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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Utilization of manpower in Jewish Centers is as important today as it has been at any other period of time for two major reasons, (a) Jewish Centers exist to provide service to meet the needs of their members, and (b) the quality and quantity of the service depend on the proper training and utilization of staff. Current patterns of staffing were created in a period when there were fewer Centers, fewer demands for membership, and when trained social workers were the major staff group providing social work services.

Today there is a new situation. This situation has three components, (1) there are fewer trained social workers entering the Jewish Center field, (2) the functions of the agency have been broadened and changed, and (3) there are more individuals with differing undergraduate preparation who are included in the Center service delivery system. When the subjects of training and utilization are discussed, concern is not only with the shortage of social workers but in finding better ways of using personnel with other levels of education, specifically the bachelor degree worker.

Utilization and training of manpower have become major subjects because of the changing nature of client needs to which the Jewish Center profession needs to address itself. On the subject of the
manpower crisis in social work, Barker and Briggs in an unpublished monograph state, "...the U.S. Government has estimated that by next year there will be 100,000 vacancies of social workers in this country, and a shortage of 178,000 by 1975. An increase by 300 percent of social workers with graduate degrees is thus needed by 1975, and one and a half times increase is needed by next year alone. Since social work graduate schools cannot possibly train more than 4,500 people annually (or only eight percent of the present number of social workers) the prospects of reaching this quota are dim indeed."

The reasons given for the shortage of social workers are the inefficient system of service delivery, i.e., organizing the agency service exclusively on a case work or group work basis, limited capacity of graduate schools, failure of graduate schools of social work to recruit students in large numbers, increasing demand for social work services growing out of government programs and the inefficient use of social workers.

In 1968, the Manpower Commission of the National Jewish Welfare Board reported:

The nature of the challenge is evidenced by the fact that among our 447 Jewish Community Centers, branches and camps, approximately 175 positions remain vacant each year and more than 100 are filled temporarily by staff not fully prepared to fulfill their functions in the Center. There are now 1,400 full time professional personnel employed in the Jewish Community Centers throughout the country; at least 300 more are needed at this time, and additional numbers will be required to staff the more than 60 new Center buildings it is anticipated will be built within the next decade.
On the subject of utilization of personnel, the Commission found there was a waste of valuable professional skill by Center workers in their job assignments. The Commission recommended a review and redefinition of professional responsibilities for social workers with social work degrees and, in addition, a new career line and professional training for program workers with Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degrees.

**Historical Background of the Jewish Center Field**

In order to provide perspective for the study, a historical examination of the developments in the American Jewish Community, which has effected the direction of the Center field is appropriate.

The Jewish Center has its roots in the Young Men's Hebrew Association formed in the middle of the nineteenth century to promote "...good fellowship and harmony among Hebrew young men and to unite them in an organization tending to improve their social, moral and mental condition."²

By the end of the nineteenth century the Young Men's Hebrew Associations modified their function to respond to the new waves of Jewish immigrants coming to the United States. The task of helping newly arrived Jews acclimate to their new homeland occupied the early Jewish Centers through the first two decades of the twentieth century.

During the period of the Center movement, from 1865 - 1920, there was no identifiable professional training for their professional personnel. People came from a variety of backgrounds, with no more specific requisite than a general college education. Heavy reliance
was placed on the personal commitment of the professional worker and
the cadre of volunteers he could attract to help in the "charitable"
work of the institution.  

With the waning of Jewish immigration to the United States by
the 1920's and the increasing numbers of second and third generation
American Jews, the Americanization function of the Center was no
longer a sufficient or necessary raison d'être. Several new functions
began to emerge at this point of transition: one was for the Jewish
Center to move in the direction of the non-sectarian settlement
house; i.e., to de-emphasize the Jewish dimension of the program and
highlight bringing together the diverse elements of the community in
social action activities. The major economic and social problems
generated by the depression of the 1930's gave special impetus to the
social action function of the Jewish Centers.

In 1945 the Jewish Welfare Board launched a survey under the
direction of Oscar I. Janowsky to study and recommend future direc-
tions for services of the Jewish Welfare Board. The survey was
highly critical of those Jewish Centers which were non-sectarian and
in which the social action function was emphasized because they
believed these Centers could not fulfill what the survey conceived
to be the only rationale for a Jewish Center: perpetuating and
enriching the spiritual and cultural needs of Jewish people. The
most important conclusion of the survey is that the Jewish Center
should have a Jewish purpose—that it should be an agency with which
the Jew might identify himself in order to satisfy his specialized
Jewish needs.  
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The Janowsky survey clearly asserted the centrality of Jewish content in the Center movement. While the survey led to a new Jewish Welfare Board statement of purposes on the Jewish Center, and it contributed to the demise of the few remaining non-sectarian Centers, it had little effect on the functioning of most agencies. The issue of translating Jewish content into practice continued as an elusive ideal.

Two other Jewish Center functions were given special prominence by social and historical developments of the 1930's. The rise of Nazism and the World War II brought about a serious challenge to the democratic way of life. Many American institutions responded by affirming the viability of democracy. This was reflected in the programs of the Jewish Centers, as the teaching of democratic values and practices assumed priority. The informal small group became the keystone of Jewish Center activities. Here the integrity of the individual was paramount, here group members could learn to function democratically, and here new leadership could be prepared for civic responsibilities.

Concurrent with interest in the small group as a vehicle for affirming and teaching democratic values, was a heightened interest in the informal group experience as a means of enhancing the personality development of the individual. This emphasis was an outgrowth of the spreading influence of psychoanalysis. While formerly the Jewish Centers addressed the task of "character training", they now served as an agency of "personality development."
At this point of transition for the Center movement there was a concurrent development in the profession of social work; the emergence of social group work as a new concentration. Its philosophy and goals closely paralleled the newly emerging functions of the Jewish Center. Social group work drew together the new insights in small group theory, human relations, individual psychology and progressive education and translated them into a coherent methodology for use in leisure time and informal education agencies. A merger of Centers and the newly developed social work specialization developed. For social group work, the Center provided a good setting for field training and a receptive source of employment for professional rationale which was intellectually and philosophically compatible with its recently revised organizational mission. This was an important consideration for the many second generation Jews emerging from the ghettos who saw in their professional status as social workers a legitimate avenue for professionalism.

From 1940 to 1945, the Center was seen as an excellent environment for social group work practice. Field assignments in the Centers were sought by faculty and students, graduates of social work looked to the Jewish Centers for jobs where they would receive a good professional grounding. The Jewish Center was recognized as being at the leading edge of innovative practices. From the perspective of the leaders of the Jewish Center movement it was an equally satisfactory relationship. The nature of this relationship is represented in an article written in 1955 by Sanford Solender, who was the executive director of the National Jewish Welfare Board.
Central to the Jewish Center's way of work is its use of modern Social Work...The Center field has acknowledged that workers who combine the talents of social group work with suitable Jewish preparation are best equipped to guide its services...While the Center utilises such other important fields as physical education and pre-school education, social group work is its central area of competence...This commitment to social work is at the heart of the uniqueness of the Jewish Center.5

The first breach in the compatible relationship between the Jewish Centers and social work appeared about 1960 with a treatment orientation in social group work. Robert Vinter, an advocate to this emphasis in social group work, stated:

We conceive group work practice to be a form of treatment most appropriately focused on the resolution of an individual's problems. (He went on to identify the settings which were appropriate for professional practice.)...Those agencies which provide treatment or problem-focused services...These are the agencies known as 'special settings', and include juvenile courts, psychiatric hospitals, public schools, rehabilitation programs...(and) certain settlements or community agencies, part or all of whose services are problem-focused with selective intake and the other procedures we believe necessary to implement treatment goals.6

The reaction of Centers to this intrusion introduced a new trend in the relationship between the Center movement and social work. We find, in 1960, greater interest in psychiatric consultations and the development of specialized services for individual groups representing dysfunction (gangs, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed).

Starting in the early 1960's, there appeared a narrowing of the common ground of social work and the Jewish Center. Increasingly, the Jewish Center was called upon to respond to changing social work priorities which were more distant from the Jewish Center's basic objectives.
In addition, as Pins noted in his recent assessment of changes in Social Work education, "...the shifting focus and image of social work education have brought to graduate schools of social work a new type of student who is more interested in social change."⁷

In 1955, Solender defined social group work as the Jewish Center's "central area of competence",⁸ the percentage of professional social workers on the staffs of all Jewish Centers in the United States stood at 58 percent of the total work force. By 1969, that percentage had dropped to 32 percent.

