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ABSTRACT

This study is concerned with non-voluntary referrals of school children with family problems to the Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver. Because the children's difficulties arose mainly from disorganized family situations, help was sought from the Family Welfare Bureau. The study deals only with referrals in which the clients did not participate. Not only did the clients not ask for help from the agency, but in many cases they were not even notified by the schools of the referral. The clients' first contact with the Family Welfare Bureau was, therefore, through a letter or a visit from the agency worker.

The study is based on case records of the families concerned, over a two-year period (June 1947-June 1949). Forty-six out of fifty-nine cases were utilized, the remainder having been erroneously marked "school referrals", or relating to clients who made their applications for service personally.

The cases studied were grouped into three categories in terms of the types of problems which had caused the school referrals: (1) behaviour of the child at school; (2) family discord brought to the attention of the school personnel; (3) apparent economic need. Twenty-five cases were analyzed in detail to find out what actually happened to the clients in the process of their contact with the Family Welfare Bureau. Examination showed that it would be unsatisfactory to use this classification for an analysis of outcome. The sample was, therefore, grouped into four new categories in accordance with the clients' response to the service offered by the agency: (1) direct rejection of help; (2) passive resistance; (3) use of environmental help; (4) use of help for changing family relationships.

There is evidence that a major number of unsuccessful school referrals (seventeen out of twenty-five cases) was caused both by an inadequate referral process and by confusion on the part of the agency worker in her initial contact with each client. The study bears out, particularly, the importance of the first contact between the family and the worker, showing that a worker who has certainty of purpose, warmth, understanding, and respect for the client's right to refuse the agency service, can often make that service acceptable to the client in spite of both an inadequate school referral and a strong initial resistance on the part of the family. On the other hand, there are indications that neither the Family Welfare Bureau nor any other social agency can meet all the needs of the child with school problems. Consequently, there is urgent need for the establishment of social work service within the framework of the schools.
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INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1. Services to School Children
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CHAPTER ONE
SERVICES TO SCHOOL CHILDREN

Education is concerned, not only with communicating certain knowledge and skills to children, but also, and primarily, with providing an experience in which the children have an opportunity to develop to the limits of their capacity. It is because of this changing focus in education that the schools are becoming increasingly concerned with children who, through maladjustment, are not able to use their school experience constructively. The acceptance by schools of their responsibility to understand such children and to help them, or to refer them for help, led to the growth of child guidance clinics, to the gradual development of school social work, and to the use of established child and family agencies in the community. Thus, the long recognized and universally accepted teaching profession, and the new, rapidly developing social work profession came in contact with each other, both striving to help children to become mature, happy, and well adjusted citizens.

Not only the broad goal but also the philosophic base is common to both education and social work. In working with people, both the educators and the social workers start from the premise that "individual uniqueness shall be conserved, and used for the common good". Even in the process of their professional learning, teachers and social workers draw on a common body of knowledge—psychology, psychiatry and sociology.

With these similarities between the two professions it was perhaps inevitable that the rapid expansion of social services as related to schools resulted in so much confusion and frustration among both the teachers and the social workers. In their desire to serve the community, both the social workers and the teachers have frequently attempted to be "all things to all men". Without realizing that their strength lies in the uniqueness of their methods of working with children, the social workers have at times assumed that the teachers should have sufficient understanding of human behaviour to be able to do case-work with their pupils; and the teachers have often felt that lack of time is the only reason for their inability to help the children in their classroom, in a manner similar to that of the social workers. Likewise, the social workers have sometimes attempted to advise teachers on matters pertaining to education. It must be remembered however, that while the teacher, in order to fulfill her purpose, has to acquire primarily a didactic skill, the social worker learns during her training to employ the case work method. Although this method is based on certain knowledge and skills which are common to other professions, "the way in which worker and client work together is related to the purpose of the agency and to the client's interest in and ability to use the services of the agency". Thus, the justification for the existence of the two separate professions - education and social work - is the fact that "they offer two distinct services with different specific purposes realized through different methods and skills".

In discharging their duties, both the teachers and the social workers must be aware of their distinctive areas of responsibility and
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their distinctive functions. Only through a clear understanding of their respective roles will it be possible for the educators and the social workers to form a strong and effective working relationship. The need for cooperation between the two professions cannot be over-emphasized. Social work and education implement and supplement each other. The child, to whose growth and development both professions are dedicated, must be offered all the help of which society is at present capable.

**Available Services for the School Child.**

Many services are used in the City of Vancouver to help the child to use his school experience constructively. Some of these services arose specifically for the purpose of helping the educators in their work with the child in the classroom. Others, which had been originally established to meet different community needs, were found helpful to the schools in the fulfillment of their objective.

In the first category belong services given by the School Board and by the Metropolitan Health Committee. The Vancouver School Board has an Attendance Branch and a Bureau of Measurements. The attendance officer handles cases of serious truancy which are referred to him by the principals. The psychologist in the Bureau of Measurements administers intelligence tests to school children at the request of the principal. In the Bureau of Measurements there is also a social worker who often works with families of mentally handicapped children.

The Mental Hygiene Division of the Metropolitan Health Committee provides, as a part of its function, a diagnostic service for emotionally maladjusted school children. The Division believes that the education of the teaching staff in mental health principles is one of its main objec-
The director of the Division is a psychiatrist. Although the referral of a particular child to the Mental Hygiene Division can be initiated by any of the school personnel, it is the school nurse who arranges the appointment, and prepares the social history. Following the child's examination by the psychiatrist, the school nurse calls a conference, in which the psychiatrist discusses his recommendations with the teacher, the principal, and the nurse. If the school nurse knows that a social agency is active on the case she invites a representative of that agency to the conference.

Apart from the specialized school services, the school personnel often calls upon social agencies in the community for help with problems which interfere with the child's adjustment to the school. One of the social agencies used by the schools for that purpose is the Family Welfare Bureau.

The Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver.

The Family Welfare Bureau, a non-sectarian family agency, is a member of the Community Chest and Council. Created by a group of private citizens to carry out the recommendations of the British Columbia Child Welfare Survey of 1927, the agency was opened February 15th, 1928. Its objects, as outlined in the constitution, are: "to do family welfare work in Greater Vancouver", and "to do such other welfare work as the Executive may from time to time deem advisable". At present, the agency helps people with family relationships, personal problems, economic and health difficulties, school and job adjustment. It also provides two special services: supervised homemaker service and legal aid. The staff of the Family Welfare Bureau consists of the Director, fourteen full-time case
workers, and one part-time caseworker, supervisor of homemakers, office manager, registrar and her assistant, receptionist, and four stenographers.

The majority of clients come to the Family Welfare Bureau on their own initiative. With the conviction among social workers that the casework process is most effective when the client wishes to be helped, the agency has been interpreting to the community at large the importance of adequate referrals in which the client participates in applying to the Family Welfare Bureau for the service. However, the agency still finds it necessary, at times, to accept non-voluntary referrals, particularly in cases where the problems affect the welfare of the children. The school referrals with which this study is concerned fall within this group.

Source of material.

The cases studied were obtained from the statistical records of the Family Welfare Bureau. All cases which were referred to the agency by principals, teachers, counsellors, school nurses and attendance officers, over a period of two years (June 1, 1947 - June 30, 1949) were read at the beginning of the study. It was soon found that thirteen of the fifty-nine cases, although marked "school referrals", did not appropriately belong in the study. Some of these cases were referred by a public health nurse and were erroneously marked "school nurse". Others were concerned with school problems, but were brought to the attention of the Family Welfare Bureau by the police or by another agency. Still others were personal applications for service but the clients learned about the Family Welfare Bureau from a member of the school personnel.
The forty-six cases studied were non-voluntary school referrals. In many cases the clients were not even notified by the school personnel of the referral to the Family Welfare Bureau. In all cases the clients did not ask for help from the agency, and the worker approached them at the school's request.

Focus and enquiry of the study.

Because this study is concerned not only with the nature of the school referrals, but also with the question: "What does the Family Welfare Bureau do with the cases referred to the agency by the schools", it was necessary to analyse carefully the contact between the families and the family agency workers. A case analysis schedule was, therefore, devised. (see Appendix A) With the help of this schedule, information relevant to the topic was obtained from the agency records. It was decided that a detailed analysis of forty-six cases was beyond the scope of this study. It was decided, therefore, to analyse one half of the forty-six cases studied. The cases were arranged in alphabetical order and every second case was taken. The sample was divided into three groups of problems—behaviour in school, family discord, and economic need, (these three groups will be discussed in detail in Chapter 2) and was then quantitively compared with the three groups comprising the total number of the cases studied. The sampling did not prove as reliable in the second group of cases as in the other two groups. While there were twelve cases of family discord in the forty-six school referrals, there were only three such cases in the twenty-three referrals taken as a sample. Two cases representing family discord, were therefore, added to the sample, bringing the total of the analysed cases to twenty-five.
An attempt to classify the twenty-five cases in terms of outcome into the three groups mentioned above proved unsatisfactory. It became necessary to work out another classification which would indicate clearly what happened to the clients in the process of their contact with the Family Welfare Bureau. (See Schedule A).

With the rapid growth in the population of the city, both the schools and the agency expanded and special school services were developed. It is no longer possible to base the cooperation between the schools and the Family Welfare Bureau solely on a personal relationship between the principal and the social worker. The plexus of forces operating in the community makes it necessary for both the schools and the agency to clarify the nature of their respective services. Perhaps it will be found that, under present circumstances, the Family Welfare Bureau cannot fulfill the expectations of the schools, and that the addition of a social worker to the school personnel is essential. But perhaps, even with gaps in the community resources, the working relationship between the schools and the Family Welfare Bureau can be improved. It is hoped that the recommendations of this study will contribute towards further integration of the educational and social services — in the interest of the child.
CHAPTER TWO

REFERRALS FROM SCHOOL TO FAMILY AGENCY

The schools have been referring cases to the Family Welfare Bureau of Greater Vancouver since the establishment of the agency in 1928. During the first year of its existence, the agency accepted five school referrals — four from school nurses and one from an attendance officer. In the same year, the total intake for the agency was 152 cases. To-day, the agency handles as many as 1641 families (in 1949), approximately seventeen of which are school referrals.

The forty-six cases referred by schools to the Family Welfare Bureau between June 1, 1947 and June 30, 1949, present a striking variety of problems. They also indicate a certain lack of understanding between the school personnel and the agency as to the kind of difficulties that could be treated successfully in a voluntary family agency. If the school personnel feels that the problems presented by the child are serious enough to verge on neglect or delinquency, it may be necessary to refer the case to an authoritative agency. In other cases the school personnel may have to accept the fact that the parents do not wish any help from the family agency and that the child would have to be helped within the school setting. Here it becomes apparent that there is a need for social workers to evaluate each case with the teacher, the principal or the nurse to decide which of the available facilities would best meet the needs of the particular case.

Referring Party.

In examining the forty-six school referrals from the standpoint of
the referring party, it is difficult to discern a pattern. Seventeen cases (thirty-seven per cent) were referred by the principals; twelve cases (twenty-six per cent) by the school nurses; eleven cases (twenty-four per cent) by the attendance officers; and six cases (thirteen per cent) by the teachers. Because each member of the school personnel seems to refer all types of cases, it is impossible to understand why, for example, one referral is made by the principal and another by the school nurse.

Local Distribution.

The forty-six studied cases include school referrals to the North Vancouver office as well as to the central office of the Family Welfare Bureau. Between June 1, 1947 and June 30, 1949, twenty-eight cases (61 per cent) were referred by the schools to the Vancouver office and eighteen cases (thirty-nine per cent) to the North Vancouver office. During the same period of time, the total intake for the Vancouver office was 2779 cases (84.2 per cent) and for the North Vancouver office 503 cases (fifteen and one-half per cent). From these figures, it is apparent that the percentage of cases which were school referrals was twenty-three and one-half per cent greater in North Vancouver than in Vancouver. This difference between Vancouver and North Vancouver, in their respective percentages of school referrals, gives another valuable aid in improving the working relationship between schools and social agencies. It seems probable that in the small community of North Vancouver, as compared with the city of Vancouver, it was easier for the school and the Family Welfare Bureau personnel to achieve mutual understanding and to work together in close cooperation. Besides having a thorough and clear under-
standing of the respective functions of the schools and the social agencies, the educators and the social workers must know, trust and respect each other. Although in such a large community as Vancouver it is difficult to have frequent personal contacts between the social workers and the school personnel, the apparent results achieved in North Vancouver point toward the necessity of such close cooperation.

Types of Problems.

The problems that were referred by the schools to the Family Welfare Bureau over the two year period, fall within three broad categories: (1) behaviour problems of the child at school; (2) problems within the family of the child brought to the attention of the school personnel; and (3) problems caused by an inadequate standard of living. In any discussion of the above problems it must be borne in mind that the problems referred by the schools are not necessarily the basic problems with which the case worker in the family agency will deal during the treatment process. The school personnel is usually in a position to see only the symptoms that a particular child is exhibiting — truancy, stealing, aggressive behaviour. With the growing knowledge of human behaviour, however, the principal, the teacher, the nurse and the attendance officer are constantly more aware of the fact that these symptoms have causes, and, that the child and the parents need help both in understanding the reasons for the behaviour, and in trying to change their attitudes. And so, the cases where the schools feel that the child's difficulties spring mainly from an inadequate, disorganized family situation, are referred to the Family Welfare Bureau.

In the forty-six cases studied the majority of referrals (65 per
cent) fall within the first category; — behaviour problems of the child at school; twenty-six per cent within the second category — problems within the family of the child; and nine per cent within the third category — problems resulting from an inadequate standard of living. Because it can be assumed that the behaviour problems exhibited by the child at school are caused by difficulties and conflicts within the family of that particular child, the first category is, in reality, only one facet of the second category. However, in making their referrals, the schools do seem to make a distinction between the two categories. The presumption apparently is that in some cases, the child's behaviour difficulties are of primary concern, and, in other cases, that the family problems, as seen through the child at school, need immediate attention.

The thirty cases which have been placed in the first category include behaviour problems caused by mental deficiency, as well as those caused by emotional disturbance of the children. Three families were referred by schools to the Family Welfare Bureau because their retarded children were causing difficulties in class — hitting their classmates, causing turmoil, and demanding constant attention. One retarded boy was referred because of the complaints of the foster parents with whom he had been placed privately by his father. The thirteen-year-old boy was apparently showing some sexual interest in the five-year-old daughter of the foster family.

Among the sixteen cases referred to the Family Welfare Bureau primarily because of truancy, eleven children, according to the school personnel, exhibited behaviour problems apart from poor school attendance. The apparent companion of truancy — falling behind in school work —
affected four of the eleven children. However, there were also other complaints. Three adolescent girls were going out frequently in the evenings, were associating with poor companions, and were becoming uncontrollable. One fourteen-year-old girl was complaining of ill health without an apparent organic basis for the complaint. Another adolescent girl was lying and stealing. A fourteen-year-old boy was very mischievous in the class-room, did some stealing, and claimed that he heard whistling sounds in the class, although no one else heard them. Another boy was considered by the school to be a trouble maker. In another case, the teacher found that an eleven-year-old boy, who was always dirty and looked tired, had taken $20. from household funds and was spending money freely. One mother asked the school for help in handling her youngster who was out of control at home.

Six cases were referred to the Family Welfare Bureau because of the aggressive behaviour of the children —— stealing money and food, lying, attacking other children, cheating in games and school work, and breaking windows. In three other referrals, the children were disturbed, unhappy, and uninterested in their school work. One case was referred because of the boy's persistent tardiness. Finally, one referral was made because a girl was always extremely sick at the time of her menstrual periods, and the school felt that she might need special medical care, and that the Family Welfare Bureau might be of help to her.

