BECAUSE THERE IS A MANPOWER SHORTAGE IN SOCIAL WORK, THE
AUTHOR CONCLUDED THAT INDIGENOUS NONPROFESSIONALS SHOULD BE
USED TO PERFORM BOTH TRADITIONAL AND NEW SOCIAL WELFARE
FUNCTIONS. THE AUTHOR FELT THAT, ALTHOUGH WIDELY USED, THE
TERM "NONPROFESSIONAL" IS INADEQUATE AND IMPLIES THE
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS GAP BETWEEN MIDDLE CLASS SUBPROFESSIONALS
AND LOWER CLASS AUXILIARIES. THERE IS A NEED FOR A
CLASSIFICATION OF THE CAPACITIES AND THE DEVELOPMENT
POTENTIAL OF THE NONPROFESSIONAL POPULATION AND OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR JOBS. SOCIAL WORK POLICY PLANNING MUST
REALISTICALLY RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR "RISK REDUCTION" RATHER
THAN "RISK ELIMINATION" IN THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF
SERVICE SO THAT IT CAN CONTINUE TO BE GIVEN. THERE ARE FOUR
STRUCTURAL FEATURES RELEVANT TO A PROGRAM FOR
NONPROFESSIONALS--(1) GOAL FORMULATION, WHOSE OBJECTIVES ARE
DEVELOPING EMPLOYABILITY, PROVIDING EMPLOYMENT, AND
STIMULATING INSTITUTIONAL (INTRA-AGENCY) CHANGE, (2) JOB
DEVELOPMENT, WHICH INCLUDES THE DEFINITIONS OF ROLES AND
FUNCTIONS AT THE ENTRY POINT AND AFTER TRAINING AS WELL AS
THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF THESE ROLES, (3) RECRUITMENT AND
SELECTION, WHICH IS ESPECIALLY DIFFICULT AMONG THE HARD CORE
POOR, WHOSE JOB NEEDS ARE GREATEST, AND (4) TRAINING, WHICH
IS RELATED TO GOALS AND REQUIRES DEVELOPING A PROGRAM WITH
APPROPRIATE METHODS. THIS WORKING PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR THE
INSTITUTE ON THE NEW NONPROFESSIONAL, MASSACHUSETTS STATE
CONFERENCE OF SOCIAL WELFARE, BOSTON, DECEMBER 2, 1966. (NH)

VD 002 913

E

## THE NONPROFESSIONAL IN SOCIAL WELFARE: DIMENSIONS AND ISSUES

A Working Paper Prepared for
Institute on the New Nonprofessional
Massachusetts State Conference of Social Welfare
Boston, Massachusetts
December 2, 1966

by

William H. Denham, Associate Director I/C Training
Institute for Youth Studies, Howard University

The purpose of these prepared comments is two-fold: (1) to
briefly set forth the main policy themes and assumptions on which
current thinking about the nonprofessional in social welfare rests;
and (2) to identify the central components in the subject and the
pertinent issues. Hopefully, these remarks will serve as a guide
for Institute members in their discussion during the day.

### Major Policy Themes and Assumptions

Current national projections of requirements for social
work manpower suggest that between now and 1975 at least 25,000
new positions will have to be filled in order to provide <u>minimum</u>
services to a steadily increasing population.[1]

This increased demand for personnel is probably conserva-
tive when measured against the multiplication of services in a
variety of federal, state and community programs such as Medicare,
urban and neighborhood development, community mental health, Head
Start, and the like.

In addition, since many new roles in these fields have yet
to be identified or defined, present manpower projections are at

best crude approximations. However, it appears obvious that current manpower recruitment, utilization and training policies are quite inadequate to cope with the rapidly increasing demand for and shortage of trained personnel. Consequently, social work can no longer avoid direct confrontation with the manpower crisis. I would venture to say that unless we can attack this problem more boldly and innovatively than we have done heretofore, we will have to deal with a crisis in public confidence. This may occur on the part of client or consumer groups, especially the poor, who may no longer be as willing to tolerate waiting for service, accepting a second-class product or, in many cases, not receiving service at all.

