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ABSTRACT

This thesis reviews the administrative process involved in initiating and developing a casework service in Gordon Neighbourhood House. The service operated over a period of eight months, and during that time accepted only members of the agency as clientele. Through intensive cooperative work with Gordon Neighbourhood House staff it was intended that caseworkers should employ their skills to improve the social adjustment of group members and thereby enhance the general health and welfare of membership groups.

The administrative structure of Gordon House, and the problems involved in integrating this new service into the agency, are described. In evaluation, the achievements and possibilities of this service are weighed against the investments of administration and staff required in an effort to introduce and to maintain this service.

The estimated effort involved in relation to the possibilities for achievement, is the criterion used to judge the value of casework services in this setting. A rating is made of the degree of success achieved in forty-eight cases referred for service. Case summaries reveal the process involved in the operation of this service.

The finding is, that, providing the agency takes appropriate administrative steps, casework services are a practicable method of coping with individual problems that cannot be handled satisfactorily within groups. It is important that the workers and the administration be sufficiently flexible to meet each other's requirements. Specifically, the administration must define the purpose and function of this service in such a way that responsibilities of the casework staff be made clear. The casework staff in turn must be prepared to apply their skills in the less formal setting of the neighbourhood house.

...
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CASEWORK SERVICE IN A NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSE:

The Administrative Aspects of Its Establishment and Operation.

A Study Made in Gordon House, Vancouver.
CHAPTER I

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF GORDON HOUSE, AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE NEW CASEWORK SERVICE

In Gordon House, as in the majority of neighbourhood and settlement houses, certain functions are considered to be administrative. These functions are usually to some extent defined by constitution. With the inception of a new program or the introduction of a new type of service, the questions of what constitute administrative tasks and what distinguishes these administrative tasks from the work of the practitioner becomes increasingly important. The introduction of casework services into Gordon House made necessary careful consideration of the responsibilities and roles of both the administrator and the practitioner. It was recognized by those concerned, namely, the Executive Director, the supervisors and the workers, that the role of each must be clearly outlined if the services were to function adequately. What then are administrative tasks, and what distinguishes these tasks from the work of the practitioner?

Administration in Gordon House

Administration is the process by which the practitioner's services are made possible. Those matters which are legislative, those which pertain to agency overall planning, and those which are otherwise concerned with the provision of execut-
ive leadership, are essentially administrative. None of these relate directly to the giving of services, but rather to the construction and maintenance of a structure which make it possible to carry out these services. Administrative tasks are, therefore, those involved in making it possible to give a service, while the tasks of the practitioner are those of actually performing the service.

In social agencies it is the responsibility of the administrator to be sensitive to community needs, even though they may not have become articulate. His job is to plan and to maintain a coherent organizational structure with these needs in view. Because community needs are so varied, the services given by neighbourhood houses also tend to vary widely. The maintenance of unity of purpose in so diversified a setting is a complex undertaking. When a new service is implanted, this task becomes even more complex. Because the organization in most social agencies is so interdependent, each new feature affects the function of the whole and the related departments must adjust accordingly. It is the intention of the present study to explore the administrative process involved in setting up and operating a casework service in Gordon House. First, however, it is important to consider what was visualized by the administration as the contribution casework services could make to the agency and to the community.

Casework has been defined in many ways. One comprehensive definition which is now being widely quoted is that of Swithrun Bowers.
"Social casework is an art in which knowledge of the science of human relations and skill in relationship are used to mobilize capacities in the individual and resources in the community appropriate for better adjustment between the client and all or any part of his total environment". 1

Common to most definitions is an acceptance that casework is a skill developed through formal training and experience. Through the media of words and action it endeavours to help the individual to a more healthy social adjustment. Obviously this type of service might be given in wrong settings; and progressive agencies are considering the possibilities of providing such a service elsewhere than in the traditional welfare and assistance areas. In Gordon House, it had been recognized that many individuals were unable to make adequate use of the established programmes. Casework services were seen by the administration as a means to enable people to use the agency facilities, or to help them to make contact with other community resources better equipped to meet their needs. When it was decided that casework could provide this kind of service, the next step was to see this service in relation to the administrative structure which already existed.

Neighbourhood houses, of course, have their own specific administrative goals. Their statements of purpose are in most instances constructed in a very flexible way in order to provide for the wide range of services they offer. This is recognized in the 1949 joint Annual Report of Alexander Community.

Activities, where it is stated that:

"Neighbourhood houses are concerned with serving the people in the communities in which they operate. They seek to meet the social needs of these people and in so doing contribute to their development and to that of the community."

The administrative organization of Gordon House is characteristically complex. The agency is one of four organizations which are members of a parent body, Alexandra Community Activities. Gordon House derives its financial support from both the parent organization and the Community Chest. The Alexandra Community Activities provides for all capital expenditures required by Gordon House. In addition, the Alexandra Community Activities membership annually elects a board of sixty directors. This board is broken down into committees which assume responsibility for the member organizations. The Gordon House Committee, to which is assigned the responsibility for Gordon House, fulfills a role similar to that of the ordinary policy-making board. It is a group of not less than twelve members, who "have control over the affairs, operations and management of Gordon House and have power to engage, suspend and discharge all employees, including the Executive Director." At the same time, any matters requiring

---

1 Annual Report, Alexander Community Activities, 1949. Vancouver, B. C.

2 This committee is composed of business and professional people elected by an "ad hoc" group selected from the membership. Unfortunately, this committee undergoes continual change due to the transference of interest of its members who leave the neighbourhood.

3 Gordon House Committee, Statement of Purpose and Function 1948 (unprinted material).
Fig. 1. The Administrative Structure of Gordon House.
legal sanction must be referred to the Alexandra Community Activities Board. This is more of a formality than a control. In the actual management of Gordon House affairs, the Gordon House Committee enjoys almost complete autonomy. It is important to be cognizant of this fact, for it was at this level that the proposal to provide casework services was introduced by the director. There is one fact, in particular, which should be mentioned in regard to this body since it could have a crucial effect on the future of the casework service. While Gordon House, in reality, does negotiate its own budget, Alexandra Community Activities Board retains final authority in "any matter affecting policy or capital funds and expenditures". Therefore, unless there is an opportunity to interpret new services to the ACA Board, their values may never be recognized. Although it would not likely occur, a decision on the part of the A.C.A. Board could vitally affect the future of casework services in Gordon House. Yet, there is virtually no contact between this final governing group and the practitioners.

The Gordon House Committee is aided in its operation by sub-committees drawn from the community. Three of these are advisory committees: one to Senior House, one to Junior House, and one to the Nursery School. The chairman of each of these committees also sits on the Gordon House Committee to ensure that the advisory body has representation at the policy making level.

1Gordon House Committee, Statement of Purpose and Function 1948 (unprinted material).

2Alexandra Community Activities organization is commonly referred to as ACA.
These committees concern themselves primarily with policy, new programmes and the setting up of new departments. There are additional committees which have specific tasks such as: public relations, house furnishings, personnel, buildings and finance. There is also one council from Junior House and another from Senior House composed of representatives appointed from the groups using these Houses. These councils have been of the utmost value in keeping the Director and staff, as well as the Gordon House Committee, in contact with the opinions and suggestions of the membership. They have acted as a sounding board to estimate the reaction of those groups. They also played a part in helping the service to get under way through providing facilities and making possible the sharing of facilities at hand.

The full-time staff at Gordon House is comprised of nine workers, three of whom are teachers in the Nursery School. Three of the others are partially trained social workers while the remaining three are fully trained social workers. There are usually four part-time workers, and, at the time of this study, one of these was fully trained. The Director and two of the full-time, trained workers assume responsibility for the supervisory duties. In addition, there are the clerical and service personnel, students, and several volunteers. The responsibility of this group in regard to new services is multifold. It is through them that, for the project described here, interpretation was made to potential clientele, the services introduced, and the referrals actually carried out.

1 Fully trained worker refers to the social worker having completed two post-graduate years of study at a recognized school of social work.
Gordon House is divided into Junior and Senior houses on the basis of chronological age of its members. Junior House members must move on to Senior House when they reach the age of eighteen years. This separation of membership is recognized as artificial and the present administration is seeking a more unified, centralized structure. This influenced greatly the course of development of casework services within the agency. Casework services were inaugurated within the agency because the director was of the opinion that many from the membership could benefit through the presence of a casework help. It was difficult to find resources within the community to which these members could be referred for the kind of assistance which, through its cooperation, would enable them to use group experience more adequately.