Among the twelve cases falling within the second category there is a wide range of problems referred to the family agency. The variety of problems can be best illustrated by two such different referrals as a potential neglect situation on the one hand, and a school's desire to
help a mother to secure employment on the other hand. In the first case, the school requested that the Family Welfare Bureau explore the home situation because the children were not getting good physical care. In the second case, the school referred one of the mothers for help in securing employment, feeling that the mother might be interested in becoming a supervised homemaker. Then there are three referrals where the family problems were brought to the attention of the school by the children themselves. In one case an adolescent girl told the Girl's Counsellor about the conflict between her parents, and the case was referred to the Family Welfare Bureau for help with marital difficulties. In the second case, the children told their teacher that "their house was about to be pulled down around their ears" and the Family Welfare Bureau was asked to visit the home. The third referral was made when a sixteen-year-old boy asked the Boys' Counsellor to help him to continue his education. He had been "kicked out of the home by his father" for going to school instead of starting to work. Then there are two requests for help to foster parents (private placement) and to grandparents caring for a dull boy and a pre-delinquent boy respectively. The following cases are also illustrative of other family problems which reach the Family Welfare Bureau through the school referrals: a mother deserted, and the father was referred to the agency for help in making plans for his five children; a mentally disturbed mother was beating her children periodically, and the father needed help in handling the situation; a mother had to stay in bed for a month as a TB suspect, and the school nurse asked for a supervised homemaker for the family; a twelve-year-old boy was in poor physical condition and, since the school doctor believed his condition to be emotional in
origin, his parents were referred for help; and in one family, six children, who had low intelligence, and who lived in a poor and overcrowded neighbourhood, were referred to the agency for assistance.

Only four of the forty-six cases fall within the third category. An eight-year-old boy needed a pair of trousers. A family was in need of bedding and clothing for the three children. Another family with seven children were "suffering from cold and hunger". And a family with problems of poor health, inadequate housing, and marginal income, desired general assistance.

Time Distribution.

From the standpoint of time distribution, the forty-six school referrals show no clear pattern. There were almost twice as many cases referred to the Family Welfare Bureau between June 1, 1947 and May 30, 1948, as there were between June 1, 1948 and June 30, 1949. It is difficult to evaluate the reasons for this drop in the number of referrals, without taking into consideration the fact that there are differences in the types of problems referred to the Family Welfare Bureau from year to year.

By dividing the problems into the three categories described above, it was found that in the two year period, 65 per cent of the referrals fell into the first category, twenty-six per cent into the second category, and nine per cent into the third category. Taking one year as the unit of time, it can be seen that from the twenty-nine cases referred to the Family Welfare Bureau between June 1, 1947, and May 30, 1948, eighteen cases (sixty-two per cent) fall within the first category, eight cases (twenty-seven and one-half per cent) within the second category, and three cases (ten and one-half per cent) within
the third category. The seventeen referrals made between June 1, 1948, and June 30, 1949, can be placed in the three categories as follows: twelve cases (70\% per cent) in the first category; four cases (twenty-three and one half per cent) in the second category; and one case (six per cent) in the third category.

From these data it is apparent that the ratio of the percentages in the three categories changed from year to year. In 1948-49 there is an increase in the percentage of cases involving behaviour problems of the child at school, and a decrease in the percentage of cases concerned with problems resulting from an inadequate standard of living. There is very little variation between the two years in the percentage of referrals involving problems within the family of the child.

**TYPES OF PROBLEMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Problems</th>
<th>1947-48 Number of Cases</th>
<th>1948-49 Number of Cases</th>
<th>1947-49 Number of Cases</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviour in School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Discord</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Need</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With these findings in mind, the drop in the total number of school referrals in 1948-49 can be more adequately evaluated. The decrease in the number of cases falling within the third category (from three
cases in 1947-48 to one case in 1948-49) indicates a healthy trend towards the wider acceptance of the concept of governmental responsibility for the economic security of the people. It is to be hoped that in the future there will be a further decrease in the number of school referrals to the Family Welfare Bureau involving primarily the economic problems of the families. Despite a decrease in the actual number of referrals falling within the first category, it has been shown that as a percentage there is an increase. This might indicate that the schools in their growing awareness of issues and difficulties involved in referrals have been more careful during the past year in deciding which cases should be referred to the Family Welfare Bureau. On the other hand, the Family Welfare Bureau, through its experience in working with school referrals over a number of years, has been slowly modifying the intake policy. Because of the increasing understanding that people can be helped only when they are ready to use the service offered, it seems probable that the Family Welfare Bureau was more selective in its acceptance of school referrals in 1948-49 than it had been in the preceding year.

With the growing understanding on the part of both the schools and the family agency as to the issues involved in referrals there can be still further decrease in the number of referrals which do not fall within the scope of the agency service; more discriminating help to those that are referred; and increased ability on the part of school personnel to detect the less obvious types of problems.
## Schedule A. CLASSIFICATION OF ANALYSED CASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Number of Families</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rejection of Help

Clients who completely rejected the help offered them by the Family Welfare Bureau:

(a) by not contacting the agency at all - (5)
(b) by refusing the service during their first contact with the worker - (3) 8

### Passive Resistance

Clients who accepted the worker's visits but did not participate actively in effecting any change in their situation. 9

### Use of Environmental Help

Clients who accepted help but only in the area of their immediate problems. Their contact with the worker resulted in:

(a) Removal of symptoms - (5)
(b) Appropriate referral - (2) 7

### Use of Help for Changing Family Relationships

Clients who were able to use help in order to effect change in their family relationships. 1

Total ... 25
PART II  A STUDY OF CASES

Chapter 3.  Direct Rejection of Help
Chapter 4.  Passive Resistance
Chapter 5.  Use of Environmental Help
Chapter 6.  Use of Help for Changing Family Relationships
CHAPTER THREE

DIRECT REJECTION OF HELP

A voluntary family agency, accustomed to responding to clients' personal applications for help, faces many problems when it has to approach clients at the request of another agency, such as the school. The agency worker has to meet a client who usually has either not been able to admit to himself that he needs help or, aware of his need for assistance, could not mobilize himself sufficiently to make the effort to contact a social agency. Sometimes the worker faces a client so disintegrated that he appears unconcerned about an obviously undesirable situation, and unwilling to participate in effecting any change.

It is not surprising, therefore, that among twenty-five school referrals to the Family Welfare Bureau seven families completely rejected the help offered them by the agency. Those clients who made some use of the help offered them by the Family Welfare Bureau, will be discussed in later chapters.

No Contact.

In four cases there was no personal contact between the client and the agency. From the information obtained through the schools it is evident, however, that there were many reasons for the parents' refusal to accept the service of the Family Welfare Bureau.

Some clients find it very difficult to admit to themselves that they have problems which they are unable to cope with.

The attendance officer telephoned to advise that she had referred Mrs. S. to the Family Welfare Bureau for help in dealing with Mary, a fifteen-year-old girl who was truanting, stealing, and lying. The attendance officer, aware of Mrs.
S.'s feelings of disgrace in connection with any social agency, originally suggested that she contact the Child Guidance Clinic (there is less stigma attached to that agency). When Mrs. S. seemed unwilling to arrange an appointment at the Clinic, the attendance officer referred her to the Family Welfare Bureau. Mrs. S. did not get in touch with the agency. The worker, at the attendance officer's suggestion, agreed to contact Mrs. S., to discuss with her, her resistance to the agency, and to offer help with regard to Mary. It was decided that worker would check with the school nurse prior to arranging for the visit.

A few days later, the attendance officer telephoned to inform worker that Mrs. S. had made an appointment for an interview at the Child Guidance Clinic, and that consequently there was no need for worker to visit her.

Obviously, Mrs. S. had to be helped to work through her feelings of resistance to a social agency before she could accept help for herself and for her daughter. Although many clients do not express this feeling openly, it can be assumed that the majority of people in our society believe that asking for help is an admission of personal weakness or failure. It is painful for any individual to face the realization that he is not "the master of his fate and the captain of his soul". By suggesting to Mrs. S. that she contact the Child Guidance Clinic, the attendance officer unwittingly accepted Mrs. S.'s feeling that going to the Family Welfare Bureau would be disgraceful. Consequently, Mrs. S. still resisting the suggestion that she might need help, finally contacted the Child Guidance Clinic because of the community's demands that Mary attend school regularly. The initial problem has been solved: Mary has been referred to a competent agency. But Mrs. S. may still resist any future suggestion of obtaining help from the Family Welfare Bureau or other social agencies.

Sometimes lack of clear understanding among the school personnel and
the social workers about the services offered by the different social
to the different social
agencies in the community seems to be at least partially responsible for
agencies in the community seems to be at least partially responsible for
a family's inability to use help constructively.

The attendance officer telephoned to inquire about
the Family Welfare Bureau's previous contact with the T.
family, as the case was to be presented at a Child
Guidance Clinic conference. Because Helen T. fourteen
years of age, has been truanting constantly, the atten­
dance officer had referred the case to the Juvenile
Court. Worker explained that two years earlier the
agency had a very short contact with Mrs. T. about mar­
tal difficulties. Worker pointed out that working with
children presenting behaviour problems was one of the
services of the Family Welfare Bureau, and wondered if
the agency could help Helen. The attendance officer
stated that she had discussed with Mrs. T. a referral to
the Family Welfare Bureau but Mrs. T. felt that, since
the agency "did not do anything to help" her previously,
she would prefer a referral to the Juvenile Court. After
further discussion, the attendance officer suggested that
worker be present at the Child Guidance Clinic conference
where the definite decision as to which agency should
carry the case would be made.

Later, the attendance officer found Mrs. T. more co­
operative and responsive, and informed worker that "the
mother might be accepting of a referral to the Family
Welfare Bureau."

At the Child Guidance Clinic conference it was de­
decided that Helen's truancy was an expression of her
rebellion against a difficult home situation. When
Helen was thirteen, Mr. T. had left his wife for a
nineteen-year-old girl. Helen also felt rejected by her
mother who seemed to prefer the girl's older sister and
who "picked on Helen". The psychiatrist suggested that
Helen might begin to adjust to the home situation if she
had a continuing relationship with a worker. At that
time her truancy also would probably stop. The atten­
dance officer was to try to clear up Mrs. T.'s confusion
regarding social agencies, and to arrange a referral to
the Family Welfare Bureau. Although a charge had already
been laid at the Juvenile Court, the attendance officer
did not think there would be much difficulty in transfter­
ing the case to the Family Welfare Bureau.

Mrs. T. did not get in touch with the agency despite
her assurance to the attendance officer that she would
do so. In the meantime, contrary to the Child Guidance
Clinic recommendation, the judge placed Helen on probation to the Juvenile Court. Because, under these circumstances, the Family Welfare Bureau could offer no service, the case was closed.

Without the existence of school social work, it is very difficult to decide which agency would best be able to deal with problems exhibited by children within the school setting. However, even with this gap in the community resources, parents and children might still be helped. But to do this, the schools and the social agencies must agree as to which agency a specific type of problem shall be referred. Should a child such as Helen, with a chronic problem of non-attendance, be referred to the Juvenile Court or to the Family Welfare Bureau? Even though the reasons for the behaviour might be different in each case of truancy, would it not be more meaningful to the child and to her mother if they knew that a specific agency or person dealt with all problems occurring within the school setting? A decision must be reached, for, as shown in the T. case, uncertainty on the part of the school personnel can only intensify the fear and the resistance of the family.

The following case illustrates the manner in which uncertainty on the part of the Family Welfare Bureau worker as to her role in the school referrals affects families who are resisting contact with the agency.

Norma C., a fourteen-year-old girl whose mother was dead, was truanting, going out frequently in the evenings, and associating with undesirable companions. Her father complained that neither he nor the housekeeper was able to control her. Although Norma's only problem at school was occasional truancy, the attendance officer was still very concerned with her total adjustment, and felt that the Family Welfare Bureau should work with the family. Despite the fact that Mr. C. expressed his desire for assistance and advice, the attendance officer did not think he was really interested in Norma or that he was trying to give her any home life.
Following a discussion between the attendance officer and the worker, it was finally decided that the attendance officer would interpret the Family Welfare Bureau service to Mr. C. and Norma, and would explain to them the reason for the referral. In view of the attendance officer's feeling that it would be better if the worker went directly into the home, it was agreed that if Mr. C. telephoned, the agency worker would visit, rather than ask Mr. C. to come to the office.

When Mr. C. did not telephone, worker sent him a letter expressing the desire of the agency to help him with his difficulties, and asking him to contact worker. The fact that there was no reply to this letter was discussed with the attendance officer, who suggested that Mr. C. "might react more favourably if offered a woman worker." Another letter was therefore sent to Mr. C. explaining that worker did not wish "to bother" him, or "to try to force agency's help" on him, for, the agency "tries to help only when requested." "However," the letter continued, "I am writing again because it occurred to me that you might prefer a woman worker to a man, and I wanted to inform you that such a change in workers could be arranged." The letter ended with worker's assurance that if Mr. C. "did not wish any further contact, no attempt would be made to force it upon him."

Because Mr. C. still did not contact worker, the attendance officer decided to "check on the situation", and to report back to the Family Welfare Bureau. At the time of the school's re-opening in September, the attendance officer informed worker that the home situation seemed improved, and therefore, that it would not be necessary for worker to make any further attempts to see Mr. C.

When Mr. C. did not telephone the worker as suggested, and later, when he did not reply to the worker's first letter, it became apparent that he was not interested in seeking help from the Family Welfare Bureau. If the agency believed that, in the interest of Norma's welfare, it had the right to approach Mr. C. without his request for help, then the
worker should have felt comfortable in visiting the home, and, by facing Mr. C.'s hostility, in assisting him to use the offered help. If, on the contrary, the agency's policy was to serve only those clients who applied for help personally, then the C. case should have been closed when there was no reply to the first letter. The attendance officer stated at the time of the referral to the Family Welfare Bureau that Mr. C. wanted "assistance and advice." However, Mr. C. obviously did not want that "assistance and advice" to come from the Family Welfare Bureau. The worker's apologetic letter to Mr. C. could only increase his resistance, for a client always senses the feelings of the worker, and often responds to uncertainty with a firmer resistance to change.

The manner in which the school refers a case to the Family Welfare Bureau is of crucial importance in formulating the client's attitude towards the agency. There is much controversy among social workers with regard to interpretation of their agencies' services to the school personnel. Some social workers believe that, in order to show the school personnel what social workers could do, it is necessary to accept most of the cases referred to their agency by the schools. Some social workers, on the other hand, believe that only through a clear statement of the agency's policies is it possible to interpret to the school personnel the different services offered by the different agencies. The following case shows that it is possible for an agency to interpret to the school personnel the conditions under which families may obtain assistance.

The principal telephoned to request a pair of trousers for Bob R., whose father was unemployed. The principal explained that he had found out from the Vancouver Clothing Committee that the Family
Welfare Bureau had previously provided clothing for the family. Worker advised that the case was closed, and carefully explained that a clothing requisition could not be given without seeing the family. The principal thought that this was reasonable, and he agreed to tell Mr. R. to call worker and to arrange an appointment if Mr. R. wished to discuss his clothing needs.

With her understanding of the R. family, the worker could expect that neither Mr. nor Mrs. R. would get in touch with the agency. Previous contact with the family had shown that the R's were deeply deprived, basically dependent people. Mr. and Mrs. R. have for years gone from one agency to another, from board members to other influential people in the community, asking for help. Mrs. R.'s demands, especially, were often unrealistic. At no time was she ready to use help to work out a constructive plan of action. Thus, the worker's decision to interpret to the principal the necessity of talking with Mr. R. prior to giving the family a clothing requisition seems sound. Of course, Bob's need for a pair of trousers might have been used by the worker as a tool for establishing a direct contact with the boy. In view of the parents' inadequacies, perhaps the agency would have been justified in approaching Bob directly and in attempting to help him. But the very fact that the worker explained to the principal the reasons behind the agency's decision probably contributed towards a clearer understanding between the school and the Family Welfare Bureau.

