically a prior variable, that is, the influence of the concomitants of age are prior to

those of the employing organization but it is not clear whether agency factors eliminate or contribute to orientational differences initially attributable to age, given certain educational contingencies, (i.e., level of education). Nor is it clear if the definition of "older" and "younger" (being predicated on the median age of the composite population) "assigns" observations to agencies in such a way that the results within employing organizations are an artifact of this process. When age was held constant, larger differences, between higher and lower levels of education and between types of education were respectively observed for the older group of respondents than for the younger group of respondents. But significant differences, specified by both the agency variable and age, emerged between practitioners trained in social work and other practitioners.

The tables concerned with "age" provide a clue to the possible interaction of concomitants of the age variable with education. At least one concomitant of age that could readily be considered an educational variable is recency of education. It may be that recency of education rather than age per se may account for the results observed thus far.

Recency of education and orientation. Study of the relationship between education and practice orientation, when age was held constant, provided a clue to the possibility of concomitants of age affecting the initially

observed relationship between education and orientation. Tables 2.30 through 2.32 test this relationship while holding recency of education constant. The rationale for examining recency of education does not imply that fundamental professional values may have shifted but that, with the passage of time, professional commitment may be extinguished given the absence of professional reinforcement.

The introduction of the recency variable does not alter the observed three-way relationship among the education, orientation and employing agency variables when comparing practitioners who hold Master's degrees in social work with those who do not hold a Master's degree although statistical tests could not be performed for all of the relevant agencies. For the composite population, recency specifies the relationship between the scores of practitioners with a Master's degree in fields other than social work and those without Master's degrees: Among practitioners who are experienced, median scores favor the former, indicating that they are more client welfare oriented than the latter. But, when the employing organization is held constant, the specifying effect of the recency of education variable disappears. The comparison between practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work and those who hold a Master's degree in other fields demonstrates that the trained social workers are more client welfare oriented than the latter. But the small number of recently

TABLE 2.30

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH REGENCY OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners With											
	Recent ^a						Not Recent					
	Master's Degree in Social Work		Less Than Master's Degree		Z or U Scores		Master's Degree in Social Work		Less Than A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	37	10	262	8	2.94		32	11	436	8	4.02	
Individual Returns	37	10	196	9	2.33		27	12	361	8	3.80	
Agency A	32	10	26	10	N.S.		11	10	31	9	N.S.	
Agency B	3	16	41	10	2.00		12	14	82	9	3.83	
Agency C	0		26				5	11	48	6	1.58 ^b	
Agency D	1		41				1		19			

^aIn order to reduce the likelihood of contaminating recency of education with shifts in Social Work curricula, the recency of education variable was dichotomized ≤ 5 years ago and > 5 years ago. (1964 was used as the anchoring year).

^b $p \approx .05$

TABLE 2.31

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH RECENCY OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners With											
	Recent						Not Recent					
	Master's Degree in Fields other Than Social Work		Less Than A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores		Master's Degree in Fields other Than Social Work		Less Than A Master's Degree		Z or U Scores ^a	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	33	8	262	8	N.S.	41	9	436	8	1.79		
Individual Returns	27	8	196	9	N.S.	35	10	361	8	2.21		
Agency A	3	9	26	10	N.S.	3	10	31	9	N.S.		
Agency B	10	10	41	10	N.S.	10	11	82	9	N.S.		
Agency C	4	5	26	6	N.S.	5	6	48	6	N.S.		
Agency D	2	8	41	9	N.S.	1		19				

^aOf the remaining 15 state agency systems for which tests could be performed, none evidenced statistically significant differences.

TABLE 2.32

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION, RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES AND EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION, WITH REGENCY OF EDUCATION HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners With											
	Recent						Not Recent					
	Master's Degree in Social Work		Master's Degree in Fields other Than Social Work		Z or U Scores		Master's Degree in Social Work		Master's Degree in Fields other Than Social Work		Z or U Scores	
n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	
Composite Population	37	10	33	8	2.37		32	11	41	9	2.12	
Individual Returns	37	10	27	8	1.87		27	12	35	10	1.84	
Agency A	32	10	3	9	N.S.		11	10	3	10		16.5 ^b
Agency B	3	16	10	10	5.5 ^a		12	14	10	11		22.5 ^c
Agency C	0		4				5	11	5	6		5.0 ^d
Agency D	1		2				1		1			

^aMarginally N.S.

^bN.S.

^c $p < .01$

^dMarginally N.S.

educated trained social workers in most of the state agency systems which have been considered. severely restricts intra-agency comparisons between groups of recently trained practitioners. Z or U scores indicate that the observed relationship is specified by the employing agency but median scores favor the trained social workers. When intra-agency comparisons are made, the evidence for trained social workers being more client welfare oriented than other graduate practitioners is somewhat stronger among those whose education is not recent.

These results are quite consistent with the variations in results noted earlier when level and type of education were held constant, and constitute suggestive (rather than conclusive) grounds for supposing that the age variable--when intra-agency comparisons are made--reflects the recency of education variable. They are undoubtedly over-lapping sets of observations.

Conclusions of the extended replication. The present study of the relationships between education and client welfare orientation replicated and refined the essential elements of Piven's study of the same relationships. Piven's criterion measures were found to be stable (i.e., empirically valid) although some indications of differences between professional norms, evidenced in the casework literature, and the extent to which casework faculty members subscribe to these norms, were observed.

For the practitioner population as a whole, the findings of this study are consistent with Piven's findings: Practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work are more client welfare oriented than other probation and parole practitioners. As in Piven's study, the present one demonstrates that the employing organization interprets the relationship between education and orientation to practice but the respective interpretations are quite unlike one another. In Piven's study, the initially observed relationship between education and orientation disappears when employing organization is held constant and the relationship is, therefore, a spurious one. In the present study, the initially observed relationship is specified by the employing organization: the initially observed relationship persists in all but one of the four state agency systems employing professional social workers. The impact of social work education on the orientation of the practitioner is therefore greater than would have previously been supposed. These findings are strengthened by accounting for a possible source of contamination ignored in Piven's earlier study, namely the potential impact of graduate education per se on practice orientation. While there are no statistically significant differences between probation and parole practitioners who hold a Master's degree in fields other than social work and those without a Master's degree, there are such differences

between practitioners with a Master's degree in social work and those with a Master's degree in other fields as well as between the social work graduates and those without Master's degrees as predicted by the hypothesis:

Probation and Parole practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work achieve significantly higher client welfare orientation scores than probation and parole practitioners without such training.

The employing organization continues to specify this relationship when level and type of education are tested separately.

In an attempt to ascertain the nature of organizational influences on orientation, organizational position and tenure were respectively held constant and each of these organizational variables was held constant simultaneously with the employing organization while separately testing the effect of level and type of education on practice orientation.

Neither organizational position nor tenure accounted for observed differences among agencies. This outcome was consistent with Piven's earlier findings.

In controlling for respondent attributes, age and sex specified the operation of the education variable although the operation of the age variable is ambiguous. For the population as a whole, when sex is held constant, the hypothesized relationship between education and practice orientation holds for males only within the graduate level of education. The hypothesized relationship perseveres in

the comparison between practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work and those who do not hold a Master's degree and is not modified when comparing practitioners who hold a Master's degree in fields other than social work with those who do not hold a Master's degree. But differences between males and females, with the latter being more client welfare oriented, are in evidence when educational level is held constant. In all cases, limited evidence concerning the operation of the agency variable suggests that the employing organization continues to affect orientation regardless of its source. All of the results concerning the operation of the sex variable suggests that sex and education interact and that sex, as a prior variable, does affect practice orientation, but that the employing organization specifies the relationship between prior variables (i.e., education and sex) and client welfare orientation.

When age is held constant, the hypothesized relationship between education and orientation holds for older practitioners only in the population as a whole. This specification may vary according to agency. When education is held constant, age differences emerge for practitioners without Master's degrees only in the population as a whole and this relationship disappears when employing organization is held constant. There may also be some variation among agencies when comparing older and younger practitioners who have a Master's degree

in fields other than social work. There are no differences between younger and older practitioners who have a social work Master's degree. Thus, education appears to interact with--perhaps to specify--the operation of the age variable. In pursuit of this latter possibility, a logical concomitant of age--recency of education--was examined since age is logically, a prior variable. Recency of education, insofar as it affects orientation at all, appears to operate primarily on practitioners with a Master's degree in fields other than social work. Among practitioners whose education is not recent, this group of practitioners is slightly more client welfare oriented than practitioners without a Master's degree but when employing organization is held constant this relationship disappears. Because of the similar way in which age and recency of education selectively affect the same sub-populations and are similarly (but not identically) interpreted by the agency variable, there is a strong suggestion--falling short of statistical demonstration--that the age variable reflects the operation of recency of education.

Respondent attributes thus appear to be more related to practice orientation than organizational position or tenure but variation among employing organizations continues to be in evidence.

The present findings depart from Piven's in that the agency variable operates on the relationship between education and orientation in such a manner as to specify

it: the hypothesized relationship holds for some state system agencies.

The findings and conclusions, summarized in the foregoing pages, are subject to limitations in the elaboration of the test of the hypothesis that trained social workers are more client welfare oriented than their untrained colleagues.

The possibility of self-selection and selective recruitment into the social work profession has not been examined in this study. Respondent attributes which may be related to social work training have not been exhaustively examined. Thus, while trained social workers are more client welfare oriented than their untrained colleagues within most of the employing organizations where the relevant comparisons were made, some factor other than professional training per se may account for this finding. For example, the concomitants of social class (i.e., class of origin) might be related to orientation. If trained social workers were systematically different in their class of origin than untrained workers, then values related to social class might account for the obtained differences between types of correctional practitioners. Alternatively, if class were held constant, the obtained differences might not have emerged in the present study.

Indirect evidence, which cannot be accepted as conclusive, suggests that the obtained differences are not artifactual.

Among the most frequently employed objective indicators of social class are occupation, income and education. With reference to education, instances of downward mobility across generations may, with reasonable safety, be assumed to be rare.

If this assumption is correct, then the level of education attained by respondents should serve as a rough indicator of class of origin. Thus, if practice orientation were associated with class of origin, then practice orientation would also be associated with respondents' educational level per se. Graduate practitioners, therefore, should be differently oriented to the welfare of their clients than practitioners without graduate education. And this difference should be greater than orientational differences between practitioners with different types of graduate education. This was not the case in the present study. While graduate social workers were more client welfare oriented than practitioners without graduate training, practitioners with graduate education in fields other than social work were not more client welfare oriented than practitioners without graduate training.

In contrast to the prestigious professionalized voluntary agencies, correctional agencies attract relatively few trained social workers. One might surmise that low-prestige correctional work could serve as a channel of upward mobility for workers who do not enter the correctional field with graduate degrees. Such workers may, after

acquiring experience, undertake social work training (often with financial support from the employing agency). In contrast to this pattern of the occupation-education sequence, ~~people in the higher levels of the class structure are~~ likely to undertake graduate education as preparation for a career. The expected pattern for this latter group would be graduate training followed by occupational experience. Thus, one would not expect to find orientational differences among graduate practitioners who are inexperienced or, perhaps, recently educated. Although the career patterns of correctional practitioners were not treated in the present study, the tables in which probation-parole experience is held constant (Tables 2.16 through 2.18) and the tables in which recency of education is held constant (Tables 2.30 through 2.32) provide suggestive evidence on career pattern:

- (1) Among respondents who received individually mailed questionnaires, about one-third of the recently educated social workers are inexperienced while almost 88% of the recently educated practitioners with graduate degrees in fields other than social work are inexperienced;
- (2) Median scores of the two categories of inexperienced graduate practitioners indicate that social workers are more client welfare oriented than other graduate practitioners;
- (3) Median scores of the two categories of recently educated graduate practitioners indicate that social workers are more client welfare oriented than other graduate practitioners.

To the extent that recency of education and the lack of correctional experience serve as indicators of career pattern (i.e., the sequence of graduate

training and occupational experience) and to the extent that career pattern is a function of social class, it would appear that systematic differences between social workers and other graduates favors the interpretation that social class does not account for client welfare orientation.

Another factor which could be associated with practice orientation is religion and, for the sample of practitioners included in the present study, the relevant comparisons would have entailed assessing possible differences between Catholics and Protestants. Unless practitioners of one or another religious origin differentially selected themselves into types of graduate education, the concomitants of religious origin could not have been associated with the obtained differences. The absence of a direct test of this possibility qualifies the findings.

It was demonstrated that sex does have an impact on orientation and that female practitioners at every level of education and with each type of graduate education are more client welfare oriented than similarly located male practitioners. But female social workers are more client welfare oriented than females with other graduate backgrounds as well as those without graduate training. It is worth noting, in this connection, that the major works on casework were written by women and that most of the casework teachers (i.e., the criterion population) or "norm transmitters" are women. As has been suggested, earlier, this points to the possibility that the professional norms

of social work, particularly of casework, may be invested with feminine attitudes and beliefs. This suggests further consideration of the professional standards--and the methods of deducing and inducing them--employed in the present study.

The distinction between ideal norms and operational norms is a familiar one. In one sense, the difference between ideal and operational norms is predicted upon the difference between deductive and inductive methods of discovering norms. Piven's approach--and that of the present author--entailed the induction of the distribution of subscription to ideal norms among norm transmitters. The operational norms of the norm transmitters may evidence a wider range than the present method of study permits. Further studies of similar matters would profit from a complementary method of identifying professional norms, namely, the employment of participant-observers in the classroom or, alternatively, a survey instrument which provides a wider range of response options.

Differences between casework teachers and professional correctional practitioners responding to the same research instrument indicate that orientational differences are not a function of instrument effect. But alternative methods of study may indicate that the observed gap between teachers and practitioners is smaller (or, perhaps, larger) than the present evidence indicates.

The Client Welfare Orientation instrument items provide respondents with a relatively small amount of

information for making case decisions. Decision outcomes may be a function of the amount of information judged because the probability of competing case information may increase with increasing amounts of information. To the extent that practitioners are able to discriminate among "bits" of information, decision outcomes, under ordinary practice conditions, may depend upon "balancing" competing information. The CWO instrument is, in effect, held constant for all groups of respondents in the present study and the obtained differences cannot be attributed to instrument effect (i.e., items discriminate among categories of respondents). But the CWO items provide relatively little case information and one may therefore question whether or not professionals would distinguish themselves from their untrained colleagues if the amount of case information were increased. On the other hand, when the decision options are related to fairly restricted case outcomes such as revocation of probation versus retention in the community, the "depth" or complexity of the case decision (as a function of the amount of case information) may be irrelevant.

The foregoing considerations suggest that the hypothesis, that trained practitioners are more client welfare oriented than their untrained colleagues, has been supported subject to the limitations in the tests of the elaboration of the hypothesis.

CHAPTER II
THE STRUCTURE OF CASELOADS AND
PRACTITIONER ORIENTATION*

Client welfare orientation has emerged as a function of professional education. But type and level of education do not fully account for the way in which practitioners are oriented to the captives of probation and parole systems. Professional training in social work generates expected case decisions under certain organizational contingencies, since trained social workers subscribe to professional prescriptions for case decisions in some, rather than all, probation-parole systems. Further, client welfare orientation varies according to respondent attributes, but these attributes (i.e., age and sex or their concomitants) interact with level and type of education. The independent sources of practitioner orientation¹ examined thus far operate under certain organizational contingencies. The evidence presented thus far tends to rule out organizational status (position) as one of the variables which specifies the operation of the independent variables. Organizational tenure as well as the

* See Author's Note.

¹The argument for level and type of education and age and sex being considered to be independent variables is predicated on their being logically (i.e., temporally) prior to employment in the respondent's present employing organization.

aggregate of organizational exposure or probation-parole experience is similarly ruled out. There is no support in the present study for the general proposition that the norms to which one subscribes or conforms are a function of one's organizational status. Similarly, there is no support in the present study for the general proposition that beliefs, of employees, which are relevant to their organizational tasks, are a function of the duration of exposure to a given set of organizational arrangements. There is no need to belabor the significance of these outcomes. The way in which organizational variables operate may be related to the formally defined functions of the organization and, therefore, to its client system. This is only to say that comparative studies among types of organizations undoubtedly complement the insights gleaned from comparative studies within a given type of organizational system. The present outcomes serve as a caution to the ready acceptance of tempting generalizations about complex organizations qua complex organizations.

It is clear from the evidence presented thus far that client welfare orientation varies among probation-parole systems, but the sources of this variation have not been identified. The search, for those organizational contingencies, conditions and arrangements which specify the relationship between the independent sources of client welfare orientation and orientation, leads to the consideration of the structure of actual work performed by practitioners.

Caseload composition: probation-parole. The most general and encompassing of these performances is whether practitioners work with probationers or parolees. Differences in caseloads presumably reflect somewhat different purposes since probation caseloads are predicated on an alternative to maximum loss of liberties for organizational captives while parole caseloads consist of captives who have completed a term of containment. Judgments about the "seriousness" or "gravity" of the offense often plays a key role in determining whether a captive is placed on probation or is sent to prison (or its juvenile equivalents). Consequently, the offender who is returning to the community may be more invidiously defined than the probationer. Such differences in caseload composition may, therefore, specify the relationship between education and client welfare orientation.

For the composite population or its most reliably sampled sub-population, the parole and/or probation composition of the caseload has no effect upon client welfare orientation scores (see Table 3.1). But when educational levels and types are compared while holding probation-parole caseload composition constant the results which emerge are: (1) Among practitioners who carry parole caseloads, those trained in social work are the most client welfare oriented, but those who hold Master's degrees in fields other than social work are more client welfare

TABLE 3.1

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG PRACTITIONERS CARRYING PROBATION AND/OR PAROLE CASELOADS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES

Sample ^b	Practitioners Carrying Caseloads Composed of																	
	Parol-ees		Proba-tioners		Z or U Scores		Parol-ees		Mixed ^a		Z or U Scores		Proba-tioners		Mixed ^a		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	403	8	14	9	N.S.		403	8	281	8	N.S.		14	9	281	8	N.S.	
Individual Returns	341	8	14	9	N.S.		341	8	278	8	N.S.		14	9	278	8	N.S.	