The membership of Gordon House is composed of a wide variation of clientele. The location of its building is close to the downtown business section of the city. The buildings in this particular part of the city are, for the most part, boarding-houses or poor grade apartments. These are surrounded by a congested district of low-rental housing. It is from this kind of area that Gordon House recruits its membership. Although some of the people take up residence in this locale because of its proximity to the city's business section, the people living in this vicinity are here, in the main, because housing is less expensive. Gordon House Annual Report describes its membership as consisting largely of pensioners, working mothers, single men and women living away from their families, and low-income
family groups whose children, in particular, make use of the agencies' facilities. Comprehensive leisure-time programmes are provided for these people, as well as the services of a well-baby clinic, a play school and kindergarten. Activities cater to a wide range of age groups. Arts and crafts, discussion groups, dances, bridge classes, dancing instruction, music appreciation, sports activities, sewing classes and friendship groups are a selection of the many activities offered to the community. The only eligibility requirements are those of residence within the area which Gordon House serves, together with a nominal membership fee. There are many in the membership who find great satisfaction in the experiences the agency could provide, but there were others who were unable to find their niche or to use the established services adequately. It was the latter group that the administration hoped to assist through providing a casework service.

The original decision to introduce casework services into Gordon House was made by the director of the agency in conjunction with certain members of the School of Social Work at the University of British Columbia. It was agreed that these services would be of an experimental nature and that the respon-

---

1 For membership in Senior House a fee of $1.50 is charged, and for membership in Junior House there is a fee of 50 cents, providing the member is less than twelve years of age. Members between twelve years and eighteen years of age pay a fee of $1.00. Some of this group use the facilities of both houses. This token fee was initiated to encourage a feeling of "belonging" among members, rather than to enlarge substantially the funds of the agency.
sibility of their execution would be undertaken by two students in the Master of Social Work course, working under the supervision of a member of the University Faculty. The casework service, therefore, assumed the form of a "staff" service working in conjunction with the "line" organization already operating. The caseworkers were made directly responsible to the casework supervisor. This person, in turn, administered her responsibility in accordance with the policy of the Agency, in order that the services should be centralized under the control of the one Executive Director.

Against this background, some of the initial administrative problems in initiating this new service, which were recognized early in the planning, may be summarized at this point. It was seen as essential, in the integration of casework into the organizational structure, that the following be observed.

1) The new casework service must be consistent with agency purpose as stated in the by-laws of the organization.
2) The necessary physical resources must be available in order to accommodate the new service.
3) The administrator must take into consideration the staff capacity to integrate and to use this service as a part of the overall programmes.
4) The administrator must be prepared for the task of keeping the many parts in harmony to insure and maintain coherent development of the agency's combined services.
5) The administration must also be certain that the new service was in gear with the needs of the community and the agency's clientele.

1 "Line organization" and "staff service" are terms commonly used in administrative parlance, the former referring to those under the direct line of authority, the latter to those serving in a consultant capacity. This is discussed in detail in Chapter IV.
It was with the last of these five points that the administration of Gordon House actually started. The question was asked, "What needs are not being met through present services?" In order to answer this question, some further discussion and description of the community and the membership is necessary.
CHAPTER II

INITIAL PROBLEMS

In observing problems which arise in the establishment and execution of casework in a neighbourhood house setting, it is important for the administration to have a picture of the community and people with which it is concerned. Considerable time had been spent by the administration in studying the community and the information that had been accumulated was passed on to the new staff. Gordon House is one of the two neighbourhood houses in Vancouver, and it seems to be in a strategic area to offer casework services. It is located in the "West End" of Vancouver, an area which contains more people per acre than any other part of the city, and residency is often of a very transient nature. Over a period of years, the West End has been transformed from Vancouver's best residential area for family homes to one of rooming houses and apartment blocks. In general, wealthy people have been replaced by a group whose income is much lower, although, in the last decade, some new, expensive apartments have been built. Landowners have been hesitant to make improvements because the population is primarily transient and because commercial business is extending far into the limits of this area. Light industry has already encroached on the fringes
of the district, and there has been a steady increase in the settlement of people of foreign extractions, bringing about a mingling of varying cultures and varying interests. Gordon House is situated close to the downtown business section of the city, where the residential buildings are particularly of the boarding-house or apartment type dwelling. Thus many of the houses adjacent to Gordon House are of multiple occupancy. Furthermore, these are surrounded by a congested district of low-rental housing.

The Norrie Report has compared the area that Gordon House serves with the eighteen other social areas of Vancouver and pointed out that, at the time of the survey, the former area contained the highest percentage of juvenile delinquency and had the largest number of broken homes. It is also stated in the Survey that in this particular area there was an eighty per cent turnover in the school enrollment. This suggests the transient quality of the people who live therein; and it is this kind of a community from which the casework service might well draw its clientele.

Unfortunately, there was little material available which could help the administration to define where casework services

---

1 West End Survey, Group Work Division, Vancouver Council of Social Agencies, May, 1941.

were most needed. From the experience of the Agency and from records obtainable therein, it was evident that the Agency must serve a wide selection of clientele. It was apparent also that any framework the administration determined to set up must be sufficiently flexible to permit service wherever individual need was recognized and whenever it was possible to bring client and service together.

A measurement of two hundred and fifty members of Gordon House under the age of eighteen years was made during the process of setting up the casework service. This was done with the intention of providing statistical verification of facts that were already surmised. The findings of this sample revealed that the greatest number of these children under eighteen years of age were of Scottish and English descent. Of this group, twenty-one per cent came from homes where at least one parent, usually the father, was absent. Fifty-five per cent were living in rooming-houses, twenty-one per cent in apartments, while only thirteen per cent came from single family homes. Of the others, a few lived in duplexes, some in cabins, shacks and boathouses, and some behind stores. It was also noted, that, in this group, the older the age, the greater the number of broken homes. This sample of only one segment of the membership was employed by the administration to gain a perspective on the magnitude of the task upon which the new service was embarking.

1 The problem of referrals is discussed in Chapter III.
2 Appendix A.
Before the casework staff could begin to select or meet the potential clientele there were two problems, in particular; that had to be considered. These may be conveniently discussed under two broad classifications: (1) problems of an interpretative nature, i.e., explanations of what these services would mean to the board, to the groupworkers and to the community; and, (2) problems involving working arrangements and the special facilities required by the workers.

The provision of suitable working arrangements for the casework staff was among the first administrative questions to arise in the establishment of this new service. At the beginning, provision was made for office space by having the caseworkers share the office of the groupwork supervisor in Junior House. This was found to be quite unsatisfactory however, because the proximity of group activity made it difficult for private interviews to be conducted without disturbance. At the same time, there was a tendency, particularly on the part of the children, to identify the caseworker with the members of the groupwork staff. In the process of building caseloads the workers found that, on occasion, children would endeavour to manipulate the caseworker into assuming the role of that of a groupworker. This was attempted when the children invited their friends to come to interviews with them, or when the children insisted that the caseworkers meet them with their groups. While this seemed to be due, partly, to the inability of the child to feel secure enough in facing the more intimate type of relationship, it also seemed to be an endeavour to fit the new worker into a
groupwork setting to which the children were accustomed. In conference between the casework supervisor and executive director, it was decided that the children might be assisted in making the transition from one type of setting to the other, should the caseworkers be located in another building. Another advantage of new allocation was that Senior House had the facilities for handling confidential material, while Junior House had none. A separate filing and recording system was necessary to look after case material, and Senior House was the only part of the Institution which could make this provision. However, this building offered no separate office space that could be used by the caseworkers. A plan was later developed whereby arrangements for the use of the office space could be made in advance. This was nevertheless a disadvantage because, in spite of careful planning, appointments would sometimes conflict.

The most obvious area of need for individual service was recognized as being the work with the behaviour problems of children. The casework supervisor was of the opinion that, since the Agency was one whose central focus lay in the provision of leisure-time activities, a playroom for play-interviewing would provide a setting that was not too familiar to the children and should thus produce results of a more satisfactory nature. This plan was approved by the Director who in turn presented it to the Gordon House Committee where it also met with approval. A special room was set aside for this purpose, and the Committee voted funds for providing the required
Office hours for the caseworkers were determined by the programme hours of the Agency. The administration suggested the hours from 1:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., since these hours coincided with most of the agency activities. Because of the success of the play-interviewing, there was extensive use of the room laid aside for this purpose. Two hours each afternoon were selected as appropriate time for these interviews and this time was chosen to avoid conflicting with the school curriculum.