A number of innovative strategies have been suggested and tried in the past few years in an attempt to find solutions to the manpower problem. One very promising approach that has been suggested in a number of recent experimental and demonstration programs involves the systematic training and utilization of indigenous nonprofessionals for a variety of new jobs in delivering welfare and welfare-related services.[2] It is the indigenous nonprofessional (a term of questionable preciseness as will be indicated below) whom we will be referring to in this paper and in this workshop as the "new nonprofessional." Simply defined, we are talking about an individual, recruited in most instances from the economically impoverished population, to perform a role in which the content includes some proportions of tasks

involving the rendering of direct service to clientele. Such tasks represent either functions previously allocated to a professional and/or those not previously performed, or performed in limited fashion, by the professional.

Although current problems related to social welfare manpower are of such magnitude and complexity that no one solution is adequate or can successfully alter a trend that has developed over a number of decades, the indigenous nonprofessional approach offers a number of potential advantages. These include:

1. The possibility of training large numbers of personnel for task-specific roles.

2. Such roles could be created through careful analysis of current roles of professionals, dissection of those tasks for which professionals are "overtrained," and development of jobs for subprofessionals with less training based on these latter tasks. In this way, it has been suggested, professionals could be freed for more highly specialized tasks, such as case diagnosis planning and evaluation, supervision and training, thus amplifying their effectiveness through greater opportunity for using their higher level of education and skills.

3. It could have the consequence of bringing about a long overdue operational and systematic job analysis of traditional direct service roles in social agencies. This, in turn, could stimulate a reorganization of the delivery system of services and hopefully result in greater effectiveness.

4. It offers the possibility of meaningful employment and training to many in the disadvantaged portion of our population in an occupational sector which is strategic both in terms of community demand for services and the needed supply of personnel to render service.

5. Properly planned, the utilization and training of indigenous nonprofessionals can lead to the development

of new lines and ladders for training and vertical
mobility toward careers in community services, thus
avoiding the dead-end, scut kind of work which often
reinforces the sense of despair and helplessness of
many unskilled workers of ever being able to enter
the mainstream of economically and socially productive
employment.

6. Finally, the training and use of local residents holds
   the promise of providing a unique link between the pro-
   fessional and the agency with the community to be
   served. Not only may this provide local organizations
   with untapped sources of community leadership for rend-
   ering service, but it can provide an effective vehicle
   for reaching the hard-to-reach.

In summary, the indigenous nonprofessional concept can be

regarded as a social intervention which responds to three major

areas of social need: (1) as a strategy for socializing under-

privileged persons through training and education for work in

health, education and welfare; (2) as a means for training and

developing a reservoir of skilled manpower for these chronically

short-staffed fields; and (3) as a stimulus for effecting change

in service agencies, particularly with respect to a reallocation

and redistribution of tasks from the professional role to the

nonprofessional role--the goal being to effect improvement in

the quality and quantity of service, especially in relation to

economically and socially deprived client populations.

There is at present a climate of opportunity for social agen-

cies to undertake projects and experiments involving the indige-

nous nonprofessional. The Public Service Employment Amendment,

popularly labeled the Community Employment Program (CEP), and

introduced by Congressman James Scheuer (Dem., N.Y.) to Section
205-B of H.R. 15111, has recently been enacted into the Economic
Opportunity Act for this year. This Amendment provides for the
training and utilization of some 30,000 nonprofessional workers
by local communities in the fields of education, recreation, wel-
fare, public safety and health. Eighty-eight million dollars has
been earmarked to implement the program during the first year of
operation.

## Workshop Discussion Boundaries

Before considering the principal elements of the nonprofes-
sional subject and the issues thereof, it may be helpful to es-
tablish certain givens in order to provide a framework for our
workshop group discussions. There are three such givens: (1)
the inadequacy of the term nonprofessional; (2) the diversity
of the nonprofessional manpower pool; and (3) the inevitability
of risk involved in present efforts to determine how nonprofes-
sionals should be used.

### Inadequacy of the Term, Nonprofessional

One of the clear implications of the term nonprofessional
is to underscore the occupational status gap between those who
have professional credentials and those who don't, often irre-
spective of the problem-solving capability of either. Stratifica-
tion of occupational titles and authority tend to become ends in
themselves, rather than means to the end of increasing quantity
and quality of service.

