

1948

Forensic Social Case Work: An Analytical Survey

Irving A. Lanzer

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Irving A. Lanzer, Forensic Social Case Work: An Analytical Survey, 39 J. Crim. L. & Criminology 34 (1948-1949)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology by an authorized editor of Northwestern University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

FORENSIC SOCIAL CASE WORK: AN ANALYTICAL SURVEY

Irving A. Lanzer

Integrated sociologically, this article surveys the problems of case work in an authoritarian setting. The various schools of thought, approaches and forms of therapy are analyzed. The article includes a comprehensive statement of casework objectives in correctional work.

The author has had ten years field experience with both adult and juvenile correctional agencies in New York State; as well as extensive experience teaching courses in criminology, juvenile delinquency and social work at the City College of New York.—EDITOR.

The concept of "forensic social case work" as used here, is analogous to that of "forensic medicine" or "forensic psychology". It denotes the social case work approach to delinquency and criminality as operationally influenced by the role of legal authority in defining agency function and limits, and in giving an authoritative character to the case work situation—its objectives, techniques, and the processes of the case work relationship.

As thus conceived, forensic case work is by no means unified or standardized. It is probably less integrated and systematized than any other field of social case work, because it is the only field in which case workers must develop a philosophy (social, personal, and professional), and a system of skills and techniques for working in a setting in which *legal* authority colors, permeates and is implicit in every relationship between the social worker and agency, and social worker and client. It does not help to point out that the operation of authority and of limitations are inherent in any form of social living, and that "there is no absolute freedom for any of us in this life. Life itself consists of a constant process of adjustment to the limitations that surround humankind."¹ This is no doubt true, as it is true also that not only legal agencies, but all social agencies exercise some kind or degree of authority, and that unless the client cooperates on the agency's terms, the agency will close the case and refuse to render any further service. It is held (we believe erroneously, for reasons discussed below) that this substantially is what the court, probation or parole agency does when it revokes the offender's limited conditional freedom and incarcerates him.

¹ Kenneth L. M. Pray—"The Principles of Social Case Work as Applied to Probation and Parole," *Federal Probation*, Vol. IX, No. 2 (April-June, 1945), P. 16.

Legal Limitations Differentiated

But this approach overlooks the fact that legal authority is distinctively differentiated from other forms of human limitations. Implicit in every law, and especially the criminal law, is a philosophy and theory of social relationships, social organization and structure, social stratification and social class values and attitudes, moral judgments, and power and status relationships in society.² One's reaction to legal authority is therefore influenced, directly or indirectly (but never in the same way for different individuals), by his personalized, subjective conscious and unconscious reactions to all these variables. This fact applies equally to both case worker and offender. Thus social workers in the correctional field, in common with police, prosecuting officials, judges and juries, often differ amongst themselves as to which offenses and offenders are serious; which demand stern and immediate action; which less serious; which may be overlooked, or condoned, implicitly or explicitly; etc. Objectively, it would be impossible to enforce the criminal law uniformly; there will always necessarily be a selective, differential application of the coercive power of governmental authority. This principle becomes especially operative during dynamic, transitional periods of social life in complex societies.

Legal authority is differentiated also from other forms of authority and limitations on behavior in that its punitive application to an individual is inescapably stigmatizing in our culture, and if only for this reason, is generally resented by the individual. Skillful and tactful use of authority by the case worker may tend to mitigate, but it cannot entirely eliminate this stigma. The individual will therefore find it somewhat difficult to accept the application of this authority, even if it is called treatment, unless he is a particularly dependent person himself. Some degree of resentment at its use is more or less unavoidable. The client generally feels that he is the victim of discrimination in being subjected to restrictions, and also suffers humiliation every time he is compelled to seek permission from probation or parole officials for some projected activity of his. No matter how much social workers talk of the use of authority in *treatment*, the fact still remains that in our culture, criminal justice is still

² On the sociological foundations and operation of the criminal law, see Edwin H. Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology* (J. B. Lippincott, New York, 4th edition revised, 1947) p. 10-19.