**TABLE 1**

PERCENT OF PROFESSIONAL SOCIAL WORKERS IN SERVICE STAFFS OF JEWISH CENTERS, NATIONALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PERCENT OF SOCIAL WORKERS ON STAFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The drop in the proportion of the social work force was a consequence of the expansion of the non-social work aspects of the Center program and the increasing number of different kinds of staff required to provide these services. Such programs included cultural arts, physical education, and adult education.⁹

The idea that Centers should function as a Jewish educational institution has been espoused since 1945 by Graenum Berger. Berger's concept of the Center is that of "...an avowed Jewish educational
institution, which would be unequivocally devoted to teaching Jews as individuals, but more particularly in families and groups, how to live as Jews in the American community, using our advanced knowledge of the social sciences better to understand those with whom we work, and to motivate their interest in predetermined Jewish Goals."  

In a presentation to Center executives in January 1971, Jacob Neusner addressed the question of the function of the Jewish Center in the 1970's. He attributed the success of the movement to the fact that Centers "...have responded to the needs of the people." Neusner proceeded to outline three tasks for Centers which grew out of his assessment of what Jews wanted and needed at that time. These tasks included: (1) developing and operating Jewish day schools, (2) sharing the function of Jewish education with the synagogues through the medium of informal educational activities and the observance of the Sabbath and festivals, and (3) offer formal and informal Jewish educational programs for college students.

The conception of the Jewish Center movement suggested by Neusner was that of an educational institution. It appears that Neusner's proposals have generated more serious consideration by agency leadership than those ideas offered by Berger. The difference is largely explained by the significant changes that have taken place in the American-Jewish community since 1965. That Jewish Center leadership was more receptive to the idea of the Center fulfilling Jewish educational functions is a consequence of their recognition of the changing attitudes of their Jewish constituency.
The nature of the programs and staff of Centers had been undergoing important changes in recent years. There are significant decreases in the proportions of social workers in the Jewish Centers. At the same time increasing elements of the program require professional skills other than those provided in schools of social work. The changing profile of the Center should be understood in relation to the major changes which have been occurring within the Jewish community. These changes account for more Jews who are more conscious of the Jewish dimension in their lives and who are in quest of support, guidance and education in responding to this resurgent interest. An agency which would be responsive to the needs of such a Jewish constituency would require an atmosphere which would be pervasively Jewish. It would require a staff made up of individuals who are knowledgeable Jews and for whom the agency objective of the creative survival of the Jewish people would be an exciting challenge.

In addition to the field of social work, a modern Jewish Center’s staff organization could reflect some six other different professional backgrounds, such as: early childhood education, adult education, camping, physical education, public relations and cultural arts. The kind of required professional education for the field is changing due not only to changes in the nature of the Jewish community, but to factors such as economics and professional mobility.

The Bachelor Degree Worker

Bachelor degree staff workers have been utilized in Centers for many years. There has been a tendency to reach for this level worker when faced with the need to cut budgets, failure to find
social workers or when new program priorities have been formulated. Untrained bachelor degree workers have been assigned to positions for which they were not ready or were unable to perform. There have been failures to define jobs and limit the specific responsibilities. At times, social workers and bachelor degree workers have been used interchangeably.

The role that could be played by a bachelor degree worker was identified at the February 1969 National Jewish Welfare Board-sponsored colloquium. "It was felt that rather than seeing the bachelor degree worker as someone to handle an unfilled position in a makeshift manner, we might best attempt to formulate appropriate job loads and see the bachelor degree person as a basic staff person..."13

The bachelor degree worker represents the largest single source of manpower available to the field. Executives and supervisors face a challenge to integrate this worker into the agency staff organization by (a) recognizing their value and special skills, (b) providing appropriate job descriptions, (c) creating differential inservice-training programs based on undergraduate educations and (d) providing advanced career opportunities.

There is urgent need for valid data in order that those responsible for developing training programs might develop training models based on the expressed needs of the bachelor degree practitioner.
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The research was designed to be quantitative-descriptive study as described by Tripodi, Fellin and Meyer:

Quantitative-descriptive studies are empirical research investigations which have as their major purpose the delineation or assessment of characteristics of phenomena, program evaluation, or the isolation of key variables.\textsuperscript{14}

The general purpose of the study was to identify the characteristics of bachelor degree Center workers and to determine their training needs.

OBJECTIVES

In order to fulfill the major purpose, the following specific objectives were used to direct the study:

1. To identify the formal training and background of new bachelor degree workers in Jewish Centers.
2. To determine how well they felt their undergraduate training prepared them for the field.
3. To determine the bachelor degree workers' evaluation of competencies considered important to their staff classifications.
4. To identify, by staff classification, the training needs of new bachelor degree workers in the Jewish Center field.

STUDY QUESTIONS

In order to reach the specific objectives established for this study, the following three study questions were developed:

1. How well prepared does the bachelor degree worker perceive himself for his level of practice?
2. Is there a difference between those bachelor degree workers who have discussed a career plan with their supervisor and those who have not and their perceived importance to the job of selected practice competencies?

3. Is there a difference between those bachelor degree workers who have attended The Jewish Welfare Board New Workers' Institute and those who have not and their perceived importance to the job of selected practice competencies?

ASSUMPTIONS

The following assumptions were considered basic to the study:

1. Bachelor degree workers in Jewish Centers would be able to determine honestly which competencies were important to their job classification.

2. Bachelor degree workers in Jewish Centers would be able to determine how well prepared they were to practice these competencies.

3. Competencies could be ranked by the workers in terms of importance to their job and their professional preparation level. This difference in rank could be an indication of training need.

LIMITATIONS

The following limitations were recognized as this study was designed and conducted:

1. The population was limited to those workers who were
working on a full time year-round work schedule and were salaried.

2. The population was limited to workers who entered the field between September, 1973 and December, 1974.

3. The study was limited to workers in Jewish Centers located in the United States.

4. The study was limited to the degree that respondents accurately interpreted all segments of the questionnaire.

Chapter II will interpret the design of the study, method of analysis, definition of terms, and the plan for the study.
NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1 Jewish Welfare Board Manpower Commission, Findings and Recommendations, April 1968, p. 3.


3 Ephriam, Ibid., p. 12


8 Solender, op. cit., p. 6.


12 Ibid, p. 11

13 Jewish Welfare Board Manpower Commission, April 1968, p. 22.

CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN FOR THE STUDY

While the general problem of training for Jewish Center professionals was clear in the literature, there was a need to discuss its dimensions in relation to bachelor degree workers. At the same time, there was a desire to discuss alternative approaches to studying the problem.

These ideas were first discussed with the author, executive directors, and program supervisors at eight different Jewish Centers. They agreed completely that training and education were a concern of all supervisors in the field. They indicated that each of their agencies did staff training based on the staff organization, background of the workers and the special needs of the community. They all indicated that training programs were difficult to sustain and that program needs receive first priority for staff time.

Subsequently, a conversation with Earl Yaillen, Community Consultant for the Midwest Office of the National Jewish Welfare Board, confirmed the concerns of the executive directors and program supervisors. Yaillen indicated other parts to the problem such as:

1. The diversity of educational background of bachelor degree workers.

2. The size of the agency in both staff and budget. Some agencies had only three or four full time workers who were either specialists, such as physical educators, or general program workers assigned to different age groups and programs.
A discussion with Dan Morrison in 1973 in the Bureau of Research at the National Jewish Welfare Board in New York convinced the author that the Jewish Center field had little to offer the worker in the way of education and training either on a national or regional level. Morrison convinced the writer that the study should focus on in-service training and that the training should be differentially determined based on the background and staff classification of the worker.

An investigation of settlement houses and Young Men's Christian Associations had a formalized program of training both nationally and regionally for their professional staff people. A conversation with Robert Cooper of the Columbus Ohio Young Men's Christian Association indicated that viewing the Young Men's Christian Association as a career choice had positive effects on workers and their relation to a formalized training program.

Other discussions were held with staff at the Cooperative Extension Service at Ohio State University. They also emphasized the value of an in-service training program.

Collection of Rosters

In order to develop a list of bachelor degree workers, communication was established with the Bureau of Personnel and Training at the Jewish Welfare Board in New York. Their list of staff did not indicate what kind of degrees the workers had.

It was then determined, with the help of Mr. Yaillen, to limit the study to a random sample of bachelor degree workers who entered
the Jewish Center field between September 1973 and September 1974 and focused only on workers of Centers in the United States.

In order to accomplish this, the Personnel Reporter, a quarterly published by the Jewish Welfare Board featuring job vacancies and new workers in the field was carefully screened. Based on the writer's experience, workers whose job titles indicated only an undergraduate degree were extracted for the study. Job titles used in the selection process included: health and physical education assistant or director, teen worker, childrens or youth worker, day camp supervisor, preschool supervisor, program associate, aquatics director and extension worker. A total of 221 names was listed.

Further discussion with Mr. Yaillen helped the writer to discard the idea of a random sample and to study the total population.

**Designing the Questionnaire**

Because three kinds of information were being sought, the questionnaire had three distinct parts. Part I seeks certain demographic information such as age, tenure, marital status, educational background, religious affiliation and religious education. The second part of the instrument deals with the worker's preparation as related to a series of competencies deemed necessary for Jewish Center work.