For the middle-class subprofessional this gap is usually temporary. For the working-class nonprofessional, it often becomes permanent. The middle-class oriented case aide in the family agency, or the investigator in a welfare department, usually tolerate this discrepancy while taking the route to graduate education in a school of social work as fast as he or she can make it. Agencies which employ them rationalize such temporary service and high turnover rate by establishing work-study programs or intensifying recruitment from the middle-class subprofessional pool. It is doubtful how much return agencies are receiving for their investment in such auxiliaries, given their powerful vertical occupational strivings and limited time in specific para-professional work roles.

On the other hand, the opportunities for upward educational and occupational mobility which are available to the middle-class subprofessional, are not presently open to the unskilled or semi-skilled lower-class auxiliary, especially the Negro--even though he may be equally, if not more, effective than his counterpart in a task, rather than credentially-oriented problem-solving situation.

It seems to me that really effective use of the nonprofessional will not be realized until agencies develop greater competence in defining service goals in terms of problems to be dealt with and the skills and techniques required to deal with them. It would then be possible to identify the personnel needed who would

be selected primarily on the basis of their capacity to perform
essential tasks in the problem-solving process, rather than
solely on their place in the occupational hierarchy.

## Diversity of the Nonprofessional Manpower Pool

Differential development of agency personnel resources in ac
accordance with what a problem takes to be solved or modified is
related to the question of just who is the indigenous nonprofes-
sional? There is the tendency in discussing the nonprofessionals,
as in discussing impoverished populations, to lump both together
in an undifferentiated mass and to attribute the alleged or proven
assets and/or liabilities to all members of both groups. While
it is laudable to use such an approach in order to promote the
blanketing in of the so-called hard core or unreachable, it is
analytically and practically unsound in terms of the tasks to
be done and the potential or actual human capacities required
to do so. Our deprived populations are multi-dimensional as far
as the socio-cultural picture is concerned. They may share the
common trait of economic poverty and lack of opportunity to real-
ize their potential, but in most other respects they are hetero-
denous rather than homogenous.

Hylan Lewis and others have strongly suggested that there
is a sizeable, if not yet precisely measurable, number of "upwardly
mobile poor."[3]  These people are clearly identified with middle-
class goals and values, have relatively well-developed minds, and
are eager for professional careers. At the other end of the scale

are the so-called "hard-core poor"--the unemployed or unskilled;
those of relatively low educational achievement and motivation;
those who reject or seriously doubt the reality of middle-class
goals and means;   those for whom our service programs in their
present stage of technical development can't reach, or reach in-
effectively.  As sizeable as this latter group may be, no one
knows who or how many constitute the "middle-range poor"--those
who fall between the upwardly mobile and hard core.  They are
likely to be of average academic, technical or skill potential.
Are these perhaps the lower middle class of tomorrow who could
perform adequately the many technical jobs which are emerging in
the field of social welfare as well as in other occupational
sectors?

On the other side of the coin, we have the diversity of
nonprofessional or paraprofessional jobs.  Some, such as counsel-
ing, research or teacher aides, may require the job holder to
have a certain acquired degree of knowledge, skill and attitud-
inal development at the high school level or beyond.  Others,
like a playground assistant or child care auxiliary, may require
less equipment, but with potential for growth.  Or there may be
positions, or permutations of positions, such as homemaker, health
or geriatric aides, for which relatively minimal levels of educa-
tional and social or occupational development are required for
effective job functioning.  In short, one of the major tasks in
planning for the utilization of nonprofessionals involves the

development of two sets of typologies--one which classifies the
nonprofessional population in terms of capacity and potential
for development; the other which differentiates the jobs in terms
of the tasks to be performed and the knowledge, skill and atti-
tudinal development required.