For a broader and more detailed discussion of the sociology of government and of law, Robert M. MacIver, *The Web of Government* (MacMillan, New York, 1947) is particularly significant, especially Ch. 3, 4, 5, 6, including p. 37-38, and 116, on relationship of social class to law and government.

largely punitive, moralistic, and vindictive. It is recognized as such by the offender, and the specific application of authority therefore often has little relevancy either to the treatment needs of the individual or even to the presumed welfare needs of society.

When government officials speak of "protecting the community", in our complex society, whom in the community do they wish to protect, from whom, from what, why, how, and for what justification? Such sociological questions point up the additional fact that whereas other "limitations that surround humankind" are generally physical or intrinsic, inherent, relevant, and more or less inevitable for the individual in the situation, and are generally accepted as such, legal limitations are often experienced by the individual, especially if he be an offender, as external to himself, superimposed, and discriminatory. Far from being defined as inevitable, legal limitations are widely recognized in complex societies as being socially contrived, selectively applied, and often susceptible of widespread violation, with more or less impunity, depending on the individual and the situation. This is made clearer when it is kept in mind that our highly competitive, free enterprise system, whatever its more positive aspects, often makes it difficult for the individual to identify himself with the group; or to see how individual welfare is dependent upon community welfare; or to accept the necessity of placing community needs above his personal needs. Under these conditions, it is not surprising if the offender consciously or unconsciously so frequently looks upon his act as a justified extension and application of free enterprise.³ The offender's resistance to the acceptance of legal authority thus has a definite sociological basis, whatever the individual personality factors involved may be.

Also, it must be emphasized that legal authority operates involuntarily, without the will, and sometimes even against the will, of both the social worker and the offender. The social worker is just as much bound by the authority he exercises as the offender is subject to that authority—although each of course is affected by the authoritarian setting in a different way. *Both* worker and client have to function in terms of the authoritarian setting, for it is legal authority which brought the relationship into being and which will determine its conditions and

³ The relationship between our social system and crime is treated concisely by H. E. Barnes and Negley K. Teeters in their *New Horizons in Criminology* (Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, Revised edition, December, 1945), esp. p. 17-27, and p. 983-985, in indirect connection with the above point. This general question is specifically elaborated in Donald R. Taft's *Criminology* (Macmillan Co., New York, 1942), esp. p. 3-19; and ch. 15.

its ending. The client's problems have to be handled as basically centering around his definition of, reaction to, use of, and differentiation of authority.⁴ If the client does not cooperate, the case is not closed, as would be the situation when non-legal agencies exercise their authority. Rather, the case is "locked up" by the agency, which represents a significantly different definition of the situation, for both case worker and client. This correspondingly basically changes the characteristics of the relationship among agency, worker and client.⁵

The mentioning hitherto of probation and parole, and the omission of reference to social case work in penal institutions, is not meant to imply that considerations pertinent to probation and parole are irrelevant to the problem of authority in prison work. They are not, and what is true of the former in this respect is also essentially true of the latter. But we will concentrate on the fields of probation and parole where the case work approach is more widely accepted, has broader grounds of operation, and where the client's reactions are less coercively controlled, and are therefore subject to more flexible formulation. It is hoped that this differentiation of legal authority from other forms of authority and limitations in the field of social work, more sharply defines the issues underlying case work objectives and techniques in correctional programs.

Approaches to Correctional Casework

On this last point, different systems of social work theory and practice and of correctional work, provide different answers, first because of different conceptions of treatment and use of authority in it; and second, because of different views as to the nature and practise of social case work.⁶ Thus some, if not most probation and parole agencies, perhaps because of limitations in staff qualifications and training, haven't gone much beyond Mary Richmond's⁷ environmental-manipulative and investigative approach. In their version of this approach, some of these emphasize exhortations and friendly assistance to the offender in meeting the environmental problems of life, and considerably play down the authoritarian role of the agency.