Part I of the questionnaire was compiled largely from the objectives of the study and based on the kinds of information deemed necessary to test a series of study questions. The purpose was also to create a profile of the bachelor degree worker.
The second part of the questionnaire was concerned with the preparation of bachelor degree workers for their staff classification and their perceived needs for training to improve their practice in these assignments. Materials for this part were compiled from literature related to training in the fields of Jewish Community Centers, Young Men's Christian Association, adult education and a review of similar studies. Selection of the competencies for the study came from the general areas of cultural emphasis, history and philosophy, motivation, working with groups, community planning, program analysis, communication skills, group process, research, social system program resources, public relations and administration and organization.

The questionnaire was pre-tested with selected professionals from (1) the School of Social Work at Ohio State University, (2) a Social Work Committee on Continuing Education chaired by Milton Ain, Field Coordinator for the School of Social Work, (3) staff personnel in both the mid-west section and national headquarters of The National Jewish Welfare Board.

The entire questionnaire was pre-tested with ten executives and program supervisors in the Jewish Center field. A final pre-test was done with fifteen bachelor degree workers at a conference in Pokagon, Indiana in November of 1973. None of these workers were included in the research project.

In all cases, the charge was to critically review all three parts with emphasis on Parts II and III dealing with specific competencies. Suggestions from all groups were incorporated into the final questionnaire. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in
Appendix A.

**Distribution of Final Questionnaire**

Once the composition of the final questionnaire was determined, it was printed and distributed to the population on December 15, 1973 and on January 2, 1974. Returns were requested within three weeks. Follow up cards were sent the week of January 21, 1974.

The following table shows the number of questionnaires sent to the study population, and the response.

**TABLE 2**

RESPONSE TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Population</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Returns</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Rejected</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Population</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that although the population consisted of 221 workers, and there were 123 respondents, twenty-four respondents had master degrees in social work and twenty were no longer at the agency. These returns were rejected; seventy-nine questionnaires were certified for the study providing a return of 44 per cent.

According to Parten's book on Surveys and Samples, "You can normally expect a 30 per cent return from a mailed questionnaire using a self-addressed envelope. It is a general practice to accept data if you have over a 30 per cent return justified as an acceptable sample."
In order to validate how well the respondents represented the population, a follow-up study was undertaken. The non-return population was asked to respond to the following variables: job classification, sex, age and marital status. Tables three through seven indicate the results of the follow-up study.

A chi square test of association showed no significant difference between respondents and non-respondents, at the .05 level. The respondents are therefore representative of the population and generalizations to the population could be made.

Analysis of Data

The questionnaire was coded so that data gathered from it could be transferred to data processing cards. This procedure then permitted the use of a computer and related machines for sorting and tabulating and mechanically carrying out the various statistical tests deemed appropriate for analysis of the data.

TABLE 3

COMPARISON OF RESPONSES OF A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF THE NON-RESPONDENT POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIAL POPULATION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Respondents</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The follow-up questionnaire mailed to 98 workers led to a return of 38 respondents or 39 per cent of the follow-up population.
### TABLE 4

**COMPARISON BY SEX OF INITIAL RESPONDENTS AND RESPONDENTS OF THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>INITIAL RESPONSE</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 8.383$  $p > .30$

### TABLE 5

**COMPARISON BY MARITAL STATUS OF INITIAL RESPONDENTS AND RESPONDENTS TO THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>INITIAL RESPONSE</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 7.344$  $p > .50$
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>INITIAL RESPONSE</th>
<th></th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 and below</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 6.392 \ p > .70
\]
TABLE 7

COMPARISON BY STAFF CLASSIFICATION OF INITIAL RESPONDENTS AND RESPONDENTS TO THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAFF GROUP</th>
<th>INITIAL RESPONSE</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 9.034 \ p > .70$

Chi square - One of the many uses of chi square is for testing for significance of differences between or among the responses of individuals in two or more groups.²

Data in Part II and III, their inter-relations and the relation of the scales to the background information were analyzed using chi square to determine the significance of the relationship.

The formula used for the computation of the chi square values is given below:

$$x^2 = N \sum_{i,j} \frac{n^2_{i,j}}{N_{i},n_{j}} - N$$

Where $N = \text{total number observations}$
Where \( N \) = total number of observations
\( i \) = row
\( j \) = column
\( n_i = n_{i,j} \) = row total
\( n_j = n_{i,j} \) = column total

The .05 level of confidence was the level of significance selected for the study.

Definition of Terms

In order to avoid confusion which may arise in use of some terms and observations, the writer has defined the following:

AJCW - Association of Jewish Center Workers is a professional association for all full-time workers in the Jewish Center field.

Competency - In this study, it is expressed in terms of understanding, knowledge, skills and abilities that are important to the Jewish Center worker.

In-Service Training - Any training a worker received, either formal or informal, once he enters the field.

J.W.B. - Jewish Welfare Board is a national agency providing professional resources for Jewish Community Centers.

Bachelor Degree Worker - A full-time professional in the Center field who does not have a Master of Social Work degree.

Supervisor - The professional worker assigned on the agency table of organization as being responsible for the professional development of the worker assigned to him.

Y.M.H.A. - Young Men's Hebrew Association, the beginning of the Jewish Center movement.
Training - "A planned educational effort by an organization to expose an individual or group to certain selected influence. In order to change their conduct in specified ways. Training always involves attempts to stimulate the learning or relearning of attitudes, knowledge, and skills in order to improve quality of performance."⁴

Plan for the Study

Chapter I has introduced the need and purpose of this study. It has presented information regarding the nature of the study.

Chapter II deals with methodology, research design and procedures that were followed in the study.

Chapter III is devoted to review of the literature and research that is related to the study.

Chapter IV presents findings related to the characteristics of the Bachelor Degree Workers and analyzes their undergraduate education in relation to their perceived preparation level. This chapter also addresses itself to the worker's perceived needs for training.

Chapter V summarizes the study. It offers conclusions and recommendations based upon the findings of this research project.
NOTES TO CHAPTER II


CHAPTER III
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize some of the more important literature and available research findings relating to this study. The chapter is divided into two sections. The first section is devoted to a review of the literature that pertains to the study. It will be composed of a history of professional training in the Jewish Center field, a discussion of differing views related to scope and function of Jewish Centers and staff, and competencies and skills needed by Jewish Center workers. The second section deals with research that is directly related to the study.

HISTORY OF PROFESSIONAL TRAINING OF JEWISH CENTER WORKERS

In order to review current literature related to the study it was deemed appropriate to present a brief history of professional training of Jewish Center workers. According to Graenum Berger:

...stipends were provided to college graduates as early as 1890, who wished to educate themselves more adequately for work in Jewish institutions. In 1902, the National Conference of Jewish Charities provided such scholarships, but a very limited number accepted the opportunity and the funds were subsequently withdrawn.

Prior to 1913, efforts were made to encourage workers to improve their knowledge and skill through in-service training. During this period, the Jewish Chautauqua Society (1893) initiated courses in New York, Baltimore, and Chicago for employed Jewish communal
workers, but this effort was short-lived, due possibly to the questionable state of the profession at the time.

In 1917, Boris Bogen recorded his feelings about the leadership of Jewish communal agencies by stating:

> It is only in exceptional cases that professional efficiency is sought. How many communities care whether their superintendent possesses knowledge of sociology, political economy, psychology, and so on; how many of the Jewish communities dealing with immigrants, their past, their peculiarities, their tendencies, their merits or their shortcomings.\(^2\)

In relation to professional training for Center workers Miriam Ephram wrote:

> During the first seventy-five years of the Jewish Center's existence there was no identifiable professional personnel... People came from a variety of backgrounds, with no more specific requisite than a general college education. Heavy reliance was placed on the personal commitment of the professional worker and the cadre of volunteers he could attract to help in the "charitable" work of the institution.\(^3\)

In 1913, the Jewish Settlement, an agency supported by the Federation of Jewish Charities in Cincinnati, established what might be termed the first School of Jewish Social Service, but when it failed to enroll students it was terminated within eighteen months.

In New York, the struggling and imaginatively directed Kehillah, established a school for Jewish Communal Work in 1915, but World War I soon brought this to an end.\(^4\)

Through the efforts of Dr. Maurice J. Karpf, the National Conference of Jewish Charities established the Graduate School of Jewish Social Work in 1925, which terminated in 1940, when the Jewish communities could not be persuaded to provide the essential funds. The school offered a Master's Degree.
Despite the rapid professionalization of the field of social work since the 1930's and the burgeoning of new non-sectarian schools of social work in the 1940's, a lacuna in preparation for Jewish communal service necessitated the establishment of the Training Bureau for Jewish Communal Service in 1947 to meet the Jewish communal requirements of the post World War II period. The Bureau was the creation of five national organizations—the American Association of Jewish Education, the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, the National Community Relations Advisory Council, and the National Jewish Welfare Board. Organized largely for selected workers already practicing in the field, it developed a mass of specialized material pertinent for those engaged in Jewish communal service. The Bureau experienced trouble in finding students and failed to sustain the initial outburst of financial support. It closed in 1951. The Training Bureau offered a certificate but no degree.