^a"Mixed" refers to caseloads composed of both probationers and parolees.

^bEmploying organization or state agency system was not held constant because there is a very substantial degree of segregation among agencies with respect to probation or parole caseload composition. In all of the unsegregated cases but one, significant differences did not emerge. In the one agency in which a statistically significant difference did emerge, practitioners carrying a mixed caseload were more client welfare oriented than those carrying a parole caseload. There were no professionally trained social workers in this particular state system.

TABLE 3.2

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG LEVELS AND TYPES OF EDUCATION
 BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES
 WITH PAROLE AND/OR PROBATION CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Carrying Caseloads Composed of Parolees, ^c																	
	With SW ^a MS ^b		With- out MS		Z	U	With Non-SW MS		With- out MS		Z	U	With SW MS		With Non-SW MS		Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	15	13	298	8	4.17		34	8	298	8	N.S.		15	13	34	8	3.22	
Individual Returns	14	13	245	8	3.78		28	9	245	8	1.69		14	13	28	9	2.63	
	Mixed Probationers and Parolees,																	
Composite Population	27	10	202	8	N.S.		15	8	202	8	N.S.		27	10	15	8	N.S.	
Individual Returns	27	10	199	8	N.S.		15	8	199	8	N.S.		27	10	15	8	N.S.	

^aSocial Work

^bMaster's Degree

^cThe number of practitioners with a Master's Degree who carry probation caseloads in the present sample is negligible.

oriented than practitioners without Master's degrees;

(2) Among practitioners who carry mixed probation-parole caseloads, median scores are directionally consistent with the hypothesis that trained social workers are more client welfare oriented than other practitioners, but there are no statistically significant differences between levels and types of education at the level of confidence accepted for the present study (i.e., .05). Although the results are not definitive, the evidence suggests that caseload composition specifies the initially observed relationship between education and orientation to practice. Thus caseload composition emerges as one of the likely organizational specifiers of the relationship between education and orientation.

There are other characteristics of caseload composition which may contribute to the specification of the relationship between education and orientation. In addition to the way in which caseload structure reflects the manifest functions of types of employing organizations (i.e., probation and/or parole), caseload structure reflects certain attributes of organizational captives. Caseloads may be composed largely of males or females, adults or juveniles.

Caseload composition: juveniles-adults. Are attitudes towards women and children more permissive and sympathetic or generally more client welfare oriented than towards men and adults? Because of the widespread practice

of sex segregation, the number of female practitioners who work with male or mixed caseloads is negligible. Similarly, the number of male practitioners who work with female caseloads is negligible.² The question of practical import, then, is: Are practitioners who work with juveniles more client welfare oriented than those who work with adults? Because of the intended (rather than effective) nature of juvenile law, which reflects a generally protective orientation towards children, one would expect that practitioners working with juveniles would be more client welfare oriented than those working with adults. But professional training should reduce this difference if professional values have had an impact on professionally accredited practitioners. That is, within types of caseload composition, the initially observed relationship between education and practice orientation should persist.

The data listed in Table 3.3 evidences very striking differences between practitioners whose caseloads are composed of juveniles and those whose caseloads are composed of adults. Those who work almost exclusively with juveniles

²For the few (i.e., n=52) male practitioners in the composite sample who work with mixed caseloads, the median CWO score is 8. This is the same median score as the median score for the large number of male practitioners (i.e., n=575) who work with exclusively male caseloads. There are no statistically significant differences between these two groups of practitioners as tested by the Mann-Whitney U test.

TABLE 3.3

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG PRACTITIONERS
CARRYING ADULT AND/OR JUVENILE CASELOADS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION
AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES

Sample	Practitioners Carrying Caseloads Composed of																	
	Juve- niles		Adults		Z or U Scores		Juve- niles		Mixed		Z or U Scores		Adults		Mixed		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	93	11	384	8	6.69		93	11	229	9	3.88		384	8	229	9	4.12	
Individual Returns	93	11	320	8	6.25		92	11	229	9	3.94		320	8	229	9	3.45	

are more client welfare oriented than those who work almost exclusively with adults; those who work almost exclusively with juveniles are more client welfare oriented than those who work with mixed (i.e., juvenile and adults) caseloads; those who work almost exclusively with adults are less client welfare oriented than those who work with mixed caseloads. As was suggested earlier, the greater the extent to which the caseload is composed of juveniles, the more client welfare oriented are the practitioners carrying the caseload.

The juvenile-adult composition of the caseload specifies the relationship between orientation and level of education and orientation and type of education, respectively. Tables 3.4 through 3.6, taken together, indicate that there are only random differences among groups of practitioners who carry adult caseloads.³ But social work training continues to affect the orientation of practitioners who carry juvenile or mixed caseloads. Other graduate programs of education do not have a similar impact on orientation when the juvenile-adult composition of caseload is held constant although median scores do not discriminate among practitioners, who have received a

³This is true for the most reliably sampled portion of the composite population (i.e., the returns from individually mailed questionnaires).

TABLE 3.4

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES WITH JUVENILE AND/OR ADULT CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Carrying Caseloads Composed of					Z or U Scores	
	Juveniles,					Z	U
	With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Without a Master's Degree				
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn			
Composite Population	8	12	70	10			2.10
Individual Returns	8	12	69	10			2.06
					Adults,		
Composite Population	11	10	283	8			1.58 ^a
Individual Returns	10	10	228	8			N.S.
					Mixed Juvenile and Adults,		
Composite Population	24	10	163	9			2.06
Individual Returns	24	10	163	9			2.06

^ap ≈ .05

TABLE 3.5

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES WITH JUVENILE AND/OR ADULT CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Carrying Caseloads Composed of						Z or U Scores Z U	
	Juveniles,							
	With a Master's Degree in Fields Other Than Social Work			Without a Master's Degree				
	n	Mdn		n	Mdn			
Composite Population	8		12	70		10	N.S.	
Individual Returns	8		12	69		10	N.S.	
Sample	Adults,						Z or U Scores Z U	
	With a Master's Degree in Fields Other Than Social Work			Without a Master's Degree				
	n	Mdn		n	Mdn			
	Composite Population	27		8	283		8	N.S.
Individual Returns	21		8	228		8	N.S.	
Sample	Mixed Juveniles and Adults,						Z or U Scores Z U	
	With a Master's Degree in Fields Other Than Social Work			Without a Master's Degree				
	n	Mdn		n	Mdn			
	Composite Population	15		9	163		9	N.S.
Individual Returns	15		9	163		9	N.S.	

TABLE 3.6

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE HOLDING A MASTER'S DEGREE IN OTHER FIELDS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES WITH JUVENILE AND/OR ADULT CASELOAD COMPOSITION HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Carrying Caseloads Composed of					
	Juveniles,					
	With a Master's Degree in Social Work		With a Master's Degree in Fields Other Than Social Work		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	8	12	8	12	22.5 ^a	
Individual Returns	8	12	8	12	22.5 ^a	
	Adults,					
Composite Population	11	10	27	8	N.S.	
Individual Returns	10	10	21	8	N.S.	
	Mixed Juveniles and Adults,					
Composite Population	24	10	15	9	N.S.	
Individual Returns	24	10	15	9	N.S.	

^aN.S.

graduate-level education, who work almost exclusively with juveniles. The median scores alone do not provide the only evidence for these interpretations. The statistically significant differences, between those practitioners trained in social work and those without a Master's degree, in contrast to the lack of significant differences, between practitioners with a Master's degree in fields other than social work and those without a Master's degree, also support the interpretation of the data listed in Tables 3.4 through 3.6.

Agencies which serve juveniles are often administratively segregated from those which serve adults and this is reflected in the organizational populations represented in the present study. This, in combination with the small number (relative to the total size of the composite population) of respondents who have completed various programs of graduate education, severely limits the intra-agency analyses of the relationship between the age composition of the caseload and orientation. In the few instances where relevant comparisons could be made, the median scores are consistent with the general findings and where the sample size is sufficient⁴ U or Z scores yield probabilities for rejecting the null hypothesis close to, equal to or

⁴The diminution of sample sizes is a partial function of the elimination of supervisory and higher statuses. Thus status is, in effect, also held constant in this series of tests concerning caseload composition.

smaller than .05. But the very same limitations on intra-agency testing suggest that differences in caseload composition among agencies contributes to other differences among agencies.

One of the more powerful organizational specifiers of the relationship between education and orientation, then, is the age composition of the caseload. But this specification can hardly be considered a "pure" organizational variable. It is, rather, an organizational reflection of, or a set of organizational arrangements which support, generally held and legally encoded values which are part of the practitioner's social environment (prior to and during correctional employment) as well as part of the organization's cultural context. In brief, these findings suggest how the structure of work is, in part, a reflection of the socio-cultural context.⁵

Caseload composition: size. There are, however, aspects of the structure of work which cannot, logically, be attributed to the socio-cultural context. One of these is the amount of work represented by the size of the caseload. If practitioners are so burdened that their orientations cannot lead to discriminations among alternative

⁵"Social environment," "cultural context" and "socio-cultural context" are ambiguous terms because of the multiplicity of implied referents. Briefly, the intended distinction between the "social environment" of the practitioner and the "cultural context" of the organization is that the former refers to beliefs and values which are recognized or supported in informal (i.e., non-bureaucratic)

performances (i.e., case actions), then orientational differences among practitioners who are similarly burdened may disappear. Thus, one would expect practitioners with small caseloads to be somewhat more client welfare oriented than those with large caseloads. Further, differences between groups of practitioners within different levels and types of education should be reduced among practitioners who carry large caseloads.

There are some indications that size of caseload and client welfare orientation are related. For the more reliably sampled portion of the composite population, median scores and the Z score tend to favor practitioners with smaller caseloads although the Z score falls short of the level of confidence accepted for the present study

interaction or in the practitioner's inter-personal contacts outside his employing organization. The latter, however, is intended to refer to values which are embedded in the interface of the system of employing organization and other systems so that the probation-parole system is constrained in its operation by the requirements of the other organizational systems. Operationally, such requirements may be treated as contextual variables. What is suggested is: some organizational arrangements which may be essentially dysfunctional for a given organization may be traced to contextual variables. Similarly, operations of organizations which are functional for organizational outcomes may also be predicated upon contextual variables rather than upon an internal rational articulation of organizational arrangements (means) and objectives (ends). The structure of organizational work, then, may reflect the practitioners social environment or context and the organization's cultural context or environment (i.e., "socio-cultural context").

TABLE 3.7

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO CARRY SMALL CASELOADS^a AND THOSE WHO CARRY LARGE CASELOADS BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES

Sample	Practitioners Who Carry				Z or U Scores	
	Small Caseloads		Large Caseloads		A	U
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn		
Composite Population	268	8	428	8	N.S.	
Individual Returns	236	9	396	8	1.55 ^b	

^a"Small" caseloads are defined as \leq 60 cases; "large" caseloads are defined as $>$ 60. This "break" is relative to the fields of probation and parole rather than what is, on a priori grounds, considered desirable.

^b_p = .06 (N.S.)

TABLE 3.8

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN LEVELS AND TYPES OF EDUCATION BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES WITH CASELOAD SIZE HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Practitioners, Who Carry Small Caseloads,																	
	With SW ^a MS ^b		With- out MS		Z or U Scores		With Non- SW MS		With- out MS		Z or U Scores		With SW MS		With Non- SW MS		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	28	11	195	8	2.22		12	9	195	8	N.S.		28	11	12	9	1.63	
Individual	28	11	167	8	1.90		10	9	167	8	N.S.		28	11	10	9	N.S. ^c	
Sample	Practitioners, Who Carry Large Caseloads,																	
	With SW ^a MS ^b		With- out MS		Z or U Scores		With Non- SW MS		With- out MS		Z or U Scores		With SW MS		With Non- SW MS		Z or U Scores	
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	Z	U
Composite Population	14	11	315	8	2.84		36	8	315	8	N.S.		14	11	36	8	2.10	
Individual Returns	13	10	288	8	2.47		32	8	288	8;	N.S.		13	10	32	8	1.58 ^d	

^aSocial Work

^bMaster's Degree

^cZ = 1.27, p = .10

^dp < .05

(see Table 3.7). Table 3.8 demonstrates that when caseload size is held constant, the differences between types of education at the graduate level are random differences for practitioners who carry small caseloads but the differences in median scores favor social work graduates. Also, practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work are more client welfare oriented than those without a Master's degree, whereas practitioners who hold a Master's degree in fields other than social work are not significantly more client welfare oriented than practitioners without a Master's degree. In all cases--with the exception of the comparison noted above--practitioners trained in social work emerge as being more client welfare oriented than other practitioners. While differences in caseload size contribute to differences in orientation at the graduate level, the contribution is not a very large contribution and the statistical case for its contribution is a marginal one.

In summary, the most telling organizational specifier of the relationship between education and orientation, for those practitioners who hold positions lower than supervisor, is the age composition of the caseload. But the age structure of the caseload which, by definition, is a function of organizational arrangements, is predicated upon extra-organizational norms.

CHAPTER III

FUNCTIONAL AUTONOMY AND PRACTITIONER ORIENTATION

The data presented thus far demonstrate that the most salient variables affecting client welfare orientation are those which are either prior to exposure to the employing organization or those which may be accounted for in extra-mural terms although reflected in organizational arrangements. In contrast to Piven's¹ findings, variations--in the relationship between education and practice orientation--among employing organizations reveal that the independent effects of graduate education in social work are not artifactual. In Piven's study, differences between practitioners trained in social work and those who are not trained disappeared when employing organization was held constant. But large variations, in the extent of perceived constraints on practitioner autonomy, emerged among employing organizations. In summarizing the relationship between the degree of perceived functional autonomy provided by the employing organization and client welfare orientation, Piven noted the following outcomes:

The terms in which probation-parole personnel define and evaluate offenders, and their obligations to the welfare of clients, are strongly and consistently related to those

¹Piven, H., Professionalism and Organizational Structure (New York: unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1960). For other contributions to the present work by Piven and the "Curriculum Evaluation Project," Herman Piven, Principal Investigator, see Author's Note.

specific organizational conditions structuring the relative freedom of agency practitioners to establish and implement case objectives and methods. When practitioners are located within agencies providing them with comparatively great functional autonomy, their orientation to client-welfare emphasizes service and treatment; when practitioners are located within agencies which are functionally restrictive, their orientation to client-welfare is characterized by a relative de-emphasis on service and treatment.²

Thus functional autonomy emerges as an explanatory variable in Piven's study.

In order to test for the possibility that the observed variations among agencies in the relationship between education and orientation is co-extensive with variations in the degree of functional autonomy, a form of Piven's autonomy-restrictiveness (AR) instrument was administered to the entire respondent population of the present study. (See Appendix B).

The measuring instrument. Piven's original autonomy restrictiveness instrument contained twenty questionnaire items soliciting the "individual perceptions of agency respondents regarding the frequency with which the practitioner finds it necessary to take into account the expectations of designated role-partners as he makes critical case decisions."³ An example of such a decision contained in an AR item is illustrated by Piven:

You have to seriously weigh the probable reaction of your supervisor before making

²Ibid., pp. 186-187.

³Ibid., p. 92.

a decision on a case, though you yourself are convinced of what the case requires.⁴

The respondent is offered five response alternatives (i.e., "Never (0-5%)" ; "Occasionally (5-50%)" ; "Often (50-70%)" ; "Very Frequently (70-95%)" ; "Always (95-100%)").

As a rough methodological check on the unidimensionality of the AR instrument, Piven followed Guttman's "Cornell" scaling technique employing median agency scores on each AR item with the result that median agency scores consistently differentiated responses to items according to agency location. Federal agency scores (i.e., agencies predicted to be less restrictive) were "less restrictive than state agency scores ten times as frequently as the reverse."⁵ Piven concludes, from this evidence, that the AR instrument measured a single dimension or conceivably related dimensions.

More important than the reported unidimensionality (since the content of the items precludes doubt, on substantive grounds, that the items are mutually consonant) is the reliability of the AR instrument (i.e., the Spearman rank correlation coefficient (ρ) for the split-half correlation was .90).

The ten AR items which had the greatest per cent agreement with total instrument scores were selected for

⁴Ibid., pp. 102.

⁵Ibid., pp. 102.

inclusion in the short form of the instrument employed in the present study.⁶ The original response categories were employed in the short form of the AR instrument.

Testing the relationship between functional autonomy and client welfare orientation. In order to test the general proposition that functional autonomy and client welfare orientation are related, a Spearman rank correlation coefficient was computed for the summated scores of AR and CWO items of every respondent who received an individually mailed questionnaire (n = 859). $Rho = -.17$, $t = 4.99$ and $p < .0005$, clearly indicating that there is a statistically significant relationship between functional autonomy and client welfare orientation for the population as a whole. The small but significant correlation is, however, predicated on the large sample size. It is possible, however, that the relationship does not hold for some other sub-populations within the composite population. Accordingly, the rho statistic was computed for the sub-populations listed below in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 indicates that when sub-populations are selected according to the variables held constant in testing the relationship between orientation and education, (i.e., the relevant sub-populations) the relationship

⁶Actually, the fourth most discriminating item was eliminated because it concerned an offense situation that is relatively uncommon among younger juvenile offenders. The fifth most discriminatory item was eliminated because it resembled a CWO item.

TABLE 4.1

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS OF AUTONOMY-
RESTRICTIVENESS AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SUMMATED
ITEM SCORES FOR SELECTED SUB-POPULATIONS OF RESPONDENTS
WHO RECEIVED INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES

Sub-Population	n	rho	t(df = n-2)	p
Practitioners Holding A Master's Degree In Social Work	67	-.12	1.02	N.S.
Practitioners Holding A Master's Degree in Fields Other Than Social Work	64	-.07	.53	N.S.
Practitioners Without A Master's Degree	595	-.19	4.94	.0005
Practitioners Who Had Their Last Educational Experience Recently	288	-.14	2.33	< .01
Practitioners Who Did Not Have Their Last Educational Experience Recently	514	-.16	3.58	< .0005
Practitioners Who Hold Supervisory or Higher Organizational Positions	151	-.18	2.25	.025 > p > .01
Practitioners Who Hold Organizational Positions Lower Than Supervisors	650	-.18	4.56	< .0005
Practitioners With Long- Term Tenure	523	-.18	4.23	.0005
Practitioners With Short- Term Tenure	328	-.14	2.50	.01 > p > .005
Experienced Practi- tioners	532	-.18	4.29	.0005
Inexperienced Practi- tioners	302	-.13	2.21	.025 > p > .01
Men	767	-.18	5.08	< .0005
Women	71	-.09	.74	N.S.
Older Practitioners	441	-.23	4.96	< .0005
Younger Practi- tioners	399	-.07	1.42	N.S.