### The Element of Risk

A major obstacle in developing manpower policy in social
welfare with respect to auxiliary personnel has been the concern
over the risk to the quantity and quality of service rendered.
This is of course a legitimate and vital concern to a public-
serving profession.  However, all too often social work manpower
efforts seem to have been directed to eliminating such risk in
the here and now, rather than recognizing risk as an inevitable
reality in the present stage of development in the field.  To
what extent the concern with risk elimination has been determined
by a preoccupation with the enhancement of the professional estab-
lishment or by a commitment to more and better service for the
client, particularly the poor client, is a moot point and beyond
the immediate purposes of these remarks.  It is possible ɔ say,
however, that social work is approaching the moment of truth as
dictated by this omnipresent reality--that unless we devise new
ways for increasing personnel input, more and more clients will
have to face the greatest risk--namely, no service at all.  There-
fore, in planning for the utilization of nonprofessionals, we may

have to shift emphasis from risk elimination to risk reduction,
or even risk stabilization. In either case, the paramount goal
would be the increase in our capability to deliver and render
services to those most in need of them. Various risk reducing
or risk stabilizing devices will have to be tried. These include:

--assignment of cases to professionals and nonprofs. based on
some system of high-, medium- & low-risk to client classi-
fication;[4]

--devising new system for worker accountability and super-
vision, based on capacity of the individual worker to
function on the job; here we might be guided by a con-
tinuum ranging from relatively complete autonomy for
the professional to varying degrees of supervision and
control for the nonprofessional, depending on his equip-
ment and the tasks to be performed;[5]

--utilizing the professional as the diagnostician, case
planner or evaluator, perhaps in the context of the
service team model wherein both professionals and non-
professionals perform specific functions;

--developing the capability of the professional worker to
play the role of supervisor-trainer of nonprofessionals.

So much for a very general overview of some of the broad
themes and assumptions governing the subject of the nonprofes-
sional. Now let us turn to the principal structural elements in the
concept and the issues which they present.

<u>Structural Elements in Utilization and Training of Nonprofessionals</u>

For our purposes, we can construct a rough working model
composed of the principal attributes involved in any effort di-
rected to the use and development of nonprofessionals in an agency
program. I will briefly identify and describe the function of
each element and then raise the pertinent issues in the form of
questions which members of the Institute may wish to address

themselves to in the ensuing discussion. Each element is not discrete, but rather inter-meshed with the others.

There are f ur basic attributes in most nonprofessional projects or programs. These are: (1) goal formulation; (2) job development; (3) recruitment and selection and (4) training.

## 1. Goal Formulation

The importance of a clear statement of the objectives for using nonprofessionals, formulated <u>prior</u> to their introduction has been universally acknowledged, but seldom effected. Such a statement serves to provide a base for decision and action on the other three components of the plan, and helps to define criteria of success on which outcome can be evaluated and facilitates decisions as to future allocation of nonprofessionals in program. Objectives are: e ployability, employment, nstitutional change.

a. <u>Employability</u>. To develop the capacity of the indiviual trainee or work recruit to function in the "world of work." It is a socialization process which seeks to promote in the person general attitudes and behavior required to operate in a work setting. Dress, attendance, conduct, responses to supervisory authority, and basic literacy skills are among the major components around which curriculum is designed. Training often tends to have a pronounced rehabilitative character a la the sheltered workshop model. The nonprofessional role in this context is primarily that of a trainee rather than a worker or worker in training. His primary reference point is to the socializing or training agent rather than to a specific work unit in the agency.

b. Employment. Many programs are committed to providing jobs for the unemployed poor. They are conceived of as serving to reduce the volume of unemployment by providing meaningful job opportunities either through the creation of new nonprofessional positions or placement within the agency's existing job supply. Training tends to be job-specific; that is to say it emphasizes acquisition of specific skills and knowledge requisite for performing in a defined job. The nonprofessional role tends initially to be that of an apprentice or worker-trainee and may over time assume the status of regular worker

c. Institutional Change. Although there is considerable agreement within the field on the desirability of using the nonprofessional as an organizational change agent, there is little consensus as to what institutional change consists of and what types of change they can reasonably be expected to influence. We shall, I am sure, be discussing this subject in the Institute. However, it is possible to simply define this objective as one which points to utilizing the nonprofessional in order to bring about some alteration in the pre-existing patterns of an agency's operation. Some illustrations of this would include: increasing the service delivery capacity, absolute increase in manpower pool, effecting a more efficient or effective redistribution of tasks among personnel, revamping service delivery systems, enhancing the agency's image in the community, or reaching the "hard to reach."

In practice, many agencies have tried to combine all three objectives in one package because of the difficulty in making fine conceptual distinctions between them and the tendency to prefer omnibus or umbrella programs which often attempt to be all things to all people, and to the funding agency. We may want to discuss some of the consequences which emerge from a multi-goal approach.