Before casework services could begin their function in Gordon House, it was necessary to gain the permission of the Community Chest and Council for the use of the Social Service Index. Prior to this, only three members of the staff had been granted use of the Social Service Index, as they were the only professional workers on the staff. On condition that a complete report be made of the plan that was being undertaken, the Community Chest and Council granted the temporary use of the Index. Through the facilities of the Council other agencies were informed that the service had been established. In order to avoid duplication of services, careful plans were made to ensure that clearance of clients of mutual concern to Gordon House casework staff and to other casework agencies would be a preliminary step with each case. When both continued to be active, the respons-

---

1. This equipment included toys of many kinds, dolls, clay, finger paints, games and pictures, all of which were chosen for their use in play-interviewing.
sibilities of each were decided by determining the nature of the problem and, in order to help the client with this problem, by determining the way in which the agencies could work together.

(a) Interpreting to the Board

Before introducing the casework services into Gordon House, the Director had brought the matter to the attention of the Gordon House Board. However, prior to this it is noteworthy that the Board had always encouraged cooperation with outside casework agencies. The opinion was that this experiment might be the logical step in bridging the gap in services rendered by both types of agencies. Because, then, the Board had always respected previous contacts with outside agencies, it was anticipated that it would respond favourably to any proposal which would enhance both services and, therefore, contribute, to the welfare of the clientele. The suggestion was introduced to the Board which gave approval and thereby sanctioned the new "counselling service". This name was thereby adopted after careful consideration of the matter by the Director and the potential casework staff. It was the opinion that such terminology would better fit the agency setting and thus facilitate interpretation of the services to the community.

This counselling service was outlined to the Board as being a service offered to three principal groups within the Agency. Firstly, those adults and children referred to the Agency

1 "Counselling Service" rapidly became synonymous with the term "Casework Service" in the vocabulary of both staff and clientele.
by an outside source. Secondly, those adults and children who come to the Agency seeking leisure-time services but who, because of personal problems, have difficulty in doing so. Thirdly, those members of the Agency and those people in the area, which the Agency serves, who present particular problems for which they seek help and for which they must be referred to other resources in the community.

The Board suggested that this service be adopted on an experimental basis. At this time, the Director explained that an evaluation would be made at the end of a six month period. Discussion of the long term aspect of integrating such services into present agency policy was introduced by the Director at later meetings. The object of this experiment, as an endeavour to fill the gap existing in present services, was interpreted to the Committee. Its immediacy was accentuated by the fact that the value of the services must be proven in order to elicit, at a later time, the financial support of the Community Chest and to lead subsequently to the establishment of a full-time staff caseworker. Because of the long-term consideration of eventually instituting this service on a permanent basis, the necessity of coming to an early decision in this matter was stressed by the Director. In such a case, the budget for additional expenditures would have to be submitted to the Community Chest well in advance, of its annual campaign. For this reason, the Director suggested that the Committee give the matter immediate consideration.
There was the additional task of aiding the Board to see the relative position which this new service would occupy in the current programme. The director deferred consideration of specific illustrations of individuals needing casework assistance, until, a concrete picture of what the services had contributed to its clientele was made available through the work of the caseworkers. The first reports that were given to the Board were designed to provide a quantitative measure of how many clients from each of the three groups had utilized this service.

(b) Interpreting to the Sub-Committees

Resistance to this plan came primarily from representatives of the Nursery School Committee. The services of these members are well established in the Agency and they have access to psychological consultation which has been used constructively in the past. Their position was, that a strengthening of this kind of assistance would be more beneficial to the Agency than the introduction of services as yet untried. The Director and casework staff strived toward the goal of showing that it is not so much a question of which service will be employed but rather the question

---

1 The Gordon House Board had been included in the initial thinking about casework services. This was done not only because of the fact that it represents good general administrative policy but because precedent had shown the value of such sharing in the Bronx House Project.

"The involvement of the members of the board of directors in the original thinking about this project and the reports submitted to them during the continuation of this programme, had made a group of laymen intelligently aware of a new field of cooperative social work, namely casework - group work". Ruth Slutzker, Yonata Feldman, Anne W. Langman, Greenum Berger, Bronx House, New York, Group Work, Case Work Cooperation. N. Y. 1946.
of seeking a means to utilize both services to the advantage of clientele.

The Director encouraged a careful approach in working with the Nursery School staff because the difference in background and educational preparation of this group was more marked than that between caseworker and groupworker. Also, Gordon House administration had done a good deal of work toward establishing close cooperation between the Nursery School and the Child Guidance Clinic. The director of Gordon House was of the opinion, that since the Nursery School was already receiving casework help from this other source, it would be confusing to introduce suddenly other casework services. Before any suggestion was made to the Nursery School regarding possible referrals to the caseworkers, several meetings and personal contacts were arranged between teachers, certain parents active in this part of the organization, and the casework staff, in order to encourage a harmonious working relationship. One can only speculate on the causes behind the resistance experienced here, but it was assumed that the teachers particularly were threatened by the possible usurpation of their responsibilities. After some initial frustration, appeals were made by the caseworkers to the Director and supervisors to effect a better understanding of the caseworkers' intended role in the agency.

(c) Interpreting to the Staff

Probably the most difficult task faced by the Director was that of interpreting the role of the caseworkers to the Neighbourhood House staff. It soon became evident, particularly when
the workers wanted to seek each other's help in relation to cer-
tain individuals, that neither caseworker nor groupworker under-
stood clearly the work being done by the other. This lack of
understanding gave rise to concern on both sides in matters of
cooperative planning.

Some explanation of the dichotomy that exists between
groupwork and casework is given by Dorothy Spellman in the follow-
ing excerpt from a speech she delivered at a Groupwork-Casework
Institute in Vancouver in 1947:

"The size of the job (social work) as it developed,
necessitated specialization and categories of service,
and while this made the work more effective we workers
began to lose sight of the fact that we were but part
of the whole idea. We began to be so concerned with
our area of responsibility or branch of the profess-
on and the cataloguing of services that there was dan-
ger of each worker or group of workers in a particular
field thinking that they or theirs was the important
and indispensable, and communication began to fade out."  

If an administration is to be effective, coordination
of specialized effort is essential. In Gordon House setting
these problems were to some extent clarified through a meeting
of staff. Consultation was arranged with members of the Uni-
versity staff, who attended certain of the Agency staff meetings,
to aid in finding means of bringing the two services to a point
where they could function cooperatively. Through these meetings
the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Spellman, Dorothy, Groupwork-Casework Institute, Vancouver,
1947, (unprinted material).
Firstly, in the matter of intake, it was decided that either groupworker or caseworker was, by virtue of his training, able to decide whether a client could use the agency resources advantageously.

Secondly, it was determined that either groupworker or caseworker could decide at intake whether the client was in need of casework services to prepare him for a group experience.

Thirdly, it was concluded that the most satisfactory means of determining how the client's needs could best be met was through a joint conference of casework and groupwork supervisors. At such conferences each case was discussed individually. As the casework service began to function, conferences did not confine themselves specifically to intake, but were concerned additionally with all cases where individuals were receiving casework services. These meetings were held bi-monthly at a scheduled hour. In addition to the original purpose, they also served to evaluate the progress of each individual and to offer suggestions in carrying out the work done with these individuals.

Fourthly, it was concluded that there should be joint conferences of workers at which individuals of mutual concern could be discussed. One member from the supervisory conference group was to attend these meetings, so as to provide direction and to offer suggestions resulting from the discussions of this group.
These four conclusions provided a formal structure through which responsibilities could be defined; and, in this way, the difficulty of determining the role of the caseworker and the groupworker with regard to specific clients was eventually overcome. In the short period that preceded this meeting, the main problem had been to determine the responsibilities of caseworker and groupworker, particularly in matters of referral. More energy had been expended in sorting out responsibilities than in actually working with the clientele. These meetings served the additional purpose of integrating the casework services into the current programme and of encouraging more cooperative effort by means of bringing casework and groupwork staff together. This also solved the problem of confidentiality, for, instead of merely turning over files from one worker to another, the caseworker could bring to conferences the information necessary for the groupworker to help the individual within the group setting. In return, the groupworker would provide the data which was pertinent to the caseworker working in an individual setting.