TABLE 4.1 (Continued)

Sub-Population	n	rho	t(df = n-2)	p
Workers Who Carry Parole Caseloads	341	-.15	2.73	.005 > p > .0005
Workers Who Carry Probation Caseloads	14	-.08	.29	N.S.
Workers Who Carry Mixed Probation- Parole Caseloads	278	-.24	4.14	< .0005
Workers Who Carry Juvenile Caseloads	92	-.16	1.55	N.S.
Workers Who Carry Adult Caseloads	320	-.28	5.33	< .0005
Workers Who Carry Mixed Juvenile- Adult Caseloads	229	-.08	1.17	N.S.
Workers With Small Caseloads	236	-.16	2.43	.01 > p > .005
Workers With Large Caseloads	396	-.18	3.68	< .0005

between functional autonomy and client welfare orientation persists largely as a function of the size of the sub-population.⁷ It may be argued that this method of testing the relationship is too "liberal" a method since perceptions of functional autonomy may vary among employing organizations. The relationship between the AR and CWO instruments may be an artifact of combining employing organizations.

Table 4.2 lists the results of rho computations by state system or employing organization for 15 state systems (i.e., those agencies which yielded more than 15 observations).

When an employing organization is held constant (see Table 4.2) the correlation between autonomy-restrictiveness and client welfare orientation varies among the state system agencies. A statistically significant relationship is evidenced in four or--applying more liberal statistical criteria--five agencies. The significant

⁷Sidney Seigel (Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), points out that in large samples the significance of rho may be tested by a value, derived from rho and the sample size, which is distributed as Students t with $df = n-2$. (See p. 212.) When $df > 120$, the degrees of freedom, for all practical purposes, may be regarded as infinite. In brief, differences in size among large samples affect the value of t less than differences in size among small samples. In this connection relatively small or weak correlations between variables in large samples yield statistically significant values of t. Thus a rho of $-.16$ for a sample size of 94 ($df = 92$) as in the comparison for workers who carry juvenile caseloads is not statistically significant whereas a rho of $-.13$ in the case of 300 df ($n = 302$) is significant.

TABLE 4.2

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF AUTONOMY RESTRICTIVENESS
AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SUMMATED ITEM SCORES BY EMPLOYING
ORGANIZATION AND MEDIAN AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORE
(n > 15)

<u>Employing Organization</u>	<u>Md</u>	<u>AR Score^a</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>rho^b</u>	<u>t^c or cv^d</u>
A ^e	34.0		120	-.14	1.64 ^f
B ^e	39.0		164	-.22	3.17
C ^e	41.0		95	-.29	3.32
D ^e	31.0		83	-.01	N.S.
E	37.0		120	-.16	1.90
F	40.0		40	-.05	N.S.
G	31.0		65	-.09	N.S.
H	34.0		26	-.07	N.S.
I	40.0		32	-.24	N.S.
J	30.0		17	-.05	N.S.
K	44.0		64	-.35	3.42
L	30.0		19	-.74	.38 < cv < .40
M	36.0		68	-.06	N.S.
N	32.0		23	-.21	N.S.
O	30.0		51	-.10	N.S.

^aThe theoretical range for the summated AR item scores is from 10 to 70 with the lower value representing the least perceived restrictiveness. Therefore, median scores tending toward the higher value represent a restrictive central tendency. The most restrictive median score was 44 and the least was 25. The latter score was obtained in an organization where n = 15.

^bThe sign implicitly predicted by the hypothesis is negative.

^cdf = n-2 for n > 30. When t is indicated, its critical value is equal to or exceeded by t at the .05 level of confidence (one-tailed test).

^dFor n > 30, the critical value for a one-tailed test at the .05 level is equal to or exceeded by rho when the cv is listed.

^eThis organization is one of four employing professional trained social workers.

^fN.S. This, however, is a marginal case.

results are found scattered throughout the range of autonomy-restrictiveness so that some highly restrictive agencies evidence the relationship while other restrictive agencies do not. Some moderately restrictive or moderately autonomous agencies evidence the relationship while other agencies similarly located with respect to autonomy do not. At least one highly autonomous agency evidences the relationship between autonomy-restrictiveness while others do not. In contrast to Piven's study, these variations cannot be attributed to variations in administrative levels (i.e., state versus federal) because all of the agencies included in the present study are at the state level. This does not, of course, preclude greater variation between state and federal levels than among either state or federal levels. It should be noted that comparisons (i.e., Mann-Whitney U tests of differences) of client welfare orientation scores between all possible pairs of agencies in Piven's study yielded the result that there were statistically significant differences in each such comparison. Significant differences occurred, therefore, within and between levels.

Since not all of Piven's state agencies employed trained social workers, significant differences emerged between pairs of agencies which did employ them, pairs of agencies which did not employ them and pairs of agencies in which only one member of the pair employed social workers.⁸ When a parallel set of comparisons among agencies

⁸Op. cit., p. 152.

was undertaken for the autonomy-restrictiveness instrument, differences between two federal agencies emerged at the .10 level. But, differences between federal agencies and state agencies emerged at \leq .03 level while significant differences between the three possible pairs of state agencies emerged in only one pair.⁹ It is reasonably evident that there is greater variation in client welfare orientation among agencies within levels than is the case for perception of autonomy-restrictiveness. Differences between levels are greater for client welfare orientation than for autonomy-restrictiveness in Piven's study. It is therefore a reasonable deduction from Piven's data, that orientation to practice and perception of worker autonomy do not vary among agencies in the same way. Piven found, however, that the rank order correlation of median agency scores for the autonomy restrictiveness and client welfare orientation instruments was significant at the .05 level.¹⁰ But this is the rank order of the central tendency rather than the full range of scores.

Whether or not one considers Piven's data to provide compelling evidence for his hypothesis concerning the relationship between functional autonomy and orientation,

⁹Ibid., p. 95.

¹⁰In computing Kendall's Tau, for the total sample of 19 state system agencies included in the present study, on median agency scores of the AR and CWO instruments, the rank order correlation was found to be significant at the .05 level but only when the agencies were so arranged as to maximize the value of Tau.

variations, in this relationship, at the state level are substantively important and the sources of this variation cannot be ascribed to administrative level. It is also clear that the presence or absence of trained social workers in state agency systems neither induces nor depends upon the perceived degree of functional autonomy. Further, when one examines the rank order correlation between autonomy-restrictiveness and client welfare orientation for trained social workers while holding employing organization constant, the results listed in Table 4.3 emerge.

The high correlation required to reach a significant level with such small intra-agency sub-populations is well above that evidenced by the data presented in Table 4.3, below. For the same set of agencies, a similar lack of relationship between autonomy-restrictiveness and client welfare orientation is observed for practitioners who hold a Master's degree in fields other than social work.

The data presented in this chapter, taken together with the analyses of the CWO instrument, suggest that practitioner orientation is not dependent upon the degree of functional autonomy. The association which emerges between the two, in given state system agencies may depend upon factors peculiar to those agencies. Among the factors which may be ruled out are selective recruitment or "self-selection" of practitioners with advanced education, size of agency and administrative level.

TABLE 4.3

SPEARMAN RANK ORDER CORRELATION COEFFICIENT OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS
AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SUMMATED ITEM SCORES FOR TRAINED
SOCIAL WORKERS, HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT

<u>Employing Organization</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>rho</u>	<u>cv</u>
A	44	-.16 ^a	N.S.
B	16	-.24	N.S.
C	5	-.10	N.S.
D	3	-.50 ^b	N.S.

^aThe relationship between the AR and CWO instruments was a marginal one for the agency population as a whole.

^bThere was no statistically significant correlation between the AR and CWO instruments for the agency population as a whole.

Another approach to the testing of the way in which client welfare orientation and functional autonomy do or do not vary together is the parallel assessment of statistical differences, between restrictive and autonomous agencies, for the CWO and AR instruments.

If the 19 state system agencies are trichotomized into "autonomous," "moderately autonomous or restrictive" and "restrictive," comparisons between pairs of autonomous and restrictive agencies should yield similar statistical outcomes for each instrument if they vary together among the state systems.

If one assumed that a statistically significant difference in autonomy-restrictiveness scores between any pair of autonomous and restrictive agencies indicated a similar difference in client welfare orientation scores, he would be wrong better than one-time in three (i.e., 36% of the time). Fourteen per cent of the paired comparisons indicate that pairs of significant differences emerge in which the more autonomous state agency system is also the less client welfare oriented system (or, conversely, the more restrictive system is also the more client welfare oriented system). The 3 least restrictive of the six most restrictive agencies contribute most to the absence of a uniform relationship between functional autonomy and practice orientation (see Table 4.4). This yields further evidence for the conclusion that whatever the relationship between functional autonomy and practice orientation might

TABLE 4.4

COMPARISONS^a OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES AND CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AMONG PAIRS OF AUTONOMOUS AND RESTRICTIVE STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS FOR SIX MOST AUTONOMOUS AND SIX MOST RESTRICTIVE SYSTEMS^b

Autonomous Systems		Most Restrictive		Restrictive Systems						Least Restrictive	
		K	CWO	C	F		I		R	B	
					AR	CWO	AR	CWO			AR
Most Autonomous	S	5.42		5.52	5.05		4.42		35.5 ^C		5.41
	O	7.49	3.55	7.54	5.93	2.15	4.73	2.77	2.76		7.18
			6.51	5.00	5.04				3.19		
	L	4.21		3.79	3.05		2.63*				3.37*
	J	4.07	3.77	2.08	2.74	2.69	2.28				
Least Autonomous	D	7.27		7.20	5.11	2.65	4.08*		2.09	108.5 ^C	3.62
			6.58	4.65	4.82		1.86		2.32		1.60
	G	6.75		6.33	4.54	4.14	3.79*		2.01		5.71
			5.94	4.40	4.40		1.71		2.18		

^aMann-Whitney U Tests were employed to test differences in the location of scores. An entry in either the AR or CWO columns consists of a Z score or a U value provided these values are sufficient to reject the null hypothesis at $\leq .05$ level of confidence. No entry signifies the absence of statistically significant differences. An asterisk signifies that the direction of significant differences are not congruent.

^bThe median AR score was used to rank the agencies. Thus the "Least Restrictive" and the "Least Autonomous" agency's median AR score yield a smaller median score difference than the difference between the median scores of the "Most Autonomous" and the "Most Restrictive Agency."

^cValue of U.

be, it is neither that of cause and effect nor that of an organizational contingency which facilitates particular cognitive outcomes.

Within the cells of Table 4.4, pairs of Z or U scores are directly comparable because the sample size is identical and because the Z transformation is derived from the ranks rather than the values of the AR and CWO scores. In general, there is less risk of rejecting the null hypotheses erroneously on the basis of the tests of AR differences than on the basis of CWO differences although that risk is relatively small in either case.

Some question may be raised as to whether the particular grouping of state system agencies into "autonomous" and "restrictive" sets is arbitrary.

Tables 4.5 through 4.7 indicate that the central tendencies of AR scores define sets of agencies which are relatively homogeneous or at least more homogeneous than any set constituted of randomly selected pairs of agencies drawn from the combined pool of six most autonomous agencies and six most restrictive agencies. To the extent that the central tendencies of AR scores in agencies within a set are not homogeneous, the lack of homogeneity is in evidence at the boundary of a set. For example, the most restrictive of all of the agencies tends to be significantly more restrictive than the other agencies in the restrictive set. Similarly, the most autonomous of all of the agencies is significantly more autonomous than the other agencies in

TABLE 4.5

COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES^a AMONG SIX MOST AUTONOMOUS STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS

Employing Organization	Employing Organization					
	Most Autonomous	Of Six Most Autonomous Systems				Least Autonomous
	S	O	L	J	D	G
Most Autonomous	S	3.09	2.12	2.33	3.75	3.17
of Six	O		N.S.	N.S.	1.67	N.S.
Most Autonomous	L			N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
State Agency Systems	J				N.S.	N.S.
Least Autonomous	D					N.S.
	G					

^aThe Values entered in the Table are Z scores which are significant at $\leq .05$ level of confidence (one-tailed test). "N.S." signifies the absence of statistically significant differences.

TABLE 4.6

COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES^a AMONG SEVEN MODERATELY AUTONOMOUS OR MODERATELY RESTRICTIVE STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS

Employing Organization	Employing Organization Of Seven Moderately Autonomous Systems					Least Autonomous	
	Most Autonomous N	A	H	P	M	E	Q
Least Restrictive	N	N.S.	1.69	1.58 ^b	2.79	2.94	2.69
of	A		N.S.	N.S.	1.71	2.52	1.78
Seven Moderately Restrictive	H			N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
State Agency Systems	P				N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
	M					N.S.	N.S.
	E						N.S.
Most Restrictive	Q						

^aSee footnote at bottom of Table 4.5

^b $p \approx .05$. This Z score just falls short of the minimal value for rejecting the null hypothesis at the .05 level (i.e., 1.59).

TABLE 4.7
 COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES^a AMONG SIX MOST
 RESTRICTIVE STATE AGENCY SYSTEMS

Employing Organization	Employing Organization					Most Restrictive
	Least Restrictive	Of Six Most Restrictive State Agency Systems				
	B	R	I	F	C	K
Least Restrictive	B	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	2.79
of	R		N.S.	N.S.	1.73	2.53
Six						
Most Restrictive	I			N.S.	N.S.	2.15
State	F				N.S.	2.49
Agency						
Systems	C					1.64
Most Restrictive	K					

^aSee footnote at bottom of Table 4.5.

the autonomous set. The boundary between the autonomous set and the moderately autonomous set is blurred (see Table 4.6) but this does not affect the comparisons between the restrictive and autonomous sets. The results of the Mann-Whitney U tests listed in Table 4.4, comparing AR scores among pairs of agencies, one member of which was selected from the autonomous set and one member of which was selected from the restrictive set, cannot be considered an artifact of arbitrary grouping of agencies.

Functional autonomy and visibility. The variations in perceptions of functional autonomy among state agency systems is not random. While there is no clear connection between the extent of functional autonomy for practitioners in a given agency and their orientation to practice, there are logical grounds for supposing that the taking of professionally indicated case actions, by professionally trained workers, would be facilitated by lack of restrictions in deciding or determining case actions. It is possible that the AR instrument, in focusing on the worker's perception of his freedom to make independent decisions, neglects alternative sources of that freedom by assuming the former to be predicated on organizational norms. It is possible that functional autonomy is an unanticipated or unrecognized outcome of organizational arrangements serving a quite unrelated purpose.

Piven, in predicting differences in autonomy-restrictiveness between the federal and state levels,

offered, as one of the rationales for his hypothesis, the observation that "the federal probation-parole agency is generally less subject to inspection than correctional agencies on lower levels of government. Physically separated from two centers of formal control, immune from examination by all but a few local interest groups . . . and politically isolated from national negotiation proceedings, role activities of federal agency practitioners are . . . relatively insulated from observability by members of the role-set."¹¹

Variations in visibility of practitioner activities may be applicable at the state level. In an inspection of the states represented by the state system agencies,¹² the possibility of differences in rural and urban caseload concentrations emerged as a likely variable affecting the degree of practitioner autonomy. The larger the general population is in a given area, the larger the offender population is apt to be. The larger the offender population is, the greater the absolute number of correctional practitioners employed by correctional organizations. The supervisory force is likely to be approximately proportional to the number of people carrying caseloads. Specialization, or organizational complexity, is more likely to be in evidence in organizations with a relatively large labor force. The more complex the organization, the more the

¹¹Op. cit., p. 89.

¹²The names of these state system agencies must necessarily remain confidential.

rélations, among incumbents of various organizational positions, are likely to be formalized or highly structured. To the extent that role behavior is formally prescribed, it is reasonable to suppose that there will be some organizational device to assure a degree of reliability in the prescribed performance. Some form of observation is likely to be employed (i.e., routine reports, regularized conferences, spying, etc.) and this may be subsumed under "increased visibility." With increased visibility comes the likelihood of negative sanctions for deviations from prescribed performances. This can be understood as a relatively restrictive situation and, it follows from the foregoing set of assumptions, that this is more likely to be the case in urban areas than in rural areas.

As predicted, practitioners carrying caseloads in rural areas feel that they have greater functional autonomy than practitioners carrying caseloads in the urban areas. This outcome is consistent with the argument that perceptions of the degree of functional autonomy are related to visibility or organizational complexity. Professionally trained workers are either accorded greater autonomy by their employing organizations or accommodate organizational demands more readily than other practitioners (i.e., the general relationship between urban and rural does not hold for this group). There is no evidence to suppose that either of these proposed explanations is mutually exclusive or that

one is more plausible than another. Inexperienced and recently educated workers--who are likely to be overlapping sets of respondents--could not have had much opportunity to appreciate the extent of their freedom to institute their own case decisions. This may account for the absence of significant differences, among this category of practitioners, between those who serve caseloads in rural areas and those who serve caseloads in urban areas. The somewhat weaker relationship among younger practitioners than among older practitioners, (i.e., given the comparable sample sizes and taking the Z scores as an indicator) is suggestive in this regard: one would expect that the set of younger practitioners would subsume the sets of inexperienced and recently educated practitioners.

Although the small number of observations in the category of women who carry caseloads in rural areas warrants caution in interpreting the outcome of the test of the hypothesis with sex held constant, it may be that women are more constrained in their decision making in rural areas.

With a single exception for female practitioners, the differences in Median scores, for each test of the hypothesis, is consistent with the direction of the hypothesis: lower Median scores (i.e., less restrictive scores) are consistently in evidence for rural areas.