### d. Questions

(1) What are the advantages and disadvantages of a multiple vs. single goal approach in the training and utilization of nonprofessionals?

(2) Is it feasible to simultaneously rehabilitate and job train? Which becomes the "tail" or the "dog"?

(3) The nonprofessional as a worker or "institutional change agent"--either or both?

(4) What kinds of change is it realistic to see the nonprofessional as influencing and not influencing?

(5) Are we talking about training the nonprofessional to develop a self-image as a change agent in the agency or that as a consequence of introducing him into the program, certain structural changes will occur?

## 2. Job Development

Of all the attributes in nonprofessional training and utilization programs, job development, although perhaps the most vital, is most poorly conceptualized, least understood, and in many instances, largely neglected. In part, this is due to such factors as: the lack of clarity with respect to the objectives

as mentio ed in previous section; the fact that it is essentially

a planning task calling for skills and knowledge in organizational

and occupational role analysis, which amany social workers have

not yet mastered.  It is safe to say, however, that job develop-

ment must receive careful consideration in order to avoid,,or at

least preclude, the possibility of such negative outcomes as:

> --training nonprofessionals for temporary work which will
> evaporate after the project is ended or when funds run out;

> --using nonprofessionals in "scut work" or "make work"
> roles;  this may accommodate the granting agency,tempor-
> arily salve the conscience of the employer, but still
> have the effect of reinforcing worker's sense of isola-
> tion from the system, undercut his motivation for growth
> and result in no tangible productive return for agency's
> service;

What, then, are the functions of job development?   They

include:

Entry job definition, which ensures the worker a specific

role and function in the occupational structure--in short, a place

and a prescribed set of tasks which can guide his efforts and to

which training can be related.

Post-entry job definition which defines the place, role and

functions of the nonprofessional subsequent to the initial or en-

try job period.  This points the way to opportunity or channels

for advancement within agency structure, thus making it possible

for worker to experience job mobility within the agency or, de-

pending on the worker, the opportunity to pursue a career in com-

munity service at the professional or advanced technician levels.

Re-examination and restructuring of professional roles as the result of either the creation of new nonprofessional jobs, changes in the content of the professional role because of a factoring out of tasks, or the inclusion or exclusion of new professional tasks such as training or supervision.

Institutionalization of nonprofessional roles--consists of the effort to make such roles legitimate and permanent parts of the occupational structure. It is probably the most complex function in job development because it involves a number of variables, some of which have already been touched on and others which have not. Consequently, there is no one grant formula for institutionalizing nonprofessional roles. It is more likely that a variety of strategies will have to be developed, depending on the agency and program. Such strategies may have to evolve from the analytic models composed of pertinent dimensions such as the following:

--the nature of agency's objectives for using nonprofessionals, i.e., employability of the poor, increasing manpower resources, or reorganizing personnel structures;

--the capacity of agency to change--i.e., the extent to which it is committed to tradition or innovation in staff utilization and program development;

--the kind of nonprofessional population--i.e., the hard-core poor middle-range poor or upwardly-mobile poor;

--the content of nonprofessional role--i.e., to what extent are tasks oriented to the professional role or away from it? or does the role have a high- or low-risk-to-client potential?

--the financial costs involved in nonprofessional salaries and in training and staff development necessary to prepare them for the role;

--the capacity for change of legitimizing agents within and outside the agency--i.e., the extent to which professional staff will accept nonprofessionals in a specific role or the extent to which certifying systems such as Civil Service Commission, can modify personnel policies to allow nonprofessionals to enter and advance within a public agency.

### Questions

(1)  What realistic job roles can be defined and developed for nonprofessionals in social agencies?

(2)  How can such jobs be made permanent rather than temporary?

(3)  What provisions and supports need to be provided for upward mobility and advancement?  How can we overcome the tendency to "lock in" the nonprofessional at the bottom of the occupational ladder?

(4)  How can           Civil Service regulations and professional association membership requirements be modified to facilitate entry employment and advancement?

(5)  How can valuable professional standards be maintaned?

(6)  Is the nonprofessional a threat or an asset to professional salary levels?