Initial contact.

The help offered by the agency is often rejected during the worker's first contact with the family. Some clients, like the aunt in the following case, resist accepting help by denying the existence of the problems, and by assuring the worker that "all is well" in their home.
The attendance officer telephoned, requesting service for the W. family, because the principal expressed his concern about Richard, an eleven-year-old boy who was dull mentally, and appeared to be lonely and unhappy. The family was known to the attendance officer through the oldest daughter's truancy. The girl had left school at fifteen, however, and the attendance officer had not had any contact with the W.'s during the previous five months. When the school nurse visited the home recently regarding Richard's unhappiness, she found that both parents were away, and that an aunt was taking care of the boy and his older sister. The nurse apparently felt that the visit was unsatisfactory. According to the principal, there was "no attachment between Richard and his aunt." In view of this fact, and the principal's fear that Richard would be left alone during the approaching summer holidays, the Family Welfare Bureau worker agreed to visit the aunt, and to advise her that the school was concerned about Richard. Worker was also to find out if the family was interested "in help with planning for the summer holiday".

During worker's visit to the home, the aunt was very cordial and friendly. She explained that Mr. W. was in the army, and that Mrs. W. was working in a laundry at Banff for the summer, in order to supplement the family income. When worker stated the reason for her visit, the aunt assured her that "Richard was happy", and that he kept busy through his activities in a boys' club. The aunt did not feel that there was any need for worker to visit them again.

The worker might have accepted the aunt's feelings that Richard was happy, but, at the same time, faced her with the fact that the school did not agree with her. Because denial of a problem is a frequent defense of clients, and has to be treated as such, it is apparent that in meeting such clients the worker must be convinced of her right to enter the home. By accepting the referral, the worker accepted the responsibility of presenting to the family the school's concern about Richard, and therefore, she did not need to retreat in face of the aunt's apparent desire that she
should leave as soon as possible.

At times, clients reject the help that is offered by expressing tremendous hostility towards the worker, and by challenging the worker's right to interfere in their private affairs.

George, Mr. A.'s son of his first marriage, was found by the school doctor to have a very offensive breath, and to be generally in poor physical condition. The doctor suspected that George's condition was emotional in origin. George was living in a private boarding home where he was very unhappy.

The school nurse contacted Mr. A. who showed some concern over George and who requested a medical report. The nurse, aware of George's mistreatment in the boarding home, referred the case to the Family Welfare Bureau in the hope that the agency's previous contact with the family might place the worker in a more advantageous position to help the A's.

During worker's first telephone conversation with the family, both Mrs. A. (George's step-mother) and Mr. A. questioned the authority of the "welfare" to come in and to "push parents around". Worker stated that she had to discuss George's "health and welfare with his father". When the A's continued to object to the "interference", worker quoted to them the Children's Protection Act and suggested that if the A's were "not willing to discuss the matter with worker, she had no recourse but to forward the school nurse's referral to an authoritative agency, the Social Welfare Branch". The A's finally agreed to let worker visit them.

It is apparent that both Mr. and Mrs. A. were greatly threatened by the school referral. From her previous contact with Mr. A., worker knew that he was not particularly interested in his son. The fact that Mr. A., following his second marriage, still did not make any attempt either to take George home or to make other suitable arrangements, would further indicate his lack of concern for the boy. Thus, the A's, who were attempting to escape from their responsibilities towards George,
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1. This case is from the North Vancouver office of the Family Welfare Bureau.
were suddenly disturbed in their complacency by the worker and faced with an unpleasant reality. Furthermore, worker's telephone call caught them psychologically unprepared, for they were never told by the school nurse of the referral to the Family Welfare Bureau.

The A's attempted to defend themselves against the intrusion by attacking the worker. They needed the worker's acceptance of their hostility and her assurance that they had the right to be angry. In addition to this acceptance, they needed to be told that the worker and the school had the right to be concerned about George. Unfortunately, the worker responded by quoting the Protection Act, and by threatening the A's with a referral to the authoritative agency. Consequently, the A's remained insecure; although Mr. A. finally agreed to a visit, and the worker saw both Mr. and Mrs. A. a number of times, she was usually greeted with overt hostility. Throughout the contact, the A's, stressing their conviction that the boy was receiving excellent care in the boarding home, refused to participate in any plans for George. Even when George ran away to his father, he was strapped and sent back to his foster parents. In view of George's "apathetic unhappiness" and the worker's feeling that the foster father's physical abuse of the boy constituted a danger to George, the case was finally referred to the Social Welfare Branch for protection.

A worker meeting the hostility of a client at the time of her first contact must be psychologically prepared in two ways for the attack. As already mentioned, she needs to have a strong conviction of her right to discuss with the parents the problems which caused the school referral. But she must also have a profound respect for the client's right to
struggle against the standards with which she, as the representative of the community, is facing him. It is undoubtedly true that some clients are "too immature or too stunted in their capacity for relationship to follow through consistently any contact which places responsibility upon them." Such clients need the external support and control of an authoritative agency. Although, to the majority of people, any social agency implies authority, the above mentioned clients usually cannot be helped by a voluntary family agency which, in fact, is given no authority by the community. But the knowledge that such clients exist, in no way removes from the private agency worker the grave responsibility of exercising her skills to the utmost in an attempt to help the client to use the contact as constructively as possible. Had the worker in the A. case accepted Mr. A.'s hostility, tried to help him to work through his initial resistance, and then ascertained that Mr. A. was too disturbed or too immature to use the kind of help she offered, a referral to the appropriate agency might have been made earlier. On the one hand, the A.'s would have been spared the unnecessary frustrations of having to fight first against the Family Welfare Bureau, and then against another agency. On the other hand, the worker probably would have been able to use her time more constructively with another family.

Sometimes clients reject the offered help so completely that they do not permit the worker to enter their home.

1. Irma E. Mohr, "Some Aspects of Authority In Working With School Children". Social Case Work In Public Schools, American Association of Visiting Teachers, October, 1941, p. 27.
The case of the L. children was discussed at a school conference. 1. The school personnel was concerned because these seven youngsters, of a family of eleven, were pre-delinquent and, without help, might follow in the footsteps of their two older, delinquent brothers. The principal felt that there was "something in the family's way of living or in the neighborhood which was leading to social problems among the older children." Both the principal and the teachers expressed their liking for these youngsters and said that they did not present any disciplinary problems. The children were described as "somewhat dull but unusually sensitive." In view of the presence of one social agency in the situation (the Juvenile Court was interested in the two older boys), it was decided that the school itself would attempt to help the younger children by finding supervised recreation for them.

Following the conference, it was determined that the Juvenile Court was no longer active on the case. Therefore, the Family Welfare Bureau accepted the responsibility of working with the family. Because the principal did not believe that any agency contact would be accepted by the L.'s, worker agreed to visit Mrs. L. regarding recreational and camp plans for the children, and "through the practical plans, to assess the home situation."

The use of "false pretenses" to gain entry into the home of a family is contrary to the basic principles of social work. It also takes from the client his right to refuse the service, a right which even an authoritative agency grants him, although, at the same time, compelling him to face the consequences of his choice. When the client knows, for example, that the Children's Aid Society has the authority to apprehend his children if he refuses to participate in improving the care given to the youngsters, he is in a position to choose between accepting or rejecting the help offered by the agency. When, however, as in the L. case, the school is worried about the possible development of delinquent
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1. One of the conferences held frequently in two West End schools between the school personnel and the representatives of social agencies for the purpose of discussing problems of school children and their families and arranging referrals if indicated.
behaviour among the younger children, and the worker contacts the parents to arrange supervised recreation for the youngsters, the clients can hardly be expected to accept the offered help. Such an approach, apart from robbing the client of his right to choose his own destiny, underestimates the client's intelligence and his probable awareness that "all is not well" in his home. When a worker does not face with the client the reality situation which the latter already knows, she increases the client's defensiveness and his resistance to help.

It can be taken for granted that Mrs. L. was aware of the delinquency of her two older sons, because charges against the boys had been laid in the Juvenile Court. It is also probable that she suspected the community's concern about her younger children. How then could she be expected to trust the worker and to relate to her when the worker's stated reason for her visit was to arrange recreational and camp activities for the children?

When worker visited, Mrs. L. greeted her in the doorway. Worker explained the reason for her visit, but Mrs. L. immediately stated that some of the children belonged to the Y.M.C.A., and others played in the street. She complained about the difficulties involved in living in such congested areas. Worker wondered if the children could get away from the neighbourhood in the summer by going to camp. Mrs. L. described in detail her own plans for each of the youngsters during the summer holidays, and stated definitely that she did not need any help in sending the children to camp. Although some of Mrs. L.'s suggestions did not sound plausible, worker did not press her. Throughout the conversation, Mrs. L. did not invite worker into the house.

In approaching the family, the worker might have been influenced by the fact that the previous contact of the agency with the L.'s, indicated that the parents were apathetic and somewhat unconcerned about their
family. However, even if there was very little hope that the parents would be either able or willing to accept help this time, the L.'s had the right to know the real reason for the school referral. Furthermore, any possibility of effective case-work with the parents was based only on the L.'s awareness of the community's expectations of them.

In the seven cases presented in this chapter, four families rejected the offered help by not contacting the agency at all, and three families refused the service during the initial interview with the Family Welfare Bureau worker or shortly afterwards.

The first four cases illustrate the need for improving the method of referral from the schools to the Family Welfare Bureau. In order to make successful referrals to the agency, the school personnel needs to have a thorough understanding of the Family Welfare Bureau's services. However, an adequate interpretation of the agency service to the schools can be done only to the extent to which the workers themselves know what the agency can and cannot do. The school personnel could facilitate the referral process by arranging an appointment with an agency worker in the client's presence and with his participation. Although the client would still be free to refuse the agency's service by breaking his appointment, his participation in the school referral would probably help him in overcoming any fear and resistance towards the acceptance of help.

Once a referral is arranged, the agency worker carries the responsibility of making the first contact meaningful to the client. The last three cases described in this chapter emphasize the importance of the
initial contact between the client and the agency worker. They suggest
that even when the referral is inadequate, the worker has the opportun­
ity to make the service acceptable to the client if she meets him with
certainty of purpose, warmth, understanding, and respect for his right
to refuse the offered help.

No one can deny the difficulties which face both the schools and
the Family Welfare Bureau in their earnest attempt to help the children
whose adjustment to school is faulty. But the analysis of the seven
cases indicates that both the school personnel and the social workers
may be able to overcome some of the difficulties and thus, to decrease
the number of clients who reject help.
CHAPTER FOUR

PASSIVE RESISTANCE

Among the twenty-five school referrals to the Family Welfare Bureau there are nine cases in which the clients accepted the worker's visits, and discussed some of their problems but did not participate actively in effecting any change in their situation. In contrast to the families of the previous chapter who openly rejected the help offered them by the agency, these clients defended their status quo by "passive resistance". Their contact with the agency was sustained.

In some cases the families' resistance towards the Family Welfare Bureau seemed to be caused mainly by the clients' limited capacity to respond to the offer of help. In other cases, the worker's approach to the family seemed to have further aroused the clients' common resistance to any change. Occasionally, an inadequate school referral also contributed to the family's inability to use the offered help constructively.

Mrs. E. resisted her worker's attempts to help her or her son, Jerry. She appeared unable to respond to the worker's genuine desire to assist her with her problems.

Mrs. E. complained to the school principal that she could not control her son, Jerry, eleven years of age. According to Mrs. E., Jerry was staying out late at nights, "was hanging around with tough gangs", lied continually, and had "screaming tantrums". Both the principal and the teacher discussed the case with the worker. They did not feel that
Jerry presented any behaviour problems at school although he was frequently absent or late for school. With an intelligence quotient of 86, Jerry was in a remedial class and was a "good worker". However, the principal thought that Mrs. E. was "the real problem", and that she needed help. Mrs. E. had not been told by the school personnel about the Family Welfare Bureau services, but it was agreed that during her first contact with Mrs. E., the worker would explain that she called at the school's request. The worker would also tell Mrs. E. that she had learned from the school that Mrs. E. "wanted help with Jerry".

When worker telephoned Mrs. E. and told her about the school referral, Mrs. E. sounded very resentful. She could not understand "what difficulties the school thought she needed help with". She stated that she was a "proud woman", and that she never had anything to do with "Welfare". She finally agreed to a home visit but impressed upon worker that she "saw people by appointment only".

Mrs. E. was visited several times over a period of ten months. She was a "heavily built woman with a ferocious manner". Although suspicious of worker, she talked freely about her marital difficulties and about Jerry's behaviour. According to Mrs. E., she had been "kicked out" by her husband when Jerry was seven years old. Mr. E., who was a doctor and a stationmaster in a rural community, was apparently "cruel, harsh and unreasonable". He had several affairs with young girls and even had intimate relations with his oldest daughter. Mrs. E. stated that her husband used to beat Jerry and to swear at him constantly. The boy has been "in a state of nervous tension since birth". At the same time, Mrs. E. continually stressed that she had "wealth and position" in the community while she was living with her husband.

In her complaints about Jerry, Mrs. E. appeared to be unreasonable. When the boy asked her for a larger allowance, she felt he was "money mad". Yet, Mrs. E. was unconcerned when Jerry became involved with a man who was giving him presents. (The principal discussed this with the Juvenile Court who promised to contact the man and talk to him.) Mrs. E.
resisted the attempts of both the worker and the principal to arrange Jerry's membership in the Y.M.C.A., to find a Big Brother for the boy or to send Jerry to camp. When worker discussed these plans with Jerry in his mother's presence, the boy was very enthusiastic. However, worker noticed that Mrs. E. did not want Jerry to talk to worker about any activities. Instead Mrs. E. kept embarrassing Jerry by asking him to tell "the lady" how he "kicked his mother" and how naughty he was.

Finally, Mrs. E. asked worker to end the contact as she "could see no purpose to visits". Worker learned that Jerry's school attendance improved. The principal placed him under a warm and "motherly" teacher as he felt that Jerry "needed this most of all". The principal thought that Mrs. E. "was hopeless to deal with" and that, therefore, there was no need for the Family Welfare Bureau to continue the contact with the family.

Mrs. E. obviously did not really want any help in her handling of Jerry. Her resistance to any plans which involved her separation from the boy, was suggestive of her inability to think of Jerry as an individual. She seemed to want Jerry to be a part of her. At the same time, Mrs. E.'s desire to impress the worker with her former position, and her need to talk about her own past difficulties, pointed to her longing for the worker's acceptance and approval. It seems probable, therefore, that Mrs. E. was trying to use Jerry for the satisfaction of her own deep dependency needs. Because she could not think of the boy as a person apart from herself, she had no understanding of his needs and wanted him to be perfect. Whenever the boy failed to reach her expectations, she became angry, and complained about his behaviour. In search of the acceptance which he did not get at home, Jerry joined gangs and took gifts from undesirable men. His screaming tantrums were probably an expression of his frustration and hostility against Mrs. E.
who was not giving him the affection and understanding he needed. It was no accident that Jerry's school attendance improved at the same time that his new, "motherly" teacher took a real interest in him.

Mrs. E. might have responded to the worker if the latter had concentrated all her efforts on helping Mrs. E. and had not attempted to arrange any plans for Jerry. However, Mrs. E. never asked for help with her problems, and the worker gained entry into the home through the school referral. Because the principal did not feel that Jerry's behaviour at school warranted a referral to the Family Welfare Bureau, the worker had to tell Mrs. E. that she was calling, at the school's request, because Mrs. E. herself wanted "help with Jerry". This approach threatened Mrs. E. as it placed on her the whole responsibility for seeking help. And Mrs. E. probably needed an external authority to tell her that Jerry's behaviour was unsatisfactory before she could really try to use the help offered by the worker. If the school personnel felt that it was Mrs. E. who needed help, perhaps the principal or the nurse could have offered Mrs. E. an appointment with the Family Welfare Bureau, explaining that the agency had professionally trained staff who were skilled in helping children and parents with their difficulties.