While the evidence is not incontrovertible (as future intra-organizational comparisons may demonstrate) the hypothetical relationship between autonomy and visibility

or organizational complexity has been heuristically demonstrated.¹³ It is especially noteworthy that the observed relationship does not hold for trained social workers, recently educated workers and women inasmuch as education and sex were shown to be probable independent sources of client welfare orientation. Graduate training in social work, recent education and being female are related to respondents evidencing higher client welfare orientation scores. This, taken together with the outcomes listed in Table 4.8, yields further evidence that the degree of perceived functional autonomy is not related to client welfare orientation (i.e., the variables which account for differences in CWO scores do not account for differences in AR scores; variables which are closely related to differences in AR scores do not account for differences in CWO scores).

Functional autonomy as projection and reflection. Practitioners' perceptions of their own autonomy in rural areas are different from perceptions in urban areas. This suggests that the perceptions may be patterned according to objective differences. There are categories of workers (e.g., trained social workers) who do not fit the general pattern and the likely explanations for such departures from the general pattern fall into two classes: (1) projection, that is, the practitioner reinterprets his

¹³It is most interesting that Merton's observations on visibility (op. cit.) provided Piven and the present author with similar theoretical rationales which suggested different operational hypotheses leading to contrasting results.

TABLE 4.8

COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS CARRYING CASELOADS IN URBAN AREAS AND THOSE CARRYING CASELOADS IN RURAL AREAS^a WITH EDUCATION, RECENCY OF EDUCATION, TENURE, EXPERIENCE, SEX, AGE, AND WORK LOAD HELD CONSTANT

Variables Held Constant	Practitioners Who Carry Caseloads In				Z or U Scores	
	Urban Areas		Rural Areas		Z	U
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn		
None	586	36	90	32	3.14	
Returns To Individually Mailed Questionnaires ^b	523	36	89	32	2.77	
Trained Social Workers ^c	32	34	11	30	N.S.	
Practitioners Without Master's	428	37	65	32	3.44	
Recently Educated	226	35	34	32	N.S.	
Not Recently Educated	332	37	49	33	2.53	
Short-Term Tenure	277	36	33	31	1.80	
Long-term Tenure	308	37	57	33	2.58	
Inexperienced	239	35	29	32	N.S.	
Experienced	331	37	57	32	3.10	
Men	523	36	83	31	3.49	
Women	48	37	5	40	N.S.	
Young	309	36	45	32	1.70	

TABLE 4.8 (Continued)

Variables Held Constant	Practitioners Who Carry Caseloads In				Z or U Scores Z or U
	Urban Areas		Rural Areas		
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	
Old	267		45		2.75
		37		32	
Small Caseload	202		51		2.65
		37		31	
Large Caseload	375		38		1.92
		36		32	

^aFollowing the practice of the Bureau of Census, areas with a population of less than 2,500 were designated "rural." "Urban," therefore is \geq 2,500.

^bThe major area of possible sampling unreliability in the composite population is in respondent's designation of organizational position (i.e., virtually all identified themselves as supervisors or higher in one of the two state system agencies which received group mailings). Since all of these comparisons concern practitioners who carry caseloads, supervisory and higher statuses were eliminated in these comparisons. Consequently the major potential source of unreliability was eliminated. One comparison, concerning respondents returning individually mailed questionnaires, was included as a check on the outcome in the composite population. In general, state systems which include caseloads in "urban" areas assign a very large majority of their workers to such caseloads. Thus intra-organizational comparisons (among the present organizational populations) are seldom possible. Intra-organizational comparisons, which would exhaust the state system universe, would, however, provide a crucial test of the present findings.

^cThere were not a sufficient number of observations in the category of practitioners who received a Master's degree in fields other than social work who serve caseloads in rural areas to permit a test holding a non-social work Master's degree constant.

organizational experience so that it is consonant with prior conceptions of his role; (2) reflection, that is, the practitioner accurately reflects special organizational arrangements (which may be quite informal) which exempt him from restrictions applying to other categories of practitioners. There is no reason--theoretical or logical--to suppose that subjective and objective aspects of perception are not present at the same time, in the same practitioner population. Those practitioners who feel that they are more constrained by organizational arrangements than other practitioners exposed to the same set of arrangements should evidence reduced or no differences in AR scores when comparisons are made between those serving caseloads in rural areas and those serving caseloads in urban areas.

Although the questionnaire employed was not specifically designed with the intention of testing this particular hypothesis, a set of responses was obtained which could be interpreted as an indicator of such perceptual differences. All respondents were given the option of signing their names to the questionnaire. Although there is no necessary connection between the perceived degree of constraint or organizational restrictiveness and lack of confidence in proffered confidentiality, it is argued that restrictions on practitioners' autonomy in determining their own case actions reduces their acceptance of and trust in the organization and probably

fosters a self-protective attitude toward investigations into role performance. While this argument might be advanced on psycho-dynamic grounds, it is not clear that the empirical evidence for the proposition would thereby be made stronger than by the present heuristic approach.

If the assumptions concerning the relationship between projection and acceptance of confidentiality are warranted, then the outcomes listed in Table 4.9 suggest that cognitive factors specify the relationship between visibility and functional autonomy.¹⁴ It is therefore possible for a set of practitioners to be structurally insulated or relatively "invisible" and nevertheless evidence high restrictiveness or low autonomy scores. The findings are suggestive but a crucial test of the stability of this outcome awaits a sample of organizations, each of which is rich in urban and rural caseloads.

¹⁴It was shown that professionally trained social workers did not evidence any statistically significant differences on the rural-urban comparisons of AR scores. Similarly there are no statistically significant differences between signers and non-signers (or those who do and those who do not accept assurances of confidentiality) among the group of professionally trained practitioners.

TABLE 4.9

COMPARISONS OF AUTONOMY RESTRICTIVENESS SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS WHO
HAVE CASELOADS IN URBAN AREAS AND THOSE WHO HAVE CASELOADS IN RURAL
AREAS, WITH ACCEPTANCE OF CONFIDENTIALITY HELD CONSTANT

Assurances of Confidentiality	Practitioners Carrying Caseloads In				Z Score Z
	Urban Areas		Rural Areas		
	n	Mdn	n	Mdn	
Accepted	486	36	81	33	2.90
Not Accepted	100	38	9	38	N.S.

CHAPTER IV
 CONTINUITIES IN THE STUDY OF PRACTICE ORIENTATION:
 NORMATIVE COMMITMENT AND THE UTILITY OF
 PROFESSIONAL PRESCRIPTIONS

Piven's seminal study of practice orientation in correctional organizations treated the orientation of practitioners in terms of the extent to which they subscribed to standardized prescriptions for practice. But to subscribe to--to agree (or disagree) with--a prescription is a cognitively simple act compared to the potentially complex task of making on-the-job case decisions.¹ A decision that may be of immediate practical value may not be consonant with professional values--especially in correctional organizations where one can identify legal and structural sources of ambivalence for professionally trained workers. Thus, what is professionally indicated may, by virtue of conditions or circumstances, be operationally contra-indicated.

A test of the power of professional education should, therefore, include: (1) Whether or not the practitioner legitimates that which he finds to be useful

¹When the outcomes of the decision process are predicated on only two choices it is not likely that the "mapping" of the decision-making process, on a multitude of theoretically relevant dimensions, will yield information with more predictive power than information based on relatively few theoretical dimensions insofar as performance is concerned.

in practice; (2) Whether the professionally trained worker, more often than other practitioners, discriminates between a case decision's utility and its legitimacy when a "useful" decision is not supported by professional norms; (3) Whether or not the professionally trained worker, more consistently than other practitioners, legitimates professionally indicated case decisions.

It is possible that an expediently oriented practitioner may subscribe to professionally indicated case decisions while a practitioner who disagrees with such prescriptions for practice may be morally committed to his alternative. "Spare the rod and spoil the child" may be a moral imperative--at least in a metaphorical sense--to a practitioner devoted to correcting wayward youths and, by his lights, the situational ethic of the professional, who prefers to "individualize" the child's treatment, may be the epitome of moral irresponsibility. Finally, the moral dimension may be irrelevant to the practitioner who is either unfettered by, or ignorant of, competing belief systems intended to guide practice. It should therefore be possible to locate practitioners with respect to the dimensions of normative commitment and evaluation of utility.

The commitment-utility items. In order to pursue the investigation suggested above, five CWO items were

selected² and each of these was paired with a six category response scale. For example:

STATEMENT NO. 2: THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER SHOULD NOT MAKE HIS CASE RECORD ON THE PROBATIONER OR PAROLEE AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, EVEN IF IT IS A BRUTAL ONE.

Useful for Practice and Right	Not Useful for Practice but Right	Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	Useful for Practice but Wrong	Not Useful for Practice and Wrong
---	---	---	---	---	---

I con-
sider
the
state-
ment
to be

[] [] [] [] [] []

Thus it was possible to examine the patterns of association between the extent to which respondents subscribed to a professional prescription (i.e., responses to CWO items with CWO response categories) and the manner

²The whole-part relationship between the five selected items and the short-form of the CWO instrument is indicated by the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (ρ) which was .72 for the most reliably sampled, largest sub-population of the composite population (n=860). Exactly the same correlation was obtained for the composite population (n=1075). Both of these findings are significant at a level considerably smaller than the .0005 level.

in which they were committed to, and evaluated the usefulness of, their position (i.e., responses to the same item with the commitment-utility response categories). Although the commitment and utility dimensions are analytically separable, the CU (Commitment-Utility) items were designed to reflect a cognitively complex situation. Commitment was, in addition, examined separately in order to determine whether different responses would be elicited by simple response categories than by the compound response categories of the CU items.

Education, commitment and utility. To satisfy the requirements of a test of the power of professional education to successfully inculcate professional norms, it was suggested, earlier, that professionally trained workers would legitimate professionally indicated case decisions more often than untrained practitioners and would more often than untrained practitioners, discriminate between the legitimacy of a prescription and its utility if the prescription was thought to be useful but not professionally indicated.

Tables 5.1 through 5.5 yield several general outcomes. Practitioners trained in social work are not more "professionally oriented" or "punitively oriented," more "expedient" or "moral," or more "welfare" or "control oriented" than either practitioners with a Master's degree in fields other than social work or practitioners without such

TABLE 5.1

EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION YOU SHOULD PUT TO YOURSELF IN MAKING A DECISION ABOUT A CASE IS, 'AM I PROTECTING THE COMMUNITY NOW BY MY ACTION IN THIS CASE,'"^a
BY PRACTITIONERS^b

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	With a Master's Degree ^c In Social Work		Without a Master's Degree ^c		With a Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Useful for Prac- tice and Right	43	61	470	64	51	65
Not Useful for Practice but Right	5	7	53	7	2	3
Useful for Prac- tice Apart from Right or Wrong	16	23	152	21	15	19
Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	3	4	20	3	4	5
Useful for Prac- tice but Wrong	1	1	20	3	5	6
Not Useful for Practice and Wrong	3	4	21	3	1	1
Totals	71	100	736	101 ^d	78	99 ^d

^aThe professionally standardized response is "Disagree."

^bThis table (and the four which follow) include only definite responses.

^cCriteria for χ^2 tests of association between evaluations and two levels (i.e., practitioners with a Master's degree in social work and those without a Master's degree) of education (5df) or evaluations and graduate levels of education (5df) were not met. Cochran's relaxed criterion was employed: if 20% of the cells had a theoretical frequency of ≤ 5 but ≥ 1 , a χ^2 test was performed. The nominal nature of both ways of classifying the data precluded combining rows or columns.

^dVariations from 100% in the totals row are due to rounding procedures.

TABLE 5.2

EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER SHOULD NOT MAKE HIS CASE RECORD ON THE PROBATIONER OR PAROLEE AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, EVEN IF IT IS A BRUTAL ONE,"^a
BY PRACTITIONERS

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	With a Master's Degree ^b In Social Work		Without a Master's Degree ^b		With a Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work ^b	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Useful for Prac- tice and Right	10	14	195	27	18	23
Not Useful for Practice but Right	6	9	41	6	0	0
Useful for Prac- tice Apart from Right or Wrong	10	14	75	10	12	15
Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	4	6	46	6	3	4
Useful for Prac- tice but Wrong	4	6	43	6	5	6
Not Useful for Practice and Wrong	35	51	329	45	40	51
Totals	69	100	729	100	76	99

^aThe standard professionally prescribed response is "Agree."

^b χ^2 criteria not met.

TABLE 5.3

EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "A PAROLEE OR PROBATIONER BEATS UP HIS MOTHER SO THAT SHE NEEDS SIX STITCHES. REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS ARE INDICATED,"^a BY PRACTITIONERS

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	With a Master's Degree ^b In Social Work		Without a Master's Degree ^b		With a Master's Degree ^b in Fields Other than Social Work	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Useful for Prac- tice and Right	22	34	384	54	42	55
Not Useful for Practice but Right	2	3	27	4	2	3
Useful for Prac- tice Apart from Right or Wrong	16	25	128	18	14	18
Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	17	27	101	14	6	8
Useful for Prac- tice but Wrong	2	3	22	3	2	3
Not Useful for Practice and Wrong	5	8	47	7	10	13
Totals	64	100	709	100	76	100

^aThe standardized professionally prescribed response is "Disagree."

^b χ^2 test criterion not met.

TABLE 5.4

EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "IT IS BETTER FOR THE PROBATIONS OR PAROLE OFFICER TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS FOR HOME VISITS THAN TO CALL UNEXPECTEDLY,"^a BY PRACTITIONERS

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	With a Master's Degree ^b In Social Work		Without a Master's Degree ^b		With a Master's Degree ^c in Fields Other than Social Work	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Useful for Prac- tice and Right	18	25	113	15	10	13
Not Useful for Practice but Right	3	4	38	5	2	3
Useful for Prac- tice Apart from Right or Wrong	16	22	106	14	18	23
Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	16	22	156	21	11	14
Useful for Prac- tice but Wrong	5	7	69	9	9	11
Not Useful for Practice and Wrong	14	19	250	34	29	37
Totals	72	99	732	98	79	101

^aThe Standardized professionally prescribed response is "Agree."

^bThis table is a composite table composed of tables originally set for purposes of computing χ^2 . The 5df test for evaluations by two levels of education yielded a χ^2 of 11.18. $p \approx .05$.

^cThe 5df test for evaluations by graduate levels of education yielded a χ^2 value of 9.60, $p \leq .10$.

TABLE 5.5

EVALUATIONS OF THE STATEMENT: "IT IS PROBABLY A SOUND POLICY FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE AGENCY TO ROUTINELY SEND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT UP-TO-DATE LISTS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF PROBATIONERS OR PAROLEES WHO SHOW PATTERNS OF SEXUAL DEVIANCE,"^a BY PRACTITIONERS

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	With a Master's Degree ^{bc} In Social Work		Without a Master's Degree ^b		With a Master's Degree ^c in Fields Other than Social Work	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Useful for Prac- tice and Right	31	45	360	50	38	48
Not Useful for Practice but Right	3	4	51	7	2	3
Useful for Prac- tice Apart from Right or Wrong	13	19	98	13	13	16
Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	5	7	62	9	9	11
Useful for Prac- tice but Wrong	4	6	37	5	4	5
Not Useful for Practice and Wrong	13	19	119	16	13	16
Totals	69	100	727	100	79	99

^aThe Standardized professionally prescribed response is: "Disagree."

^b χ^2 , 5df = 2.65, N.S.

^cCriteria for χ^2 test not met.

degrees according to a stringent³ statistical criterion. This suggests that the extent to which one agrees with a professionally prescribed case decision is, at best, a rough indicator of the success (as distinct from the general impact) of professional education where success is understood as the inculcation of values which subsume prescribed case actions. The values referred to are imbedded in the items. For example, the practitioner's responsibility to his individual client is the paramount concern (according to the criterion measure) yet 85% of the trained practitioners evaluate a distinctly opposite alternative (i.e., protection of the community) as being paramount.

³It is not the power (which is largely unknown) of the χ^2 test which makes it a stringent test in this application. It is, rather, its lack of sensitivity to the effects of order when $df > 1$. (See Siegel, *op. cit.*, p. 179) χ^2 requires, as a test of the expectation that the two ways of classifying the data are associated, certain differences in the magnitude of proportions of oppositely classified frequencies. Thus χ^2 is a stringent test of an ordinal hypothesis because it is a very conservative test of such an hypothesis. It is not the best test of such an hypothesis but the nominal nature of the CU response categories and of the classification of education precludes a meaningful assignment of scores to the CU categories. (Scores could be assigned if the problem under study concerned the evaluation of prescribed responses rather than an exploration of the types of commitment). It is evident, however, by inspection of the data, that if a statistic (e.g., Kendall's coefficient of concordance) which ordered (ranked) the responses from the most frequently chosen evaluation to the least frequently chosen evaluation, within the categories of the classification of education, the concordance among the latter would be substantiated. Thus the order of choice of evaluations would be, in statistical terms, the same.

Eighty-five per cent of the trained practitioners evaluate the alternative as being useful. Twenty-three per cent believe that protection of the community is the most important question in making a case decision and that such a decision is useful quite apart from any moral evaluation (i.e., normative standards are irrelevant.) Sixty-one per cent are morally committed to the proposition that the concern with community protection is paramount. A very similar account may be given of the responses of practitioners with other educational backgrounds.

One of the most "hallowed" norms--that of maintaining confidentiality--is binding on about one-third of the professionally trained practitioners but only 15% of the trained practitioners are morally committed to the proposition that confidentiality is not to be violated even when the police are investigating a brutal crime. Fourteen per cent of the trained practitioners subscribed to the norm of confidentiality but do not evaluate the norm in moral terms and 6% of these practitioners evaluate the norm as being useful but do not believe that it is legitimate. The overall pattern for practitioners with other educational backgrounds is similar but, curiously, more of these practitioners are normatively committed to maintaining confidentiality than the professionally trained social workers.

Most practitioners would not "individualize" their clients when the client happens to be a child who inflicted

substantial physical injury on his mother. Information that a child engaged in a violent episode of this sort is sufficient information for a decision to initiate revocation proceedings. Trained practitioners respond to this information more often in terms of the pure utility of alternative decisions than in terms of whether a given decision is legitimate but the evaluative category which elicits the greatest number of responses is "useful and right."