### 3.  Recruitment and Selection

Recruitment and selection are concerned with acquiring a pool of candidates and choosing a specific number of them in accordance with objective criteria for specific jobs defined prior to the recruitment and selection process.  By and large, most

programs report little difficulty in recruiting adequate numbers
of nonprofessional candidates from such typical sources as State
Employment Service, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Neighborhood Develop-
ment Centers and social agencies.  A sizeable number of candidates
are self-referrals.  However, the vast majority of candidates tend
to fall in the categories of the upwardly-mobile or middle-range
poor.  Few programs have succeeded in attracting the hard core,[6]
partly because of their inaccessibility to recruitment efforts,
but more likely because most available jobs call for a level of
socialization or potential for socialization that these persons
may not possess.   Here we are presented with a major dilemma.
On the one hand, these are among the most needy of the unemployed
or underemployed;  on the other hand, if agencies set goals which
envisage the nonprofessional as increasing its manpower potential
within existing job structures, it must establish criteria calcu-
lated to effect this result...  This often means screening out the
hard to reach.  I might add that even in those programs such as
The New Careers Project at Howard University, which originally
planned to train primarily the hard-to-reach and least qualified,
the job requirements of employing and certifying agencies has
served as a major constraint to implementing this open-door
policy.  This results in a "creaming" of the unemployed pool.

### Questions

(1) How can recruitment and selection criteria be
developed which would screen in nonprofes-
sional candidates?

(2) How can such criteria be "sold" to employing
and certifying agencies? For example, can we
develop and promote the acceptance of more
functional criteria related to the job to be
performed rather than solely to arbitrary
standards of age, educational attainment or
previous experience?

(3) Do we really mean recruiting and selecting the
hard core for job training? Or are we talking
about "rehabilitating" them to the point where
they are ready for job training?

## 4. Training

The subject of training goes to the core of the task of

nonprofessional utilization and development. It is also central

to the problems which the nonprofessional brings to the work ex-

perience. Time permits only a cursory review of the principal

aspects associated with the training function. Let me, therefore,

identify these aspects which are primarily extrapolated from the

training experience of the Lincoln Hospital Community Mental

Health Program in New York City and the Institute for Youth Studies'

New Careers Project at Howard University.[7] These elements pertain

primarily to entry jobs and the nonprofessional's initial or

early work experience in the agency.

a. Formulation of training goals. This means that

training objectives must be designed to serve the broader purpose

for which the nonprofessional is being used by the agency (i.e.,/ employment

employability, organizational change). For example, if the aide

is being introduced primarily to increase personnel resources,

training is a means to that end.  If, on the other hand, the aim is essentially to socialize or rehabilitate within the context of work experience, then training may become both a means and a goal.

   b.  Structure of training program.  This usually includes the following:

(1)  A basic core curriculum designed to equip and develop in the aide trainee the resources required to:  understand the system he is to be employed in, conduct himself as an employee in terms of satisfactory work habits, accept supervisory authority, and assume responsibility for the tasks assigned.  This might be termed the employability aspect of curriculum content.

(2)  A specialty skill component composed of specialized and concretized knowledge and skills requisite for functioning in the particular task-centered role.

(3)  Remediation (in some instances included in a package of supportive services) specifically tailored to equip trainee with basic reading, writing and arithmetic skills for use in the particular job.

(4)  Supervised teaching in the actual on-the-job situation in relation to the tasks involved in the role which the aide will be expected to perform.

(5)  Constant exchange and coordination between trainees and relevant program personnel to enable on-going assessment of trainee performance and training effectiveness.

(6)  Provision for training of professionals who are involved in the nonprofessional training process.

(7)  Provision for some form of training evaluation which will vary from a systematic attempt to measure program and performance outcomes and the more usual supervisory assessment.

c. __Methodology.__   Training in a large agency, where several nonprofessionals will be working, may be a seperate, highly organized program.  In a small facility, it may mean only the professional teaching the nonprofessional his specific job. In either case, there are teaching and supervisory methodolologies which are particularly appropriate for indigenous personnel. No  matter what the formal training structure, it should include the following elements:

(1) __Continuous on-the-job training__ beginning almost immediately.  Long preparatory training is very dangerous because considerable anxiety develops in the nonprofessional until he gets into "action," more than the normal amount of anxiety associated with any new job.  Consequently, it is extremely important that he actually begin performing some tasks as soon as possible. These tasks must be carefully phased:  the initial assignments must be relatively simple and within the range of nonprofessional skills; as on-the-job training continues, the tasks should be progressively more complex

(2) __The use of the group method as the major training technique__ for teaching content and as a peer group vehicle for group interaction and problem solving by trainees around training and on-the-job related issues.