(d) Interpreting to the Community

The casework supervisor had originally proposed that the community might best be informed of the casework service by means of a letter, in the form of a circular, addressed to present and previous members of Gordon House. Because it was thought that a more controlled selection of clientele would provide better material for the experiment, this plan was abandoned. The procedure which
was followed instead, is similar to that which has been described by Gertrude Wilson:

"It is suggested that any group of caseworkers and groupworkers wishing to start an experimental project begin by studying the needs of the clients and members within their own agency loads; then, choosing one or two individuals or groups with which they hope to work, that they work out together a plan of procedure of which each keeps careful records; and at regular intervals hold conferences when records are analyzed and reactions exchanged." ¹

The administration was of the opinion that a similar method of introduction would be more suitable than a circular.

The experimental nature of this project at Gordon House, and the fact that it is pioneering new relationships, has made imperative the need of an "imaginative approach". The justification for this service depends upon the contribution it can make to the well-being of the community generally. This service has been introduced with the intention of knitting together community services that Gordon House has previously given to the West End.

The importance of this "imaginative approach" has been stressed by Pierce Atwater, who says:

"The practitioner with an imaginative approach to problems of administration always keeps in the forefront the community organization aspects of the job. He recognizes that his position as the director of a programme provides a base from which improvements in the pattern of community services can be accelerated." ²


² Atwater, Pierce, Problems of Administration in Social Work, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, January, 1940, P. VII
The success of any organization depends upon community needs, the ability of its executives to clearly define these needs, and the thoroughness with which the executives plan the internal machinery of the agency to meet these needs. Succeeding chapters describe the problems of operation once the agency machinery had been set in motion.
CHAPTER III

THE SERVICE IN OPERATION

To this point, discussion has been confined primarily to planning for the counselling service. The problems encountered in the internal organization may be termed "problems of perpendicular co-ordination" since they concern the function and relationship of various levels within the administrative organization. The more critical administrative difficulties were manifest however as "problems of horizontal co-ordination", and, which occurred on the level of actual practice primarily between caseworkers and groupworkers.

At first, it was necessary to determine how casework services would supplement the programme which already existed, and to decide what type of cases would make up the clientele to whom services would be offered. It was known that certain individuals who were members of the Agency were unable to take full

---

1 James D. Mooney describes perpendicular co-ordination as that which operates through leadership and the delegation of authority. He contrasts this with horizontal co-ordination, which operates not through authority and the function of command but through the universal service of knowledge.

advantage of the programmes offered within the groupwork structure, presumably because their personal problems made participation very difficult. Many of these individuals were asking directly or indirectly for the kind of assistance the counselling service could offer. The groupwork staff were, at the outset, able to compile a list consisting of thirty names to which the statement would apply. These persons, with the exception of some of them, who, the Social Service Index had indicated, were already receiving casework services, were to become the prospective case-loads of the casework staff. The next question was that of the mechanics involved in bringing the client and the caseworker together. It was necessary to provide, within the administrative structure, some organization through which this could be accomplished. David Franklin has done a previous study describing the complexity of inter-agency referrals. This work was carefully consulted to anticipate some of the factors which would need to be considered. In this instance however, both inter-agency and intra-agency referrals were contemplated and many new questions arose. The Director suggested that an early,

1 The Director of Gordon House had requested that the groupwork staff prepare and submit a list of individuals whom they believed needed and would accept casework assistance. This group were screened in early meetings of staff to determine which could utilize these services. The screening was done also with the intent to select those who would be best prospects from the point of view of demonstrating the counselling service.

mutual understanding of referrals be reached, and made arrange­ments for the staff to meet in order that this might be accomp­lished.

What is a Referral?

In referring cases from one service to another or from one agency to the other, one assumes that the agency having the original contact with the individual has been able to outline the problem presented and has made a brief summary of the circum­stances which previously existed. This having been done, after careful consideration and, possibly, after all agency resources have been used, it may be concluded that the individual would best benefit from assistance available at some other agency. Following this decision the referral is then carefully planned and, providing the agency receiving the case is willing to ac­cept the individual and his problem, preparation is made to en­sure that the least possible time elapses and the most natural transfer is expedited.

A referral, then, in actuality, is a transfer, or pass­ing on from one to another. However, when applied to the field of social work it involves a far more intricate procedure, for one must consider how this individual would most likely be bene­fitted and this should determine such a transfer. There is a tendency for some agencies to be unable to foresee the advantages of referring certain cases for other specialized services even though, at the same time, they themselves could be equipped to
carry certain cases from other agencies. Only by a mutual system of referral between agencies will the individual seeking assistance be able to benefit to the greatest degree.

In neighbourhood houses the need for individual attention is frequently recognized by the staff, and, in such instances, the use of casework services within the agency would be sought. As an intra-agency referral, this would be made, most probably, by the groupworker who has had the initial contact with the individual concerned. The procedure in this instance would be, perhaps, less formal than that between outside agencies. However, at the same time, it is recommended that, in order to register the problem in a permanent manner for agency records, a written referral be made. The value of thus preserving the material for future reference cannot be too greatly stressed. It is of importance that neighbourhood houses keep detailed records of any service they have rendered as do the outside casework agencies. If there is to be a successful referring of cases between the neighbourhood house and all other social agencies, it is evident that the records must be kept in such an order as to be of value to others interested.

At this point, it should be mentioned, that, following the referral of a case within the neighbourhood house, there must be close association between the worker who originally referred the case and the worker who accepts the case on an active basis. Regular conference periods should be set aside for concentrated discussion, at which time mutual contributions could be made by
both caseworkers and groupworkers. Unlike the referring of cases to outside agencies, this intra-agency referring of cases from the one service to another can demand a far closer contact between both workers. Not only is this to the advantage of the individual in receipt of assistance, but at the same time, it allows for the interplay of services by which the one can complement the other.

**Roles of Caseworker and Groupworker**

There is no doubt that, within a neighbourhood house offering a multiplicity of services, the structure of the agency, among other factors, necessitates that the associations of each service with the clients will vary quite markedly. The director, in conjunction with the staff, decided that it would be of value to outline the circumstances under which the groupworker and caseworker particularly must demonstrate his specialization. This was actually an extension of the subject-matter discussed at earlier meetings in preparation for the casework service. The decisions that were made at that time in relation to intake were not being applied effectively because the roles of groupworker and caseworker were not clearly defined. It was possible to isolate five areas of distinctly different function. The director employed this knowledge to focus more sharply on the situations where casework could be employed.

---

1 See Chapter II, p. 20 and 21.
The first area is rather an obvious one. The group-worker, in the main, focuses his attention upon the interaction of his entire group. He is interested, primarily, in the contributions made by each individual to the group as well as in the contributions made by the group to the individual. In comparison, the caseworker focuses his attention upon the needs of one individual and his interest is that of meeting these needs so as to contribute to the development and better adjustment of that person. If the caseworker speaks of the individual as a part of a group, it is usually incidental. He speaks of that person's ability to adjust to the social milieu without emphasizing his place in a specific group or the reaction between that individual and other members of the group as it relates to group development generally.

The second statement that can be made is that the group-worker is usually unable to devote his complete attention to any one individual for any appreciable length of time. To do so would injure his relationship with the group as a whole, and thus impair his role as a group leader. The caseworker can devote his entire attention to one person, should the necessity for this be indicated. The association is therefore a more direct, more intimate one between two people. Except for the residue which is carried into these contacts from the experience and associations of both caseworker and client, these meetings are relatively free from the more diffuse relationships involved where there are a group of people participating in discussion, play or work.

Because there is usually a more intimate, personalized
relationship between caseworker and client, the relationship often develops more slowly. Usually too, it is assumed that the contact has been made by the client because he is seeking help for a particular problem. The groupworker does not necessarily start with this assumption. He may instead see the client as a person seeking leisure-time activities, companionship or recreation.

In the group setting, in order to preserve the welfare of the group, and, at the same time, to limit behaviour which might not be acceptable to the group, the client is, at times, restrained from expressing himself freely. Limitations may also be imposed in the casework setting, but the worker in such instances is not hampered by the fact that he must consider the reaction that a statement or action will have on others for whom he may have equal responsibility. This is particularly in evidence with the hostile client. The groupworker may perceive the motivations behind the anger but may find it extremely difficult to cope with when it comes out in a group setting. The caseworker, with similar understanding of the individual's motivations, can handle such hostility without endangering the well-being of other members of the group.

Finally, when problems arise for the individual, the group may become a threat to him. The groupworker may fully accept the individual and his problem, but, at the same time, he cannot control the reactions of various group members toward this individual. In casework, however, a more controlled atmosphere
can generally be maintained. There is, again, not the same necessity to divide attention, and interest, and an opportunity to focus more directly on the client's problem.