On less critical procedural matters than those concerning primary responsibility, confidentiality and the depth of a diagnosis, trained social workers distinguish themselves from colleagues of other educational backgrounds: the trained practitioners believe that it is useful and right to make appointments with their "clients" rather than call unexpectedly but 44 per cent of them would argue the pros and cons of this decision purely in terms of utility. The classification of evaluations is not independent of the classification of types of graduate education and the association between the two ways of classifying the data appear to be predicated on the opposite tendencies of the two types of graduate practitioners in the use of consistent compound categories.

Finally, when the issue of confidentiality is raised again, in connection with sexual deviance, most practitioners would not maintain confidentiality even

though there has been no request or immediate pressure to violate this norm. Forty-five per cent of the trained social workers believe that it is legitimate and useful to routinely send lists and descriptions of their "clients" who show patterns of sexual deviance to the police department and an additional 19% would do so purely on the grounds of utility (i.e., normative evaluations are irrelevant). The professionals are quite similar to their colleagues who have other educational backgrounds.

The evidence presented in Tables 5.1 through 5.5 suggests that despite the established impact of social work education on orientation (under certain organizationally reflected conditions) its impact cannot be attributed to inducing a uniform commitment to a professional value system. While professionally trained workers may subscribe to professionally indicated case decisions and may be inclined to initiate more case actions that could be described as client welfare oriented than their non-professional colleagues, the utility of a given set of procedures for practice alone may be just as influential as whether or not procedures are professionally legitimate. Most professionally trained practitioners legitimate those case decisions they believe are useful even if these decisions conflict with professional norms. In sixty per cent of the items, the responses of most of the trained practitioners indicate that they believe that

normative standards are irrelevant. The similar outcome for those practitioners who have not been professionally trained is not remarkable but the lack of clear patterns of differences between professionally trained workers and the former is striking--especially when the substantive contents of the items are taken into account.

Normative commitment, the resolution of conflict and social work curricula. Among the evaluative options offered to respondents by the CU response categories, inconsistent options (i.e., "useful for practice but wrong," "not useful for practice but right") are seldom elected. Professional practitioners, like others, tend to rule out inconsistent compound categories thereby eliminating cognitive dilemmas. Another method of resolving conflicts between professional prescriptions and evaluations of what is believed to be useful, is the legitimation of what is useful whether or not it is professionally indicated. Thus if moral evaluations are indicated as relevant, they are made consistent with the implied case actions. Cognitive conflict is thereby reduced--especially for professional workers who, it is assumed, would be more vulnerable to discrepancies between professional prescriptions and case decisions which are accepted as useful.

The foregoing description of the resolution of conflict assumes that in the course of their professional education practitioners are made aware of the normative components of practice. It is possible, however, that ambivalence is induced, in the educational process, by the lengthy field apprenticeship which cannot be as well designed as the formal aspects of the social work curriculum. The accepted practice of agency sponsorship of students and employment commitments may affect students' loyalties, identifications and, therefore, their belief systems. While these considerations are, by-and-large, beyond the immediate scope of the present study, it is apparent that the ingredients of cognitive conflicts are to be found not only in the employing organization but also in the structure of social work curricula. It is quite possible--perhaps likely--that expediently oriented practitioners may be counted among those produced by graduate schools of social work. One would expect, however, to find differences in the evaluations of casework teachers (who are responsible for transmitting professional norms relevant to practice) and the composite sample of correctional practitioners, if the formal educational components of social work curricula were relatively undiluted by the requirements of and accountability to a service organization.

TABLE 5.6
CASEWORK TEACHERS^a AND PROFESSIONAL PRACTITIONERS^b EVALUATIONS
OF FIVE CASE DECISIONS^c IN CORRECTIONAL PRACTICE

Evaluations (Commitment-Utility Response Categories)	Case Decisions															
	One		Two		Three		Four		Five							
	Teach- ers n	Work- ers ^d n % ^d	Teach- ers n	Work- ers ^d n % ^d	Teach- ers n	Work- ers ^d n % ^d	Teach- ers n	Work- ers ^d n % ^d	Teach- ers n	Work- ers ^d n % ^d	Teach- ers n	Work- ers ^d n % ^d				
Useful for Practice and Right	14	43	3	10	2	22	3	18	8	31						
Not Useful for Prac- tice but Right	4	5	2	6	0	2	1	3	0	3						
Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong	8	16	6	10	1	16	2	16	5	13						
Not Useful for Prac- tice Apart from Right or Wrong	22	3	15	4	6	17	6	16	20	5						
Useful for Practice but Wrong	5	1	7	4	7	2	5	5	6	4						
Not Useful for Prac- tice and Wrong	19	3	41	35	60	5	55	14	32	13						
Residuals	5	1	3	3	1	8	5	0	6	3						
Totals	77	72	77	72	77	72	77	72	77	72						

^aA portion of the casework teacher sample had the commitment utility items included in their questionnaire.

^bThe professional practitioners are identical with practitioners who hold a Master's degree in social work in the composite sample.

^cThe five case decisions referred to are the five commitments utility items noted in Tables 5.1 through 5.5. Decision One, therefore, is the same as the CU item noted in Table 5.1, etc.

^dThe percentages in this table are different than those listed in Table 5.1 through 5.5 because residual responses have been taken into account.

Inspection of Table 5.6 reveals substantial differences between casework teachers and professional probation-parole practitioners in their evaluations of case decisions. The evaluations of casework teachers, in general, is fairly consonant with professional norms although consonance is a function of two types of evaluations (i.e., one which includes a normative dimension and one which explicitly excludes it). It is evident that the criterion measure simply assumed that professional prescriptions were morally appreciated. The assumption that demonstrated agreement (or disagreement) with a set of practice prescriptions, among a group of "norm transmitters" (i.e., those whose status--casework teacher--dictates such a role) is equivalent to empirically establishing professional norms is challenged by these findings. It seems more accurate in the light of Table 5.5 to think of Piven's criterion measurement as the establishing of statistical norms for a professional elite rather than as a statistical description of professional values (i.e., ideal norms).

At least some of the conditions for determining decisions without regard to the normative dimension are embedded in the educational process. The employing organization may also play a role in the practitioners' evaluation of practice prescriptions which may have been obscured by the Client Welfare Orientation response categories (i.e., "agree"; "indifferent or can't decide"; "disagree").

TABLE 5.7

COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS^a EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS HOLDING
EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANTCase Decision No. 1^b

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories) ^d	Employing Organization ^c															
	A				B				C				D			
	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1	32	73	47	78	7	44	73	60	2	40	53	72	1	50	32	51
2	3	7	3	5	1	6	6	5	0	0	3	4	0	0	5	8
3	6	14	7	12	6	37	30	25	3	60	13	18	0	0	15	24
4	1	2	1	2	11	6	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10
5	0	0	2	3	0	0	3	2	0	0	21	3	1	50	3	5
6	2	5	0	0	1	6	8	7	0	0	31	4	0	0	2	3
Totals	44		60		16		122		5		74		2		63	

^aOnly two categories of practitioners are included because these categories are sufficient to provide evidence of variations between professionally trained practitioners and others and because these categories have, throughout the present study, evidenced the greatest differences.

^bThis is identical to the practice prescription contained in the heading of Table 5.1.

^cOnly those organizations employing professionally trained social workers were included.

^dThese are the same as those indicated in Tables 5.1 through 5.6.

TABLE 5.8

COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS HOLDING
EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT

Case Decision No. 2

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	Employing Organization														
	A			B			C			D					
	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree			
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%		
1	9	21	22	37	0	0	22	18	1	20	16	22	0	17	27
2	4	9	4	7	1	6	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	4	6
3	6	14	11	18	2	12	14	12	0	0	8	11	1	50	5
4	2	5	1	2	0	0	6	5	1	20	3	4	1	50	8
5	3	7	2	3	1	6	12	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	2
6	19	44	20	33	12	75	63	53	3	60	45	61	0	32	52
Totals	43		60		16		120		5		74		2		62

TABLE 5.9

COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS HOLDING
EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT

Case Decision No. 3

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	Employing Organization															
	A				B				C				D			
	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1	16	40	36	62	2	14	52	45	1	25	42	57	0	0	29	47
2	1	2	0	0	1	7	4	3	0	0	2	3	0	0	2	3
3	11	27	7	12	4	29	24	21	1	25	12	16	0	0	10	16
4	9	23	12	21	4	29	21	18	1	25	9	12	2	100	15	24
5	1	2	3	5	0	0	7	6	1	25	4	5	0	0	1	2
6	2	5	0	0	3	21	8	7	0	0	5	7	0	0	5	8
Totals	40		58		14		116		4		74		2		62	

TABLE 5.10

COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS HOLDING EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT

Case Decision No. 4

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	Employing Organization															
	A				B				C				D			
	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree		Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work		Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1	7	16	12	20	5	31	21	17	1	20	6	8	3	100	17	27
2	3	7	8	13	0	0	41	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	10
3	11	25	12	20	5	31	29	24	0	0	21	28	0	0	13	21
4	10	23	15	25	4	25	35	29	2	40	12	16	0	0	14	22
5	4	9	0	0	1	6	12	10	0	0	7	9	0	0	1	2
6	9	20	13	22	1	6	20	17	2	40	27	36	0	0	12	19
Totals	44		60		16		121		5		74		3		63	

TABLE 5.11

COMPARISONS OF PRACTITIONERS' EVALUATIONS OF CASE DECISIONS HOLDING
EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION CONSTANT

Case Decision No. 5

Evaluations (Commitment- Utility Response Categories)	Employing Organization															
	A		B				C				D					
	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree	Practi- tioners With a Master's Degree in Social Work	Practi- tioners Without a Master's Degree
n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1	22	50	37	63	7	44	78	66	1	25	32	44	0	0	32	52
2	3	7	2	3	0	0	7	6	0	0	2	3	0	0	4	7
3	7	16	7	12	4	25	18	15	0	0	14	19	1	50	10	16
4	3	7	4	7	2	12	5	4	0	0	5	7	0	0	2	3
5	3	7	1	2	0	0	6	5	1	25	2	3	0	0	4	7
6	6	14	8	14	3	19	5	4	2	50	17	24	1	50	9	15
Totals	44		59		16		119		4		72		2		61	

Inspection of Table 5.7 reveals that among agencies and between practitioner groups there is very substantial agreement on the most frequently selected evaluation of case decision number one. This is, perhaps, more indicative than the proportions of respective groups of practitioners selecting a given evaluation because of the large number of options compared to the small number of respondents in the professional category of some agencies. For this case decision, then, when the most frequently selected category is employed as an indicator, there is little evidence of differences among agencies. A similar pattern emerges in Table 5.8 and Table 5.11 although some variation in the pattern emerges in Table 5.11 which is attributable to the small number of observations in the trained worker category within two of the employing organizations. Table 5.9 and 5.10 evidence greater variation. In Table 5.9 there is less variation among agencies for practitioners without a Master's Degree than for practitioners with a Master's Degree in social work while Table 5.10 evidences variation within and among employing organizations. The substance of the case decisions therefore elicits variations in the observed consensus within and among agencies but there is little evidence that the employing organization accounts for the evaluations of case decisions.

Consistency of orientation and commitment. One of problems in relating the findings on commitment to those

based on client welfare orientation scores concerns the measurement procedures.

CWO scores which fall within the inter-quartile range can be composed of various proportions of high and low item scores or reasonably consistent item scores. It is therefore possible that the summated item scores or CWO scores mask substantively important orientational differences between, for example, two sub-populations of practitioners whose central response tendencies are essentially similar but whose CWO scores are constituted of markedly different sets of item scores. One such group might evidence a high proportion of "indifferent" or ambivalent responses (each of which would be scored as a "1") while another group might have a nearly equally divided set of "client welfare oriented" and "punitive" responses (i.e., items scored as "2" and items scored as "0").

In order to explore possible differences in orientation related to response consistency, two indices were developed. Index P consists of a distribution of punitive responses to the eleven items of the Client Welfare Orientation instrument, ordered from the most consistently punitive responses to the least consistently punitive. Thus, those respondents who elected a punitive response to ten or eleven of the CWO items constitute the first class of the Index P; those who elected a punitive response to 8 or 9 of the CWO items constitute the second class, and so forth to the sixth class constituted of those respondents

who elected a punitive response to none or one of the CWO items. Index A, was constructed in the same manner as Index P except that Index A is a classification system for ambivalent (i.e., "indifferent or can't decide") responses. Each of these indices was cross-classified with the CU items in order to assess the relationship between the consistency of subscription to professional prescriptions and commitment-utility. It was expected that respondents who were more punitive or consistently punitive would legitimate prescriptions contra-indicated by professional norms and find them useful for practice. Similarly, those respondents in classes approaching the sixth or non-punitive class would be expediently oriented to professional prescriptions or would find the normative dimension of the CU categories to be irrelevant.

In interpreting Tables 5.12 through 5.21 it should be noted that as one examines responses in the progressively less punitive categories of Index P, one observes an increase in an alternative but disjunctive class of responses, namely, those responses which are client welfare oriented or ambivalent. Thus one cannot interpret Index P, by implication, as the complement of an index of client welfare oriented responses. Analogous words of caution apply to Index A.⁴

⁴The necessary conditions for performing X^2 tests are not evident in Tables 5.12 through 5.21 and this is obvious, upon inspection, in the case of Index A Tables. The ensuing discussion is not, therefore, predicated upon statistical tests.

TABLE 5.12

CROSS CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES
AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF
RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION YOU
SHOULD PUT TO YOURSELF IN MAKING A DECISION ABOUT A CASE IS:
'AM I PROTECTING THE COMMUNITY NOW BY MY
ACTION IN THIS CASE?'"

Index P	Commitment-Utility Response Categories												Totals	
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	2	40	0	0	1	20	1	20	0	0	1	20	5	100
8-9	28	32	4	5	34	39	7	8	6	7	8	9	87	100
6-7	138	54	20	8	65	25	12	5	11	4	10	4	256	100
4-5	266	66	38	9	71	18	9	2	11	3	6	1	401	100
2-3	209	79	145	5	31	12	3	1	5	2	3	1	265	100
0-1	42	79	0	0	10	19	1	2	0	0	0	0	53	100
Totals	685	64	76	7	212	20	33	3	33	3	28	3	1067	100

TABLE 5.13

CROSS CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION YOU SHOULD PUT TO YOURSELF IN MAKING A DECISION ABOUT A CASE IS: 'AM I PROTECTING THE COMMUNITY NOW BY MY ACTION IN THIS CASE?'"

Index A ^a	Commitment-Utility Response Categories												Totals	
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	566	65	61	7	168	19	25	3	28	3	25	3	873	100
8-9	109	64	14	8	34	20	8	5	5	3	1	1	171	100
6-7	10	43	1	4	10	43	0	0	0	0	2	9	23	100
Totals	685	64	76	7	212	20	33	3	33	3	28	3	1067	100

^aThere were no responses which could be classified in the three remaining categories of Index A.

TABLE 5.14

CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER SHOULD NOT MAKE HIS CASE RECORD ON THE PROBATIONER OR PAROLEE AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, EVEN IF IT IS A BRUTAL ONE."

Index P	Commitment-Utility Categories													
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	1	20	0	0	1	20	0	0	0	0	3	60	5	100
8-9	27	31	5	6	8	9	10	12	7	8	29	34	86	100
6-7	68	27	17	7	34	13	18	7	20	8	95	38	252	100
4-5	104	26	19	5	45	11	27	7	16	4	187	47	398	100
2-3	62	33	13	5	22	8	11	4	14	5	142	54	264	100
0-1	12	33	0	0	4	8	1	2	5	9	31	58	53	100
Totals	274	26	54	5	114	11	67	6	62	6	487	46	1058	100

TABLE 5.15

CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER SHOULD NOT MAKE HIS CASE RECORD ON THE PROBATIONER OR PAROLEE AVAILABLE TO THE POLICE WHEN THEY ARE INVESTIGATING A CRIME, EVEN IF IT IS A BRUTAL ONE."

Index A	Commitment-Utility Categories												Totals	
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	232	27	46	5	89	10	47	5	57	7	401	46	872	100
8-9	38	23	8	5	23	14	16	10	5	3	76	46	166	100
6-7	4	20	0	0	2	10	4	20	0	0	10	50	20	100
Totals	274	26	54	5	114	11	67	6	62	6	487	46	1058	100

TABLE 5.16

CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "A PAROLEE OR PROBATIONER BEATS UP HIS MOTHER SO THAT SHE NEEDS SIX STITCHES. REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS ARE INDICATED."

Index P	Commitment-Utility Response Categories												Totals	
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100	0	0	0	0	4	100
8-9	9	12	0	0	12	15	28	36	4	5	25	32	78	100
6-7	75	32	15	6	47	20	61	26	10	4	27	11	235	100
4-5	219	56	17	4	86	22	42	11	11	3	17	4	392	100
2-3	189	73	8	3	42	16	12	5	5	2	4	2	260	100
0-1	46	90	0	0	4	8	0	0	1	2	0	0	51	100
Totals	538	53	40	4	191	19	147	14	31	3	73	7	1020	100

TABLE 5.17

CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "A PAROLEE OR PROBATIONER BEATS UP HIS MOTHER SO THAT SHE NEEDS SIX STITCHES. REVOCATION PROCEEDINGS ARE INDICATED."

Index A	Commitment-Utility Response Categories												Totals	
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	486	57	33	4	150	18	99	12	24	3	61	7	853	100
8-9	48	32	7	5	39	26	39	26	7	5	10	7	150	100
6-7	4	24	0	0	2	12	9	53	0	0	2	12	17	100
Totals	538	53	40	4	191	19	147	14	31	3	73	7	1020	100

TABLE 5.18

CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IS IT BETTER FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS FOR HOME VISITS THAN TO CALL UNEXPECTEDLY."

Index P	Commitment-Utility Response Categories													
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Prac- tice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	5	83	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	6	100	
8-9	17	20	7	8	11	13	28	5	6	22	26	86	100	
6-7	40	16	16	6	41	16	26	18	7	73	29	253	100	
4-5	58	14	17	4	66	16	21	36	9	138	34	401	100	
2-3	30	11	7	1	37	14	20	27	10	111	42	266	100	
0-1	4	8	1	2	2	4	15	8	15	30	57	53	100	
Totals	154	14	48	5	157	15	22	94	9	374	35	1065	100	

TABLE 5.19

CROSS CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IT IS BETTER FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE OFFICER TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS FOR HOME VISITS THAN TO CALL UNEXPECTEDLY."