(3) __An activity rather than lecture approach__ ("do" __rather than write__), with a heavy emphasis on role playing and role training.[8]

(4) __Building strong group solidarity__ among the nonprofessionals a strong supportive base, and minimizes dangers of imitating the professionals.

(5) __Informal individual supervision at any time on request__, supplemented by group discussion and supervision.

(6) <u>A down-to-earth teaching style</u>, stressing clarity and detail, and recognizing that concepts and theory, if properly presented, are definitely within the reach of indigenous personnel.

(.7) <u>Freedom for the nonprofessional to develop his personal style</u>. Experience in working with nonprofessionals strongly suggests that the worker's personal style is an essential ingredient in the successful performance of his duties.

### d. Questions

(1) Is there a definable core of interpersonal skills which can be developed and refined for imparting to the nonprofessional working in a social service program?

(2) Should nonprofessionals be trained to perform counseling functions? If so, what are such functions?

(3) Is there a danger or perhaps it is desirable or inevitable, to "train out" the "indigenous" attribute in the nonprofessional? Can we or should we prevent him from becoming "middle class"?

(4) How can professional social workers learn to communicate with the nonprofessional as a worker, worker-trainee, rather than as a client?

(5) What steps need to be taken by social agencies and schools of social work to equip workers with the skills, knowledge and attitudes requisite for training and utilizing nonprofessionals?

❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊❊

These, then, are a few of the themes involved in the subject of the new nonprofessional. They are suggestive, rather than definitive, since the concept is still in its early stages of development. Nevertheless, I hope that these remarks will prove useful stimulii for the day's discussion.

## Notes

1. <u>Closing the Gap in Social Work Manpower: Report of Depart-
   mental Task Force on Social Work Education and Manpower</u>.
   Washington, D.C.: Department of HEW, 1965.

2. Jacob R. Fishman, <u>et al.</u>, <u>Training for New Careers: The
   Community Apprentice Program</u>. Washington, D.C.: President's
   Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, June 1965

   M. Herman and S. Sadofsky, <u>Youth Work Programs</u>. New York:
   Center for Study of Unemployed Youth, New York University
   School of Social Work, 1966

   A. Pearl and F. Riessman, <u>New Careers for the Poor</u>. New
   York, N.Y.: Basic Books, 1965

   R. Reiff and F. Riessman, <u>The Indigenous nonprofessional:
   A Strategy for Change in Community Action and Community
   Mental Health</u>, National Institute of Labor Education Report
   #3, 1964

   W. Denham, <u>et al.</u>, <u>The Neighborhood Worker: A New Resource
   for Community Change--A Monograph on Training and Utiliza-
   tion</u>. Washington, D. C.: Institute for Youth Studies,
   Howard University, 1966

3. H. Lewis, <u>Child Rearing Practices in Working Class Families:
   Report of a Research Study</u>. Washington, D.C.: Health and
   Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, 1964.

4. W. Richan, "A Theoretical Scheme for Determining Roles of
   Professional and Nonprofessional Personnel," <u>Social Work</u>,
   VI:4, October 1961.

5. P. Levinson and J. Schiller, "Role Analysis of the Indige-
   nous Nonprofessional," <u>Social Work</u>, XI:3, July 1966.

6. Fishman, <u>et al.</u>, <u>op. cit.</u>
   Reiff and Riessman, <u>op. cit.</u>

7. <u>Ibid</u>.

8. Role playing is the flexible acting out of various types of situations in a permissive group atmosphere, e.g., a homemaker working with a withdrawn client, a community organizer interviewing a hostile tenant. Most role playing situations are acted out by two people with a group discussion following. Since it is free of the tensions of an actual problem situation, role playing stimulates the trying out of new alternatives and solutions. It increases the participant's role flexibility in an atmosphere where he can safely take a chance with different kinds of behavior. (See Frank Riessman and Jean Goldfarb, "Role Playing and the Poor," Group Psychotherapy, 17:1, March 1964, pp. 36-48.)