Thus, under the influence of this approach, and surprisingly

⁴ On this point, see Helen L. Witmer, "Social Case Work in the Field of Juvenile Probation", in the *1941 Yearbook of the National Probation Association*, p. 165.

⁵ On this point, see Nathaniel Cantor, "The Function of Probation", *The Yearbook of the National Probation Association*, 1941, p. 294.

⁶ For a more detailed description of current systems of probation practice, see Everett Wilson, "The Nature of Probation", *The Social Service Review*, September, 1946.

⁷ Mary E. Richmond, *Social Diagnosis*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1917.

for a newspaper, the *New York Times* of August 18, 1947, in an editorial entitled "Understanding The Offender", defines parole as ". . . the beginning of a process of rehabilitation for the offender beyond prison walls—a regime of case work in an authoritarian setting provided by law." This editorial goes on to emphasize rehabilitation and treatment in parole; and completely ignores the law-enforcement and community-protective roles of parole work. It makes no reference to these roles in any way whatsoever.

Others, in contrast, while also offering friendly *environmental* assistance to the offender, emphasize the police and the authoritarian investigative role of the agency. They believe that their indispensable function is to "prevent further depredations in society", and they tend to define a probation or parole department as a "law enforcement agency with a case work orientation."⁸ This is in contrast to the approach of the first group, which generally defines probation and parole work as "case work in an authoritarian setting". Often, under the authoritarian approach, workers are trained to be alert to detect probation or parole violations or new offenses; to investigate all complaints and suspicions thoroughly; to cooperate actively with the activities of other law-enforcing agencies, general and specialized, and to supplement them; and to handle and use, if necessary, the basic police tools of the gun, blackjack, handcuff, and to trail people, "frisk" them, search rooms, etc.

This form of probation and parole work raises, but leaves unanswered, except by ambiguous implication, the question as to the differentiation, if any, between itself and the work of these other general and specialized police and law-enforcement agencies. It also raises unanswered questions as to type of personnel; physical requirements; and training, educational, and experience qualifications that should be sought for probation and parole work. This problem is further commented on below; but it might be noted here that this approach, since it emphasizes the community and group function of the agency, makes individualized case work somewhat more difficult to achieve, both inherently and administratively. It also, since it emphasizes community protection and law-enforcement as its basic functions, makes the agency more responsive to expressed public opinion, especially to expressed public criticisms of its work. Inasmuch as expressed public criticisms are most frequently

⁸ David Dressler, "Case Work with the Adult Offender", in *Social Defenses Against Crime* (Yearbook of the National Probation Association, 1942, New York), p. 179-180.

likely to take the form of sensationalistic, "yellow-press" attacks on parole and probation for carelessness and laxity in dealing with "dangerous convicted criminals," such a situation tends to make the policies and procedures of the agency unduly dependent on "public opinion." Such circumstances necessarily tend to affect adversely the working relationships between agency administrator and the case worker, and between the case worker and the offender-client.

On the other hand, some agencies emphasize the *personality-helping function* in case work, within the definitive limits of agency authority and function, with the objective of using the professionally controlled relationship between worker and client, operating strictly within these limits, to bring about significant personality changes in the offender. This approach, although it has the emphasis on agency authority, function and limits, in common with the authoritarian approach described above, breaks sharply with that approach by emphasizing: "A careful analysis will show, I think, that the function of the officer is to be a psychological policeman. (Let no reader make the mistake of reading into the phrase 'psychological policeman' anything connected with the attitude of a 'copper')."⁹

This school of "relationship therapy" concentrates on helping the client make constructive catalytic, maximum use of agency authority and function in personality growth and development, in terms of helping him accept himself, of clarifying his own goals and needs, and in terms of stimulating him to face his immediate problems more realistically. For these reasons, these practitioners are "permissive" in approach; they insist that the client make his own decisions, aware of the limits of the relationship, and of the limits and consequences of his behavior as the cardinal reality principle. This approach tends to oversimplify the problems of using authoritarian limits constructively, as indicated in our earlier discussion. It also overlooks the fact that peace officers, which probation and parole officers generally are, cannot be completely impersonal in the use of their authority, since in complex societies, there must necessarily be, and there is, the differential enforcement of the criminal law, expressing variable agency policies, and the subjective views and personalities of the individual workers in the case. It is well known that in all probation and parole agencies, different workers have different reputations as to "toughness",

⁹ See Nathaniel Cantor, "The Function of Probation" in *Probation and Parole Programs* (Yearbook of National Association of Probation, 1942, New York), p. 277-297. Page 288 contains the quotation.