As it happened, the worker's telephone call caught Mrs. E. completely unaware; she responded with hostility and resistance. It seems possible that even if the school did discuss the referral with Mrs. E. the latter would have attempted to minimize her complaints about Jerry in order to prevent the worker from contacting her. The worker might have then interpreted to the school personnel the need for a referral on the basis of Jerry's behaviour at school. Although Mrs. E. undoubtedly would
still have responded with hostility to the agency, the worker might have been able to help her work through this feeling, using the school's concern about Jerry (external authority) as a tool in assisting Mrs. E. to mobilize her strength to the point where she could act effectively.

In another case, Mr. P. who was left with five young children following his wife's desertion, also responded with resistance to the help offered him by the Family Welfare Bureau. His attitude was characterized by his inability to participate in making plans for his children.

The attendance officer telephoned to notify the Family Welfare Bureau that Mr. P. needed assistance in making plans for his five children. Following Mrs. P.'s desertion, the two older children were alternately staying away from school in order to take care of the youngest boy, Walter, five years of age. The worker suggested that the attendance officer discuss with Mr. P. the possibility of a referral to the Family Welfare Bureau.

Later, the worker was told by the attendance officer that Mr. P. definitely wanted assistance. The worker agreed to visit the home, and the date of her visit was forwarded to Mr. P. through the attendance officer.

During worker's first interview with Mr. P. the latter seemed tense and uncomfortable. Worker attempted to help him bring out his possible hostility around the school referral but Mr. P. did not respond. He was a small man, with a dirty, unkempt appearance. The family lived in an old, shabby house, poorly furnished. The rooms were "cluttered, disorganized and somewhat dirty". Mr. P. a plumber by trade, was working irregularly. However, he did not seem to worry about the family's precarious financial situation. He was very proud of the children's ability to manage without Mrs. P. and tried to
convince worker throughout the interview that he was "taking good care of the children". When worker explained to Mr. P. that the two older girls, Joan, eleven years old, and Bernice, ten years old, were not allowed to miss school in order to look after Walter, Mr. P. agreed to ask his mother to come and live with his family. Worker had the feeling that Mr. P. was not really concerned about his present living arrangements but consented to ask his mother because "he wanted to please" worker.

Although Mr. P. kept all his appointments with worker, he did not participate actively in making adequate plans for his children. His original suggestion of bringing his mother into the home fell through because Mrs. P. Sr., did not feel well enough to accept such a responsibility. When worker told Mr. P. about the supervised homemaker service, he became very anxious to obtain that service. He found it difficult to accept the fact that the agency could not place a homemaker for an indefinite period and that consequently, it would be necessary for Mr. P. to have a definite plan in mind. Again worker felt that Mr. P. held to the idea of a homemaker in order to satisfy the demands of the community rather than to work out a constructive plan for the children.

Mrs. P. whom Mr. P. once brought to the office at worker's request, appeared disinterested in the children. She visited the youngsters occasionally, but worker thought she did so only to gain entry into the home. During worker's joint interview with both Mr. and Mrs. P. the latter hinted that she would like to come back home but Mr. P. definitely stated that after fifteen years of nagging and fighting, "it was peaceful now". When worker wondered how Mrs. P. felt about the care the children were receiving, Mrs. P. said that she "had given her husband the responsibility".

Worker learned from the principal and the teachers that the children were not neglected. They behaved reasonably well at school. The intelligence tests indicated that they were all dull normal. In her own contact with the youngsters, worker found them to be friendly and pleasant. They did not seem upset about Mrs. P.'s desertion. Only Walter showed some signs of disturbance for he began to stutter and became extremely excited whenever Mrs. P. visited.
It is apparent that neither Mr. nor Mrs. P. felt any need for help. However, while Mrs. P. left the home and showed very little interest in the children, Mr. P. did want to keep his family together. Although Mr. P.'s conception of adequate care for his children was at variance with the standards of the community, the children's reasonably good adjustment indicated that they felt fairly secure with their father. It was important, therefore, to support Mr. P. in his desire to take care of his children.

The worker could not know, at the time of the school referral, that Mr. P. had so little capacity to participate in making plans for adequate care of his children. It seems probable that he told the attendance officer he "wanted assistance" because she represented authority. And Mr. P. could bring himself to act only when he felt that the community demanded it. Perhaps, after a few interviews with Mr. P. the worker could have referred the case to the Children's Aid Society. The latter agency, with its authoritative function for the protection of children, might have been better able to help Mr. P.

Mr. P. did finally agree to Walter's placement in a day foster home where the boy seemed to settle down. In the summer, when the worker arranged for the children to go to camp, Mr. P. even contributed financially towards the project. And six months later, when a different worker visited, she found Mrs. P. Sr. taking care of the children. It is not known whether the latter arrangement was made at the request of Mr. P. or whether his mother decided that the children could not be left alone. Although during Mr. P.'s contact with the agency, he seemed only able to accept passively all the plans made for him by the worker, the
later events suggest that possibly Mr. P. through his relationship with the worker, was able to affect some change in his situation.

Worker's Differential Approach.

The following case illustrates the fatalistic approach of some workers to families who had been known to the Family Welfare Bureau prior to the school referral. Although in the past the families had been difficult, and had not seemed able to respond to the offered help, the workers could not expect to accomplish much if they contacted the clients with a --- what is the use --- attitude.

The school nurse discussed with worker the referral of the B. family, which had been known to the agency previously over an extended period of time. Rose B., a fourteen-year-old girl, was attending school very irregularly and was consequently falling behind in her school work despite her intelligence. The school doctor felt that Rose "was inclined to be neurotic". The school nurse visited Mrs. B. and felt that the latter would appreciate receiving some help with Rose. It was agreed, following the school nurse's second visit to the family and her interpretation to Mrs. B. of the Family Welfare Bureau services, that worker would make a home visit.

When worker visited, Mrs. B. seemed pleased, and anxious for help with Rose. Throughout the nine months contact, however, worker found Mrs. B. to be "apathetically uncooperative". A thin, haggard looking woman, Mrs. B. appeared to be in very poor health. Untidy in her personal appearance, overwhelmed by the task of looking after three children in a two-room shack, worried about an uncertain income from a sick husband, Mrs. B. began to feel that "everything was beyond her". She became defensive and querulous with worker. Unable to cope with Rose, Mrs. B. attempted to place the blame for the girl's non-attendance on everyone else.

Rose, in her two office interviews with worker, seemed to "withdraw behind a wall of negativism". A well developed, attractively dressed girl, she had a sulky expression and responded to worker with "I don't know" and "nothing". She expressed her dislike
of school, but did not indicate any interest in a job. She explained her irregular attendance at school by saying that, due to over-crowding, she was continually disturbed in preparing her homework. Rose's only suggestion for improvement of the situation was that worker find a house for her sister Anne and her brother-in-law. Rose could then move into that house, prepare her homework in peace and consequently attend school regularly.

Here the worker was faced with clients overwhelmed by the problems of living, unable to bring themselves to the point where they could use help for the improvement of their situation. In this family lived Rose, an adolescent, greatly in need of support and guidance in her struggle for emancipation. The only person in her environment with whom Rose felt she could identify was her older sister, Anne. And Anne, known to the Family Welfare Bureau during her own adolescence, was promiscuous and confused.

Rose needed an understanding but firm mother person, someone who would like her but at the same time would not accept any of her anti-social behaviour. Unfortunately the worker did not play that role. Frustrated by Rose's negativism, she concluded after the two interviews that the girl had "a well formed personality pattern, based upon that of her mother and her older sister".

Several months after the initial contact with the family, when Rose's school attendance did not improve, worker told Mrs. B. and Rose that the Family Allowance would be cut off if Rose's truancy continued. Mrs. B. helplessly stated that she "needed this extra money" but could not do anything to force Rose to attend school regularly. Rose responded to worker by saying that she "would stop school the day she was fifteen".

Although it was important for both Mrs. B. and Rose to be aware of
the consequences of chronic school non-attendance, the approach the worker used in facing them with this reality seemed to be somewhat negative and punitive. Authority can be used constructively, especially with clients who are as immature and stunted as Mrs. B. but it has to be used for and with the client not against him. With this threat of the Family Allowance being cut off, the worker, feeling that the situation was hopeless, closed the case. At Mrs. B.'s request, every time Rose was away from school for more than one day, the school nurse was to visit in order to ascertain if the girl was really ill.

Every case worker, at one time or another, has had to work with a family such as the B.'s. No one can deny the difficulties and frustrations involved in dealing with clients who have so little capacity to respond to the warmth and acceptance of the worker. However, there is too much tendency among social workers to decide immediately that such a situation is hopeless, and not enough attempt to evaluate each case carefully, to find the spark of strength or response in the client, and to decide what approach would have the best chance of firing that spark. It is probable that even the greatest skill on the part of the worker could not have helped the B.'s, for they needed the external support and limits of an authoritative agency. In that case, perhaps it was the responsibility of the worker, who knew about the previous unsuccessful agency contact with the B.'s, to refuse the case and to interpret to the school personnel, the reasons why it would be more constructive to refer the family to an authoritative agency.

In some school referrals where the agency is expected to assist the family in raising the standard of living, the worker in her eagerness to help, may actually increase the client's resistance.
The case of the J. family was discussed at a school conference. The family's standard of living was inadequate. Although Mr. J. was working, the family had heavy medical debts. Mrs. J. was described as "sloppy, rather dull and apathetic". She was a poor housekeeper and was not taking very good care of her two children, Grace, thirteen years of age, and Bill, ten years of age. Because there was no actual neglect in the home, the school nurse asked that the Family Welfare Bureau help Mrs. J. "to improve standards and care of the children". Although the principal felt that "neither of the parents was particularly good stuff" and doubted Mrs. J.'s ability to accept case work service, the nurse expressed the opinion that "with encouragement and instruction Mrs. J. might improve the situation". Apparently Mrs. J. was not antagonistic or resentful towards the nurse's visits. It was decided that the nurse would accompany worker on the first visit.

After introducing worker, the nurse talked with Mrs. J. about the children. She enquired about Grace's health, as the girl had a heart condition. In this connection there was a discussion about a bed for Grace. Mrs. J. admitted that the sleeping arrangements were very cramped and that Grace and Bill had to share the same bed. The nurse suggested to Mrs. J. that worker might be able to help her in this respect, and worker promised "to make enquiries regarding a bed and to get in touch with Mrs. J. the following day".

When worker located a bed for Mrs. J. and advised her to get it, Mrs. J. found that "the bed would not be suitable for her". In discussing other possibilities of obtaining a bed, Mrs. J. definitely stated that she could not afford to pay even a nominal sum for it. However, when worker suggested a few days later that the children be sent to camp, Mrs. J. became very interested and thought she could pay three or four dollars for each of the children. Finally, worker obtained a bed for Grace and Mrs. J. was very pleased. The children went to camp and enjoyed it tremendously.

Mrs. J. seemed to look upon worker's visits as a necessary evil. She talked with worker about daily events but rarely volunteered any information. Worker "found it difficult to know how to approach Mrs. J. regarding her housekeeping" as sometimes the house was quite clean and at other times it was extremely dirty.
gestion that she obtain a bed for Grace, the latter failed to appreciate the importance of gaining Mrs. J.'s cooperation in the affair. Here was an opportunity to arouse Mrs. J. from her lethargy, to help her mobilize her strength, and thus to begin to improve the standards of the home. Obviously Mrs. J. was emotionally overwhelmed by the financial pressures and was unable to be a good housekeeper or to take adequate care of her children. The worker must have realized that the acquisition of the bed alone would not help Mrs. J. to cope with the realities of everyday living. But the community's demands that a thirteen-year old girl should not share her bed with a ten-year old brother, could have been used by the worker as a starting point in arousing Mrs. J.'s interest in changing her present situation. That Mrs. J. did have some interest in her children, and an ability to plan for them was shown in her participation in making arrangements for camp for her children.

Yet the worker eagerly pursued her objective of finding a bed for Grace, without consulting Mrs. J. She did not even sense Mrs. J.'s growing resentment against this interference in her own affairs, a resentment which was revealed by her readiness to pay for camp after having said that she could not pay towards a bed.

In the fall there was a change of workers. The new worker attempted to help Mrs. J. in connection with housing. Despite the fact that the family lived in a very over-crowded two-room apartment, Mrs. J. did not seem sufficiently dissatisfied with her surroundings to try to find another dwelling. She decided to wait until she could get one of the new houses in Burnaby. On two occasions, when worker was leaving Mrs. J.'s apartment, the latter "shouted that she would like worker to enquire about housing". Worker felt "that this was for the benefit of the other tenants" because Mrs. J. "was sensitive about her contact with the Family Welfare Bureau".
Sensing Mrs. J.'s reluctance to accept worker's visits, the latter brought up the original referral from the school nurse and wondered if Mrs. J. felt that the Family Welfare Bureau could help at present with any of her problems. Mrs. J. said "no"; she did not feel the need for any other service. She expressed her desire that her two children go to camp again next year, and worker suggested that she contact the agency in the spring to make the necessary arrangements for camp.

The new worker was much more aware of Mrs. J.'s resistance towards the agency and realized that Mrs. J. was actually ashamed of her contact with the Family Welfare Bureau. She, therefore, enabled Mrs. J. to terminate the contact. However, the worker's withdrawal from the picture did not help Mrs. J. with her problem. Perhaps, if the worker had assisted Mrs. J. to bring out her apparent hostility towards the agency, Mrs. J. would have been able to accept the offered help. By giving the bed to the family without asking for any effort on Mrs. J.'s part, the previous worker could only increase Mrs. J.'s feelings of inadequacy. It is not surprising, therefore, that Mrs. J., ashamed of her relationship with the Family Welfare Bureau, resisted any further contact.

The four cases discussed in this chapter emphasize the necessity of early evaluation of the clients' ability to use the help offered by a voluntary family agency. Not only the social workers but also the school personnel need to understand that not all people can benefit by being referred to the Family Welfare Bureau. If the principal, the teacher, or the nurse talks with each troubled family about the possibility of a referral to the Family Welfare Bureau, the clients' attitude might give
him a clue to the advisability of such a referral. Mrs. E. might have either tried to minimize her complaints about Jerry in order to prevent the referral to the Family Welfare Bureau or accepted an appointment with an agency worker for the purpose of obtaining skilled help with her problems with Jerry.

The Family Welfare Bureau workers need to decide reasonably early in their contact with the clients whether or not they can be of assistance to the families. Such a decision cannot be reached without the worker's confidence that she has used her skills to the utmost and that it is the client and not she who is responsible for the sterility of the relationship. But it is probable that Mrs. B. could have responded more positively to the approach of an authoritative agency.

Recognition by the schools and by the agency of the motivating forces in each family and greater self-awareness on the part of the social workers, would result in fewer cases of "passive resistance".
CHAPTER FIVE

USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HELP

Although case work is also concerned with effecting a change in the actions or attitudes of the client, there are many cases in which the worker can help the client only by improving his immediate situation. Even clients who come to the agency personally, often ask for help with minor, environmental difficulties and are not ready to discuss their basic problems. How much more this is true of families whose first contact with the agency is imposed upon them through a non-voluntary referral. In those cases where the referral itself points towards basic difficulties in the family, the worker has the unique opportunity of facing immediately with the client the necessity of changing his situation. However, when the reasons for the referral are vague and general, the worker can help the client only with the problems which the latter is ready to bring out and to discuss.