Index A	Commitment-Utility Response Categories												Totals	
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	123	14	36	4	124	14	196	22	80	9	313	36	872	100
8-9	26	15	11	6	30	18	34	20	13	8	56	33	170	100
6-7	5	22	1	4	3	13	8	35	1	4	5	22	23	100
Totals	154	14	48	5	157	15	238	22	94	9	374	35	1065	100

TABLE 5.20

CROSS-CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF PUNITIVE RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IT IS PROBABLY A SOUND POLICY FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE AGENCY TO ROUTINELY SEND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT UP-TO-DATE LISTS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF PROBATIONERS OR PAROLEES WHO SHOW PATTERNS OF SEXUAL DEVIANCE."

Index P	Commitment-Utility Response Categories													
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong		Totals	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	20	0	0	3	60	5	100
8-9	14	17	3	4	15	18	13	15	11	13	28	33	84	100
6-7	81	32	14	6	40	16	28	11	19	8	70	28	252	100
4-5	194	49	33	8	54	14	37	9	23	6	57	14	398	100
2-3	165	62	17	6	38	14	17	6	5	2	22	8	264	100
0-1	43	81	4	8	5	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	53	100
Totals	497	47	71	7	153	14	97	9	58	5	180	17	1056	100

TABLE 5.21

CROSS CLASSIFICATION OF INDEX OF CONSISTENCY OF AMBIVALENT RESPONSES AND COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO THE STATEMENT, "IT IS PROBABLY A SOUND POLICY FOR THE PROBATION OR PAROLE AGENCY TO ROUTINELY SEND THE POLICE DEPARTMENT UP-TO-DATE LISTS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF PROBATIONERS OR PAROLEES WHO SHOW PATTERNS OF SEXUAL DEVIANCE."

Index A	Commitment-Utility Response Categories												Totals	
	Useful for Practice and Right		Not Useful for Practice but Right		Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Not Useful for Practice Apart from Right or Wrong		Useful for Practice but Wrong		Not Useful for Practice and Wrong			
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
10-11	424	49	58	7	126	15	79	9	46	5	135	16	867	100
8-9	67	40	12	7	24	14	18	11	11	7	37	22	169	100
6-7	6	30	1	5	3	15	1	5	1	5	8	40	20	100
Totals	497	47	71	7	153	14	97	9	58	5	180	17	1056	100

The hypotheses that: (a) respondents who are more punitive or consistently punitive legitimate, and describe as "useful" prescriptions contra-indicated by professional norms, and (b) responses in the classes of Index P indicate an increase in expedient orientation or an orientation which defines the normative dimension as irrelevant, as the least punitive class is approached, are not uniformly sustained.⁵

Inspection of the Index A tables suggests why there is no consistent relationship between classifying responses according to Index P and according to the CU categories. All of the ambivalent responses are subsumed under the three most ambivalent classes of Index A. The majority of the most consistently ambivalent respondents most frequently legitimate, and describe as "useful" punitive prescriptions (or do not legitimate and describe as "not useful," professional prescriptions). Thus ambivalent respondents, that is, those who "can't decide" or are "indifferent" to professionally prescribed case actions or those which are contra-indicated by professional norms, emerge as tending to be punitive when electing a CU category (i.e., when they are required to make a cognitively more complex judgment). Another trend which emerges among the responses of the more

⁵This interpretation is not based on the fact that χ^2 criteria could not be satisfied but on the grounds that consistent trends in the data which are consonant with the hypotheses are absent.

consistently ambivalent respondents is that while the most frequent choice of CU category is one that is punitive and consistent on the normative and pragmatic dimensions, the next most frequent choice is one that is similarly punitive but rules out the relevance of the normative dimension.

Contrary to expectations, ambivalent respondents cannot be characterized as expediently oriented.⁶ Among all categories of respondents who evidence a very high degree of response consistency (i.e., 10 or 11 consistent responses) the ambivalent respondents account for more than 50% of all responses. Among the respondents who legitimate punitive prescriptions or find them to be useful, the majority tended to offer ambivalent responses to the Client Welfare Orientation Instrument. In contrast, the responses of the small group of highly consistent punitive respondents exhibit curious inconsistencies among CU items. In 60% of the CU items, the most consistently punitive respondents most frequently legitimate professional prescriptions and find them useful.

The results are suggestive: The responses to cognitively complex stimuli are not necessarily consistent with responses to cognitively simple stimuli. It is evident that "agree" and "disagree" responses to professionally

⁶Nor do they resemble Ohlin's "protective agent" who vacillates between punitive and client-welfare-oriented responses to case demands.

standardized prescriptions for practice do not yield sufficient information concerning respondents' appreciation or evaluation of such prescriptions and do not serve as indicators of the success of professional education. But the question remains: Are the observed differences between respective sets of responses to the different response categories a function of substantive differences or a function of complexity per se?

Subscription to, and legitimation of professional prescriptions. In order to explore the relationship between the extent to which respondents subscribe (i.e., "agree" or "disagree") with professional prescriptions for practice and the extent to which such prescriptions are legitimated (i.e., the extent to which they are "right" or "wrong") in a cognitively simple context, a number of rank order correlations of CWO scores and scores to an analogous instrument--the Legitimation of Professional Prescription Instrument (LP)--were completed.

The LP instrument consisted of eight⁷ items, six of which were quite similar to six of the eleven CWO items. For example:

⁷The two dissimilar items were to be employed for another analytic purpose not treated in the present dissertation. Thus, the rank order correlations are necessarily conservative tests of the implied hypothesis that the order of CWO and LP scores are the same.

Agree Indifferent
 or Can't
 Decide Disagree⁸

CWO ITEM: The probation or parole officer should not make his case record on the probationer or parolee available to the police when they are investigating a crime, even if it is a brutal one..... [] [] []

LP ITEM In general, is it right for the police to expect the probation or parole officer to make a client's record available to them if it concerns the investigation of a brutal crime?⁹

Yes [] No [] Can't Decide []

By imbedding the moral judgment in the LP items (i.e., "In general is it right to . . .") the response categories to the LP Instrument were as normatively "neutral" as the CWO response categories.

The rank order correlations (ρ) between CWO and LP scores are consistently high and statistically significant. In substantive terms, it would appear that the order of subscription to professionally prescribed case

⁸The response categories indicated reflect the way in which responses were treated rather than the response scale employed, as noted earlier.

⁹The instructions for the LP ITEMS were: "In the questions below, the word "right" has the following meaning: If you consider a statement to be "right," then the statement is saying what you think is right for probation and parole practice--aside from what actually happens in practice and apart from anyone's power to control what you do in practice.

TABLE 5.22

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS (ρ) OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES AND LEGITIMATION OF PROFESSIONAL PRESCRIPTIONS SCORES WITH EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND TYPE HELD CONSTANT

Population	ρ	n	t (df=n-2)
Total	.50	1074 ^a	18.83 ^b
Practitioners with a Master's Degree in Social Work	.68	72	7.67 ^b
Practitioners with a Master's Degree in Fields Other than Social Work	.45	79	4.45 ^b
Practitioners Without a Master's Degree	.51	381	11.45 ^b

^aEither one respondent did not respond to all of the items of the LP instrument or one response was lost in the process of data card duplication, in which case the design of the data processing program called for the elimination of that respondent. Since the eliminated respondent, as can be deduced from the information in this table, was a practitioner without a Master's degree (i.e., the largest sub-population) the effect on the analysis was necessarily negligible and did not warrant a search of the raw data or arbitrary manipulation of the scored data.

^b $p < .001$

actions may be taken as an index of the order of legitimation of professional norms but the similarity of response categories with respect to extent of cognitive complexity accounts, in part, for the correlation.¹⁰ The limited evidence obtained suggests that professional education is not sufficient for the purpose of enabling the trained practitioner to consistently determine normatively oriented case decisions when he is required to choose among complex categories for evaluating case decisions. Further, the degree of complexity, entailed in the evaluations of case decisions, was of a fairly low order.

¹⁰This interpretation is predicated on the results of the cross-tabulations of indices P and A, respectively, with the CU categories, that is, CWO scores cannot serve as an index of compound normative-pragmatic evaluations of CWO items.

CHAPTER V

CONTINUITIES IN THE STUDY OF PRACTICE ORIENTATION:
INTER- AND INTRA-POSITIONAL CONSENSUS

The final question to be addressed concerns the extent of perceived and actual¹ consensus among practitioners who occupy similar and different positions in probation or parole organizations.

It was shown, earlier (see Table 2.26; cf., Tables 2.10 through 2.12) that there were no statistically significant differences between the client welfare orientation scores of practitioners who are incumbents of different organizational positions when level and type of education are held constant and that the hypothesized relationship between education and practice orientation persisted² when organizational status was held constant. Although these results make actual inter-positional consensus on the CWO items and, therefore, on the norms the items indicate, probable, the results do not yield information on perceived consensus. As has been indicated in

¹The study of actual consensus was necessarily restricted to consensus between workers (i.e., correctional practitioners holding organizational positions lower than supervisor) and supervisors. The "one-shot" survey design with an anonymous mailed questionnaire does not readily lend itself to a study of actual intra-positional consensus and the necessarily small number of administrators with statuses higher than supervisor limit meaningful comparisons in the study of actual consensus.

²It should be recalled that the agency variable (i.e., employing organization), when held constant, specified this relationship.

Chapter IV, practitioners' evaluations of the imperative nature and the usefulness of given prescriptions may differ even though they may subscribe to the same prescriptions.

Marked perceived discrepancies among what Robert Merton defines as members of the "role-set"³ yield strategic clues to the structurally defined sources of organizational influence. Similarly, discrepancies between perceived and actual consensus (or information on the accuracy of perceptions) may shed light on the insularity within, or visibility of, the organizationally required behavioral concomitants of the status structure.

The absence of contrasting perspectives on professional prescriptions within and among statuses also provides valuable information on the ways in which probation and parole agencies do not influence the appreciation of professional expectations.

In order to ascertain the patterns of perceived consensus within and among organizational positions, all of the respondents were asked to respond to the Commitment-Utility items (see Chapter IV) in the way in which they

³R. K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure. (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958), pp. 368-380,

would expect their role-partners would respond.⁴ Thus, each of three paired sets of responses (i.e., respondent-organizational peer or "colleague"; respondent-supervisor; respondent-"top" administrator), to the same set of six response categories, could be cross-classified.

Because consensus rather than agreement on the substance of items per se was the object of this analysis,

⁴The actual instructions for the Commitment-Utility items and the consensus items were:

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Please give only one response to each statement below.
2. Each response indicates whether you consider the statement to be useful or not useful when you apply it to your daily practice, AND whether it is also right or wrong.
3. If you consider a statement to be "useful," then it is like advice that can be applied in your everyday work.
4. If you consider a statement to be "right" then the statement is saying what you think is right for probation and parole practice-- apart from: a) what may actually happen in practice; b) anyone's power to control what you do in practice; and c) those laws which apply only to probationers or parolees.

After reading STATEMENT No. 1, check which one of the six responses most resembles your point of view, even though the response you choose may not reflect all of the points you would want to make about the statement. Then go on to check the response which is your best guess, even if it is a rough guess, about how other people would respond to the statement: your supervisor, your "most often colleague" (which means the colleague with whom you discuss on-the-job concerns most often) and the "top administrator" in your agency.

the items were treated in the aggregate.⁵

Worker-supervisor perceived consensus. It is evident, from an inspection of Table 6.1, that workers' selections of response categories and workers' projections of supervisors' selections are the same with respect to the most frequently chosen response categories. It is clear that the two sets of responses are not independent of each other.⁶ Table 6.1 which is an aggregate of five tables (i.e., one table for each of the items) is an accurate reflection of each of the tables for the composite

⁵In the analysis of patterns of perceived consensus, only the responses of practitioners below supervisory status were employed. This had the effect of eliminating the largest suspected source of response error in the group mailings. While the sub-population included here is not identical to the sub-population of returns from individual mailings, there is an average overlap of at least 91% (per item) of the actual responses from the individual mailings population and the actual responses from the composite population to the consensus items.

⁶The χ^2 value for this table is 7675.47. Although this value indicates that the degree of association between the two samples is highly significant, the large total number of observations would render relatively small degrees of association statistically significant. Cramér's V, which takes df and n into account and can vary between 0 and 1, yields a more meaningful measure of .45. The index of predictive association (or lambda) yields a value of about .65 when predicting from workers' responses to workers' projections of how supervisors would respond. Finally, the rank order correlation (rho) of the marginals is .82, $p \approx .05$.

TABLE 6.1

CROSS TABULATION OF WORKERS' RESPONSES AND WORKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW
SUPERVISORS RESPOND TO THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES:
AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS

Workers' Responses For Self	Workers' Perceptions Response Categories												Totals	
	1	2		3		4		5		6		n	Pct. col.	
Response Categories	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Pct. col.
1	1296	91	42	3	53	4	14	1	11	1	6	0	1422	
		84		22		11		4		6		1		42
2	51	30	95	55	12	7	12	7	0	0	2	1	172	
		3		51		2		3		0		0		5
3	118	22	22	5	359	66	12	2	29	5	4	1	547	
		8		13		72		3		16		1		16
4	25	7	17	4	28	7	280	73	12	3	20	5	382	
		2		9		6		77		7		3		11
5	26	15	3	2	24	13	7	4	98	55	20	11	178	
		2		2		5		2		55		3		5
6	19	3	5	1	22	3	40	6	27	4	585	84	698	
		1		3		4		11		15		92		21
Totals	1535	45	187	6	498	15	365	11	177	5	637	19	3399	

population insofar as each table exhibits an identical pattern.⁷

The pattern which emerges in Table 6.1 (and the tables it accurately reflects) supports the following description: workers within and among state system agencies believe that their supervisors' orientations to professional prescriptions for practice are the same as their own orientations. Surely this belief reduces those forms of inter-personal strain which are dependent upon inter-positional conflicts. One question which occurs is: does the general perceived inter-positional consensus represent a cognitive solution to actual inter-positional conflicts or are workers' perceptions accurate?

Worker-supervisor actual consensus. The practitioner sample includes both workers and supervisors and it is therefore possible to directly compare the aggregate of worker and supervisor responses.

Tables 6.2 and 6.3 yield essentially the same information: the percent of workers and supervisors choosing each response category are quite similar and, the rank order

⁷ Similarly, the aggregate table for the composite population, as might be expected, is an accurate reflection of the aggregate table for the returns from individual mailings population. This table, and other related tables exhibiting identical patterns, has been excluded in the interest of avoiding a redundant presentation. The aggregate pattern, for those state-system agencies in which there were a sufficient number of observations, is also accurately reflected by the aggregate table for the composite population.

TABLE 6.2^a

CROSS TABULATION OF WORKERS' AND SUPERVISORS' RESPONSES
BY THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES:
AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS

Commitment- Utility Response Categories	Supervisors		Workers		Totals
	n	%	n	%	
1	380	37	1,459	41	1,839
2	55	5	186	5	241
3	157	15	575	16	732
4	118	11	401	11	519
5	61	6	182	5	243
6	257	25	717	22	974
Totals	1,028	99 ^b	3,520	100	4,598

^aThis is an aggregate table for the composite population.

^bVariations from 100% are attributable to rounding procedures.

TABLE 6.3^a

CROSS TABULATION OF WORKERS' AND SUPERVISORS' RESPONSES
 BY THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES:
 AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS

Commitment- Utility Response Categories	Supervisors		Workers		Totals
	n	%	n	%	
1	197	37	1,334	42	1,531
2	29	5	176	6	205
3	93	17	516	16	609
4	60	11	373	12	433
5	33	6	165	5	198
6	126	23	628	20	754
Totals	538	99 ^b	3,192	101 ^b	3,730

^aThis is an aggregate table for the returns from individual mailings population.

^bVariations from 100% are attributable to rounding procedures.

correlation (ρ) for the order of choice of response categories is .97, $p \leq .01$ for Table 6.2 and .82, $p \approx .05$, for Table 6.3.

There is a very substantial actual consensus between workers and supervisors on practice prescriptions. This, in conjunction with the results of Table 6.1, indicates that workers' perceptions are in accord with reality. It is possible, however, that the general inter-positional consensus does not reflect the intra-organizational consensus.

Table 6.4 lists worker-supervisor comparisons for the four employing organizations which employ professionally trained social workers.

The data listed in Table 6.4 suggest that the rank order of choice of six response categories is substantially similar over all eight of the rankings.⁸ With few exceptions the respective percent of workers and supervisors choosing a given response category, in a given state system agency, differ by only a few percentage points. In

⁸When Kendall's coefficient of concordance is computed, $W = .94$ and $s = 986$ $p < .01$. Since "W bears a linear relation to the average" ρ s "taken over all groups" (i.e., state system agencies) the obtained value of W yields statistical evidence of actual consensus between workers and supervisors within and among the four state system agencies included in the test. (See S. Siegel, Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956), p. 229). Of the remaining 15 state system agencies there were sufficient numbers of observations for worker-supervisor comparisons in seven agencies. In two of the seven agencies, the number of supervisors were so few that rank-order comparisons encompassing more than two choices of response category could not be made. Of the remaining five agencies, three followed the general pattern and two deviated somewhat from that pattern.

TABLE 6.4

COMPARISONS AMONG FOUR STATE SYSTEM AGENCIES OF WORKERS'
AND SUPERVISORS' CHOICES OF COMMITMENT-UTILITY
RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AGGREGATES OF FIVE ITEMS

State System Agency

Commitment- Utility Response Categories	A				B				C				D			
	Super- visors n	%	Workers n	%	Super- visors n	%	Workers n	%	Super- visors n	%	Workers n	%	Super- visors n	%	Workers n	%
1	9	32	226	47	51	33	227	40	38	41	125	38	24	44	130	41
2	2	7	29	6	6	4	22	4	0	0	10	3	2	4	15	5
3	4	14	84	18	32	21	115	20	16	17	59	18	4	7	56	18
4	6	21	54	11	23	15	73	13	8	9	28	9	14	25	44	14
5	3	11	18	4	8	5	33	6	3	3	17	5	0	0	12	4
6	4	14	67	14	34	22	104	18	28	30	89	27	11	20	60	19
Totals	28		478		154		574		93		328		55		317	

general, Table 6.4 indicates that the actual consensus, between workers and supervisors within and among the included state system agencies, is substantial. With two exceptions, the remaining state system agencies (which contained a sufficient number of observations) exhibited a similar pattern.