“being regular”, being easy marks”, etc. Administrative policies and supervisory coordination can, of course, help to reduce these variations, but cannot eliminate them.

Carl Rogers' non-directive counseling approach¹⁰ is in many respects similar to the approach of relationship therapy, and Rogers indicates general agreement with it. However, his theory is founded more on an eclectic, clinical psychology than on case work in an agency setting. It more emphatically stresses the emotional content of the client's reaction patterns and responses in efforts to help him toward self-understanding and toward gaining insight. It insists that the client take responsibility for his own decisions; it accepts as immutable the client's right to his own goals, and the complete incompetence of and inadvisability for the counselor to offer advice or use authority in any way. For this reason, Rogers states “Therapy and authority cannot coexist in the same relationship”,¹¹ though he recognizes the complexity of the problem and discusses several compromises, none of which he himself finds completely satisfactory. He therefore recommends the separation of counseling functions from the authoritarian functions of correctional agencies. This raises and leaves unanswered the inescapable question as to how these two functions would be ultimately coordinated and integrated, and by whom. A legal agency could not of course escape its responsibilities and avoid this problem.

No extensive discussion will be attempted here of the basic criticisms of the agency-functional and non-directive approaches made by otherwise-oriented case workers.¹² However, it might be pointed out that these approaches are not suitable to all cases; they make no allowance for the phenomena of transference and counter-transference; they unnecessarily complicate and make more difficult the establishment of rapport between client and worker; they often make impossible the rendering of necessary adequate and timely supportive therapy to the client; from the pragmatic viewpoint they unnecessarily limit the agency's usefulness to the client and to the community; and while they no doubt possess unique strength and advantages of their own, nevertheless these approaches pragmatically fail to use techniques and methods successfully applied to similar cases by other systems of case work.

¹⁰ Carl R. Rogers, *Counseling and Psychotherapy*, Houghton-Mifflin Co., New York, 1942.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

¹² For further analysis and critical evaluation of Roger's approaches, see *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* Vol. XVI, No. 4 (October, 1946), especially the comments from the Freudian viewpoint in the article, ‘Counseling and Psychotherapy’, by Lawson G. Lowrey, pg. 615-623.

In other therapeutic correctional agencies, psychoanalytically-oriented case work is the basic system applied. This immediately raises the question of differentiation of function between case worker and psychiatrist, as the agency-functional and non-directive schools point out. This problem has been handled differently by various agencies in terms of administrative organization and relationships. It is usual to emphasize teamwork and cooperation, with the case worker generally consulting with the psychiatrist, working under his direction, and applying his instructions and suggestions. In still other such agencies, case workers and psychiatrists treat their own cases individually, and are looked upon as fulfilling more or less essentially similar professional functions. There are also several agencies in which psychiatrists may work under case workers.¹³

Authority in Analytic Psychotherapy

The problem of the role of authority in analytically-oriented case work is handled again in contrasting ways by different protagonists of this system. More traditionally, the psychiatric approach, which views delinquency and criminality as basically a disorder of the personality, has tended to minimize the situational nature of behavior and factors in it; to ignore the socio-cultural standards and evaluations of conduct; to overlook the social definition of legal situations and of agency function; and to disregard community feelings and needs as an objective component of the offender's reality situation. It has therefore generally tended to be severely critical of what it calls the "authoritarian approach." Looking upon the use of authority as essentially destructive of the client's personality, and as precluding the successful establishment of a therapeutic relationship, it has generally indiscriminately rejected the use of authority, especially legal or coercive authority in social case work. Its records are replete with case histories where the element of authority is ignored, and no effort is made to use it even selectively. On the contrary, emphasis is often placed on permissiveness and on making explicit efforts to counteract the presumed destructive effects of the authoritarian setting of the situation. Carrying this approach to its expected conclusions, we find one authority on psychiatry saying:

There is absolutely nothing in common between psychopaths on the one hand, and homosexuals and sexual perverts on the other hand. Homosexuals and sexual perverts (paraphilias) are first of all human

¹³ On this problem, see pamphlet *The Case Worker in Psychotherapy*, published in 1946 by the Jewish Board of Guardians, 228 East 19th St., New York 3, N. Y.

beings and as such may be variedly organized, which means that they also may be psychopathic but I fail to see any direct connection between psychopathy, and homosexuality and sex perversion. The reason they are often put together is because, in common with the rest of descriptive psychiatry, homosexuality here is regarded as an antisocial behavior; hence, *by the same token*, as psychopathic. I don't think this argument will hold water. It is more than merely a question of a point of view. Antisocial behavior may be due to any number of conditions as already stated. The functionally and dynamically oriented psychiatrists do not regard homosexuality as a form of antisocial behavior, but as a highly specific type of neurosis. I think it is about time that we have grown big enough to realize that people are entitled to their own form of sex life and that we must not brand as psychopathic people different from us merely because they are different. Personal moral judgments should not enter into scientific discussions.¹⁴

In this quotation, Dr. Karpman, whose illuminating writings on criminal psychopathology are well known,¹⁵ very aptly takes psychiatrists in general to task for *post hoc* and circular reasoning when they take mere criminality as diagnostic of psychopathy, without any other supporting signs in the psychopathic syndrome, and psychopathic personality as prognostic of criminalistic conduct. Psychiatrists thus use criminality to diagnose psychopathy and use a diagnosis of psychopathy to *explain* criminality, even though there is no other evidence.

It is significant of the blind spots in the psychiatric approach, that while Dr. Karpman sees the fallacies of this approach when applied to a particular kind of crime, namely, homosexuality, he nevertheless makes a cognate error, when he personally decides that homosexuality, etc., should be declassified as a criminal offense. What this fails to recognize is that sociologically there are no *mala in se*, and that all offenses are *mala prohibita*, necessarily functioning in terms of socio-cultural values and group standards. Thus it is found that notwithstanding the subjective validity of Dr. Karpman's views about homosexuality on other grounds, the continued punishment and stigmatizing of sexual deviates by the group for some time to come is to be objectively anticipated in our culture. Thus the group (however dynamically and differentially organized) has and uses the authority to define criminal behavior, and any case work approach, especially when applied under the auspices of a socially organized and legally licensed agency, which rejects or ignores the pragmatic implications of this fact, risks serious consequences to its being and future, regardless of what its professional status and reputation may be.

¹⁴ Ben Karpman, "A Yardstick for Measuring Psychopathy", *Federal Probation*, Vol. X, No. 4 (October-December, 1946), p. 29. (Underlining (italics) added.)

¹⁵ *Case Studies in the Psychopathology of Crime*, Vols. I and II, Medical Science Press, Washington, D. C.—1933.

However, psychiatrists and analytic case workers seem to be reexamining their former views about the place and possible uses of authority in a therapeutic relationship, apparently reflecting the accentuating influence of war service and military experiences in this connection. There is thus evidence that psychiatrically-oriented social workers will increasingly accept the use of authority in correctional work; and accepting it, will learn through experience how to use and experiment with authoritarian techniques on a selective, differentiated, individualized basis, adapted in form and amount to the needs of the individual offender in the particular situation of the client and agency.¹⁶