While the previous two chapters dealt with families referred by the schools to the Family Welfare Bureau, who either rejected or passively resisted the help offered them by the agency, the school referrals in this chapter will introduce those clients who were able to accept help but only in the area of their immediate problems. In some cases, the contact between the family and the agency worker resulted in the removal of the symptoms. In other cases that contact resulted in an adequate referral to the appropriate agency. In neither of these two classes did the workers grapple with the basic causes of the families' difficulties.
Removal of Symptoms.

The D. Family, referred by the school to the Family Welfare Bureau, had no specific problem.

The school nurse telephoned the Family Welfare Bureau worker to report the teacher's concern about the D. family. The three D. children, Andrew, nine, Margaret, seven, and Carol, six, told their teacher that their "house was about to be pulled down about their ears". The teacher thought that the family might need help in making other plans. Worker, who remembered Mrs. D. from the family's previous contact with the Family Welfare Bureau, agreed to visit the home.

Mrs. D. seemed pleased to see worker. She talked appreciatively about the help she had received from worker when she was sick and needed the services of a supervised homemaker. Mrs. D. was amused when worker explained the reason for the school referral. She stated that she had had some difficulties with her landlord but these were already "straightened out". Apparently Mr. D.'s attempt last winter to establish a woodworking shop had failed, and the family found itself in very difficult financial circumstances. However, Mr. D. was selling vacuum cleaners when visited, was successful at his job, and the family was slowly getting out of debt.

During her interview with worker, Mrs. D. mentioned the difficulties she was having with Andrew. The boy had enuresis, and was constantly soiling himself. Mrs. D. responded with interest to worker's discussion of the emotional factors often involved in these practices. She volunteered that she sometimes "neglected Andrew in favour of the girls". At worker's suggestion she decided to arrange for a check-up of Andrew by the school doctor in order to ascertain if there were any physical cause for the boy's difficulties.

After Andrew's medical examination, Mrs. D. carefully followed the doctor's instructions. She bought the boy a bicycle as the doctor recommended bicycling as an exercise for Andrew's varicose veins. She also gave the boy vitamins to improve his poor skin condition. The doctor felt that there might be a physical cause for Andrew's soiling as the boy did not have much control over his muscles. However,
both the soiling and the enuresis improved as soon as Mrs. D. began to follow the other recommendations of the doctor.

Thus, the worker very simply helped Mrs. D. with her difficulties with Andrew. One could undoubtedly question the basis on which the worker entered the D. Home. The referral was very vague, and had Mrs. D. not been known to the worker previously, the latter would probably have suggested that the school investigate the situation further. However, because of her earlier contact with the Family Welfare Bureau, Mrs. D. accepted the visit cordially and, while she was faced with no specific problem, discussed freely her present circumstances. It was probably Mrs. D.'s readiness to follow the doctor's recommendations that helped Andrew to feel wanted and accepted. Consequently, his enuresis and soiling were almost cured.

In her further contact with Mrs. D., the worker helped her to make arrangements for camp for the children. The worker later learned that Andrew had a very happy experience at camp and that his total adjustment improved greatly.

This time, as in her previous contacts, Mrs. D. used the agency to help her with a pressing worry. The worker knew about Mrs. D.'s deprived childhood and about her dependency needs. But she gave her assistance at the level on which Mrs. D. was ready to accept it.

The F. family was referred to the Family Welfare Bureau because of a specific problem - Harry's frequent, unexplained absences from school.

The attendance officer telephoned to request a report of the Family Welfare Bureau's previous contact with the F. family and, indirectly to refer the case, as Harry was continually absent from school. In view of
the fact that two years ago the agency had helped Mr. and Mrs. F. with their marital difficulties, the worker agreed to visit the home and to explain to Mrs. F. that she was calling at the attendance officer's request.

Prior to her contact with Mrs. F., the worker interviewed the principal, and discussed with him Harry's school record. In the past year Harry's grades had dropped from "A" to "C". The principal described Harry as a "likeable, bright little fellow" who was capable of "good work". He thought that the boy's academic decline was mainly due to his constant absences from school.

When worker first called, Mrs. F. was not at home. The following day, in response to the note that worker had left in the home, Mrs. F. telephoned the agency. Worker explained that the Family Welfare Bureau had been asked by the school authorities to discuss Harry's absences from school with Mrs. F. The latter was quite willing to arrange an appointment in her own home.

Although Mrs. F. was expecting worker, and seemed to be "carefully dressed for the occasion", worker sensed her defensiveness. When worker asked how Mrs. F. felt about the school referral, Mrs. F. indicated that she was not aware of any "real trouble" at school. Harry's absences could be explained by illness. She did feel that Harry was bullied by older boys because of his slight stature. She was also worried at times by Harry's tendency "to be moody". During these periods he liked to be left alone and did not eat. On the whole, however, Mrs. F. considered Harry to be a "pretty average boy".

Worker was impressed by Mrs. F.'s wise handling of Harry's eating difficulties and his enquiries about sex matters. However, Mrs. F. did not seem really concerned about Harry's absences from school. She readily gave worker permission to talk to Harry's teacher and to find out "a bit more about the difficulties the boy may be having at school". But in her attitude she seemed to be placing on worker and on the school the whole responsibility of improving Harry's school attendance.
A few weeks later, worker found out from the principal that Harry "was improving and was attending regularly". During worker's second visit with Mrs. F., the latter seemed to be less defensive. She was very pleased with Harry's progress at school. She told worker that she had arranged for a medical examination for Harry and, following the doctor's advice, "was re-enforcing the boy's diet with vitamins". In view of the lack of any further complaints from the school, Mrs. F. felt that there was no need for continuance of her contact with the agency.

It is difficult to ascertain why Harry's school attendance improved so suddenly, following the worker's interview with Mrs. F. Although friendly and willing to discuss other areas of Harry's life, Mrs. F. tried to avoid facing the issue which precipitated the school referral. Yet, the principal told the worker that Harry "was improving and was attending regularly". Perhaps the mere fact that the worker visited Mrs. F. at the school's request, stimulated Mrs. F. to pay more attention to her son's school attendance. It is also possible that Harry's health improved, and influenced his school attendance.

In this case again, one could question the basis of the school referral. Because the problem which caused the referral centred around school attendance, it seemed logical for the attendance officer to visit the home once at least, and, if necessary, to then refer the F.'s to the Family Welfare Bureau for further help. Even though the family had been known previously to the Family Welfare Bureau, the agency worker did not need to feel obliged to accept the case immediately, without a clearer picture of the situation. This time, the problem was in a different area, and, while the Family Welfare Bureau might have been very helpful to Mr. and Mrs. F. in their marital difficulties, it did not fol-
low that the agency would automatically be of assistance to Mrs. F. with
regard to Harry's school attendance.

However, the worker's contact with Mrs. F. did remove the symptoms
which had caused the school referral and, therefore the Family Welfare
Bureau was of help to the family.

In the following case the Family Welfare Bureau worker gave help on
an environmental level to an adolescent girl.

The Girls' Counsellor telephoned to enquire if the
Family Welfare Bureau would be willing to help Gail H.,
sixteen years of age, whose mother was dead. The girl
was "extremely sick during her menstrual periods", and
often fainted at school. This made Gail very apprehen-
sive and uncomfortable. Although the Counsellor felt
that the girl might be in need of special medical care,
and had talked to the school nurse about it, she
stated "emphatically that she could not have anything
to do with a referral to a specialist". Worker sugges-
ted the possibility of emotional factors being connect-
ed with Gail's menstrual pains. It was decided that
worker would see Gail in the office, and would discuss
the situation with her fully.

Gail was a slight girl, with "a rather fragile
air". Alert and friendly, she talked with ease about
her menstrual periods. She explained that her family
doctor thought the pains were caused mainly by a
tilted uterus, and that an operation could be per-
formed to correct this. However, because the opera-
tion might not effect "a permanent cure", Gail decided
not to undergo it.

In further discussion with Gail, worker found out
that the girl had neither been given any information
regarding sex nor been prepared for the menstrual
periods. Gail's mother died when the girl was eleven
years old. Because Gail commented that she seldom saw
her father, who worked on the night shift, worker felt
that perhaps there was a strained relationship between
the father and the daughter. Gail did not feel close
to her older sister, a dental nurse, and therefore
could not talk with her about the "facts of life". In
her second interview with Gail, the worker "gave her
counselling on sexual matters", with the help of
diagrams. Gail seemed very eager for the information
and expressed her delight in discovering that "sex was not sordid".

Gail terminated her contact with worker when, following an emergency appendectomy, her condition during the menstrual periods improved. Although worker told her about other ways in which Gail could use the agency, the girl did not think that she needed any further help.

Here the worker helped a motherless adolescent by explaining to her the "facts of life". At an age when full information about sexual matters was of utmost importance, Gail found in the worker an understanding mother-person with whom she could talk freely.

It is questionable if the worker should have given Gail sex instruction without discussing the matter with the girl's father. As a parent of an adolescent, Mr. H. ought to have been consulted regarding the worker's plans for Gail.

However, Gail used her relationship with the worker to obtain the information she needed and wanted, and therefore, her contact with the agency was constructive.

Appropriate referral.

In working with a family, referred by the school to the Family Welfare Bureau, the worker found it necessary, at times, to refer the clients to another agency. In these cases, the worker felt that the family could not respond to the kind of help offered by the Family Welfare Bureau. She, therefore, concentrated her efforts on assisting the client to accept a referral to an agency better able to deal with the particular problem.

The school nurse discussed the K. family with the Family Welfare Bureau worker. Donald, fourteen years of age, was truanting. He did
not seem able to concentrate in the classroom and consequently, had failed in grade four, and was repeating grade five. He was stealing small items which were of little monetary value (usually stamps and coupons). Donald's teacher was particularly concerned about the boy, because of his recent, unusual behaviour in the classroom. Once, during the class, Donald "stood up and clutched his arm saying that there was a hole in it and air was coming out of the arm". He also told the teacher that he "heard whistling sounds". According to the school nurse there was no organic basis for Donald's complaints. It was agreed that it would be wise for the worker to see the family and to offer the agency service.

When worker first called, no one was at home. A letter was then written to Mrs. K. telling her about the school referral, and asking her to contact worker in order to arrange an appointment. Mrs. K. did not reply to the letter. Finally, following a second letter, in which Mrs. K. was advised about the time of the appointment, worker visited the home. Mrs. K. was obviously expecting worker, and she appeared reconciled to the visit. When worker asked Mrs. K. direct questions about her life and her husband, she answered briefly and with reluctance. She was tense and anxious. Worker did find out, however, that Mr. and Mrs. K. had arranged a legal separation, following Mr. K.'s return from overseas. Mrs. K. never found her marital relationship satisfying as her husband "ran around with other women", and was rarely at home. Mrs. K. retained the children, Evelyn, nineteen, and the twins, Donald and Michael. Mr. K. showed little interest in his children, who felt the rejection keenly. The twins said to Mrs. K. at the time of their parents' separation: "Daddy doesn't want us, nobody wants us, maybe you do".

The family was supported by Mrs. K.'s earnings (she worked as a seamstress), and by Mr. K.'s monthly payments made in accordance with their separation agreement. Evelyn, who worked in a factory, also contributed towards the upkeep of the home. Although the total income of the family seemed adequate, Mrs. K. felt strongly
that her husband should be contributing more towards their maintenance. She mentioned this to worker on several occasions.

In discussing Donald's behaviour, Mrs. K. expressed a feeling of hopelessness when she said "but what can I do, I have tried everything". She talked about Donald's slow physical development, about his moodiness whenever he was frustrated, about his fears of doctors and of medical examinations. She attributed Donald's unusual behaviour in the classroom to this fear of any physical check-ups which the boy had acquired at the time of his tonsillectomy two years earlier. Mrs. K. stated that Donald never liked school and that his attendance was poor. She constantly compared Donald unfavourably with Michael who was "so quick and active". But in talking about both sons, Mrs. K. mentioned several times that they were a heavy responsibility and wondered if it would not be wise to place them in a boarding school.

The difficulties that the worker had in contacting Mrs. K. suggested her resistance to accepting help from the Family Welfare Bureau. That she was not ready to discuss her own problems was evident in her blocking when questioned by the worker. When faced with the reasons for the school referral, Mrs. K. appeared to be helpless. Although she showed some understanding of Donald's problems, her immediate reaction was to escape from the responsibilities of caring for both sons by suggesting placement in a boarding school.

During her further contact with Mrs. K., worker suggested an examination for Donald at the Child Guidance Clinic. Mrs. K. was very cooperative in making the necessary arrangements for the examination. Prior to the clinic appointment, worker had a short interview with Donald. Worker felt that the boy was "pathetic-looking", with "deep-set eyes, large nose and sunken cheeks, accentuated by full lips". Donald talked with worker easily. From the boy's description of his exploits, worker gained the impression that Donald was partially living in fantasy. In his need to impress worker, Donald also showed his desire to gain worker's interest
and approval.

During the Child Guidance Clinic examination Donald was found to be of average intelligence. He showed "absence of close personal relationships" and "feeling of inadequacy". He "admitted having nervous manifestations". He seemed to have "high goals in life" and to "want to conform to socially acceptable principles". The psychiatrist felt that Donald exhibited symptoms of serious disturbance, and that procrastination could be dangerous. Because there seemed to be "little likelihood of changing the home", the psychiatrist recommended long term foster home placement for the boy.

Although Mrs. K. herself thought of sending her two sons to a boarding school, she could not accept the psychiatrist's recommendation. While she was discussing with worker her doubts regarding foster home placement for Donald, the boy "got into trouble". He had to appear in the Juvenile Court on a charge of breaking and entering. Because of the unsatisfactory home situation, Donald was made a ward. It was decided that he would go to camp at first, and then be placed in a foster home.

Mrs. K. showed little concern about the wardship action. She seemed almost glad to be relieved of the responsibility of caring for Donald. She enquired about the possibilities of placing Michael in a foster home, pointing out to the worker that she was unable to give her children adequate care and supervision. Mrs. K. thought a foster home would be "better for Michael" than his own home. She added quickly that Michael was "a good boy".

In view of Mrs. K.'s apparent desire to be relieved of the responsibility for her other son also, worker felt that the Children's Aid Society with its protective and child placing functions, would be of more help to Mrs. K. than the Family Welfare Bureau. Following a discussion with Mrs. K., the case was referred to the Children's Aid Society.

Mrs. K. did not want to use the help offered her by the Family Welfare Bureau worker to improve her relationship with her children. It became apparent, during her first interview with the worker, that Mrs. K. preferred to solve her difficulties by "washing her hands" of Donald.
The worker seemed ready to use this desire of Mrs. K.'s to escape from her responsibilities in order to effect foster home placement of Donald. Undoubtedly the boy did need the security of a home in which he could feel accepted. But the worker's primary responsibility was to use her skills to the utmost in an attempt to improve the mother–son relationship and thus to enable Donald to have his basic needs satisfied in his own home. The worker tried to help Mrs. K. with her own problems by asking her questions about her personal history. These questions were not directly related to the school referral, and it is not surprising, therefore, that Mrs. K. gave the answers very reluctantly. Because she never asked the agency for help, she probably considered the worker's questions an unwarranted intrusion. Had the worker at first discussed with Mrs. K. the reasons for the school referral, and in talking about Donald become aware of Mrs. K.'s own needs and desires, she probably would have been able to establish a more meaningful relationship with Mrs. K. Mrs. K. might then have discussed her own needs and received help without the use of direct questions.