The data listed thus far suggest that workers perceive a worker-supervisor consensus because such a consensus exists. Differences, in the commitment to professional prescriptions and in the evaluations of the utility of such prescriptions, between groups of practitioners cannot be attributed to differences in orientation associated with organizational status. The absence of such orientational differences rules out organizational position as a determinant or indicator of orientational differences in the probation-parole agencies examined in the present study. Both the Mann-Whitney tests (i.e., holding status constant while testing the relationship between level and type of education and practitioner orientation) and the rank order correlation coefficients (or related tests) employed to analyze consensus patterns provide ample statistical evidence for the foregoing observation.

Worker-worker and worker-administrator perceived consensus.

Although the accuracy of workers' perceptions of consensus between themselves and some of their role-partners (i.e., "colleagues" and "top" administrators) cannot be treated

in this study, it is of interest to determine whether workers discriminate between their own orientations and those of incumbents of other non-supervisory statuses.

Table 6.5 lists data pertaining to worker-colleague perceived consensus. Similarly, Table 6.6 concerns the perceived consensus between worker and "top" administrator.

Both Tables 6.5 and 6.6 indicate patterns of perceived consensus which are consistent with each other and are consonant with previous findings on perceived consensus.⁹ Workers do not perceive orientational differences among incumbents of different statuses and, in the case of worker-supervisor comparisons, worker perceptions have been demonstrated to be accurate.

Within the general perceived consensus, one pattern of difference does emerge and this is suggested by the index of predictive association as well as by V which permits direct comparisons of Tables 6.1, 6.5 and 6.6. These comparisons are summarized in Table 6.7.

Predictions from workers' responses to workers' perceptions of how other members of the role-set respond can be predicated upon the organizational status hierarchy. Thus a better prediction, from workers' responses for

⁹For purposes of comparison with Table 6.1, computations on the data listed in Table 6.5 yield the following values: $X^2=9681.79$; $V=.57$; $\lambda=.75$. Similar computations for Table 6.6 are: $X^2=6299.07$; $V=.38$; $\lambda=.58$. The rho value for the marginals of both Tables 6.5 and 6.6 is .82, $p \approx .05$.

TABLE 6.5

CROSS TABULATION OF WORKERS' RESPONSES AND WORKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW THE COLLEAGUES THEY SPEAK TO MOST OFTEN ABOUT ON-THE-JOB CONCERNS RESPOND TO THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES: AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS

Workers' Responses For Self	Workers' Perceptions Response Categories												Totals	
	1	2		3		4		5		6		n	Pct col	
Response Categories	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Pct col
1	1298	92	45	3	41	3	9	1	8	1	6	0	1407	
		91		22		8		2		4		1		42
2	23	14	114	67	13	8	12	7	1	1	6	4	169	
		2		55		2		3		1		1		5
3	61	11	21	4	422	78	14	3	20	4	2	0	540	
		4		10		79		4		11		0		16
4	14	4	20	5	17	5	307	82	7	2	11	3	376	
		1		10		3		84		4		2		11
5	15	9	1	1	22	12	5	3	125	71	8	5	176	
		1		0		4		1		66		1		5
6	11	2	6	1	16	2	19	3	27	4	609	89	688	
		1		3		3		5		14		95		21
Totals	1422		207		531		366		188		642		3356	

TABLE 6.6

CROSS TABULATION OF WORKERS' RESPONSES AND WORKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF HOW
THE "TOP" ADMINISTRATORS OF THEIR EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION RESPOND
TO THE COMMITMENT-UTILITY RESPONSE CATEGORIES:
AN AGGREGATE OF FIVE ITEMS

Workers' Responses For Self	Workers' Perceptions Response Categories												Totals	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	Totals		Totals		Totals			
Response Categories	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Percent row col.	n	Pct col.
1	1236	89	44	3	64	5	20	1	11	1	16		1391	
		80		28		13		6		7		3		42
2	67	40	64	38	14	8	14	8	3	2	5	3	167	
		4		41		3		4		2		1		5
3	150	28	13	2	321	60	16	3	23	4	8	2	531	
		10		8		67		4		15		1		16
4	32	9	22	6	25	7	257	71	8	2	16	4	360	
		2		14		5		72		5		3		11
5	26	15	6	4	30	18	3	2	83	49	21	12	169	
		2		4		6		1		56		3		5
6	32	5	7	1	25	4	47	7	21	3	546	81	678	
		2		4		5		13		14		89		21
Totals	1543		156		479		357		149		612		3296	

themselves to their perceptions of how colleagues they most frequently communicate with respond, can be made than from workers' responses for themselves to their perceptions of how supervisors respond. Similarly, a better prediction, from workers' responses for themselves to their perceptions of how supervisors respond, can be made than from workers' responses for themselves to their perceptions of how "top administrators" respond. In brief, the greater the inter-positional difference, the worse the prediction, given the evidence provided by λ .

The association between worker-perceived other responses similarly diminishes as the inter-positional difference becomes greater (according to V) but the rank order correlation coefficient (ρ_0) of the marginals is stable for all three tables.

This very minor trend in the data provides a suggestive clue to the manner in which the employing organization operates so as to specify orientation. Neither status nor tenure affect the initially observed relationship between education and practice orientation. The invisibility of workers (granting differences in the extent of visibility and its concomitant, perceived autonomy) probably puts them well beyond the reach of formal sanctions. Thus the most formally defined mechanisms of "socialization," control or management are apt to have the least impact. But the relatively greater perceived

TABLE 6.7

SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL TESTS ON TABLES TREATING
 WORKER PERCEPTION OF CONSENSUS WITHIN
 THE ROLE-SET

<u>TABLES</u>	<u>Statistical Tests</u>		
	<u>lambda</u>	<u>V</u>	<u>rho</u>
Table 6.5	.75	.57	.82
Table 6.1	.65	.45	.82
Table 6.6	.58	.38	.82

consensus between workers and the colleagues they elect to discuss case decisions with suggests that the informal system of voluntary communication may play a crucial part in the specification of practice orientation.¹⁰

¹⁰ In order to assess the possibility that measures of inter-positional consensus obscure formal sources of influence over time, orientational differences among practitioners were tested while holding duration of time supervised by the same supervisor constant. For purposes of comparability with logically similar analyses reported in Chapter I, these comparisons are based on CWO scores and employ the Mann-Whitney U test. The results of these tests are listed in Appendix C.

CHAPTER VI
CORRECTIONAL FUNCTIONARIES AND CAPTIVES:
OBSERVATIONS ON SOCIAL WORK

A review of the findings. This study examined the relative influence of professional education, the conditions of practice and other factors on the social worker's orientation to the welfare of his "clients."

As hypothesized, professionally trained correctional practitioners achieved higher client welfare orientation scores than similarly located untrained practitioners. This difference, which was statistically significant, means that professionally trained practitioners, in contrast to their untrained colleagues, subscribed to a set of statistically established professional standards and that differences between trained and untrained practitioners were not random. Either graduate training in social work or factors systematically associated with graduate training in social work accounted for the obtained differences. This qualification is important. Respondent attributes may have contributed to differences among practitioners. It was demonstrated, for example, that sex (i.e., its social concomitants) had an independent effect upon practice orientation. Females were more client welfare oriented than males but professionally trained females were more client welfare oriented than females who had not been professionally trained. The possibility of an overlap between the set of professional norms

employed in the study and feminine attitudes emerged in the discussion of the findings of the influence of sex on orientation. Neither respondents' age nor a likely concomitant of age, recency of education, substantially modified the initially obtained differences. Other respondent attributes, such as social class origin and religion, which may have been related to self-selection or self recruitment into social work, could have been related to the obtained differences between trained and untrained practitioners. The absence of direct statistical tests of the contribution of these and, perhaps, some other demographic variables to the obtained results limited the interpretation of the findings. But the persistence of the obtained differences when level and type of graduate education were held constant provided suggestive evidence that the findings were not artifactual.

Trained practitioners were more client welfare oriented than untrained practitioners but, when employing organization was held constant, the obtained differences persisted in some, but not all, of the organizations which employed trained practitioners. Thus, the employing organization specified the impact of professional education or factors associated with graduate education.

Among the organizational specifiers of practice orientation, which reduced differences between trained and untrained workers, were: (1) Age composition of the caseload; (2) Probation-parole composition of the caseload. Workers with different types and levels of training evidenced

reduced differences if they carried adult caseloads or probation caseloads. Thus, working with juveniles was systematically associated with higher client welfare orientation scores for all groups of practitioners. The operation of the probation-parole variable is ambiguous because the number of professionally trained workers who carried probation caseloads was negligible. The relevant comparisons therefore concerned differences between workers carrying mixed probation-parole caseloads and those carrying exclusively parole caseloads. While the manifest functions of the employing organization (i.e., probation vs. parole) as reflected in probation and parole caseloads may specify client welfare orientation, the argument that parolees may be more invidiously defined than probationers was not supported by the statistical outcomes of the tests in which probation and parole caseloads, respectively, were held constant.

Other organizational or organizationally relevant variables, particularly organizational position (status), duration of employment in the same organization (tenure), probation-parole experience and size of caseload did not have any systematic effect on client welfare orientation. Thus, practitioner role obligations and responsibilities which are differentially distributed over organization positions (e.g., supervisor versus worker) were not associated with client welfare orientation. This suggests that either factors associated with graduate education or the absence of

an operationally powerful organizational sanction system-- or both--may account for this unusual outcome. The amount of interaction between incumbents of different organizational positions is structurally reduced in probation-parole organizations because workers are typically "in the field" at least fifty per cent of the time. This aspect of correctional work provides workers with a certain amount of insularity from organizational controls and, perhaps, those conflicts which enable workers and others to define status-dependent orientations.

Another central organizationally relevant variable, namely, perceptions of the extent of freedom from organizational constraints (i.e., functional autonomy) proved not to be associated with client welfare orientation when employing organization was held constant. Further, variations among employing organizations in client welfare orientation and perceptions of functional autonomy, respectively, were dissimilar. Perceptions of functional autonomy, however, varied according to whether a worker carried a case-load in a rural area or an urban area with the exception of perceptions of professional workers, recently educated workers, inexperienced workers and female workers. Both professionally trained and female workers (i.e., client welfare oriented workers) did not show variations on the rural-urban "break." Thus, perceptions of functional autonomy had no relationship to client welfare orientation for these practitioner populations. The overlap of recently educated and

inexperienced practitioners, among practitioners with less than graduate levels of education, suggests that many non-graduate practitioners may not have had an opportunity to assess the operational degree of freedom from constraints. Whether or not perceptions of functional autonomy are accurate, there is another group of practitioners--those who were circumspect about the researcher's assurances of confidentiality (i.e., those who elected not to sign their questionnaires)--who did not evidence differences on the rural-urban "break." It was suggested that for at least some practitioners there is no necessary connection between perceptions of functional autonomy and objective factors associated with functional autonomy. The argument, that rural-urban differences indicated differentials in practitioner insularity from organizational constraints, was advanced as a plausible explanation for the finding that practitioners who carried caseloads in rural areas perceived themselves to have greater functional autonomy. The central point of the argument was that urban agencies are more complex and routinized (i.e., workers are more visible) as a function of large offender populations.

In summary, professional training or factors systematically associated with professional training and the social concomitants of being female yield a client welfare oriented practice orientation. Practice orientation is specified by organizational contingencies and the most powerful of these appears to be the age composition of the

caseload (i.e., orientational differences between trained and untrained practitioners are reduced for those who carry adult caseloads).

The extent to which professional and other practitioners subscribed to professional prescriptions for case decisions may be taken as a rough indicator of the extent to which such prescriptions were morally appreciated. There was a high probability that an "agree" response implied a "yes" response to the statement that a professional prescription is "right" or legitimate. But when practitioners were asked to evaluate a practice prescription in terms of its usefulness and legitimacy simultaneously (e.g., "right and useful"), the apparent normative commitment of professionally oriented practitioners disappeared. The overall pattern for professionally trained practitioners was not substantially different from other practitioners when all of the relevant questionnaire items were taken together. There was minor variation between trained and untrained practitioner groups and among employing organizations when prescriptions for practice were held constant. But the order of choice of response category (i.e., commitment-utility response categories), for the most frequently chosen response category, was virtually identical between groups of practitioners and among employing organizations.

The majority of trained social workers, like their untrained colleagues, regarded protection of the community as the most important question in making a case decision.

Sixty-one per cent of the professionals were morally committed to, and found "useful," the prescription to regard community protection as the paramount case concern (i.e., the opposite of the professional prescription to place the "client's" needs at the center of case decision-making). An additional 23% believed that community protection, as a paramount concern, was "useful for practice apart from right or wrong." Fifty-one per cent of the trained workers believed that maintaining confidentiality, in the event of a police investigation, was "not useful for practice and wrong." Thirty-four per cent of the trained workers believed that probation or parole should be revoked upon learning that a "client" inflicted serious physical injury on his mother and an additional 53% of the trained workers argued the pros (25%) and cons (27%) of such a case decision but agreed that a decision should be made "apart from right or wrong." In contrast to the foregoing responses, 25% of the trained workers found that appointments for home visits, rather than surprise calls, were "useful for practice and right" but 44% argued the pros (22%) and cons (22%) of this decision "apart from right or wrong." On this item, the professionals responded in a way that was sufficiently different from other practitioner groups so that the commitment-utility response categories were demonstrated to be statistically associated with levels and types of education. Without any pressure or request to violate the norm of confidentiality, professionally trained workers, like other practitioner groups, generally

supported the statement (contra-indicated by professional norms) that "It is probably a sound policy for the probation or parole agency to routinely send the police department up-to-date lists and descriptions of probationers or parolees who show patterns of sexual deviance." Forty-five per cent of the trained practitioners found that statement to be "useful for practice and right" and an additional 19% of the trained practitioners said that it was "useful for practice apart from right or wrong."

With the exception of only one item (concerning making appointments for home visits) there were only random differences between social workers and other correctional practitioners in their commitment to professional norms. There was general approval and a great deal of commitment to punitive case decisions. This finding persevered when respondents were classified according to the degree of their response consistency on the form of the Client Welfare Orientation Instrument which provided for "Agree," "Indifferent or Can't Decide" and "Disagree" response categories. The most consistently ambivalent respondents emerged as being punitively oriented when given the opportunity to evaluate professional prescriptions in terms of their usefulness and legitimacy. In the case of violations of confidentiality during police investigations, those respondents who most consistently disagreed with professional prescriptions on the CWO Instrument most frequently found the professional alternative to be useful for practice and right

when given an opportunity to evaluate that alternative in terms of usefulness and legitimacy. This paradoxical outcome provided a clue to the meaning of the responses to the Commitment-Utility items: When more than one dimension of judgment entered, simultaneously, into the process of making a case decision, response consistency declined as a function of cognitive complexity. Inconsistent compound response categories were seldom elected by respondents and there was some evidence that what was believed to be useful was also legitimated by practitioners, including social workers, whether or not what was judged to be useful conformed to professional norms. Thus, under complex conditions of decision making, professional education did not insure normative commitment to professional prescriptions for practice. This finding is especially interesting because the degree of complexity--two judgment dimensions--was of a fairly low order. Obtained differences between the criterion population (i.e., casework teachers) and professional practitioners suggest that practice conditions did not, alone, account for the shift from differences between professionally trained and untrained workers on the CWO Instrument to a lack of such differences on the Commitment-Utility items. It should be recalled, in this connection, that the only difference between these sets of items was in the response scales. Casework teachers who responded to the C-U items frequently found **normative** decision criteria to be irrelevant although most of the teachers, on most of the C-U items,

included normative evaluations. Thus, ambivalence toward a moral appreciation of professional standards may be induced in the process of social work education.

Finally, there was a substantial consensus on punitive case decisions between workers and supervisors and workers accurately perceived this consensus. Workers also perceived a similar general agreement on case decisions between themselves and the colleagues they most frequently elected to discuss case decisions with. The same outcomes obtained for workers' perceptions of how "top administrators" would respond to the Commitment-Utility items. A very minor trend in the data indicated, within the general consensus, a relatively greater worker-worker perceived consensus than worker-supervisor perceived consensus and a relatively greater worker-supervisor perceived consensus than worker-top administrator perceived consensus. Elective relationships within the employing organization may be a more important source of organizational "socialization" than the formally defined and hierarchically structured relations among position incumbents.

Correctional functionaries, captives and the community. The major implication of this study may be summed up by a variation on an old barb: If the social worker is the captive's friend, the captive doesn't need any enemies. Even if the findings were merely "suggestive," rather than reliable and valid, the correctional functionary's professional pretensions to therapy and rehabilitation would have to be accepted with reservations. Similarly, it would appear that

professional education in social work is not a sufficient condition of professionally oriented case decisions in correctional practice. A defense of the effectiveness of professional education would, in the light of these findings, have to be interpreted as unwitting complicity in the punishment of captives.

It is clear, given consensus on punitive attitudes, that neither professional supervision nor professionally-oriented in-service training programs are adequate to ameliorate the conditions of captives. In response to Hughes' rhetorical questions, "Whose agent is the professional?" and "Who is the client?," it may be said that the professional is the agent of the State and the community is the client. What about the captive? He must look elsewhere for help or he will pay, in most cases, more than the official price of his offense. In a somewhat more remote sense, the community is not well-served because the captive who is not, by definition, "rehabilitated" and who does not commit a new offense during or after probation or parole is simply a bit of good luck. Presumably, the client (i.e., tax-payer) does not buy the services of correctional functionaries with the expectation that the results they achieve is attributable to chance.