Knowledge of the differences as well as the similarities between groupwork and casework was extremely important to administrative organization and structure. Since Gordon House is primarily a groupwork agency, it was necessary to recognize these differences in order that roles of caseworker and groupworker could be more perspicuously defined. With this accomplished, it was thought that sounder organizational lines could be established, duplication of work avoided, and conflict and anxiety within the staff minimized. For example, it was clear that the groupwork supervisor would not be in a position to supervise casework activities. Such a supervisor could, however, serve as a consultant. The organizational structure could not then be defined simply as director, supervisors and workers; it was necessary to use descriptive titles to differentiate. So it became director, supervisors of groupwork or casework, groupworkers, caseworkers and teachers. Once a more clear definition of role had emerged it was possible to delegate responsibilities without the confusion that previously existed. The administration, having clarified its organizational lines, was ready for action.

1 The groupwork supervisors were often requested by the casework staff to interpret the relationship of the individual in the group and to estimate their potentialities for leadership, creative capacities and status, etc.
CHAPTER IV

THE ADMINISTRATION IN ACTION

One viewpoint regards administrative operation as a five-fold process. The steps are described as follows: (1) planning, (2) organizing, (3) coordinating, (4) commanding, and (5) controlling. Some aspects of planning, organizing, and coordinating, have already been discussed. The subjects of this chapter are the functions of command and control as these were attained in Gordon House, with particular reference to case studies drawn from the counselling service records.

Once an organization is formed, it must be made to work. This is the function of a "command". Once goals are set and responsibilities delegated, the executive's task is one of seeing that the job is accomplished in accordance with the adopted plan of action, in such a way that there is a minimum expenditure of man-power and materials and a maximum result. This is termed "control". When a new service begins, the administrative organization must be adjusted accordingly, and command and control need to be examined in relation to that service.

The problems discussed in the preceding chapter dealt with the maintenance of coordination and harmony within the administrative organization of Gordon House. This was partially accomplished through setting up mechanical devices to define staff responsibility more clearly, and is exemplified through the discussion of the revised referral system. What the Gordon House administration sought to do was to establish an integrated type of relationship between different services and particularly between casework and groupwork. In discussing relationships which can exist between casework and groupwork, Matthew Elson distinguishes three specific types: (1) The supplementary type of relationship, which had been used rather extensively in the past, and involved "a neighbourhood visitor", who visited homes to help the settlement house become familiar with the home situation of its members. (2) The referral type of relationship, where within the referring agency, neither groupworker nor caseworker participates after referral has been made to another agency. (3) The integrated type of relationship, where casework and groupwork function together in jointly supervised projects. Since an integrated relationship presumed a jointly supervised project with caseworkers and groupworkers working together, it meant major changes in the lines of authority through which command and control were maintained. The situation which existed with the introduction of counselling services is illustrated in Fig. 2 (a). The goal of

---

integrated service is represented in Fig. 2 (b).

Command and Control in the Counselling Service.

Before the counselling service was introduced into Gordon House, the administration was already actively engaged in making major organizational changes. Under the previous executive, Senior House and Junior House had developed into separate units functioning almost independently of one another, and yet operating under one administrator. This was an artificial division which had resulted in part from the geographic separation of the two buildings. The division was of concern to the present director because it also split up membership and staff not on the basis of activities, or responsibilities, but merely because of the identification individuals developed with either Junior or Senior House. This had progressed to the point that when, for example, a group from Junior House wished to use the facilities of Senior House there was general misunderstanding and discomfort.

The director was gradually bringing about a transition from the dual kind of authority to a clearer, more functional kind of structure. The counselling service made the need for a more unified organizational structure come still more to the fore. When the question came up as to where the casework offices would be located, it was recognized that the members of Junior House would be intimidated by visits to the "adult" building. Similarly, the members of Senior House regarded the other building as exclusively for children's activities. There was some resistance
Figs. 2(a), (b), Administrative Requirements for Coordination.
on the part of staff as well, and staff members were uneasy when their responsibilities brought them to the "Other House".

In breaking down the dual administrative pattern which had existed, another semi-executive office had been formed, namely, the office of the Assistant Director. The role of this officer was largely that of supervision, but some administrative responsibilities had also been delegated to this office. When the supervisory committee was formed to discuss the joint responsibility of caseworkers and groupworkers, it was made up of the workers who would have direct contact with the client, and the supervisors of these workers. Since both director and assistant director were also assuming supervisory responsibilities, it meant that in the supervisory committee there was a disparity of authority. The executives, forced to assume two roles, could not function to full advantage as administrators to the casework staff or as members in a supervisory capacity to the supervisory committee. The casework supervisor and caseworkers found this dilemma equally difficult to handle. It was no easier for the latter group to see the administration in two roles than it was for the director and assistant director to make this change.

Another question which arose was that of a uniform understanding of the goal of casework services. It has already been stated broadly that the goal agreed upon was that of integrated service to clientele, where the combined services of Gordon House could function as a team to the advantage of the client. The casework service saw its goal, in many instances, as intensive
work with specific clients. Many of the theories developed through similar experiments were not in accordance with this goal. The administration was willing to give the casework staff an opportunity to experiment in this area, but at the same time questioned whether this was the most productive function of this part of staff. The alternatives, which were seen as possible functions of casework staff, were the interpretation of individual behaviour to the groupwork staff, and assistance to refer individuals in need of casework to appropriate agencies.

The result of the difference in goals envisioned, in conjunction with the transition administrative structure was undergoing, placed the counselling service in a peculiar position within the administrative organization. It became primarily a "staff" service in its relationship to the organization because the caseworkers' function was to deal with a particular phase of the work. Also, the casework service was intended to advise the "line" officers in areas in which the caseworkers were experienced. Again, the responsibility for co-ordinating work with clients was largely assumed by the caseworkers. These functions are generally considered to be those of staff organization. In other respects however, the counselling service was in direct line of authority. Responsibilities were delegated through the same channels as in the case of other agency workers. The caseworkers recognized the assistant director and groupwork supervisor as their immediate supervisors and work was delegated to the caseworkers through these officers.
Some Specific Cases

(a) The case of John D is illustrative of what occurred prior to the setting up of an adequate referral system. It also indicates the need for a formalized intake policy on which staff and volunteers are thoroughly briefed.

John D was referred by a public agency, where he was part of a "special case load". In addition to the fact that he was an assistance recipient, that agency was working with him to assist him with severe personality disorders. It was thought that it would be of value if he could participate in group programmes. When John D expressed an interest in the suggestion of group activities, a consultation was held between the public agency worker and a caseworker from Gordon House. Information was exchanged regarding the client and Gordon House as a resource to meet this client's needs. It was decided that a referral would be made. Unfortunately, through a misunderstanding John D went directly to a meeting of the group in which his membership had tentatively been planned. The volunteer leader was not prepared, by experience or training, to aid John D. Additionally, at the time of this referral, there was no clearly stated policy regarding what should be done in such matters of intake. As a result of this confusion John D. completely withdrew, refusing further contacts with the agency. The failure here which resulted in disappointment for the client, frustration for the volunteer, and poor public

1 "Special Case Load": this particular agency in addition to providing assistance offers more intensive work to a small selective group.
relations with the referring agency, could have been avoided.
Subsequent recommendations, resulting from this and other similar experiences, were: the use of trained workers at intake, the utilization of referral forms, and a sharing of information regarding adequacy of procedures.

(b) The case of Mrs. L. is indicative of the later functioning of the counselling service with the operating advantage of more complete organization. Mrs. L. was referred by the social service department of a city hospital. The worker making the referral was of the opinion, that, if the client could be helped to participate in group activities, it would greatly assist her health and her social adjustment. There were two contacts between the medical social worker and the Gordon House caseworker during which information was exchanged regarding the client and the neighbourhood house resources. The medical social worker used this information to prepare Mrs. L., who had continually expressed a desire for social outlets, for her first visit to Gordon House. The referral form was completed by the Gordon House caseworker, and at the next meeting of the supervisory committee her case was discussed.

Mrs. L. was a middle-aged woman, pleasant in appearance, sensitive and intelligent. Coincident with the death of her only child, five years before this contact, she had suffered a fainting spell. Subsequent spells, accompanied by convulsive activities

1 Appendix B

2 Appendix B
and incontinence occurred, and the seizures were diagnosed as epileptic. Medication had improved the situation considerably, and attacks were less frequent and less severe. The medical social worker had interpreted the nature of the illness to Mrs. L., and while Mrs. L. had gained some acceptance of her seizures, she was very self-conscious, and reticent to make social contacts, although she would state that she wished very much to do so. Mrs. L.'s illness had brought forth repressive tendencies and strong dependency needs. In fantasy she had described to the medical caseworker her desire to be at home again with her parents, with whom she had lived until her marriage. Mr. L. was completely intolerant of what he described as his wife's childish ways. The quarrels that ensued were often followed by a seizure.