Mrs. K.'s emphasis upon economic security, as shown in her insistence on obtaining more money from her husband, and her inability to accept the responsibility for her children, were indicative of her need to be dependent — to receive rather than to give. At the same time Mrs. K. did seem to have some feeling for her children. Perhaps, by facing with Mrs. K. her need to escape from her responsibilities, by accepting that need, and by offering to help Mrs. K. with her problems, the worker could have brought out the positive aspects of Mrs. K.'s attitude towards her sons. By concentrating on the foster home place-
ment for Donald at once, the worker strengthened Mrs. K.'s negative feelings, and, in a sense, encouraged her to continue running away from the realistic demands of her life.

It is possible, of course, that Mrs. K. was too disturbed to face the reality situation, and that she would have continued to cling to her defenses. Because this was apparently the conclusion reached by the worker, the referral to the Children's Aid Society was a constructive move. Following the wardship action for Donald, Mrs. K. was ready to give up Michael also. And only a Children's Aid Society worker could help her to evaluate carefully all the facets, problems and demands of placement and to reach a decision on the basis of available resources.

The four cases in this chapter illustrate the social work principle that a worker, in order to be effective, must meet the client at his own level. The supportive relationship with their workers enabled Mrs. D. to show more interest in her son Andrew; resulted in marked improvement in Harry F.'s school attendance; permitted Gail H. to obtain the much needed information about the "facts of life"; and helped Mrs. K. to accept the referral to the Children's Aid Society.

It can be questioned whether some of these clients would not have been able to move further with the help of the worker, and to effect more profound changes in themselves and in their situation, had the school referrals been more specific and the agency's first contact with the family better defined. If the school had referred Mrs. D. to the Family Welfare Bureau for a definite reason, the worker would have been
able to face with the client directly the particular problem. Thus, Mrs.
D. might have been assisted to bring out her basic dependency needs, and
helped to handle these needs more constructively.

Referrals of school cases from the Family Welfare Bureau to another
agency need to be made on the basis of a thorough evaluation of the
strengths and weaknesses in each family. Had the worker used her skills
to strengthen Mrs. K.'s positive feelings towards her sons, the referral
of the family to the Children's Aid Society might not have been necessary.

Although many clients are able to use help only on the environmental
level, it is essential that, in handling school referrals, agency workers
be aware of their own part in the treatment process, and know what kind
of help each client really wants and can use.
CHAPTER SIX

USE OF HELP FOR CHANGING FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Because the client responds not to the ideas of the worker, but to her emotional attitude, no amount of knowledge can compensate for a lack of human empathy. But empathy alone is not sufficient. In non-voluntary referrals particularly, where the client does not request the service, the worker must also have a belief in her right to approach him, and an equal belief in his right to refuse the service. Because of its importance a single case is discussed in this chapter. It illustrates the vital role that a worker's emotional attitude towards a family plays in a school referral. Here is an outstanding example of what a worker can do, even though the school referral is inadequate and the family is hostile and resistant to the agency because of its previous unsatisfactory contact with the Family Welfare Bureau.

The Z. family was one of those which has been known intermittently to the Family Welfare Bureau over a period of six years. During this time, the school referred the family to the agency three times because Peter presented serious behaviour problems. All three referrals are instructive. In order to show clearly the situation with which the worker had to deal in the third school referral, it is necessary to summarize the previous two contacts between the agency and the family.

First School Referral (1944).

The school nurse referred the Z. family to the Family Welfare Bureau when Peter, six years of age, was stated to be stealing, lying, attacking girls, and suffering from enuresis. Although the family had
just moved into the neighbourhood, and Peter had been at the school only two weeks, the principal was "desperate about his behaviour". In the school that Peter had previously attended, he was reported to have acted "like a little animal". In the discussion with the worker, the principal expressed his feeling that Mrs. Z. was "a weak type of personality willing to shift all responsibility to the school". Mrs. Z. apparently accepted Peter's behaviour, and expected the school to "know what to do with a little boy behaving in such a way". The worker agreed to visit the home.

Mrs. Z. "welcomed the worker quite cordially". She was concerned about a rash that her baby had, and worker suggested that she contact the Victorian Order of Nurses. Worker then "began to talk about Peter and his behaviour problems, and explained to Mrs. Z. the function of the Family Welfare Bureau". Mrs. Z. talked about the difficulties she has had with Peter since his birth, comparing him unfavourably with her two younger children, Michael, three years of age, and Robin, one month old. As a child, Peter cried constantly, and was very nervous and high strung. He has always been very jealous of Michael, refusing to share anything with him. According to Mrs. Z., Peter "has never been affectionate, and has never played with other children". "He was different from everyone else in the family". Worker felt that Mrs. Z. preferred Michael to Peter, and deprived Peter of love and affection. Worker "impressed upon Mrs. Z. the importance of treating Peter and Michael alike", and suggested that both Mr. and Mrs. Z. work out a plan by which Peter would be given special attention in various ways. Mrs. Z. seemed willing to arrange an examination for Peter at the Child Guidance Clinic in the near future, in order to "get guidance". She also agreed that worker might return for an interview with both her and her husband.

Mr. Z., when seen by worker, described the difficulties that the family had with Peter's toilet training. For a year, Peter "would hold himself back from going to the bathroom", and laxatives did not help at all. He also continued until recently to wet the bed. Mr. Z. seemed ready to accept worker's suggestion that Peter should be examined by a pediatrician, as worker thought his history was "somewhat suggestive of glandular disorders". He asked worker to arrange an appointment at the Child Guidance Clinic "in case the child specialist
felt it was the thing to do". Throughout the inter-
view, Mrs. Z. disclaimed any responsibility for
Peter's misbehaviour. "I am leaving it all to Mr. Z." 
she said.

The school nurse and the principal, rightly concerned with Peter,
asked the Family Welfare Bureau to help the family. Mrs. Z. had been
told by the school nurse that a worker from the Family Welfare Bureau
would pay her a visit. There is no mention in the record of any inter-
pretation of the services of the Family Welfare Bureau to Mrs. Z. by
either the nurse or the principal. Even with no information about the
personalities of the parents, the worker must have known that Peter's
behaviour problems were serious enough to suggest a disturbed mother or
father or both. Yet, during her first visit, the worker launched into a
detailed discussion of Peter's difficulties. She ignored the fact that
Mrs. Z. would have to feel accepted for herself before she could co-
operate in helping Peter.

When Peter was examined at the Child Guidance
Clinic, he was diagnosed as slow normal. His social
adjustment was down with regard to school and family
relations. The psychiatrist thought that Peter might
be suffering from chronic chorea, but this diagnosis
was never verified. Because it was felt that Peter
was rejected at home, and that his behaviour was a
"compensation for his inferiority complex", foster
home placement for the boy was indicated. It was al-
so suggested that Peter return to the previous school,
as he had formed a definite attachment to his teacher
there. Mr. Z., with whom the psychiatrist discussed
these plans, "was depressed, but obviously relieved
to know how to handle the situation". During his next
telephone conversation with the worker, he agreed to
place Peter temporarily in a foster home which he had
found himself. In the process of arranging the place-
ment through the Children's Aid Society, the worker
left the agency.

Two months later, the new worker visited the
family and found that "the suggestions of the psychia­
trist had been ignored". Mrs. Z. showed "abso­
lutely no understanding and no interest in the
problems of her son". She held firmly to the idea
that Peter was a school problem, and that she was
not responsible for his difficulties. Worker
wondered if Mrs. Z. did not feel that "home discip­
line had something to do with the child's behaviour".
Mrs. Z. insisted that "it was up to the teachers".
However, during the next visit, Mrs. Z. was again
cordial, and seemed anxious to talk with the worker
about Peter. She complained that the principal and
the teachers were unfair to Peter, and were blaming
him for any misdemeanours that occurred at the
school. When worker wondered how she could arrange
to meet Mr. Z., Mrs. Z. stated that he worked long
hours, and rarely had any free time. Mrs. Z.,
apparently wanted to handle the situation alone.
Peter's behaviour at school did not improve, and
the principal stated that the boy was disrupting the
whole school by his constant stealing, lying and
fighting. Both the principal and the school nurse
seemed to assume that Peter was to blame for any in­
cident that occurred at the school. Nevertheless,
there was a real basis for their attitude and alarm.
For Peter's behaviour could constitute a danger to
the other children.

Following further unsuccessful attempts of
worker to help Mrs. Z. to make suitable arrangements
for Peter, worker informed the principal that the
Z.'s might need the authoritative approach of the
Child Welfare Division. It was decided that the
Family Welfare Bureau would close the case in view
of the parents' lack of cooperation. However, if
further trouble developed, the principal was to con­
tact the Family Welfare Bureau, who would then dis­
cuss the case with the Child Welfare Division.

Mrs. Z., a hostile and uncooperative woman who could not accept any
responsibility for Peter's behaviour, expected the school to handle the
boy's problems. Mr. Z. seemed to be the weaker partner in the marriage.
Although he showed an interest in Peter, and tried to cooperate with
both the agency and the school, he could not carry through any plans for
his son. Peter's aggressive, anti-social behaviour seemed to be an out-
come of his unsatisfying relationship with both his mother and his father.

The worker's lack of acceptance of Mrs. Z. may have been responsible for the fact that despite Mrs. Z.'s seeming readiness to take Peter to the Child Guidance Clinic, she later began to resist any suggestions regarding plans for the boy; she thrust the whole responsibility for Peter's behaviour upon Mr. Z. and the school. Mrs. Z., of course, might have been unable to cooperate with the worker even if she were approached in a suitable manner. However, the fact that Mrs. Z. sometimes greeted the worker cordially and seemed anxious to talk was indicative of some desire for help. But the worker still concentrated on Peter's problems, and relentlessly pursued the objective of foster home placement for the boy.

Mrs. Z. was not even consulted following the Child Guidance Clinic examination and the psychiatrist's recommendations. Threatened by this, Mrs. Z. increased her tendency to blame everyone else for her difficulties. The new worker found her completely "uninterested in the problem of her son". It seems probable that it was Mrs. Z.'s opposition to the psychiatrist's recommendations that influenced Mr. Z.'s withdrawal from his original agreement to Peter's placement. When the case was closed --- because "the family did not seem able to accept the Family Welfare Bureau services" --- Peter's behaviour was unimproved.

Second School Referral (1945).

Five months later, the case was re-opened. The school inspector telephoned the worker to inform her that Peter had been suspended from school for incorrigible behaviour. Several incidents led to the suspension. It finally occurred when Peter "took a whistle forcibly away from another child and threw him on the ground". Mrs. Z. asked the
school inspector's advice "as to what she should do", and, following his suggestion, enrolled Peter in a private school. Because the family had not seemed able to use the service offered by the Family Welfare Bureau, the worker and the school inspector agreed to call a conference. It was felt that a meeting of the Child Welfare Division, the Family Welfare Bureau and the school representatives could more effectively plan ways and means of handling the present situation.

Meanwhile, worker visited the family and found Mr. Z. at home. Mr. Z. expressed his appreciation of the seriousness of Peter's behaviour. He stated that his wife had known for a long time that Peter was a problem not only at school but also at home. Mr. Z. thought that if the private school could not handle Peter, he would have to be sent to a boarding school. Worker told Mr. Z. of her intention of visiting again in order to see Mrs. Z.

At the conference, it was generally agreed that Peter's enrolment in a private school would not solve his difficulties. Although to date the private school did not report any trouble, it was doubted that Peter's behaviour was essentially altered. Because the Z.'s were living opposite the school, Peter continued to be a disturbing influence in the school yard on week-ends. Following a long discussion, the representatives at the conference decided that the school inspector would see Mr. Z., urge him to assume more responsibility for Peter, and advise cooperation with the Family Welfare Bureau; the Family Welfare Bureau worker would then contact the parents and "try to persuade them to take Peter back to the Child Guidance Clinic"; worker would also keep in touch with the private school; at the time of the Child Guidance Clinic examination or earlier, the Child Welfare Division would accept the case.

Mr. Z. did not keep his appointment with the school inspector. The latter had a talk with Mrs. Z., however, who expressed considerable antagonism towards the Family Welfare Bureau. The school inspector felt that Mrs. Z. responded to authority. He mentioned to her that "a Family Welfare Bureau worker might be calling."
Worker visited the home twice but, although people could be heard inside, no one answered the door. Two appointments, arranged at the Child Guidance Clinic for Peter, had to be cancelled because worker could not contact the family. Finally, the case was closed because of the Z.'s "unwillingness to participate in a plan involving case work services".

The conference of the representatives of social agencies and schools attempted to evaluate Peter's home situation and to decide on a constructive course of action. Again, in their concern for the boy, whose delinquent behaviour was becoming a threat to the community, the representatives of the conference concentrated on finding ways of helping Peter, and, in the process, neglected the basic problems of the family. The assumption of the conference that the Z.'s were not able to use casework service offered by the Family Welfare Bureau was based on sketchy evidence. Mr. Z.'s apparent desire, as expressed in his previous contact with the Family Welfare Bureau, to cooperate with the agency, followed by a sudden withdrawal when Mrs. Z. opposed the plan for Peter, was suggestive of Mrs. Z.'s dominant position in the family. Is it not logical, therefore, to conclude that Peter could be helped only if Mrs. Z. were willing to cooperate. Yet at no time did the worker accept Mrs. Z. or try to understand and help her with her own problems. No one can question the difficulty of working with Mrs. Z. But if social workers believe that the emotional health of a child is an outcome of a secure and satisfying relationship with its family, then their help to a disturbed child must of necessity include helping its parents. Only when all attempts to effect any change in the parents have failed, should the worker feel comfortable in concentrating her efforts on helping only the child.
There is no mention in the record as to whether or not the final decision to transfer the case to the authoritative agency (Child Welfare Division) was ever carried into effect. The worker's attempts to get in touch with Mrs. Z. failed; the case was again closed. Mrs. Z.'s resentment towards the Family Welfare Bureau had probably increased with this second "intrusion" of a worker into her home. By closing the case without either seeing Mrs. Z. or writing her a letter, the worker left her with a hostility against the agency which she could not handle by herself.

Third School Referral (1949)

Three years later, when the school nurse telephoned the Family Welfare Bureau to discuss Peter's serious behaviour problems, the case was again opened. This time a different worker was assigned to the case.

The nurse and the principal expressed their grave concern with Peter, who was at school on probation and was in serious danger of being again expelled. Peter had several times severely injured other children and has been continually pushing girls into ditches. He has also been caught stealing from other pupils and from the neighbourhood store. According to the principal, Mrs. Z. still "refused to admit that there was anything wrong with the boy, and blamed everyone for picking on him". When the worker said that Peter did sound like a very disturbed boy, the principal stated that "he would not be surprised if Peter murdered somebody". After further discussion, the worker agreed to visit the home and to see what could be done. She told the principal, however, that in view of the Family Welfare Bureau's past experience, "the outlook was far from hopeful that the family would accept casework services".