By-and-large, professional social workers have avoided correctional practice and many of the recently trained correctional functionaries have had their graduate education financed by the State. It would therefore be cynical to

suggest that the pressure to professionalize correctional work is simply an example of Social Work's attempt to expand its occupational "turf." If this is the case--if the profession does not need to protect a vested interest in corrections--then professional ethics require that the relevant questions be asked: What arrangements can be made for the captive in order to balance his rights and needs with the community's expectations? What are the means of constraining functionary discretion and abuse of captives? To state the issue in these terms is to suggest that the captive-functionary relationship and, by implication, the captive-community relationship is an adversary relationship. The "rules" that govern such relationships are recognized in the adversary proceeding, complete with advocate (lawyer), State counsellor and impartial hearing board. Only romantics would suggest that "due process" and "due speed" are the same thing and redress of captive abuse requires both. The sluggishness of adversary proceedings would defeat the intent of the adversary procedure. Another "model" is that of binding arbitration in the collective bargaining process. The application of this model requires an organization of captives--an unlikely and unpalatable possibility. A third approach is that of the Ombudsman, free from organizational constraints, who can exercise a wide array of mandated sanctions. The appeal of the captive to the Ombudsman is direct, uncomplicated and potentially effective. But the Ombudsman was developed in an environment where the politics of

legislation and the administration of State agencies is relatively separate and distinct; where executive leadership is not the same thing as pandering to public ignorance; where the appointment of administrators and political appointments are not the same sort of appointments; where the public tolerance for a variety of deviant behaviors is somewhat greater than in most countries. All of these models have a "third impartial party" feature but they would have to be adapted to special features of the correctional system and the political system. The third party could be sanctioned but not appointed by a state legislature. The Act under which the third party's Office would operate would have to guarantee autonomy and, to protect that autonomy, would have to grant a singularly wide range of legal and financial immunities (e.g., long-range funding; no restrictions on the input of voluntary funds). Third party decisions would be binding on the adversaries. A panel of paid full-time counsellors and volunteers would be available to the captives and would operate as a sub-unit of the third party's Office. Violations of third party decisions would be subject to criminal proceedings in which correctional system administrators and functionaries would have no immunities.

The profession of social work could be instrumental in supporting the development of a third party institution. A professional association could consider the accreditation of agencies, including correctional agencies, provided that

the agencies conformed to responsible treatment of captive groups. The Professional Association would provide access, to a commission on professional practices, for captives so that reports of captive treatment would not be mediated by bureaucratic functionaries who also happen to be professional social workers. The Commission would not hesitate to include non-social work professionals such as lawyers with an interest in civil liberties, academics who are students of professionalism and a broad spectrum of concerned citizens. And the Commission would not be reluctant to permit press coverage of its hearings.

There is another side to captive abuse in public correctional agencies which has to do with the attributes of the captives. A striking case can be made, in the case of juveniles in the large urban centers, that low-income minority group children are subject to a discretionary process which more often leads to (a) detection, (b) arrest, and (c) adjudication, than is the case for middle-income and upper-income juveniles. The phenomenon is so well-known that a re-statement of the evidence would be gratuitous. This suggests that there is differential or selective tolerance, for deviation from legally prescribed forms of behavior, which is a function of social class. To the extent that social mechanisms for prescribed or preferred forms of economic mobility cannot be expanded to include children from low-income families, an expansion of the captive population in the large urban centers is inevitable.

The most creative institutional devices for dealing with an increasing captive population will tend, under population pressure, to be quite inadequate.

Social work education. There is no reason to view social work education and, in particular, social work curricula as being unchangable. While much of the content of casework curricula, over the years, may have been the pouring of old wine into new bottles, the notion that "old wine is best" should be tempered by the recognition that it eventually turns to vinegar.

One educational problem, discussed earlier, is that ideology fills the vacuum of a largely absent technology. The virtue of humanism does not compensate for the vice of therapeutic ineffectiveness. But therapeutic competence, which is unquestionably desirable, will not solve the problem of serving the wrong master. There is no way 'round this problem other than to desist in the attempt to sell casework to every customer who is willing to buy. Casework is not relevant to every inter-personal problem nor to every social problem. Casework is not relevant to every problematic relationship between the individual and his society. The value of individual and group forms of psychosocial treatment should be set in the perspective of the full-range of professional offerings. It may be that a multiple-service public agency emphasizing casework services would be of use to correctional captives, as well as others, but the captives,

in relation to casework, must have client--not captive--status. Thus, the casework offering cannot be contingent on the client's status in a correctional organization. This writer does not propose, here, to treat "new" forms of "aggressive," "reaching-out" or "authoritative" casework as serious objections to this formulation. These tags are the class-names of old rationalizations.

To the extent that "field placements" in public agencies such as juvenile courts and public assistance departments involves the "officer" or "investigator" role, that is the extent to which casework students are being trained in normative ambivalence. Other uses can be made of these "settings" than vocational training. Students can be introduced to these agencies in more relevant and organizationally potent roles: as service analysts, administrative assistants, program researchers, client consultants and community workers.

Psychologically-oriented training, including the development of interviewing or communication skills requires observing skilled practitioners in controlled environments and being observed by experts and peers, followed by theory-related evaluations and open discussions of performance. The invisible student-worker, who is permitted to have his work mediated by a process record which is evaluated by a single field instructor or supervisor, has been robbed of the opportunity to develop professional skills efficiently in an objective atmosphere. But these remarks

only scratch the surface of developing the "skills component" and its intellectual concomitants in casework training. More important, if the present study is relevant to curricula, is the educational objective of enabling the student to grasp the relevance of the conditions of service to his professional activities and to learn how to use or respond to those conditions. In contrast to the dictum that a student identify with the agency, the student should identify with the norms of effective and humane practice. In contrast to the norm of neutral affectivity, the student should take some emotional risks and identify with the client.

Finally, casework education should increasingly rely upon empirical investigations of practice in the "didactic" portions of the curriculum and casework educators should not rationalize negative findings with the excuse that students' confidence in the profession needs to be nurtured before objective conflicts can be emotionally assimilated. Intellectual honesty and respect for the students' integrity are not optional attitudes for the social work educator and these attitudes may be essential to the conduct of graduate education.

It may be that the inclusion of the study of the structure of practice in social work curricula will stimulate advanced students to study the structure and financing of professional education. To re-phrase an old adage: He who pays the piper expects to call the tune.

APPENDIX A

CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION ITEMS¹

1. The proportion of time and effort which a worker spends with a parolee or probationer should be determined primarily by the offender's previous offense record and the extent of his current adherence to the rules of probation or parole.
2. When newspapers print a critical but erroneous account of the agency's handling of a probation or parole case, a good tactic is to open the file to them and show them their error to gain their support.
3. A parolee or probationer beats up his mother so that she needs six stitches. Revocation proceedings are indicated.
4. The probation or parole officer should not make his case record on the probationer or parolee available to the police when they are investigating a crime, even if it is a brutal one.
5. The most important function of the probation or parole officer is to protect the community at all times.
6. It is better for the probation or parole officer to make appointments for home visits than to call unexpectedly.

¹The split half (i.e., odd-even method) rank order correlation coefficient (ρ) for the form of the CWO instrument employing these eleven items is .31 for the composite population and .30 for the "individual returns" population ($p < .0005$). The source of the 11-item form of Herman Piven's Client-Welfare-Orientation Instrument was the "Curriculum Evaluation Project," Herman Piven, Principal Investigator. (See, also, Author's Note.)

7. It is frequently desirable to hold a man in prison past his parole date while the parole worker investigates and approves his employment plan.

8. If the officer finds out that a parolee or probationer is working as a bank clerk, he should immediately tell the offender to find another job or inform the employer of the probationer's agency status.

9. It is probably a sound policy for the probation or parole agency to routinely send the police department up-to-date lists and descriptions of parolees or probationers who show patterns of sexual deviance.

10. When a parolee or probationer is arrested on a loitering charge 50 miles out of his probation district, and he has not received permission from the officer to leave the district, revocation is almost surely the indicated course of action.

11. A parolee or probationer who lives with his wife and children has an extended sexual affair with a 16-year-old girl and she gets pregnant. Revocation proceedings are indicated.

APPENDIX B

AUTONOMY-RESTRICTIVENESS ITEMS¹

1. The intense feelings of the district attorney have to be taken into account when preparing your pre-sentence, pre-parole, or revocation recommendation.

2. You have to seriously weigh the probable reaction of your supervisor before making a decision on a case, though you yourself are convinced of what the case requires.

3. Does your agency encourage revocation proceedings in "borderline adjustment" cases when there's a good chance of a big public fuss if the parolee or probationer gets involved in another offense?

4. Do you feel your agency allows you the freedom to advise your client to reject or stall the claims of finance companies and other creditors when your judgment indicates it would be advisable to do so?

5. Is the frequency of your case contacts affected by agency policy as opposed to your own conception of the case needs?

6. What the newspapers could make of the case if it should blow up is something you consider in case planning.

¹The split-half (i.e., even-odd method) rank order correlation coefficient (ρ) for the form of the AR instrument employing these 10 items is .40 for the composite population and .39 for the "individual returns" population ($p < .0005$). The source of the 10-item form of Herman Piven's Autonomy-Restrictiveness Instrument was the "Curriculum Evaluation Project," Herman Piven, Principal Investigator. (See, also, Author's Note.)

7. When you think the probationer or parolee would have a better chance of getting and keeping a job by lying about his criminal background, do you feel you can advise him that he is free to do so as far as you are concerned?

8. Before making a touchy case decision, it is necessary to get the opinion of your supervisor or chief so that you'll be protected if anything happens.

9. The agency's rules of probation or parole determine your decisions with clients when they are pertinent to the case.

10. In working out a case, the informal and perhaps subtle wishes of your agency administrators are important factors you have to take into account.

APPENDIX C

TABLE A.1

COMPARISONS OF CLIENT WELFARE ORIENTATION SCORES BETWEEN PRACTITIONERS: (A) WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, (B) WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WITHOUT A MASTER'S DEGREE, (C) WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN SOCIAL WORK AND THOSE WHO HOLD A MASTER'S DEGREE IN FIELDS OTHER THAN SOCIAL WORK, BY COMPOSITE POPULATION AND RETURNS FROM INDIVIDUALLY MAILED QUESTIONNAIRES, WITH LENGTH OF TIME SUPERVISED BY PRESENT SUPERVISOR HELD CONSTANT

Sample	Number of years supervised by present supervisor ^a	Comparison A				Comparison B				Comparison C			
		n		Mdn		Z or U Scores		Z or U Scores		Z or U Scores		Z or U Scores	
		(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)	Z	U	(1)	(2)	(1)	(2)
Composite	≤ 3 yrs.	36	12	3.87	47	8	N.S.	36	12	2.51			
		436	8		436	8		47	8				
	> 3 yrs.	8	10	N.S.	4	8	N.S.	8	10	13.0 ^b			
		82	8		82	8		4	8				
Individual Returns	≤ 3 yrs.	34	12	3.53	41	9	N.S.	34	12	1.93			
		384	8		384	8		41	9				
	> 3 yrs.	8	10	N.S.	4	8	N.S.	8	10	13.0 ^b			
		78	8		78	8		4	8				

^aThis "break" was selected in order to facilitate comparison with results obtained for analogous tests with organizational tenure and probation-parole experience, respectively, held constant.

^bN.S.

The statistical results of the comparisons for the composite population are consistent with those for the "individual returns" population. Employing the median score as an indicator, the results in Table A.1 are consistent with the general finding that practitioners who have completed a graduate course of education in social work are more client welfare oriented (i.e., achieve higher CWO scores) than other practitioners engaged in correctional work. The results of the Mann-Whitney U test indicate that, for the relatively small number of practitioners who have been supervised by their present supervisor for more than three years, type and level of education does not discriminate among practitioners. The evidence suggests that over very long periods of time, the effect of supervision is such that it tends to militate against the professional's subscription to professional norms. But the number of practitioners who have a graduate degree and have also been supervised by their present supervisor for more than three years is very small and this suggests that the results of the tests of significance do not warrant more than tentative acceptance. There is not a sufficient number of practitioners with graduate degrees who have been supervised by the same supervisor for more than three years to permit a similar series of tests while holding employing organization constant but the "dispersion" of this set of graduate practitioners over four state agency systems

suggests that the effects of long-term supervision on intra-organizational inter-positional consensus on practice prescriptions are negligible for this survey population. The finding is of theoretical interest if it is not artifactual. Why should long-term supervision selectively affect professional workers? Instead of speculating, here, on the plausible sources of this effect, the effect should first be verified. A future investigation may take this problem as its object.

APPENDIX D

LEGITIMATION OF PROFESSIONAL PRESCRIPTIONS.

ITEMS¹

1. In general, is it right for a probation or parole agency to determine the frequency of case contacts as a matter of policy?
2. In general, is it right for a probation or parole agency to encourage revocation in borderline adjustment cases if there is a good chance that there will be a big public fuss if the probationer or parolee gets involved in another offense?²
3. In general, is it right for the local citizens to expect you to make case decisions by mainly answering the question of whether the community is now being protected by your case decisions?
4. In general, is it right for a probation or parole agency to encourage revocation in a case where a probationer or parolee has an extended sexual affair with a young girl and she gets pregnant?
5. In general, is it right for the agency to expect you to call on probationers or parolees unexpectedly rather than to make appointments for home visits?

¹The rank order correlation coefficient (ρ) for the "LP" and CWO instruments is .50 ($p < .001$). These items are part of an instrument which was derived from Herman Piven's Client-Welfare-Oriented and Autonomy-Restrictiveness instruments and developed, primarily, by the present author in connection with the "Curriculum Evaluation Project," Herman Piven, Principal Investigator. (See also, Author's Note.)

²This item does not correspond to any of the items included in the eleven item form of the CWO instrument.

6. In general, is it right for the police to expect the probation or parole officer to make a client's record available to them if it concerns the investigation of a brutal crime?
7. In general, is it right for a probation or parole agency to encourage revocation if a probationer or parolee beats up his mother so that she needs six stitches?
8. In general, is it right for the police to expect the agency to send them up-to-date lists and descriptions of probationers or parolees showing patterns of sexual deviance?

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barton, A. H. "The Concept Of Property-Space In Social Research" in The Language of Social Research. (Lazarsfeld and Rosenberg, eds.). Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Barton, A. H. Organizational Measurement And Its Bearing On The Study Of College Environments. New York: College Entrance Examination Board (Research Monograph No.2), 1961.
- Bieri, J. "Analyzing Stimulus Information in Social Judgments" in Measurement in Personality and Cognition. (Messick and Ross, eds.) New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962.
- Billingsley, A. "Bureaucratic and Professional Orientation Patterns in Social Casework" in Social Service Review. December, 1964.
- Blau, P. M. "Orientation Toward Clients in a Public Welfare Agency" in Administrative Science Quarterly. December, 1960.
- Blau, P. M. and Scott, W. R. Formal Organizations. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.
- Burke, K. A Rhetoric of Motives. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950.
- Dewey, J. Logic: The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1949.
- Eaton, J. W. Stone Walls Not A Prison Make. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1962.
- Etzioni, A. A Comparative Analysis Of Complex Organizations. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Goffman, E. "The Characteristics of Total Institutions" in Complex Organizations (Etzioni, ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.

- Goffman, E. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959.
- Green, A. D. "The Professional Social Worker in the Bureaucracy" in Social Service Review. December, 1964.
- Gross, N., Mason, W. S., and McEachern, A. W. Explorations In Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958.
- Haberstroh, C. J. "Organization Design And Systems Analysis" in Handbook of Organizations. (March, ed.) Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.
- Hamilton, G. Theory and Practice of Social Case Work. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.
- Hobbes, T. Leviathan. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1950.
- Hollis, F. Casework. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Hughes, E. C. "The Social Significance of Professionalization" in Professionalization (Vollmer and Mills, eds.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Hyman, H. Survey Design and Analysis. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.
- Kraft, I. "Towards A New Conception of Social Work in American Society." (Unpublished paper). School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University. January, 1968.
- Lefton, M. and Rosengren, W. R. "Organizations and Clients: Lateral and Longitudinal Dimensions" in American Sociological Review. December, 1966.
- Lubove, R. The Professional Altruist. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

- Maxwell, A. E. Analysing Qualitative Data. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.
- Menninger, K. Theory Of Psychoanalytic Technique. New York: Basic Books, 1958.
- Merton, R. K. Social Theory and Social Structure. (2nd rev. ed.) Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1958.
- Merton, R. K. "Notes On Problem Finding In Sociology" in Sociology Today. (Merton, Broom and Cottrell, eds.) New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Merton, R. K. "Social Problems and Sociological Theory" in Contemporary Social Problems. (Merton and Nisbet, eds.) New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1961.
- Morgan, R. W. "Role Performance by Social Workers in a Bureaucracy" in Social Work Practice. (National Conference On Social Welfare.) New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.
- Ohlin, L. E. "Major Dilemmas of the Social Worker in Probation and Parole" in National Probation and Parole Association Journal. July, 1956.
- Parsons, T. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations" in Complex Organizations. (Etzioni, ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Parsons, T. The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.
- Pepitone, A. "Some Conceptual and Empirical Problems of Consistency Models," in Cognitive Consistency. (Feldman, ed.) New York: Academic Press, 1966.
- Perlman, H. H. Social Casework. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Piven, H. Professionalism and Organizational Structure. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation.) New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, 1960.

- Richan, W. C. The Influence Of Professionalization, Work Environment and Other Factors On Social Workers Orientation Toward Clients. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Columbia University School Of Social Work, Columbia University, 1965.
- Richmond, M. E. Social Diagnosis. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1917.
- Ryle, G. Dilemmas. Oxford: The Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- Smalley, R. Theory For Social Work Practice. New York: Columbia University Press, 1967.
- Sterhinsky, N. A., Billingsley, A. and Gurgin, V. "A Study Of Social Work Practice in Protective Services: It's Not What You Know, Its Where You Work" in Child Welfare. October, 1966.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics For The Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.
- Sykes, G. M. The Society Of Captives. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Thomas, E. J. "Role Conceptions and Organizational Size" in American Sociological Review. February, 1959.
- Thomas, E. J. and Goodman, E. Socio-Behavioral Theory And Interpersonal Helping In Social Work. Ann Arbor: Campus Publishers, 1966.
- Varley, B. K. "Are Social Workers Dedicated To Service" in Social Work. April, 1966.