The next venture was undertaken by Yeshiva University. From some initial courses offered at the undergraduate level in 1944, it made a giant leap forward by founding the Wurzweiler School of Social Work in 1957, the first such "Jewish" school in a total university setting and a Jewish university at that. While it initially prepared professionals for casework and group work, in 1972 it introduced a department in Jewish community organization as a result of a grant from the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York. The School offers both Master's and Doctoral programs. It is the only graduate school which provides all its students with four basic Jewish
courses, thus giving it both the milieu and the academic character of a Jewish institution.

Mindful of the need for more professional as well as Jewish underpinning for future as well as for existing staff, local Jewish agencies, Jewish Federations and many of the national Jewish organizations have sponsored short term institutes for their specialized requirements over the years.

Studies of individual programs, agencies, and communities raised questions about the effectiveness of social work methodologies; it was not until recent years that the questioning became so widespread.5

These studies revealed that Jewish communities no longer found the schools of social work, as they were operating, appropriate instruments for developing future Jewish professionals. Not that Jewish students were not attending or graduating, for they did; but the Centers did recognize that the schools were not concerned with preparing workers for either voluntary social work and more particularly for service in the Jewish community.6 They did nothing to enhance the Jewish backgrounds of their students. Their preoccupation with advocacy and public policy often ran counter to Jewish interests.

The second, and related element, in the relationship of the various fields in the Jewish Center is the concept of social work as related to other Center disciplines. This led to the procedure of social workers "supervising" physical educators, arts specialists, and adult educators, and trying to help these "untrained" workers to
adapt their skills to "social work goals". It is no accident that even to this day many Centers reserve the term "professional worker" exclusively for persons with a graduate degree in social work.

An ecological view of program and administrative structure assumes that various disciplines are to equal significant and stature in the Jewish community center. Each is at once independent and related. All elements of the Center system are guided by the common goal of enriching the Center member's life with a special emphasis on his Jewish, cultural, physical, and social potentials. The ecology of the Center structure reflects the ecology of the human being.

According to Kolodney:

The administrative implications of this ecological view are obvious. The Center is no longer seen as an institution with a hierarchy of disciplines. It becomes as natural to imagine a physical educator or adult educator as executive director as it is to imagine an arts educator or social worker as one. The concept of supervision changes from persons of one profession supervising persons of another according to a simple administrative table of organization to a new model resembling that of the college where the dean attends to coordinating budget, public relations, general academic policy matters and most important the motivating of his faculty to the highest professional aspirations and standards; but where the various departments attend to their specific areas of knowledge.?

It would appear that although, historically, some effort was focused on the training of Jewish Center workers in an emerging field, no significant organization emerged. The conflict among disciplines in the field was one of many to become a deterrent to a professional training program.

This part of section one of a review of the literature delineates the conflict pertaining to scope and function of Jewish Centers as they relate to the nature of the agency and professional training.
Conflict in Scope and Function

Writing in 1946 Graenum Berger said, "Group work offers an instrumentality for providing individuals with an opportunity to make increasingly more complicated adjustments to the mobile society of which they are inextricably a part." In another part of the same article he comments:

If one were to aptly sum up the significance of group work, it would be as follows: it recognizes that individual personality is more important that program; that program is an instrument in the development and socialization of the individual; that we need to know a great deal about individual and group behavior to effect this growth process; that the group through the rich stimulation which it gives its members assists in this growth process; that native leadership can be developed through group experiences; that the group leader is not an adult who imposes his own world image upon a new generation, but one who seeks to give each age rich nourishment from the contemporary scene; that in the ever evolving process of the individual and the group both look forward to a future which will insure fulfillment and not frustration.8

In 1948 Joshua Loth Liebman wrote the following about the human needs function of the Jewish Center:

Through group work there emerges a desirable competition for status, competition in games and in dramatics, the harmless express of ego-drives sublimated rather than primitive and violent. And out of that group togetherness there emerges a warm and intimate sense of happiness, of shared experience, of value, for the young Jew and the older Jew alike...we at the same time find a blessed relief from much of the hostility and the anger which is bottled up within us by our highly competitive and often frustrating industrial civilization. We find in play and recreation a salve for the wounds inflicted upon our minds and hearts in the outer world.9

In 1954, in describing the functions of the Center, Louis Kraft wrote of the community organization function and then went on to say that the Center: "renders social services, especially to transients and
newcomers...The Center becomes involved in these activities because it is regarded as a community institution, has community-wide support support...and often has the only Jewish professional social work staff in the community."10

At the National Conference on Social Welfare in 1959 Robert D. Vinter called for the withdrawal of social workers from the socialization agencies where he maintained that their professional skills had fallen into disuse. He also noted that professional advancement in these agencies required that social workers move even further away from professional functions requiring social skill. He also called for schools of social work to stop using agencies such as Jewish Centers for graduate social work student training. While he allowed for the existence of some trained social workers in agencies such as ours, his message was clear.11

In 1961 Robert D. Vinter called for the government to take over what socialization agencies had been doing until then. And in his words: "doing wrongly and wastefully in terms of community dollars and manpower."12

As Alan Klein put it:

To assure that the Jewish Center was or is a social welfare agency or that its functions were or are primarily social work was and is a mistake. There is a social work service role in the Center to be sure. This is the point at which Center function and social work function articulate, but the Center function also articulates with physical education, adult education and so forth. The Center must define the social work factor and then use group work therein, appropriately for what social group workers were educated to do.13
In 1963, although there were some severe personnel shortages, Arnulf Pins was able to report that the future looked bright with regard to the availability of trained social workers for the field.\textsuperscript{14} In 1967 Alfred Dobrof urged that the field required some re-definition of social work function, and he proposed some approaches using the "episode of service" concept. Finally, he suggested some beginning differences between core social group work and other skills.\textsuperscript{15} Less than a year later Sanford Solender stated that the Jewish Center is an instrument of Jewish group life and insisted that although it is a multi-function Jewish communal institution its core is social welfare. He held that social work should still be the core or host discipline because of the centrality of social welfare purpose.\textsuperscript{16}

Between 1964, when Abe Vinik restated the function of social work with groups in a Center setting\textsuperscript{17} and 1968 when Robert Glass presented a paper which was a comparative analysis of the work of Vinter (the remedial approach), Schwartz (the reciprocal or mediating approach), and the Pittsburgh model (social goals)\textsuperscript{18}, the literature was rather thin on social work practice or theory discussions. It would be false to say that there was a complete absence of any internal struggle within the field or an absence of any attempts to examine the challenges from the profession of social work.

Charles S. Levy, in the first Annual Irving Cantor Memorial Lecture identified some of the contradictions between what he calls "disparities between idealization of professional practice and the actual experiences of the Center workers." They are:
1. His place within the Jewish Center has no meaning unless the focus of his activity is on Jewish survival, but his professional role idealizes service to people as individuals, in families and in groups, not their manipulation for some ultimate community end.

2. Group workers employed precisely because they are social group workers find themselves deprived of opportunity to do what group workers can do--rather they must increasingly perform work which does not utilize their core professional skills.

3. While social work puts priorities on people who need a great deal of help, Center members do not come to their agencies because they look for help, and frequently have access to all the resources needed.

4. The fourth discrepancy, the ideal of ethical practice and the reality of unethical experiences, is of course, not peculiar to the Jewish Centers alone.19

In a recent article, Solender wrote, The "Jewish Center is concerned primarily with enriching the life of the American Jew and his community. The Center aims to assure the continuity of the Jewish group, with historic values which contribute to the lives of the Jews and to the larger society of which they are a part. To these ends, individual family and group fulfillment, along with community development are central."20

Professor Oscar Rosenfeld of the New York University of Social Work in 1966 made the following comment related to the nature of social work students.