Various values for emotional reeducation and psychotherapy have been assigned to this positive and controlled use of authority in the treatment process. Bromberg and Rodgers¹⁷ emphasize the role of personalized authority in providing emotional security to the offender, satisfying his conscious and unconscious dependency needs and in providing a firm, authoritative but humane father-figure to the offender. The following quotation from their article, however, shows how sharply different is this psychiatric approach both from the usual impersonal non-authoritarian analytic approach, and from the specifically authoritarian, but impersonal approach of the agency-functional school:

As in every psychotherapeutic situation, contact with the therapist reinvoles feelings which were present in the home situation of the delinquent. The therapist who is completely passive allows the delinquent to project an image on him which is incorrectly interpreted as that of a confused or hostile parent. When, however, the therapist by his firmness and understanding supplies a parent-figure in whom reality elements of authority and love are experienced, considerable relief is afforded . . . The figure of a directing authority relieves the insecurity and allows a glimpse of a parent who may serve as an ego-ideal. Super-ego formation will not proceed until the ego of the delinquent is comfortably settled in an emotional atmosphere in which solidity of authority is actual as well as implied.

Although authority provides emotional security, reactions of a negative nature do occur . . . In a surprisingly short time, however, the

¹⁶ Significant studies accepting and defining the use of formal authority by psychiatrists and case workers are to be found in:

(1) Walter Bromberg and Terry C. Rodgers, "Authority In the Treatment of Delinquents", *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. XVI, No. 4, Oct. 1946, p. 672-685, and further references there cited.

(2) Robert P. Kemble, "Objectives of Military Psychiatry", *The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, Oct. 1943, p. 626-630.

(3) Bertram M. Beck, *Short-Term Therapy In An Authoritative Setting*, published by the Family Service Association of America, 122 East 22nd St., New York 10, N. Y., 1946.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 683, ff.

delinquent accepts the therapist as a real parent-figure. His acceptance depends for its fullness on the depth of the dependency needs in the individual delinquent. As the therapist demonstrates himself to be a living figure, expressing pleasure or displeasure with the delinquents' behavior, he becomes the standard by which the delinquent tests reality. Therefore, in his role of parent-figure, the therapist must have a conscious appreciation of his participation in authority. Before accepting the therapist as a parent-figure, the delinquent frequently tests the therapist's potency as an authoritarian by misbehavior and disciplinary infractions. When, as a result of this reality testing, the delinquent is convinced that the father-figure combines humaneness with firmness, the positive transference is enhanced . . . The authority visited upon the delinquent must include explanations of its meaning in relation to society. It cannot be overemphasized that such authority must be personal. The impersonal administration of authority, no matter how just, is viewed only as unwarranted persecution by the prisoner.

Other psychotherapeutic values assigned to the directed use of authority include the satisfaction of the offender's psychological need for punishment, based on conscious or unconscious guilt feelings; satisfying unconscious masochistic needs; precipitating controlled aggression against the therapist, and thus displacing uncontrolled aggression against others, etc.

Training Implications

This brief survey lights up the often sharp differences in the theory and practice of forensic case work not only as between opposing approaches, but even as between different developments of the same approach. The results are expectedly confusing and disorganizing. It is therefore perhaps accurate to say that in practice while some case workers in the field are pragmatically dogmatic about their approach, manifesting blind spots so far as other systems are concerned, most are eclectic and disorganized or unorganized, not being sure of what they are trying to do or why. However, to the limited extent that the eclectic integration of and application on an individual case work basis of useful contributions from all systems may be said to constitute an organized approach, the field may become more adequately systematized in coming years.

At any rate, administrators, training supervisors, and personnel officers, because of these differences and inadequacies in social work systems, etc. have long been dissatisfied with the training that students in various schools of social work have been receiving for forensic social case work. Many leaders in the field have often felt that while correctional case work is part of generic social case work, nevertheless the presence of *legal* authority as its *raison d'être*, has so sharply set it off from other

fields of social work, that the ordinary school of social work cannot be expected to train students properly for correctional work, even if they do add a course or two on juvenile delinquency or criminology to their curricula. As a result, to meet this dissatisfaction on the part of correctional administrators, universities are beginning to set up special training institutions or curricula for professional work in correction.¹⁸ This trend raises serious questions about the future relationships between generic social work and correctional case work, as well as about the areas and degree of competition, or cooperation, or overlapping between the traditional schools of social work and these newer more specialized professional training centers.