Most of the information passed on to the Gordon House caseworker was brought to the supervisory committee. The caseworker described what in her opinion represented the needs of this client. The groupworker then discussed the interests of the group and what he thought might be the reaction of its members to Mrs. L.'s personality. The caseworker visited Mrs. L. in her home twice before Mrs. L. came to Gordon House. The medical social worker had decreased her contacts with the client at this point, but was still seeing Mrs. L. once a month when the latter made trips to the hospital. This type of support through the period of referral was thought to be desirable for Mrs. L. After a period of two months, the medical social worker in conference with the Gordon House caseworker, decided with the
client that hospital contact could be terminated. Mrs. L. meanwhile, had become a member of one of the Gordon House groups. Her performance and reactions in the group were observed by the groupworker and brought to supervisory committee meeting. Mrs. L.'s progress was observed from two perspectives, casework and groupwork, and a combined effort was made to help her to find satisfactions in the group and at home.

The plan followed in this particular case was one where casework services provided the client with guidance, support and some insight. Groupwork, on the other hand, offered a controlled setting through which Mrs. L. could utilize and consolidate the gains which she had made in the more intimate contacts with the caseworker.

This case indicates cooperative planning carried out through a simple but effective administrative scheme. Fig. 3 illustrates the joint service in action.

(c) The case of Jimmy R., in addition to serving as a further description of groupwork-casework collaboration, typifies administrative activity in three phases: experimentation, documentation and interpretation.

Jimmy was a ten-year-old, attractive youngster, from a broken home. There was an older brother and a younger sister, also at home. The father had deserted shortly before the birth of the third child. Jimmy's mother, shortly after the desertion, had taken in a boarder who had become, in all except in name, the
Fig. 3. Co-operative Services.
head of the household. The family were closely knit and very loyal. There was, however, a good deal of bickering and some more serious arguing between the boarder and Mrs. R. which led occasionally to evident verbal and physical abuse. Jimmy was known by the groupwork staff to be in severe conflict over his home situation. His anger, which he dared not express at home where punishment was apt to be severe, periodically broke through in his play with other children. Normally he was a sullen little boy who suffered occasional attacks of asthma. The groupworker, in proposing to make the referral, described Jimmy as the most unpredictable child he had known. He further stated that Jimmy's pattern of behaviour in the group was either that of complete refusal to participate, or of aggressive, hostile behaviour which endangered other members of the group.

The supervisory committee, reviewing the information presented by the groupworker, decided that the best plan for Jimmy would probably involve the use of play interviewing. To use this form of interview meant that the agency was declaring that its personnel would do treatment work with certain children. This was an experiment that in particular required interpretation to other social agencies. Records were kept in process form in order that they could be used at any time in disguised form for presentation as a means of interpretation to the board and to other agencies.

1 Process recording is the most detailed type of record kept by caseworkers of contacts between worker and client.
As the case discussed illustrates, the administration of Gordon House succeeded in planning for casework services in the agency, integrating these services into the existing organizational structure, and centralizing operations to the point where joint planning and joint action could be carried out. It is by no means unimportant, that records containing information regarding accomplishments of the dual service, and permitting evaluation of the service, be kept to furnish material for interpretation.
ALLIED EXPERIMENTS WITH CASEWORK IN GROUPWORK SETTINGS

It is common administrative practice to survey the potentialities of a service before staff, energy, time and money are invested. Budgets in social agencies are such that trial-and-error methods must be minimized. Expense is seldom incurred unless the administration of such an agency can be reasonably certain that the investment can be justified. A survey of community, membership, potential clientele and resources, is essential to prognosticate new trends. The information obtained aids materially in the setting up of the new service and in determining where emphasis should be placed for best results. It is important also to be informed of what other social organizations in the same community are doing in order to prevent overlapping of services and possible conflict between agencies. Equally essential is the exploitation of any knowledge or experience of a similar nature which might be obtained. The acquisition of reported information from similar projects was of great value in setting up a counselling service in Gordon House.

The recognition of a need for individual services in neighbourhood houses is not entirely new, but its importance has been accentuated by the growth in this specialization of the profession, and has been further enhanced by the increase in
the number of professionally trained groupworkers. The development of casework consultation in neighbourhood houses has followed no uniform pattern, but has instead varied with each local setting. In some respects, this fact, in itself, offers an indication of the need for this type of service. Although experimenting agencies often began with distinctly different philosophies and methods they have often arrived at startlingly similar conclusions. As has been shown, there are certain people who, before they can benefit from group experience, need individual help. There are still others who come to the neighbourhood house seeking to fulfil needs which can be met only through contact with other community resources. For these people, it may be a matter of interpreting a need of which the individual may have little or no awareness. It may be a highly personalized, specialized job.

Examination of various groupwork settings reveals that there are a significant number of individuals in each who seem to be unable to take advantage of groupwork programmes. The Settlement Houses in Minneapolis, Hudson House and Bronx House in New York, the Council Educational Alliance in Cleveland, the Jewish Centers Association in Boston and the Jewish Board of Guardians in New York, in an endeavour to provide more accessible casework resources to the communities they serve, have taken an active interest in introducing the casework type of programme into their administrations. Each administration has tried to adapt the programme to its own particular setting, and it is
doubtful whether the spread of this service has been as much a result of "transporting the idea" as it has been a result of spontaneous development in response to community needs.

The Twin City Federation of Settlements Counselling Service

The growth of the "individual service plan" in the settlement environment is perhaps the historic forerunner and closest equivalent to what we now refer to as casework in a group-work agency. In 1934 the "Twin City Federation of Settlements" in Minneapolis and St. Paul introduced a department into their administration which they called the "Personal Service Department". Their publication describes the work as follows:

"The Personal Service Department, in working out solutions of problems, is not only called upon to act as liaison between the Settlement House and other social agencies in behalf of clients and their interests, but it also frequently acts in the same capacity as between its clients, with their different phases of family life, and other departments of the House. The work of the department is, in short, inter-agency as well as intra-agency. The department is called upon to deal with both major and minor types of adjustments. In making these adjustments, the Department is of great help in coordinating and supplementing the work in all other departments of the settlement. The department is the main link between the House, the family, the inner intimate neighbourhood life-problems and the available social work services of the community."  

The close parallel that exists between this description and the description of the Gordon House experiment in preceding chapters, is at once evident. Closer observation reveals that there are many differences, but these are principally in the type of pro-

---

1 Self Analysis Survey of Minneapolis Settlement Houses, Twin City Federation of Settlements, 1934, page 15.
blems met because of the differences in setting, economic circumstances and in training of practitioners.

From an administrative standpoint, certain differences stand out. The Federation was less formalized in administrative structure, and less precise in its understanding of agency function. Their staff was, for the most part, not trained in social work schools. They would not have claimed that their first service to clientele followed what might be described as "groupwork methods". Their work was in fact closer to the other social work specialization of community organization. The Federation describes its purpose in the following terms:

"Taking it by and large, it can be said that the ten Settlements of Minneapolis are strategically located for non-sectarian, non-partisan, civic, and moral service to the City." 2

These agencies did not see their "personal service" as a specialization to be handled by specialists, but rather as a new fact of an established programme to be conducted by the existing staff. One can assume that while this might avoid some of the initial problems of "old staff" sharing responsibility with "new staff", it would also mean certain losses. It is an administrative truism that what is everyone's job is no one's. This apparently

---

1 The Federation was concerned with the development and adjustment of individuals within the settlement. Its staff did not, however, have the benefit of the scientific and formalized training of today's generically-trained groupworker. Their approach was to seek within the community resources which might be mobilized to help the individual to a more healthy, and satisfying way of life.

tended to be the case in the Federation set-up. Its workers dealt with the problems they observed and the staff member who perceived these difficulties often treated them. Furthermore, the difference in definition of clientele and contact is marked. The Federation states:

"The Settlement closes a case only through the death of the client or his removal from the neighbourhood ---as long as he is a neighbour, he is potentially 'an open case'." 1

This description, of course, also reflects the change in methodology and philosophy which has occurred in social agencies since 1934. The personal service described here was a logical forerunner of the specialized counselling service which Gordon House developed. It points out a recognition of the need for individual counselling where people are living, working and finding their recreation in groups. What is missing is the awareness that a specific kind of preparation in education and experience is required to make this kind of service of value to clientele.