Social work students are increasingly negative with regard to the purposes of the Jewish Center. They complain about sectarianism, servicing the middle-call, the recreation emphasis, the Jewish culture emphasis and the enhancement, provision and precaution emphasis vis-a-vis the treatment emphasis.21

Bernard Reisman maintained, "It is my contention that it is with the group work agencies--the Jewish Centers and the YM and
YWHA's—that there has developed the greatest divergence between agency functions and the training available in the schools. 22

The nature of the programs and staffs of the Jewish Center have been undergoing important changes in recent years. There are significant decreases in the proportion of social workers in the Jewish Centers. At the same time increasing elements of the program require professional skills other than those provided in schools of social work. The changing profile of the Jewish Center has to be understood in relation to the major changes which have been occurring within the Jewish community. 23

According to Emanuel Tropp:

The potential for group work as a contributing force in society is great and largely untapped. It will find suitable outlets available in the traditional agencies and in certain types of treatment settings. The established group service agencies need to separate out their group work objectives from their recreational and educational objectives. 24

Klein states the following when related to untrained staff:

The Center must define the social work factor and then use group work therein, appropriately for what social group workers were educated to do... It would be of service to social work, to group work and to the Center movement to have this clarified. What you need is a group work department in the Center with group workers doing group work. 25

Carol Meyer suggested that "the contexts of social work practice are a melange of values, knowledge, skills, commitments, and patterns of service. To the extent that these contexts remain out of touch with the world as it is, the world will have little need of social workers." 26

The rationale for the emphasis upon services through groups and its relationship to social work function in the Center field is spelled out by William Schwartz as he examines group work in a social and historical context:
There were two common emphases which, taken together, constitute perhaps the community agencies' outstanding contribution to the American scene. One was their shared belief in the salutary social and personal effects of group association; the other was a tested conviction that the development of sound leadership was a central problem and a special task in the mobilization of group life in a democracy.27

It should be emphasized that this conception is different from that which places the social worker in a sphere of concern known as "dysfunctioning". While it is true that the profession operates in areas where the individual social interaction is impaired, these areas are only part of the social work field of action. The concern with developmental tasks has provided part of the traditional pre-occupation of the leisure-time agencies, while the ordering of needs and resources has engaged those agencies concerned with social planning and action.

If one examines the function or "professional assignment" as Schwartz refers to it, against the service priorities of supporting Jewish family life and enhancing the mental and physical health of our constituents as defined by Bernard Warrach28, one discovers that the function statement holds.

The problem of differentiating tasks in social work stems from the broader problem any new profession has in setting the bench marks that define its boundaries of service.

There are a limited number of approaches or methods to deploy staff and each presents problems. However, these approaches also have positive aspects containing the germs of solutions for specific agencies such as the Jewish Center. The major methods described in the literature attempting to differentiate the role and function of
the professional social worker and other staff, are well categorized by Finestone's four dimensions.29

By Unit of Differentiation
Choice of what is allocated to the social service staff by units such as cases, tasks, problems or other units. This represents the traditional approach to differential deployment of staff in social work. In the "Case" unit, a worker is assigned and carries out all the elements in serving the case, whether simple or complex. Assignment by tasks requires defining every task in a given service and a worker is assigned based on his ability to carry out simple or complex tasks.

By Principle of Differentiation
Choice in how to organize the agency into specialized segments such as "intake", "supervision", "child welfare", and deploy all professional workers in one division and all non-professional workers in another division depending again on complexity of tasks in each division.

The agency social work staff can also be deployed based on client vulnerability to harm or degree of worker motivation. The non-professional can then be assigned to specific and concrete services like helping client find a job or arranging for transportation.

By Staff Differentiation
Choice of how to identify different categories of workers. Assignments are then based on level of education, years of experience and skill of staff.
By Staff Grouping

Choice about how to place the available personnel in such a fashion that their efforts are mutually complimentary and consistent. These variations include the assignment of the professional social workers and non-professionals in the same case unit or placing all the professional social workers in one unit and other workers in another unit.

These alternative models of "staffing do not automatically solve specific issues of differential task assignments for social workers vis-a-vis other professionals and social work associates. It does provide a starting place and suggestions for experimentation and demonstration. Dobrof suggests that the job of the social worker be defined in the Center with reference to four functions of administrator, supervisor, trainer, and practitioner.30

The staff models developed for Center work must start with agency purposes and include whom is to be served, what services are required, and the most effective deployment of staff to provide the service. The first step calls for defining purposes and translating them into specific services.

Vinter suggested three criteria must be met in establishing tasks for workers:

1) The professional must have regular opportunity to work with people who require his or her skills.
2) The professional, in working with such people, must be able to exercise professional skill.
3) To function as a professional the practitioner requires an administrative climate congenial to the exercise of social work skill.31
Carp added two more criteria:

1) The purposes of the agency under whose auspices the professional exercises his or her skill (including such service boundaries as time or length of service).
2) The specific purpose of the service provided by the professional as agreed upon by the agency (through the worker) and those using the service.32

Schwartz provides information of use in a search for clarity. He identified five categories of tasks common to all social workers:

1) The task of searching out the common ground between the client's perception of his own need and the aspects of social demand with which he is faced.
2) The task of detecting and challenging the obstacles which obscure the common ground and frustrate the efforts of people to identify their own self-interest with that of their "significant others".
3) The task of contributing data--ideas, facts, value-concepts--which are not available to the client and which may prove useful to him in the attempt to cope with that part of social reality which is involved in the problems on which he is working.
4) The task of "lending a vision" to the client in which the worker both reveals himself as one whose own hopes and aspirations are strongly invested in the interaction between people and society and who projects a deep feeling for that which represents individual well-being and the social good.
5) The task of defining the requirements and the limits of the situation in which the client-worker system is set.33

Carp proposed the following standards in order to insure an agency climate conductive to the required professional tasks:

1) Centers should require that all workers, including the agency executive director and assistant executive director, carry ongoing direct practice responsibilities with members (Boards, committees and supervision are not direct practice).
2) Regular recording should be required of all workers. These recordings should be the basis for ongoing consultation or supervision of all workers doing direct practice.
3) Adequate time should be built into workers' job loads for these and other related practice responsibilities.
4) The Center has the responsibility to provide adequate consultation for advanced practitioners where the Center cannot internally provide such assistance.
5) The Center should provide an ongoing in-service training program for social workers designed to sharpen the knowledge and skill of staff (including provision for attendance at institutes and conferences).

6) The Center should clearly define its social work function, identify its social work staff clearly, and project this information to the Center's constituency.

7) The Center's statement of purpose should include reference to the use of social work methods in clear terms (not to be confused with "character building").

8) Social work principles are reflected in the administrative relationships and procedures which govern the delivery of social work services.34

In relation to the manpower picture Alfred Dobroff suggests, "One factor, complicating the Center manpower picture, is the assumption (based on experience) that Jewish Centers (and other social agencies) are not properly utilizing current staff, making a realistic analysis of the manpower shortage difficult".35

If professional social workers are assigned tasks appropriately belonging to the adult educator, the social work associate or the recreation specialist, then it follows, the improper use (or under-utilization) of the social worker limits his social work service and does not describe the true picture of the need for other than professional social workers. One must also assume some inadequacy of service in the educational and recreational programs of the Center since the social worker is not trained in either of these professions. If he is trained and skilled in helping others perform their jobs more productively (supervision) as one of the number of definable social work skills, then effective utilization calls for his job assignment this and other social work tasks. This is similarly true for the health and physical educator and others serving on a multi-disciplined Jewish Center staff.35
The possible implications of effective utilization of Center staff are many. The specific number of vacancies for all categories of staff could change drastically. It is possible that fewer professional social group work vacancies would exist with an increase in the number of vacancies for other categories of workers. This, in turn, could change the direction of the recruitment and scholarship program and would have major implications for in-service staff training programs.

Retention of staff, another important factor, is also affected by utilization and deployment. Job satisfaction for all staff resulting from doing that for which they were trained and can do best, is a major issue in holding a worker in a Center and in the Jewish field. Realistic job descriptions, and adequate salaries and good personnel practices also play a major role in retaining staff and tend to make recruitment for Center work easier.

In dealing with manpower utilization, consideration must also be given to the increased use of the college graduate with a general education and with individuals with less than a college education. Although the Jewish Center field has always employed these people, the highly professionalized case work agencies are employing them in greater numbers to carry out social work tasks under the supervision of a professional social worker. It is this trend that gave impetus to the development of research and demonstration programs in the utilization of social welfare personnel. Solender suggests that the Center performs other functions, albeit, within the context of its Jewish social welfare commitment. These correlative functions are in
the following fields: education, mental health, physical health, library services, vocational counseling, camping, rehabilitation and research. The professions which compose the Center's staff must be those needed to carry out these functions.

In view of the centrality of the social welfare role of the Center, and the expectation that the goals, values and methodology of social welfare will permeate all the functions of the Center, the executive personnel of the Center must come from the social work profession. Social work knowledge and skill, and experience with its application in Center practice, are essential to Center planning, evaluation, policy-making, priority determination, budgeting, staff selection and direction, and interpretation to Board and community.

Broad program-planning and direction and definitive personal supervision are the critical processes influencing the orientation, framework, content and methodology of the Center's services. Therefore, Solender feels, "the key staff responsible for general program direction and staff supervision must be social workers".36

Personnel for the program services of the Center must be considered in several categories: staff required for individual and group services, for special activity areas, and for special services. Individual and group services in the Center's program are those which emphasize the cultivation of relationships among individuals to enhance their personal functioning, and of group and inter-group experiences whose purpose is individual and group development. This portion of the Center's work is organized must frequently be divisions of age groups, with staff members assigned responsibility for
particular divisions.