When worker visited, "Mrs. Z. was reluctant to stop washing the floor, stating quite flatly that she
never appreciated visitors when her work was not done. Worker agreed that it was often inconvenient to have unexpected visitors but explained that the school nurse had asked her to discuss Peter with Mrs. Z. Worker said that she realized this would probably worry Mrs. Z. but worker felt that the request from the school would not have been made unless there were a real difficulty. According to the principal, Peter was having a difficult time and there was a real possibility that he might be expelled. The principal did not want to take this step if he could possibly avoid it, and perhaps worker and Mrs. Z. could talk about it together and see what could be done." Mrs. Z. at first stated that Peter was much better lately and that he was able to work out his own problems. With worker's help she could admit later that Peter had "nightmares sometimes" and that he did not talk much. She still insisted however, that at school Peter was discriminated against and blamed for other children's misdemeanours. Worker told Mrs. Z. that "no matter where the roots of the trouble lay, it was plain that the school was having difficulty with Peter and while she might feel they weren't very understanding, they were showing a desire to help Peter by referring him to the Family Welfare Bureau rather than expelling him immediately." Worker explained the function of the Family Welfare Bureau and said that the agency wanted only to help Mrs. Z. in a situation which must be a great worry to her. "Tears came to her eyes and she said she would be less than human if she didn't worry, but Peter has been punished so often by the school and by his parents that they were sure everything possible has been done". Mrs. Z. then talked about the difficulties she has had with the neighbours who forbid their children to play with Peter. Worker suggested that it must be hard for Mrs. Z. to live among neighbours she did not like and wondered if the Z.'s ever thought of moving. Mrs. Z. said that this was their home but that if they had enough money they would send Peter to a boarding school. She then started to talk again about her inability to understand why Peter was in so much trouble. When worker suggested that a child's difficulties often began very early and that it was sometimes helpful to discuss these early years in order to understand more clearly his present behaviour, Mrs. Z. immediately stated that "this had been done when the Family Welfare Bureau worker visited before and she couldn't see that there was any value in that sort of thing". Certainly they hadn't learned anything about Peter and she could not see where any discussion of her married left could be helpful". Worker ex-
explained that Family Welfare Bureau was not an authoritative agency, and that Mrs. Z. "could not be forced to divulge any information she did not choose to give". However, it might be helpful to her to talk over the problem with an interested outsider. Although Mrs. Z. arranged another appointment with worker, "her whole attitude was defensive and somewhat frightened".

When the worker entered the Z. home for the first time, she was greeted with hostility. In view of Mrs. Z.'s resistance, and unresolved conflicts from her previous contact with the Family Welfare Bureau, her need to reject a representative of the agency is understandable. The worker's complete acceptance of Mrs. Z.'s feelings, along with her clear statement of the purpose for her visit, enabled Mrs. Z. to admit that Peter did have nightmares. Although she still had to place the blame for Peter's behaviour on the school and on the neighbours, Mrs. Z. could now express her feelings "that she would be less than human if she didn't worry". The worker is obviously concerned with Peter's behaviour, but in talking with Mrs. Z. about the boy she never forgets that Mrs. Z. also has problems, that she is probably unhappy, and that she needs help. In offering the services of the agency to Mrs. Z. the worker explains to her the non-authoritative function of the Family Welfare Bureau and leaves Mrs. Z. free to reject the offered help.

Although "defensive and somewhat frightened" at the end of the first interview, Mrs. Z. must have sensed the worker's genuine warmth, understanding, and respect for her. She was not at home when the worker visited her again, but she telephoned the agency a few days later to apologize for having forgotten the appointment. Mrs. Z. was still unable to admit that either she, or Peter needed help, and resisted the
idea of further contact with the agency by saying that she could "handle the problem in her own way". However, Mrs. Z. did ask the worker to visit her in order to discuss the possibilities of a camp referral for Peter. Her movement was slow and with every forward step she had to retreat again. But she no longer rejected the agency totally. Perhaps Mrs. Z. was beginning to feel that she could trust this worker who so plainly faced with her the reality of the situation and at the same time seemed to like her and to want to understand her.

During worker's second visit to the home Mrs. Z. was much more cooperative. While talking about sending Peter to camp, she went so far as to tell worker that Peter was "nervous and high strung". When worker mentioned the difficulty of referring Peter to a camp, Mrs. Z. stated that she would see the counselor of the camp chosen for Peter in order to explain the situation to him. "She did not want Peter to be accepted under false pretenses". Although Mrs. Z. felt that she could not talk to anyone at school about Peter because "they could not understand her", she seemed anxious for worker to speak to the principal and to the teacher. She asked worker to let her know "what their present attitude toward Peter was".

The principal felt that Peter's behaviour had not changed. He was afraid that the boy "might kill someone before he is much older". At the principal's suggestion, worker discussed with Mrs. Z. during her next visit, the possibility of Peter's referral to Dr. Gundry. Mrs. Z. resisted this suggestion by pointing out to worker that both she and her husband were so "disappointed" in the results of the Child Guidance Clinic examination. However, just as worker was leaving, Mrs. Z. asked if the agency "could get some young man to be a friend to Peter".

When worker visited Mrs. Z. a few weeks later, the latter was "more at ease and less defensive". She seemed relieved to find out that a male worker would be able to work with Peter during the summer and she volunteered to forget about sending the boy to camp until "we see how this works out". She suggested that Peter's worker come to see him every day but finally agreed to one or two interviews a week.
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Worker interpreted to Mrs. Z. that Peter's attitude to his parents might undergo a change while he was being seen by his worker. Worker stressed especially the possible hostility on Peter's part. Mrs. Z. accepted this and was able to talk about Peter's need for help. She was fearful, however, that if Peter suspected that he was being helped, he would "rear right up". She thought she would "just tell Peter that Mr. D. (the worker) was interested in boys and wanted to be a friend for him this summer". Later, Mrs. Z. apparently talked to Peter in those terms and the boy seemed pleased.

In her request for a "friend" for Peter, Mrs. Z. moved to a point where she could directly ask for help. On the one hand she insisted that Peter should not find out he "was being helped" because he might refuse to see the worker, and on the other hand she wished that the worker would visit Peter every day. Thus, she was probably expressing her own conflict around the acceptance of help, her fear of admitting to herself that she had weaknesses, and her desire to gain the worker's acceptance, approval and help.

Mr. D. saw Peter nine times during the summer. Peter usually met him down-town. He kept all his appointments and showed evident concern as to whether or not Mr. D. would meet him. He did not participate much in planning what he and Mr. D. would do together and usually said that he would do anything Mr. D. wanted. Each outing was devoted to a different activity—walks to different parts of town; a visit to the museum, to the fish hatchery, to a department store; a trip to North Vancouver on the ferry. Peter was friendly and carried on a steady stream of conversation. When he and Mr. D. went to the museum, Peter exhibited vivid imagination in his comments about the Indian masks and carvings. At other times, however, while Peter described events in which he particip-
ated, Mr. D. found it difficult to distinguish between fantasy and reality.

Throughout the contact Peter tested Mr. D. constantly. He seemed to wait for Mr. D.'s reaction to both his verbal boastings of past events and his unorthodox activities during the outings. He spoke, for example, of his attempts to catch pigeons at Victory Square, stressing the fact that he might have been caught by the "cops". During the trip to North Vancouver on the ferry, Peter kept opening car doors, "banging on backs of trucks and fiddling with a motorcycle". Once, while passing a service station Peter "grabbed a water hose and squirted the back of a car with water". At all times Mr. D. accepted Peter even though his attitude towards the boy showed he disapproved of some of Peter's activities. An incident which occurred in a department store probably illustrates best both Peter's need to see "what he can get away with" and his desire to have Mr. D.'s approval. While admiring small guns in the toy department, Peter hid one of the guns in his pocket. Although the store clerk did not notice it, Peter knew that Mr. D. had seen the incident. A few minutes later Mr. D. asked Peter if "he wanted the gun that bad". Peter laughed and immediately returned the toy to the counter.

Peter often talked about his friend, Barry, thirteen years of age. Barry was "not afraid of anything". He could not swim very well, but he jumped into deep water. He liked to ring door-bells, and then run away. When Barry hitch-hiked, he would tell the driver to take him to his destination "or else". At first, Peter seemed very impressed with Barry's daring exploits, and was obviously trying to pattern his own behaviour on that of his friend. As he began to trust Mr. D., and to feel closer to him, there was a marked change in Peter's attitude towards
Barry. Peter mentioned, for example, that he "did not have much fun with Barry because he could not do the things he wanted to do". Apparently, when Peter wanted to row a boat, Barry was "very critical of his attempts to row". Peter also said that he could not understand "how Barry got through school at all, because he played around so much". At the same time, with Mr. D.'s encouragement, Peter began to talk about his father. He explained to Mr. D. that his father "looked after machine maintenance in a mill", and proudly stated that Mr. Z. "knew all about machines". On another occasion, he mentioned that his father had built a band-saw "all by himself". During the last few outings, Peter's need to boast about the things he could do decreased. Although he still had to impress Mr. D. with his courage by threatening to jump into the water while hanging over the edge of a sea wall (twenty feet above the water), he could at the same time admit that "it might not be a very good idea to go in over one's head before one could swim fairly well".

In accordance with Mrs. Z.'s insistence that Peter should think of Mr. D. as "a friend", the question of helping the boy with his difficulties was not discussed with Peter. The relationship between Peter and Mr. D. remained on a friendly basis. Peter must have sensed, however, that his contact with Mr. D. was helpful to him, for he reacted strongly when the contact was terminated at the end of the summer. (Mr. D. left the agency). Although Peter said that "it would be alright" to have someone else come to see him in the fall, and was very non-committal when saying good-bye to Mr. D., it was revealed later through Mrs. Z. that he felt rejected.

When Mrs. Z. came to the office, at her own request, to see Peter's
worker, the boy went down-town with his mother and sat in the street-car
"with a hurt look on his face, like he was going to cry". Questioned by
Mrs. Z., Peter said that he wanted to come with her to the office.
Peter was also very upset because Mr. D. telephoned Mrs. Z. a few times
and did not ask to speak directly to him.

Peter's contact with the worker showed that, despite his serious
problems, he could utilize help in order to grow. It was apparent that
Peter had a great need to form a relationship with his own sex. Mr. Z.'s
inability to assert himself when confronted with Mrs. Z.'s dominance,
left Peter without a strong father person on whom he could pattern his be-
haviour. Barry, who himself exhibited undesirable behaviour, became
Peter's hero. It was only through his contact with Mr. D. that Peter was
able to show some disapproval of Barry and respect for his father.

When Mr. D., Peter's worker, left the agency, it was felt that
Peter should have another male worker to assist him in further growth.
It was also felt that the contact would probably be more constructive if
Peter knew that the worker wanted to help him, and was not just "a friend".

Except for a short time when her worker was on holidays, Mrs. Z.
was also visited at regular intervals.

Mrs. Z. seemed very glad when worker called,
following her return from holidays. Mrs. Z. said
that she "had been thinking about worker all morn-
ing, and wondering if worker would call her". She
wanted to talk to worker about Peter. She was
very curious about the contact between Peter and Mr.
D., and wondered what Mr. D. had "found out". When
worker explained to her that it might take a long
time for Mr. D. to get to know Peter well enough to
help him, and that anything Peter said was confiden-
tial, Mrs. Z. admitted that she felt "left out a lit-
tle". Following further interpretation of the nature
of the Family Welfare Bureau services, Mrs. Z. suddenly said: "things have certainly changed". She then talked for half an hour about her feelings concerning social agencies. She mentioned how shocked she had been at the previous worker's suggestion of foster home care for her son, and the terrible resentment she had felt at the questions for the social history. With encouragement from the worker, Mrs. Z. admitted that she needed help with Peter; but worker felt that she was still "far from wholly trusting". Nevertheless, worker was able to help her to express her disappointment over the camp's refusal to accept Peter. Mrs. Z. seemed to accept and to understand the reasons for the camp's decision; "She had almost expected camp to fall through", she said.

Occasionally, Mrs. Z. almost brought herself to discuss her own difficulties. During one visit, she mentioned that she had had three nervous breakdowns, and said that she had been independent since early childhood. Mrs. Z. insisted that "you had to depend on yourself; you couldn't expect much of people". She rejected worker's suggestion that it was very difficult to go through unhappy experiences alone. "It wasn't that she had to be independent, she had always wanted to be on her own", she said. However, Mrs. Z. was reluctant to terminate the interview. She walked with worker to the car.

Mrs. Z.'s attitude towards her own worker, since the latter's return from holidays, showed clearly the conflict between the realization of one's need for help and the denial of that need. In a society which places so much emphasis on "rugged individualism", this conflict is common to the majority of men. People find it very difficult to ask a social agency for help. They feel that such a request constitutes an admission of weakness and of personal failure. It is not surprising, therefore, that Mrs. Z., with her deep-seated distrust of the outside world, held so firmly to the idea that in solving her difficulties she had to depend on herself alone. Yet, probably for the first time in her life, Mrs. Z. found in the worker someone she could trust; she ten-
tatively reached out to the worker for help. Her struggle was most apparent in the interview during which she talked to the worker about her three nervous breakdowns. On the one hand, Mrs. Z. kept repeating that she "always wanted to be on her own". On the other hand, she described to the worker her difficult childhood and, in her reluctance to terminate the interview, walked with the worker to the car.

Mrs. Z. was very upset by the necessary transfer of Peter to another worker. When Mr. D. was leaving the agency, Mrs. Z. asked to come into the office to talk to Peter's worker. She was not satisfied with Mr. D.'s explanation of his contact with Peter in terms of getting to know the boy, and gaining his confidence. She wanted definite facts which would help her to handle Peter at home. When seen by worker a few days later, Mrs. Z. expressed the fact that she was angry about the unsatisfactory interview with Mr. D. "How would you feel", she asked worker,"if the truth about your child were kept in the hands of a stranger". "I have no use for social workers", she said, "I have had two lemons who must have been in the job too long". "They were insensitive", she continued,"they criticized me and Peter, they told me this is wrong and that is wrong until I couldn't stand to see them come near the house". Worker wondered how Mrs. Z. felt about the Family Welfare Bureau now, and again assured her of the agency's desire to help, and of her right to refuse that help. Mrs. Z. then said that she had "no objection to worker coming", but both she and Mr. Z. had to know "everything about" Peter—his worries, his fears, and "what made him the way he was". Worker said that "if it were possible to know this, Mrs. Z. would not need the agency, and this was probably what she would like". Mrs. Z. laughingly said that worker had "hit the nail on the head, this was just what she did want". Mrs. Z. relaxed, but was still unable to consent to actual treatment of Peter in office interviews. To prevent Mrs. Z. from feeling guilty about the hostility she had expressed against the agency, worker mentioned the possibility of Mrs. Z. being afraid that worker would not visit her again. Mrs. Z. admitted that she was worried about this. When worker assured her that she was not angry, and that she wanted to help her, Mrs. Z. said that she would like worker to continue visiting her.
Because it was felt that at this point Mrs. Z. might be able to accept help more realistically, worker attempted to have her come to the office for interviews. Mrs. Z. became upset, and seemed to be in conflict. "If there was something definite to talk about, she might consider coming in". Finally she decided, however, that because of the long distance and the children's different shifts at school, she could not arrange any suitable time for interviews. However, she did ask worker to visit her again.

It was the worker's awareness and acceptance of Mrs. Z.'s struggle, and her ability to say that Mrs. Z. would probably be happy if she did not need the Family Welfare Bureau, that enabled Mrs. Z. to ask the worker to continue visiting her. However, Mrs. Z.'s life-long fear of revealing her weaknesses and of sharing her feelings with someone else, prevented her from mobilizing herself sufficiently to agree to office interviews. The same fear made it so difficult for Mrs. Z. to bear her exclusion from the relationship between Peter and Mr. D. She was probably greatly threatened by the possibility of Peter revealing too much to Mr. D.

Following her refusal to come to the office for interviews, Mrs. Z. became sick. The vagueness of her protracted illness suggested that it might have been partially due to her emotional conflict. The worker visited Mrs. Z. to tell her about a new male worker for Peter and to discuss with her again the possibility of weekly office interviews with both Mrs. Z. and Peter. When the worker accepted Mrs. Z.'s feeling of being "let down" and "mad" because of Mr. D.'s leaving the Family Welfare Bureau, Mrs. Z. for the first time was able to refrain from blaming the agency for her own feeling of rejection. She stated that she had been told that "Mr. D. was only temporary" and added that the worker "had been
honest with her and she appreciated that "During the same interview, while discussing her "mixed feelings" about coming to the office, Mrs. Z. again expressed a positive attitude to the agency. She mentioned how angry she had been the last time the worker had visited her and how much of that anger had been directed at the Family Welfare Bureau. "Now she was beginning to feel the agency had a good deal to put up with, too". Finally Mrs. Z. decided to talk to Peter "about what he wanted to do" and if the boy wished to continue with a new worker, she and Peter would start their weekly office interviews.