The Hudson Guild Child Counselling Service

The Hudson Guild Child Counselling Service, on the other hand, is the product of a completely different type of setting. Although, basically, its work is somewhat similar to that done in the Gordon House experiment, it, too, has been conditioned by the local environment. The effects of this are reflected in the type of programme that has developed. The reason for the conception of this service is described as follows:

1 Self-Analysis Survey, op. cit. p. 18.
"The Counselling Service was established as a part of the Hudson Guild program in 1948, in response to the specific expressed needs of the community, and because of the strategic position of Hudson Guild as an agency which has been active in community organization and in helping the neighbourhood make most constructive use of the resources which it and other agencies provided. 1

There are two factors in this statement that have been given consideration earlier in this study in connection with Gordon House. The first is the matter of "strategic position". Because its groupwork programmes were utilized to a considerable extent by young veterans with problems, and because it was located in a community of social and ethnic changes, the Hudson Guild found its locale peculiarly suited to this type of work. Similarly, Gordon House is located in an area that gives a casework type of service strategic value. As already described, the West End of Vancouver is a community that is badly in need of social services as well as being one where individuals who need casework services are frequently overlooked. To some extent, this gap can be filled by providing a screening process within the Neighbourhood House. The second point worthy of note is that of community response. In 1945, Hudson Guild initiated a joint Hudson Guild Community Service Society project with the intention of bringing family casework services into a community centre where there was a regular attendance of a large number of families. At this time, a psychiatric social worker was as-

1 Hudson Guild Child Counselling Service, 1949 (unprinted material).
2 See Chapter II, p. 11.
signed by the Community Service Society to act as consultant on casework problems, visiting once a week, through a trial period of one year. Shortly afterwards, the Mayor's Committee on the Wartime Care of Children, working in conjunction with the New York City Committee on Mental Hygiene, set up a mental hygiene programme in certain day-care centres. Hudson Guild was active in this development and the result has been that one of the chief goals of the counselling service in this setting has become that of integrating recreational and educational programmes in accordance with mental hygiene principles. The administrative goals of the two agencies are markedly different. The Gordon House experiment has had none of the advantages of a previously established casework programme. On the other hand, this has meant that the objectives of the service in Gordon House have been determined solely on the basis of social work philosophy, and that outside influence from other community projects has not had a marked effect on the direction in which this service has developed.

Where the Minneapolis Federation seems to suffer from too diffuse an organizational set-up, the Hudson Guild experiment with counselling services, in contrast, appears to represent a kind of organization which is too narrow to fit the needs of Gordon House. The counselling service in Hudson Guild confined itself principally to individual situations which could be classified as within the scope of an already established mental hygiene programme. Its goals are more similar to those of a child guidance clinic. The Hudson Guild had made the following state-
"Coordinated handling of an individual by the consultant, nursery teacher, psychiatrist, and psychologist, presented an educational demonstration to the Hudson Guild Group Work Staff as well as to the community."

It could be seen from the onset of the Gordon House experiment that individual interests, specifically those of the casework staff, could result in the development of a programme apart from the organization which fostered it. In view of this fact the executive of Gordon House attempted to develop the casework service as a part of the unified service to clients.

**The Bronx House Casework Service**

Perhaps the most thorough plan for incorporating casework services into the administration of a groupwork setting has been carried out in Bronx House, New York. The origin of this programme has been somewhat similar to that of the Minneapolis Settlements. There are, however, very important differences. The objective of this agency is that of offering groupwork service to the community, and, by strengthening the professional groupwork representation within the staff, it has endeavoured to keep these services of high calibre. As a result, there has come a growing awareness that, in many instances, group activity can become a very real part of the individual treatment plan. This is, in reality, an expression of the commencement of cooperative treatment. Miss Miriam Cohen in her writings on casework and groupwork cooperation states:

---

1 Hudson Guild Child Counselling Service, 1949, (unprinted material)
"It was with such cooperative service in mind that the joint consultation of the Jewish Board of Guardians and Jewish Welfare Board was set up."

Joint consultation has meant a blending of the skills of both caseworker and groupworker.

In Bronx House, the function of the caseworker is that of diagnosing and determining the need for intensive individual treatment. Where need occurs, a referral is made to an outside agency. In other instances this function includes the responsibility of interpreting to the groupworker what the caseworker regards as the special needs of the individual and thereby assisting the groupworker in resolving the individual's problems through the group. What is important is the realization that the caseworker in this setting is not the only one in possession of professional skills. Caseworker and groupworker, each with his own skills, function together in a cooperative endeavour to help the individual to a more satisfying social adjustment. Gordon House similarly endeavoured to develop its programme on a cooperative basis.

The Bronx House project has received wide acclaim and has succeeded in pointing out the validity of the need for a caseworker within the agency as a consultant. As a result of the documentation of their experience, the executive body of Gordon House were reasonably certain that casework services within the agency would help the staff to a greater awareness of the indi-

individual personality and its needs. The intent in Bronx House however, was to work only to the point where the person could recognize his need for individual help and express his desire for such assistance. The caseworker then prepared the client for a referral to a cooperating agency. Gordon House was prepared to go one step further and to try experimentally to do some individual therapy within the neighbourhood house setting.

Gertrude Wilson views the question of casework counselling in a different light. It has been her conviction that, while casework is at present valid in the groupwork setting, this is only true because groupworkers have, in the past, been lacking in professional preparation. The inception of casework into the groupwork agency Miss Wilson regards as a temporary measure until groupworkers can become truly generic social workers. It is not, however, in the basic social work equipment that groupwork and casework differ, although it is true that both are specializations and require the cultivation of slightly different skills. The principal distinctions appear rather to be those of setting and relationship. Even if the groupworker possessed casework skills, his position with regard to the group would be impaired if he concentrated his attention upon an individual member. This was discussed in some detail in staff meetings in Gordon House and it was decided that, while either caseworker or groupworker, by virtue of his generic background in social work, could do equally competent work at intake, or in 'spotting'
problems, the groupworker could not provide treatment on an individual basis without damaging his relationship with the group. In her commentary on Miss Wilson's 'Symposium', Yonata Feldman has summed up these facts in the following passage:

"It seems to me that the value of counselling service does not lie in the superior theoretical knowledge or practical skill of the counsellor, though this might be a fact in many instances. Case work and group work are two different approaches to the individual that cannot, for psychological reasons, be vested in one worker at the same time. Just as much as the group leader can benefit from the case worker's investigation and understanding of the total behaviour and personality of the individual and then, with this understanding adjust his role to him and the group, so will, perhaps, the caseworker in the future modify his approach to the individual in casework treatment when he will obtain from the skilled groupworker a more profound understanding of the dynamics of group behaviour."

While few are today in accord with Miss Wilson's view, one fact does stand out which was important to the Gordon House project. Part of Miss Wilson's belief that groupworkers could do the job, given more adequate preparation, was probably based on her strong sense of the value of formed relationships between client and worker. It could be argued that, if the ultimate goal of the caseworker in a groupwork agency is to make a referral to another casework agency, this could surely be handled by the group leader who may already have some knowledge of the client and some positive relationship with him. Gordon House, therefore, saw a different goal for casework. Work was done on the hypothesis that

casework can function co-operatively with groupwork and even under the same roof.

The preceding passages outline some current situations in which groupworkers and caseworkers combine their skills within a single administration. In New York, where the most advanced work has been done, this type of practice is no longer regarded as experimental in nature. Many of the advantages which have been discussed in the foregoing chapters with reference to Gordon House would, no doubt, be equally applicable to other settings from which Gordon House has taken its lead. What is most important is that each of these diverse settings has produced the need for a similar type of counselling service. There are, of course, particular differences, depending upon the needs of the community in each local setting. In this connection, perhaps the outstanding contribution casework can make in Gordon House is one of filling a gap in community services that has been overlooked.

...
CHAPTER VI

AN EVALUATION

The measure of success in this administrative venture must depend finally upon what casework services were able to accomplish in Gordon House; and plans for the future of this service could only be made through evaluation of what had been accomplished.

The counselling service functioned over a relatively short experimental period: in total, the operation continued for eight months. During this period 48 cases were referred successfully to the Gordon House staff. Of these, 12 received direct casework service within the agency, 15 were referred to other agencies, 11 received slight services, and 10 contacts were terminated with indeterminable results. Of the 12 cases, in 8 instances there was evidence of marked improvement in the individual's behaviour in the group. In 2 instances, there was moderate improvement registered in the behaviour of the individuals in their respective groups. In the remaining 2 cases, no appreciable change was recognized. Of the 15 cases referred to other agencies from the counselling service, 11 were known to have been completed successfully. Three made contact with the other agency but did not maintain their contacts. The remain-
ing one withdrew from Gordon House without completing contact with the new agency.