The tasks of workers responsible for individual and group services are principally those of admission of members and concern for their personal adjustment and progress, assignment of members to groups and group formation, admission of organized groups, program-planning and development for groups and inter-group units, supervision of group leaders, direct leadership of inter-group bodies, relationships with parents, interpretation of program, work with Board committees, and participation in the staff processes of the agency.

To perform these tasks, the workers need a general comprehension of individual growth and development, group life, and community living. They should have sensitivity and knowledge sufficient to enable problem "recognition" and "understanding", rather than problem "diagnosis" and "solving". They require the skills of relating to and working with individuals for general developmental purposes and of group leadership. They should be familiar with programmatic resources and be oriented to the dynamics of agency structure. They should possess the skills of supervision of group leaders of working with Board committees. For practice in Centers, they must possess likewise a broad orientation to Jewish history, sociology, religion and practices, and to modern Jewish community life, its components and its problems.

Undergraduate preparation should wherever possible be carefully planned with students and should consist of major studies in sociology and psychology, as well as some social work courses.
In the special activity areas of Center programming, a highly diversified body of professions is utilized. This follows the line of the functions performed by the Center. Here the Center makes the most extensive use of educators with many specialties, chief among them being the adult educator, the health and physical educator, the early childhood educator, and the cultural arts educator.

Each of these professions should be recognized for its intrinsic and distinctive contribution, and highly qualified practitioners are needed in each area. Each of these professions should be accorded the status and the functional conditions which can assure their operation with integrity and with a high level of effectiveness. These professionals should work in close partnership with the social work staff and a spirit of integration and units should permeate the staff system in the Center.

Several elements are relevant to the effective utilization of these professionals. Their generic professional training must be of good quality and to further this end there must be close collaboration between the Center field and universities training such people. Training facilities should be sensitized to the Center setting and to the curriculum content suggested by the Center field. Beyond this, there is need for programs to orient these professional workers to practice in the Center. Special Jewish training and its appropriate application to the Center is of particular importance.

Related also to the best functioning of these professionals as vital components of the Center is their integration into the social welfare context of the Center. This is a function of orientation and
in-service training provided by the field and of the supervision afforded these workers. The historical stress on the responsibility of trained social workers for the executive and supervisory functions is significant to this discussion. It is through these channels of supervision and training that the Center implements the units of purpose in its multi-functional operation.

In the Center's special services, still another group of professions are drawn upon for whom similar principles and practices must obtain. Programs for strengthening the family may use the family life educator. Services for the mentally retarded or handicapped utilize health and education specialists. Health and physical education and preventive services concerned with physical and mental health require professionals from the health fields (physicians, psychiatrists, and psychologists). Studies and research require researchers and statisticians.

In relation to the utilization of professional personnel The Jewish Welfare Board Manpower Commission stated the following:

1. The Commission's work is based on the premise that the Jewish Center is a Jewish social welfare institution, committed to serving the developmental needs of Jewish individuals, groups and the community in today's complex society. It therefore is to the profession of social work that the Center looks for focal direction of its organization. The Center also recognizes clearly the vital role of other professional Center workers employing other professional disciplines, such as the fields of physical education, early childhood education, cultural arts, camping, adult education and Jewish education.

2. There also is increasing acceptance in the field of social work generally and in a growing number of Jewish Centers, that many of the tasks which have to be performed in serving people and the community do not require the services of a professional social worker with a masters
degree. These roles can often be carried out effectively by workers with bachelor degrees who obtain the necessary supplementary education through in-service training, professional supervision on the job and programs of continuing education. The permanent use of the person with a bachelor degree is obtaining increasing acceptance in the field of social welfare. These workers can render valuable direct service and, after several years of experience and training, can carry some supervisory responsibility in the Center. In some instances, a worker also might devote full time to direct leadership. The trend therefore is in the direction of developing career lines for such people.

3. The bachelor's degree worker can assume responsibility for direct leadership and organizing and supervising informal education, recreation and some group services. The bachelor's degree worker should be supervised by an experienced professional social worker.

4. Health and physical educators, early childhood educators, cultural arts specialists, camp directors, adult educators, and Jewish educators should function as high status members of the Center staff, making their unique contributions to the fulfillment of Center purposes.37

It is obvious that the debate on the scope and function of the Jewish Center has drawn no clear cut decisions. It is clear that the organization of a professional staff and its goals for training are closely tied to the scope and function of the agency.

Solender calls for creative replanning of Center staff organization to advance the effective use of professional social work personnel, as well as of all the other professions in the Center.38

Skills and Competencies

This part of the literature review deals with the competencies, skills and training needed by the Jewish Center worker. Classification and utilization of workers will also be discussed in this section. In order to deal with competencies and skills of Jewish Center workers, it is important to understand the classifications
and definitions related to bachelor degree workers.

The Association of Jewish Center Workers established general job
definitions for all staff classifications. The classifications
related to the bachelor degree workers are as follows: 39

**Group Work Associate** - A worker in this category is a college
graduate, but is not a professional educated social worker - i.e., he
does not possess a Master's degree from an accredited school of
social work.

The Group Work Associate is under very close supervision and
works primarily with groups of children, youths or adults as the lead
leader of informal program activities.

This classification is presently listed by local agencies under
the following job titles: "Group Work Aide"; "Group Leader";
"Program Aide"; "Group Leader - Untrained"; and "Program Assistant".

**Health and Physical Education Worker** - This is the assistant in
a large Health and Physical Education Department. A Bachelor's degree
in health and physical education or recreation is a prerequisite.
This worker is responsible for planning and carrying out assigned
portions of the department's program and activities, under the super-
vision of the Health and Physical Education Senior Director.

The position is classified by local agencies under the following
job titles: "Health and Physical Education Assistant Director";
"Health and Physical Education Supervisor"; "Health and Physical
Education Assistant"; and "Gymnasium Worker".

**Health and Physical Education Director** - This is the worker who
directs the Physical Education program of an agency. He plans,
develops, and administers the budget for this program, and works with a committee of the board to determine membership needs and agency program in this area.

A Bachelor's degree plus at least two years experience as a physical education worker are prerequisites; or a Master's degree in Physical Education or Recreation and at least one year as a worker.  

Nursery School Teacher - A college graduate who works directly with groups of children under supervision of the Nursery School Director.

Nursery School Director - This is a college graduate who assumes responsibility for supervising the pre-school department. The worker takes responsibility for the administration of the pre-school budget, works with board committees, makes and maintains community contacts based on departmental needs and supervises the pre-school staff.

Cultural Arts Specialist - This would be a person in a large cultural arts department who has had two years previous experience and a Bachelor's degree in Fine Arts, or the equivalent. The worker would be responsible for planning and carrying out assigned portions of the department's program and activities under the supervision of a cultural arts director. This person would have direct client contact responsibilities.

Cultural Arts Director - This is a person who has had a minimum of two years experience teaching in the arts and who directs a cultural arts program in an agency utilizing only part-time leadership to implement his own direct leadership. The worker plans, develops and administers the budget for the program and works with a committee
of the board in determining the needs of membership and program in the cultural arts area. It is recommended that the person in this category, besides having a Bachelor’s degree and at least two years experience, be working on a Master’s degree in one of the cultural arts areas or has already secured one.

Lowenberg and Dolgoff ask, "what kind of skills and knowledge will those working in the helping services need in the 1970’s and 1980’s?"

It is clear that they will want to know a lot about analyzing and understanding individual and social problems. They will have to know more about the techniques of how to work in teams. They will also have to know more about individual and group psychology, small group sociology, and the behavioral sciences generally.

Furthermore, they will want to know more about the management and initiation of change as well as about the management and stimulation of innovation because they will be involved with the constantly changing pattern of living and life styles.40

Bismo explored nine methods related to undergraduate social welfare education:

1. ADVERSARY: Processes, techniques, and skills involving articulation and resolutions of conflicts of interests and commitments.

2. CONCILIATORY: Processes, techniques, and skills involving the maximizing of associative processes.

3. DEVELOPMENTAL: Processes, techniques, and skills involving the creating, mobilizing, and use of resourced for purpose of development.

4. FACILITATIVE-INSTRUCTIONAL: Processes, techniques and skills involving teaching, supervision, etc.
5. KNOWLEDGE, DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING: Processes, techniques, and skills involving research, evaluation, and dissemination of findings, data, programs and policies.

6. RESTORATIVE: Processes, techniques, and skills involving the remedying and healing of impaired functioning.

7. REGULATORY: Processes, techniques, and skills involving adherence to rules and norms.

8. RULE-IMPLEMENTING: Processes, techniques, and skills involving the operationalizing and administering of laws, policies, and programs.