A few days later Mrs. Z. telephoned to let the worker know that Peter had refused to come to the office. Mrs. Z. was obviously upset about this and began the telephone conversation by saying "I am going to tell you something that may make you mad". She then assured the worker several times that she had "nothing to do with Peter's refusal". When the worker suggested that Mrs. Z. come in without Peter, Mrs. Z. said she was not feeling well and did not want to go out.

In the meantime, Peter's behaviour improved noticeably. Mrs. Z. told the worker that Peter "seemed happier with himself, as if he was worth something". She mentioned that Peter and Mr. Z. were getting along "like a house on fire". Peter seemed to choose his friends more carefully and he told his mother that he did not like Barry any more. Mrs. Z. could not admit that the change in Peter had anything to do with the boy's contact with Mr. D. She attributed it to her ability to "let Peter go" last summer, and to the boy's capacity to handle his own problems.

The principal placed Peter under a very skilled teacher "whose discipline was good but kindly" and he felt the boy "was responding very
definitely". Peter apparently made several friends and "there have been no new incidents of anti-social behaviour". In view of this improvement, Mrs. Z. did not feel there was any need for Peter to come to the Family Welfare Bureau.

When the complaints from the school ceased, Mrs. Z. had an excuse for withdrawing from her relationship with the worker. There was no longer any external compulsion forcing her to face her own need for help. Consequently, Mrs. Z. has not contacted the worker for several months. However, the worker had already interpreted to the principal that Mrs. Z. needed the authority of the school to give her security and to enable her to accept help. Therefore, in the event of any serious incident with Peter, the principal will explain to Mrs. Z. that the boy has to conform to certain rules. At the same time he will suggest to Mrs. Z. that the Family Welfare Bureau is ready to help her. When Mrs. Z. returns to the agency she will probably be ready to use the casework service constructively.

The case of the Z. family clearly illustrates the relationship between the worker's emotional attitude towards the client, and the outcome of the case. While in the first two school referrals the workers responded with hostility to Mrs. Z.'s resistance and her inability to accept responsibility for Peter's behaviour, in the third referral the worker responded with understanding and acceptance to Mrs. Z.'s overt rejection of the agency and of the help it tried to offer. Consequently,
on the one hand the case was closed twice because Mrs. Z. was "unco-operative", "hopeless", and "unable to accept the Family Welfare Bureau services"; on the other hand, Mrs. Z. moved to the point where she could spontaneously ask for help for Peter, and later, could trust the worker sufficiently to disclose some of her own conflicts and fears.

The contact between Mrs. Z. and the third worker shows that it was not only the latter's warmth and acceptance, but also her certainty of purpose and her respect for Mrs. Z.'s right to refuse the offered service, that helped Mrs. Z. to overcome her initial fear and resistance.

The Z. case like the cases described in previous chapters, points toward the need for improved methods of referral between the schools and the Family Welfare Bureau. Although Mrs. Z. probably would have resisted the referral to the agency under any circumstances, she might have been more ready to use the casework service had the school personnel asked her to go to the Family Welfare Bureau for help on the basis that Peter's behaviour at school could no longer be tolerated.
PART III  CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 7. Planning to Meet the Needs of the Child with School Problems
CHAPTER SEVEN

PLANNING TO MEET THE NEEDS OF THE CHILD WITH SCHOOL PROBLEMS

The cases presented in this study illustrate one way in which the schools in Greater Vancouver attempt to deal with their "children in trouble". The very fact that these children and their families were referred to the Family Welfare Bureau is indicative of the school personnel's realization of its broad responsibility for the total development of each pupil. Apart from the family, within which every child ought to find the satisfaction of his basic needs, the school is the only institution in our society through which every child passes. The school has, therefore, the unique opportunity of providing both a fertile field for a child's further growth and development, and a place where a child's first symptoms of maladjustment are brought to public attention.

Any child who is not learning, or making an adequate social adjustment at school should become the special concern of the school personnel. The teacher, whose primary responsibility is to the class as a whole, cannot be expected to give her full attention to a child who day-dreams or to a youngster who clowns continually. Even if her class-room were small enough to permit her to work closely with an individual child, she could never forget that her primary function was that of an educator. How, then, can a child exhibiting behaviour problems within the school setting be helped most constructively?

While the cases discussed in this study illustrate, among other things, the difficulties involved in non-voluntary referrals from the
schools to the Family Welfare Bureau, it can be assumed that the schools have equal difficulties in trying to refer parents to the Children's Aid Society or to any other social agency in the community. Granted that the referral process could be improved, and that better relationships between the schools and the social agencies could be established, those needs of the child which are related to his school experience would still not be adequately covered. Many communities find that there is a very real need for a social case work service related directly to the school administration, a service which could offer help within the school setting to children and their parents.

Need for School Social Work.

It is apparent that only those schools which conceive of their task as that of providing a service to the whole child can recognize a social case work programme as a part of their function. School social workers have demonstrated that their "contribution to the accomplishment of the school's purpose for its children is one which, by virtue of their own professional preparation, cannot be made as effectively by any other member of the school faculty". Because school social work, like health service, is a specialized service attached to the schools, it must be wanted and accepted by principals and teachers as a vital and integral part of the general purpose of schools. The focus of school social work is always on the child's problems as shown at school. Those social workers who have thought of their role within the school setting as that of "meeting the needs of the school child", have only contributed towards further confusion and misunderstanding among the members of the school personnel. It is apparent that the principals, the teachers, the nurses,  

1 Ruth Smalley, "Field Instruction in Social Work in the Schools under Public Auspices". Social Case Work in Public Schools, American Association of Visiting Teachers, October 1941, p.17.
the attendance officers, all in an important way meet the child's needs. It is the teacher who first detects a child's maladjustment in the classroom. In most cases she discusses her concern about that child with the principal. Together they decide on a plan of action which always includes talking with the child, and is also likely to include interviewing the child's parents. If no immediate solution is possible and the child's difficulties persist, the principal, the teacher, or the nurse require the assistance of a school social worker.

It is widely recognized at present that no social agency in the community can take the place of a social work programme within the school setting. By virtue of being a member of the school personnel the school social worker is able to perform the important function "of helping teachers and principals to discharge their own responsibilities to the individual child". She does this by working as the only member of the team whose training and experience enables her to work intensively with the individual child and his social problems. Moreover, in helping the individual child with problems manifested in his school experience, a social worker who "belongs" to the school can be more effective. The case of Peter Z. is illustrative of this point. It was the school which found Peter's behaviour unacceptable, and it was the school which showed constant concern about Peter's attitudes towards other children. Mrs. Z. denied having much difficulty with Peter and placed on the school the whole responsibility for the boy's behaviour. A school social worker would have been able to work directly with Peter, facing with him the fact that his behaviour was unacceptable to the school, and helping him with his difficulties. In discussing Peter's problems with Mrs. Z., a

school social worker would have been in a position to assume authorita-
tive responsibility for the boy's behaviour at school. Because Mrs. Z.
needed the external support and control of the school before she could
use help constructively, she probably would have been able to respond
to a school social worker of equal skill long before she was able to
accept the Family Welfare Bureau worker.

School social work is essentially preventive. Early referrals from
nurses, teachers, and principals enable school social workers to help
the child before he becomes an extreme "school misfit". From the stand-
point of the well-being of other children in the class-room the impor-
tance of early referrals needs to be emphasized. Every teacher knows
the disruption that can be created in the class-room by a youngster
whose own needs are so great that he cannot become an integrated member
of the group. And finally, early referrals of children to school social
workers are valuable to teachers. During conferences between the prin-
cipal or the teacher and the social worker the reasons for the child's
behaviour can be discussed and a decision regarding the plan for treat-
ment can be reached. While the social worker might meet with the child
once a week for an hour, the teacher sees him every day for several
hours. Her attitude towards the youngster is, therefore, of great im-
portance in the treatment process. Because a difficult child in the
class-room can be extremely annoying and irritating, the teacher has a
right to expect whatever help she may need from the social worker in re-
gard to her relationship with a child. Thus, in working together the
principal, the teacher and the social worker help the child in his
social adjustment at school.
In most cases, the school social worker works with the parents as well as with the child. Her contact with the parents needs to be "focussed on their relationship to their child's use of school". Her understanding of the problems in each family enables the school social worker to know when a particular family needs the help of a social agency. If the child's difficulties at school are caused or aggravated by serious marital conflict in the home, the school social worker may refer the parents to the family agency. It is part of her skill to help clients to consider using the service offered by a social agency. Sometimes, the school social worker might continue helping the child with problems connected directly with his school adjustment and thus supplement the work of the family agency with his parents. At other times it may be in the best interest of the child for the school social worker to work with both him and his parents.

A school social worker has the opportunity to help parents whose difficulties with their children are not acute enough to impel them to seek the assistance of a social agency. Even when the agency service is offered to such parents by a member of the school personnel, the mother or the father often refuses to contact the agency because fear of the unknown is greater than their need for help. It is probably true that some of these parents do not even feel ready to use the help offered by a school social worker. But the latter has the right to approach parents whenever the school is concerned about a child. And, because the school is a part of a child's life, any service connected with it is more acceptable to parents. Furthermore, it can be assumed that all parents have some interest in their children, and that most of them want their children

to be happy at school. Thus, the child and the parents can often be helped with minor difficulties which, if not cleared up, might be later referred to a social agency as grave problems.

Relationship between Schools and Family Welfare Bureau.

Although "school social workers operating from within the framework of the schools and employed by the School Board are in the best position to give the school staffs and the children effective service", this study reveals that, even with the present gap in community resources, much could be done to improve services to Vancouver school children. Despite the fact that the cases studied include school referrals to the Family Welfare Bureau only, many implications of this study are of importance in considering the improvement in social services to school children in general.

Among the twenty-five school referrals described in the previous chapters, seventeen families refused the Family Welfare Bureau service either by direct rejection of help or by passive resistance; seven clients accepted environmental help; and one family used help to effect some change in the family relationships. What were the reasons for so many unsuccessful school referrals? Does the responsibility for the clients' unwillingness to use the Family Welfare Bureau service lie with the school, the agency, or the families themselves?

Obviously, there are no simple answers to these questions. Careful study of the school referrals does reveal, however, the extreme importance of the initial contact between the family and the agency worker. Indeed, it can be stated that a worker who has certainty of purpose, warmth,

2. Two further examples of situations in which the clients made some use of help offered by the agency, were overlooked because of a clerical error in the statistical records. These cases were not discovered until after the body of this study was completed.
understanding, and deep respect for the client's right to refuse the agency service, can often make that service acceptable to the client in spite of both an inadequate school referral and a strong initial resistance on the part of the family. The third worker's approach to Mrs. Z. described previously, illustrates this point clearly. There is evidence, however, that the Family Welfare Bureau workers were often unaware of the implications of non-voluntary referrals, and were uncertain of their own role in contacting families which did not request help from the agency. Therefore, as shown in previous chapters, they responded to the clients' initial resistance either with hostility, or with a feeling of hopelessness, or with a desire to "protect" the families. The latter response usually resulted in the workers discussing with their clients recreational resources for the children instead of talking with the families about the problems which had caused the school referral. It can be questioned whether a voluntary family agency can expect all its workers to feel comfortable and secure in the different role that they have to assume when dealing with non-voluntary school referrals. Perhaps, if the agency continues to accept such referrals, it needs to delegate the responsibility for working with these clients to a few workers only.

The responsibility that the agency worker carries for trying to make the service acceptable to the client during the initial contact, in no way exonerates the schools from improving their referral process. Inadequate interpretation on the part of the agency is at least partially responsible for the incomplete understanding of the Family Welfare Bureau services as shown by the school personnel in this study. If the schools had a clearer recognition of what a family agency can and cannot do, they
would be better able to explain and offer the service to those clients who seemed to need the help of the agency. Because this study does not include clients who personally applied to the Family Welfare Bureau at the suggestion of the school personnel, it is not possible to know how much successful interpretation of the agency's service has been done by the schools. There is evidence in this study, however, that many clients were either only vaguely asked by the school personnel to contact the Family Welfare Bureau, or were not even notified of the referral to the agency. While some people do come for help on their own initiative, others have to be prompted by the community's demands that they change their conduct. Thus, if it is not possible for all members of the school personnel to become involved in trying to interpret clearly the agency's service to families, they should at least inform the clients that in view of the child's difficulties at school, the parents can go to the Family Welfare Bureau, where a professionally trained staff, skilled in working with children presenting behaviour problems, is ready to help them. The school personnel could also facilitate the referral process by arranging an appointment at the Family Welfare Bureau for the client in the latter's presence and with his participation. This would help the client to go to the agency for professional consultation, and would limit the practice, evidenced in the cases described in this study, of social workers always visiting in the homes.

Both the schools and the Family Welfare Bureau have to face the fact that some clients are too immature or too emotionally stunted to use the help offered by a voluntary agency. Undoubtedly, in the absence of school social worker, it is very difficult for the school personnel
to know what kind of help a particular family may need. But in discussing with the family the possibility of a referral to the Family Welfare Bureau, the principal, the teacher, or the nurse might obtain some valuable information or clues about the client's attitude and feelings regarding the acceptance of help. This information, when shared with the agency worker, would enable her to decide if the client's needs could best be served by the Family Welfare Bureau. In cases where the worker feels that a family agency would not be of real help to the family, she has the responsibility to interpret to the school personnel her reasons for not accepting the case and to suggest the resources in the community which may be of more value to that particular family.

Current Developments.

Despite many shortcomings and many gaps in the services for Vancouver school children, there is evidence of constant striving both on the part of the educators and of the social workers towards helping children with their problems in social and school adjustment. In two West End schools and the Hastings East schools, many conferences have been held between school personnel and representatives of social agencies for the purpose of discussing individual children presenting behaviour problems and, if necessary, effecting appropriate referrals.

Furthermore, during the winter season of 1949-50 a series of eight meetings, attended by representatives of public schools, public health services and social agencies, took place in Vancouver. Although the purpose of the original meeting was "to see that all were acquainted with the points of view of the various agencies as they pertained to the problem of delinquency", the scope of this "Institute on School, Health and Social Services", Chairman, Dr. C.H. Gundry.

1. Minutes of October 6, 1949, "Institute on School, Health, and Social Services".
Social Services" soon expanded into a discussion of the philosophies and functions of the three types of service represented on the Institute. From the minutes of the meetings it is apparent that the members of the Institute were very concerned about the improvement of Vancouver services to the school child.

The efforts of the educators, the nurses, and the social workers must continue. This study shows not only the need for better integration of the existing resources but also the urgent necessity of establishing social work service within the school setting. In any consideration of school services the valid criterion is — the total development of the pupil.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FAMILY</th>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Composition.</td>
<td>1. Attitude of client to agency at time of referral</td>
<td>Rated qualitatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Economic Status.</td>
<td>2. If previous contact — its meaning to client</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>3. Living Conditions.</td>
<td>3. Ability to relate to worker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Personality of Parents.</td>
<td>4. Ability to participate in making plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Attitude towards Child.</td>
<td>5. Readiness to accept help.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Worker's role in treatment.</td>
<td>7. Length of contact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILD</td>
<td>1. Relevant Background.</td>
<td>1. School's estimation at the time of referral of client's ability to work with the agency.</td>
<td>Rated qualitatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Present Behaviour Pattern.</td>
<td>2. Contact between agency and school during treatment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Relationship with Members of School Personnel.</td>
<td>If child interviewed—— Summary of contact between child and worker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Relationship with Parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>1. Problems which caused referral.</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Recommendations of Mental Hygiene Division or Child Guidance Clinic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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