Case Work Objectives Applied

It is thus clear that social case work in the correctional field is regarded as highly specialized, but that pragmatically most case workers are eclectic, applying whatever principle or technique seems appropriate and beneficial to an individual case, no matter what the source of such principle or technique, or the underlying consistency of the individual principles and techniques applied. Keeping this in mind, it becomes possible from a heuristic viewpoint, to outline the most widely accepted (pragmatically and eclectically), but differentially applied, case work objectives in correctional work.¹⁹

It might be well to define first the social case work approach to the crime field from the above viewpoint, so that the specific case work objectives enumerated can be related to this definition. This social case work approach may be described as the application of agency authority, resources, and personnel, in a differentiated, individualized and controlled process of helping an offender to achieve better organized and more stable behavior patterns and environmental adjustments, and to achieve more adequate emotional satisfactions in his group relationships, in

¹⁸ See *Federal Probation*, Vol. X, Nov. 4 (Oct.-Dec., 1946), p. 61, announcing the establishment of such a curriculum at Wisconsin University, both on an undergraduate and graduate level.

Also, *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. LXIII, No. 1 (July, 1947), p. 64, announces the establishment of a similar specialized curriculum for the crime field at the University of Notre Dame, on a graduate level, leading to the master's degree in sociology.

¹⁹ For examples of eclectic approaches, see Everett Wilson, *op. cit.*; also Victor H. Evjen (Ass't. Chief of Probation, U. S. Courts) in a "Discussion" of Cantor's article, *ibid.*, p. 298-307. In his discussion, Mr. Evjen emphasizes that " * * * a general therapeutic rather than a limited social service relationship, is the area in which the probation officer must function." (p. 307.)

Mr. Evjen also rather strongly emphasizes that the primary purpose of probation is treatment, social service and rehabilitation, and not community protection or law enforcement.

terms of a more socially-acceptable mode of existence. The contributions to this definition of the various approaches discussed above are apparent. The very fact that it is eclectic and integrative, may make it over-inclusive. But basic to this definition is its foundation in cause and effect analysis of human behavior, the recognition of human behavior as a psychological *and* socio-cultural phenomenon, and the analysis of treatment as necessarily involving, in one way or another, social retraining and emotional reeducation and redirection. Practically all systems of social work theory agree that people do not change unless they feel a need to change—a subjective, but sociogenic and socially-oriented need.

In terms of this viewpoint, case work processes in a correctional agency, from an eclectic, inclusive viewpoint, strive for the following objectives, so far as heuristic science can observe:

1. Establishment of rapport, which can be evaluated by the extent to which there is established a working, professional relationship with the offender and his family, so that they will want and feel free to express themselves on their problems, and to seek and accept aid from the worker. It is to be noted that this implicitly recognizes that the successful treatment of the offender involves treatment of his family relationships as well, so that helping the offender often necessarily also involves helping others in his family group, with due regard to the competence of the agency, its resources, its relationships with primary family case work agencies, etc.
2. Personality diagnosis, within the competence of the particular case worker, and his supervisor, of the specific psychodynamics of the delinquent or criminal behavior pattern of the offender—that is, analysis of what emotional goals, conscious and unconscious, direct and indirect or symbolic, and explicit and implicit, is the offender consciously or unconsciously trying to achieve by his misbehavior.
3. As a corollary, case work processes strive for self-analysis by the worker of the emotional use he makes of the professional relationship, to guard against abusing his professional and official position to gain unprofessional, personal satisfactions out of the situation and to help him better control the relationship in terms of its professional nature and agency responsibility. Such self-analysis by the worker is designed to prevent overidentification with the client, as well as to prevent subordinating the client's emotional needs to the worker's emotional needs.
4. The same processes stimulate the offender and help him to gain insight into the factors and motivations in his behavior (through interpretation, education, persuasion, self-analysis by the offender, and where available, through controlled group process, etc.). It is anticipated that such self-knowledge will lead to better self-control on the part of the offender, and increase his ability to assume better personal responsibility for his behavior.
5. Partly through catharsis and interpretation, case work processes help the offender release his feelings and to re-evaluate the destruc-