9. RULE-MAKING: Processes, techniques, and skills involving the making of policies, laws and other rules.\(^{41}\)

He also states:

The professional activities of the social worker include not only transactions with "clients" but with many other "systems" such as colleagues, organizational subordinates and superordinates, lay persons, indigenous non-professionals, members of other occupational groups and relevant community organizations of all sorts.\(^{42}\)

According to Bernard Reisman:

If one lists the various areas of information and competence required for Jewish Center practice and compares this list with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes taught by different professional disciplines and schools at the present time, schools of social work, and a concentration on the group work method in particular, would come closest to providing most, although not all, of the important competencies needed.\(^{43}\)

Bertram Gold and Arnold Pins state that a new Jewish Center Worker should have:

A. Knowledge of individuals, groups and society. The Center Worker needs information about people and society in general as well as Jews and the Jewish community in particular.
B. Knowledge of and positive attitudes towards goals of the Jewish Center and its services. This includes knowing and accepting the Center not only as a social welfare institution but also as a Jewish communal agency, with functions and responsibilities as both.

C. Knowledge, positive attitudes and skills in working with individuals, groups and the community in and through the Jewish Center toward achievement of specific goals. The goals include general communal societal aims, professional social work objectives and the goals of Jewish life and the Jewish community. The skills, in addition to those which deal with social work process and relationships, must include knowledge of program media, supervisory and administrative techniques and insights in how to work with other disciplines.

D. Understanding of self and ability to use self consciously. A Center worker needs to know himself as a person, which includes accepting himself as a Jew, and he should be able to use himself consciously as a Jewish communal worker who is a social worker.

E. Knowledge of and positive attitudes toward Jewish history, life, beliefs, practices, culture and literature. This is an important area which is large and extensive. No worker can even obtain all the potentially valuable information. The more Jewish knowledge a worker has the better is he able to deal with Jewish material that comes up in groups or is raised by individuals and the more ready and able is he to introduce Jewish values and experiences to individuals and groups with who he works.44

The five items enumerated above are the key competencies required by a Jewish Center worker. Every new worker should bring at least beginning proficiency in each of them. Further study is required to determine the level of awareness, familiarity or understanding which is necessary in the knowledge areas, to clarify the nature and degree of appreciation, acceptance or commitment which is needed in the attitude areas, and to consider the level of skill which can be expected from a beginning worker and which is required for effective beginning practice.
Pins and Gold translated the five competencies into educational objectives. A complete text of these objectives can be found in Appendix B.45

Rosenman suggests the following general areas of knowledge in relation to the competency of Jewish life:

1. A general knowledge and understanding of Jewish resources; Bible, Talmud, Medieval Philosophy, Modern Jewish Thought (A knowledge sufficient to enable worker to locate references and refer others to them).

2. A more sophisticated knowledge of Jewish history which provides a sense of historic community, with special emphasis on the last two hundred years.

3. A detailed knowledge of Jewish religious and secular movements and ideologies beginning with Chassidism.

4. A detailed knowledge of the Jewish calendar and life cycle, i.e. holidays, customs and practices, mores and folklore.

5. A general knowledge and appreciation of Jewish culture; literature, music, art, drama, etc.

6. A detailed knowledge of the American Jewish community; its history and development, organizational make up, leadership, problems and concerns of the community, etc.

7. A detailed knowledge of Israel - her history, settlement, present society, culture, political and military problems.

8. A detailed knowledge of the contemporary situation of Jewish communities the world over, with special emphasis on Jews in Russia and Arab countries.47

Teicher describes four categories related to the meaning of being a Jewish social worker: knowledge, empathy, auspices and commitment. It was his feeling that to carry the responsibility and to seize the opportunity of being a Jewish social worker, knowledge, empathy and auspice are not enough. Ultimately, the meaning of being a Jewish social worker rests on the commitment of the worker.48
A report by the Training Committee of the National Jewish Welfare Board considered the following as fundamental premises related to training:

1. Undergraduate training or graduate training constitutes only a beginning point. A continuing program of training for all fields of work and all levels of practice should be developed.

2. There was recognition that institutions now providing training for the various disciplines employed in the Jewish Community Center will not be able to provide for current or projected need and therefore personnel from allied or even unrelated disciplines will need to be utilized. This emphasized the need for specialized training of such personnel.

3. It was recognized that the primary focus of training should be on content related to the Center field. Such training should be supplemental to that given by existing educational institutions. The training programs of local Centers or the National Jewish Welfare Board should utilize existing training resources where they meet the educational needs of Center personnel.

4. While utilizing the resources of various academic institutions, the Jewish Welfare Board training program should not be exclusively identified with any one academic institution.

The Committee established a series of eight goals for training Jewish Center workers:

1. To develop an awareness of agency purposes and the relationship of such purposes to membership needs and to the Jewish community's needs. Training should help the worker understand his role in assisting membership to find their identification as Jews and live a meaningful Jewish life on their terms.

2. To develop a sense of Jewish history including the maintaining of religious tradition and holidays, Jewish cultural developments and Jewish contributions and the Jewish encounter with the non-Jewish world.

3. To help the worker find and understand his own relationship to the Jewish community and Jewish life.
4. To develop an understanding of the sociology of the American Jewish community, its organization, structure and its internal differences.

5. To help see the relationship between the individual and his relationship to Israel and world Jewry.

6. To assist the worker in translating basic value systems of the Jewish community such as charity, social justice, education and family life into Center program.

7. To help the Center worker see how the Jewish purposes of the agency can permeate all programs where feasible, so as to maximize integration of learning.

8. To develop in both lay and professional people an understanding of their respective roles. It is recognized that such training needs to be based on the Center as a membership and community agency where policy, program development and methods of work are shared responsibilities of both the lay and professional community.

In the section on training of professional workers, the Jewish Welfare Board Manpower Commission suggested that:

A. Bachelor degree workers often lack basic courses in individual and group behavior and methods of working with people which are received by professional social workers. His need therefore is both for orientation to the Center field and for continuing professional education and in-service training which will provide the knowledge and the skills necessary for working with individuals, groups and the community.

B. The social worker, health and physical educator, early childhood educator, cultural arts director, adult educator, Jewish educator and other specialists are all well trained in their specialization but they too need intensive training in the purposes and philosophy of the Center, the Jewish community and the informal methods employed in the Center.

The Commission suggested that new knowledge is emerging from social sciences which has directed relevance to the practice of professional workers in the Center field. A regular program of in-service training and continuing professional education therefore,
is essential to enable all workers to remain fully abreast of new knowledge and methodology which can enhance the services of the Center.

Training should be provided for workers of all levels of competence, beginners to executives, and for all professional disciplines employed in the Center. It should be incorporated into an organized system of training which enables the worker to move to higher levels of competence. The highest priority should be assigned to the entering worker in helping him acquire the necessary knowledge, attitudes and skills, and in translating them into Center practice. The training program also should supplement basic professional education in areas where there are gaps which need to be filled for Center functioning, such as Jewish background, supervision of part-time and full-time workers, working with lay committees and administration.

The training program should encourage a sense of fellowship among Center workers; help workers to understand their relationship to the Jewish community and Jewish life; aid them to increase and deepen their awareness of Center purposes and understand the worker's role in assisting members to find their own identification as Jews; develop a knowledge of Jewish history including the maintaining of religious tradition, holidays and Jewish culture, and to understand the Jews as a religious group and the Jewish encounter with the non-Jewish world. The program should include knowledge of the sociology of the American Jewish community, and the translation of basic Jewish values such as charity, social justice, education, family life, relationship to Israel and world Jewry into Center programs.
The Jewish Welfare Board Manpower Commission's recommendations for training as related to the role of the agency were as follows:

A. Jewish Centers should make it mandatory for all new staff members to participate in the Jewish Welfare Board's National Training Institute, which orients workers to the purposes, goals and methods of Jewish Centers. Necessary time and budget must be provided.

B. Centers should develop a year-round continuing education program for their entire staff and encourage their staff to participate in these local, regional, and national training programs. These programs should be designed to meet the needs of workers from various disciplines and should help to promote continuity and advancement of workers to higher levels of functioning.

C. Training programs should give a high priority to helping the worker to deepen the degree of his Jewish understanding and commitment, which hopefully will be reflected in all aspects of Center programming. There should be built into all training programs a local community component, including history of the local Jewish community, local Jewish patterns and sociology.

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

In an attempt to determine what research has been done in the area of in-service training, considerable time was spent reviewing the following publications: Dissertation Abstracts; Adult Education; An Overview of Adult Education Research; Journal of Jewish Communal Service; Association of Jewish Communal Workers' Conference Papers; National Jewish Welfare Board Research Papers; Association of Jewish Center Workers Research; and research from the YMCA area and the field of mental health.