The following table may be an aid in consolidating these figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Moderately Successful</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casework</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total of 27 cases represented approximately 56 per cent of the persons referred to the casework service and were the groups where intensive work, or a series of contacts with intent to refer, were involved. In 70 per cent of these 27 cases, the result was considered very successful, 19 per cent moderately successful, and in 11 per cent unsuccessful.

The remaining 21 cases, from the original 48 cases successfully referred, involved slight service to clients, and contacts which were terminated with indeterminable results. The slight services involved single contacts and in some instances were actually referrals to other community resources. In these situations, however, the referral was made without follow-up. The cases where contact was terminated without determined results, probably included the majority of failures in the experiment. Many of these occurred when the service was just beginning to function. The case of John D., discussed previously in Chapter IV, is illustrative of such a failure. In some in-
stances, the caseworker was unable to define his role to the client, or, perhaps, too little preparation had been done by the groupworker when the referral was made. The result might then be that the client withdrew with no service being given.

Although the number of failures and withdrawals from the service were quite large, a fairly large figure was anticipated. It was thought that this was in part due to the fact that the service was new. Also, in the majority of social agencies, withdrawals and incomplete services are fairly frequent. The transient quality of membership in Gordon House has previously been stressed and this also, was thought to be a factor of significance in regard to withdrawals. On the basis of statistics, the opinion was that casework services within the agency were warranted and valuable.

The Quality of Services: Strength and Weakness

The goal of the Gordon House administration was to offer to its membership a counselling service of high calibre which would improve the health and social adjustment of individual members. It was believed that if this could be accomplished the health of groups would also improve.

Evaluation of recorded material by the administration of the agency led to the conclusion that the services, in quality, were on a par with casework services given elsewhere in the community. Supervision of both caseworkers and groupworkers was known to be of the best quality. A sample case was presented by
the Gordon House staff to students of the school of Social Work in the University of British Columbia. The objective opinion of this group revealed that they were in accord with the experiment, and that they thought services given were of good standard. It was also the expressed opinion of this group that services reached clientele who would otherwise have never made contact with casework agencies.

The referral system between groupwork and casework agencies had previously never proven to be adequate. Casework services in Gordon House provided a bridge between the specialized agencies. Outside casework agencies referred more readily to Gordon House because there was not the same awkwardness in knowing what information the groupwork agency would need. The referral was made easily in the manner they were accustomed to making referrals to other casework agencies. The Gordon House caseworker had an opportunity to interpret the groupwork programme of his agency in the process of referral, and the referring caseworker was able to understand the kind of help groupwork could provide. When it was the groupworker who initiated a referral that resulted in transfer to an outside agency, this was accomplished more easily with greater understanding and facility due to the aid of the counselling service. Greater respect and appreciation for the work of the other was manifest in contacts between casework and groupwork as a result of the intermediary service. After initial resistance, mutual respect for the skills of the other grew stronger within the agency. The supervisory
committee group through continued consultation greatly enhanced this development. An increasing awareness of individual problems developed in the groupwork staff. Similarly, the Gordon House Caseworkers were more appreciative of what could be accomplished through groups. The two perspectives operating together in joint diagnosis, joint planning, and joint treatment, offered a far more comprehensive service to clientele.

Some of the weaknesses which were manifest in the development of this new service were present in the administrative structure prior to the introduction of casework in the agency. Indeed, the administrative organization has been under the scrutiny of the director and the board, in order to provide a more efficient kind of working structure. The division between Senior and Junior House membership has been discussed, as well as the difficulties this created for the new service. In coping with this problem, the director has had to compromise between what would be a more efficient structure, and what is acceptable to the membership. The result has been confusion in the lines of authority, and the effect of this confusion on the casework service has also been described. The result was that the position of casework in the administrative structure was never clearly defined.

Like most neighbourhood houses, Gordon House suffers from a shortage of trained personnel. More trained practitioners would have been of great advantage, since their generic pre-
paration would have brought them closer, in their understanding, to the work of the caseworkers.

Although, in general, interpretation was done thoroughly, it was occasionally done too late. There was never actually a working relationship developed between the casework services and the nursery school. The nursery school staff were encouraged to make referrals as were the groupworkers. The teachers however, being less well acquainted with social work services, were unable to move ahead at the same pace as the groupworkers. The nursery school, as a result, did not lend full cooperation. In its relationship with other social agencies Gordon House also failed to interpret the new service to full advantage. Those who learned of the existence of the service often voiced questions of whether it was not duplicating services already being given in the community.

Another weakness which influenced the development of the service adversely can be described as the "human element". Resistance to change, vested interests and security with the status quo, were all factors that continued to be present through the service's period of operation. The casework staff struggled particularly with the informality of the neighbourhood house setting and reported that their ability to work was impaired.

The encouraging fact with regard to the weaknesses which evaluative analysis revealed, was that in almost every instance the weakness once discovered was easily remedied.
Recommendations

The casework services were thought to be of definite advantage to the membership and to warrant continuation. It was thought that eventually a caseworker should be added to the staff on a paid basis, possibly at first, as a part-time employee.

1. **Need for Clearer Administrative Organization.** It is the opinion of the writer that the administration of Gordon House should continue the scrutiny of its administrative structure in order that clear lines of authority can be drawn. A more integrated programme will then be available to the community.

2. **Need for Continued Integration.** Closer contact between board and staff also would appear to be of value, and possibly periodic presentation of practitioner's problems to the board would also bring board and staff closer together. The board would then be better equipped to interpret to the community and to other agencies.

If it is possible to continue with casework services, as early as possible a meeting of representatives from the various agencies that work in the West End should be arranged. Such a meeting could invite the thinking of these agencies in regard to the future of casework services in Gordon House and elicit their cooperation and interest. Socio-dramatic presentation of one or two situations in which caseworker and group-worker work as a team might make the situation more vivid for such a group.
3. Need for Carefully Defined Roles and Trained Workers. The roles of caseworker and groupworker should be continually examined so that the part each plays in cooperative diagnosis and cooperative treatment are understood. In this way each service will be of maximum assistance to the other, and of greatest advantage to the client. The supervisory committee can be the instrument of control for the administration in the operation of joint services. This group should define the responsibilities of both caseworkers and groupworkers in regard to specific cases. More work should be done by this committee specifically in the matter of intake and, it would seem advisable, that whenever possible a trained social worker should be on intake to make the initial contact with new members. If this could be arranged, early diagnosis might be possible, and in many instances an immediate referral to the counselling service. Either caseworker or groupworker are qualified to meet this task. If trained workers are not available, carefully selected and briefed volunteers should be used.

4. Need for More Adequate Facilities. It is desirable that more adequate facilities be provided for the casework staff. This would include an office in which they could interview, a separate filing cabinet for confidential records, and a playroom with necessary furnishings for play interviewing.

The experiment recorded here is merely the beginning for a kind of cooperation which could strengthen the ties between
rapidly diverging specializations of the same profession. With the same careful and conscientious administrative leadership, this kind of cooperative service can be the medium through which a better and healthier community can be built.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

A MEMBERSHIP SURVEY

A random sample of 250 membership cards were taken from the files of Junior House and examined to determine what could be learned statistically of the membership. These members were all under eighteen years of age. It was found that of the 250, there were 155 living in boarding houses, 10 lived in duplexes, 50 lived in apartments, and 29 lived in single family homes, the remaining 6 lived in boathouses, shacks, cabins or the back of stores. Of the 250, there were 45 who came from homes where there was only one parent present, usually the mother. In most instances the mother was employed. This figure was somewhat enlarged by the fact that some of the members were siblings.

The original sample of 250 cases was broken down into two groups; those under fifteen years of age, and those between fifteen and eighteen years of age. It was noticed that there were a preponderance of broken homes in the second group. Closer examination revealed that in the 52 cases representing the group between fifteen and eighteen years of age there were 35 from homes where only one parent was present. This meant that 70% of the children in this group came from broken homes. It was concluded that many of the younger children, who came from homes where both parents were present, were from families which would eventually break down.
APPENDIX B

REFERRAL FORM FOR
GORDON HOUSE COUNSELLING SERVICE

FILE #
Date Opened______

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>Living With</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of Birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Service Index Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program attended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referred by</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Referral:
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