- tive, disorganizing, demoralizing, and aggression-producing phases of his experiences and relationships with other agencies of the law and representatives of social authority, such as police, courts, prisons, business men, lawyers, clergymen, social agencies, etc.
6. Case work aims at identification and evaluation of the criminogenic forces and associations, and deviation pressures in the individual's situation, and the taking of appropriate available steps to minimize and control them.
 7. They help the individual to obtain a better knowledge of the resources and potentialities of his environment for self-improvement and self-expression, with special emphasis on the occupational and recreational areas, thereby recognizing their special significance for personality integration. They provide enlarged ability to make use of these resources.
 8. They help the individual to understand and accept community attitudes, values and laws as an objective and impersonal part of the reality situation to which he must adjust, and assist him to interpret them.
 9. They assist in interpreting agency function, rules, regulations, and policies and procedures and in understanding the reasons behind them so that the individual is helped to abide by them and to accept them as an objective, impersonal part of his reality situation.
 10. They aim at the discriminating use of authoritarian disciplinary measures and warnings, as an impersonal, supporting and emotionally stabilizing influence in terms of the dependency, guilt feelings and other emotional needs of the offender.
 11. The differentiated use of authoritarian controls (reporting requirements, probation and parole privileges, special rules and regulations, etc.) as a means of facilitating the client's identification with the worker and the agency, so far as the interests of the community are interpreted as permitting this. It is felt that by giving the offender a sense of obligation to worker and agency, the offender is provided with additional motives for acceptable behavior.
 12. They set an example of personal honesty, fairness, dignity and stability in the worker's relationships with the individual, in the recognition that such an example is bound to be helpful, whatever the psychodynamic mechanisms involved may be.
 13. They offer the offender continual, deep-seated, and meaningful acceptance, support, encouragement and reassurance, not only in terms of supportative therapy but also in terms of helping him regain his self-respect and his ability to relate himself to others. His confidence in himself and in his ability to make good is thus correspondingly increased.
 14. They bring out and stimulate the forces within the individual that make for constructive change and growth in terms of personal and social maturation.
 15. They help the individual to redefine and reintegrate his situations, values and attitudes and his concept of himself, in a new configuration and in a new orientation, so that he finally succeeds in achieving satisfying self-expression in socially acceptable ways. This last objective includes the process of interrelating all the loose ends and factors in the treatment relationship, but is significantly based on

the recognition that personality and human behavior are *gestalts*, and that no change in any one element or component is lasting until its implications, complications, and ramifications, for the whole are perceived, assimilated and acted upon by the individual. This of course is generally an end product rather than something distinct and separate.

The above by no means exhausts the activities and objectives involved in correctional work; as for example, a good deal, if not the larger part of probation and parole work, depending on specific agency policies and emphasis, consists of straight law-enforcement work (searching, surveillance, cross-examination, transferring prisoners, making arrests, etc.). But these activities could hardly be called case work, and it is therefore clear that not all probation and parole work is case-work. However, if interpreted broadly, such activities, though not part of social case work, might still be classified as social welfare work, if done with sufficient objectivity and with due regard to the social values and the social problems involved.

An analysis of the case-work objectives specified, shows they include environmental-manipulative techniques; educational and informational therapy; attitudinal, permissive, and deep therapy, or emotional re-education; and generic as well as specifically authoritarian case work techniques and processes. Thus it is clear that in practice, whatever the theories and standards of social work systems, forensic social case work is likely to run the range of generic case work fields (family case work and psychiatric social work). It is also likely to have to formulate and apply distinctively unique techniques and processes, derived from the operation of *legal* authority as the specifically differentiating factor in the case work program of a correctional agency.