In a study completed in 1971 titled, "Survey of Manpower Needs in Jewish Communal Service," Loewenberg provides a definition of the Jewish communal service which includes "all those fields which by
common consent devote their efforts to some activity considered to
further the group identification and group survival goals of American
Jews, and are financed through Jewish communal funds."52 This defi-
nition is inclusive of the full gamut of Jewish welfare services.
Twelve functional fields are identified; campus programs; child and
family welfare; Jewish federation and community planning; community
relations; group work; recreation, camping and informal education;
homes and hospital for the aged; Jewish cultural services; Jewish
education; migration services; synagogue administration; the rabbi-
nate; and vocational services.

Greene, Kasden and Segal in a study of first year field work
students in social work showed that the students exhibited less
interest in Jewish Center work after having their field placement in
such agencies. One factor in the loss of interest was "obscure and
vaguely defined goals" as related to the social work aspect of the
agencies.53

Armand Lauffer examined data on all first-year students enrolled
in graduate schools of social work in the United States and Canada as
of September, 1966. With an "N" of 2,766 students, he found that the
social actionist students do not enter Jewish Center work. He con-
cluded, "Jewish youth do not enter schools of social work because of
any strong commitments to their ethnic identities. Nothing in the
school of social work experience, including field placements in
Jewish Centers enhances such identification."54

Scotch examined social workers who remained in the Jewish Center
field and those who left the field. He found that the single most
important reason for a decision had to do with loyalty to the profession of social work as contrasted to loyalty to the Jewish community.55

A study of the Jewish Welfare Board in 1968 determined that nearly one-third of the full-time workers had baccalaureate degrees.

**TABLE 8**

PERCENT OF TOTAL BUDGETED POSITIONS HELD BY WORKERS IN JEWISH CENTERS RELATED TO COLLEGE DEGREE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Full-time incumbents</th>
<th>Part-time incumbents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a study of Jewish Centers conducted by the Jewish Welfare Board Bureau of Personnel in 1969, staff members were asked: "Do you expect to be working for this Jewish Center five years from now?" There was a significant difference in the plans to remain of staff workers with professional social work training as compared to workers without graduate training in social work. 31 percent of the social workers expected to remain as compared to 48 percent of the non-social workers.

Scotch studied the factors influencing professional staff turnover in the Jewish Center of Chicago. He found that loyalty to the profession was the single most important determinant of whether staff
would remain in the agency (high professional loyalty associated with leaving the agency; low professional loyalty associated with remaining). A secondary finding noted an association between Jewish identification and leaving the field. Fifty-six percent of the workers with high Jewish identification left the Jewish Center field, while 85 percent of those with low Jewish identification left.56

TABLE 9
PERCENT OF ALL FULL TIME WORKERS IN JEWISH CENTERS WHO EXPECT TO BE WORKING IN THEIR JEWISH CENTER IN FIVE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Staff</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Social Workers</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Levy's research, recent group work graduates from schools of social work do not have all the needed knowledge, attitudes and skills when they begin their employment in group service agencies. Levy stated:

Center executives and supervisors frequently complain that the new graduates are not adequately prepared for the task they must assume and at times bring values and attitudes, often based on misinformation or confusion, which get in the way of their doing an effective job. Similarly, new Center workers frequently express frustration at being asked to assume functions for which they were not trained, at not being given clarity about agency purpose and function. The fears, frustrations, and conflicts of new workers,
resulting from the gaps between their professional education and job expectations, are usually projected by them on both school and agency.57

Similarly, new Center workers frequently express frustration at being asked to assume functions for which they were not trained, at not being given clarity about agency purpose and function. According to Levy: "There are fears, frustrations, and conflicts of new workers, resulting from the gaps between their professional education and job expectations.58

A study sponsored by the Jewish Welfare Board Bureau of Personnel Services related to the utilization of bachelor degree workers in Jewish Center work. The project involved a series of questions directed to Center Executive Directors.

Ninety percent of the Centers currently did employ bachelor degree workers and staff with equivalent degrees. Of those Centers which employ bachelor degree workers, fifty-eight percent utilized them as Junior Department workers, forty percent as Teen Department workers, and thirty-eight percent as Older Adult Department workers. They were utilized to a lesser degree in other positions in the Centers. The exception is health and physical education where the bachelor degree is the professional degree and is highly represented.

Services to elementary school children were appraised to be adequately rendered by bachelor degree workers. The survey indicated a strong demand for social workers for work with Teens and Older Adults. Eighty-two percent of the Executive Directors felt that a bachelor degree worker can be adequate as a department head or departmental worker.
The directors felt that a bachelor degree worker could adequately supervise a department in the Center after an appropriate period of training. In discussing advantages and disadvantages of utilizing bachelor degree workers, the directors indicated that the main advantage was "that they were easy to find". The "task orientation" of bachelor degree workers was considered a disadvantage as compared to the "process orientation" of trained Center workers.59

A study of Tables of Organization of fifty-six Jewish Centers by Harry A. Schatz, Jewish Welfare Board Director of Administrative Services indicated that a variety of staff organizational models were used depending on the size of the community. A summary of Schatz's study can be found in Appendix B.60

In some instances, Schatz suggests that the executive may assume direct responsibility for a program department, most frequently because of shortage of staff but sometimes because the executive expresses a desire to have a continuing "programming experience". This is most likely to be in the area of adult education or in the cultural arts. Sometimes the executive director assumes responsibility for supervising one or more of the program departments in order to limit the span of supervision of the program director to a viable work load.61

He went on to indicate that there are variations on the staff organization described above. Either because of limited size of program and membership or because of staff shortages, one social worker may supervise two or more departments. There were a significant number of situations in which departmental heads are staffed by non-social workers. In most instances this was due to the
unavailability of social workers. 62

Grodofsky analyzed differences among bachelor degree workers. According to Grodofsky, "The undifferentiated bachelor degree worker, at best, has majored in liberal arts, with no specific focus on service to people. The person may not even have majored in liberal arts. In many schools, students may major in the hard sciences or receive a bachelor degree in education. The bachelor degree worker in social work has a liberal arts base and has been socialized for the profession." 63 He suggested the following as a reason:

The bachelor degree in social work has one very important and major difference in his education from other bachelor degree workers. Aside from all other courses, he is required to demonstrate practice competence by doing field work in a social agency, two days a week for one year. This field work is a most important feature of the undergraduate program. 64

The body of findings from research and pilot projects on manpower utilization in social welfare have come exclusively from the casework field.

Coggs and Robinson reported on experiments using social work departments. In addition to creating new careers, they found that services could be extended and the professional could be freed for other tasks. 65

A study of the use of social work assistants in the Veterans Administration indicated that there were activities in the professional social worker's job which do not require professional skill. These activities can be grouped to form a job load for a social work assistant but require supervision and training for the assistant.
The study also concluded that the social work assistant position was considered practical and desirable by the workers in this category. They enjoyed the work and accomplished it to the social worker workers' satisfaction.66

Barker and Briggs found that social work assistants can be trained to perform a group of social work tasks under the supervision of a professional social worker and that guidelines can be developed to insure that social workers with professional education are utilized in appropriate tasks. In addition, programs could be structured with this level of worker in mind.67

Laufer's study on Jewish Social Workers concluded that: "There is nothing in their backgrounds or interests, nor anything in their aspirations that would suggest the Jewish community as a locus for either self-fulfillment or realization of their social goals." He suggested we look to other professions for the future staff of our agencies.68

Alfred Dobrof urges defining the professional functions of the social worker in the Center as: administrator, supervisor, trainer and practitioner. He suggests the use of associates and aides for other than professional functions presently performed by the trained social workers. Analysis of function and development of precise job descriptions may assist the Center to deliver more service, without increasing the number of MSW's.

He suggests that research and demonstration projects will not provide all the answers. No single staff model can be effective in the variety of existent Jewish Centers. In Dobrof's judgment the
Jewish Center field has had the longest experience in effective use of the trained social group worker supplemented by college graduates and volunteers.69

Samuel Asofsky did a statistical analysis of a Jewish Welfare Board Study of program and supervisory staff employment. His findings indicated that seven out of eight Centers were prepared to fill social worker vacancies with bachelor degree workers.70

A study of Staff Utilization done by Douglas Holmes investigated different models of Center Staff function. Dr. Holmes discovered that in terms of job functions, the categories which emerged during the pre-testing and which therefore were used as categories in the structured interview were as follows:71

1. The administrative function.
2. Program development.
3. Participation in community relations activities.
4. Work with volunteers.
5. The provision of professional supervision.
6. Direct work with center memberships.
7. Work with board, or board committees.
8. Providing individual counseling to members.

Holmes studies the line worker in relation to four areas; (1) function, (2) training needed, (3) career plans and (4) Center goals.

Function

When related to function, the proportion of time spent at each job function did not differ appreciably according to size of center. Administration is the largest single job function category, requiring between 1/5 and 1/4 of the staffs' total time allocation.

It is interesting to note that the proportion of time spent in administration at the smaller centers most closely approximates the
time allocation given to professional supervision and direct member work. Job functions given the least time by staff of all centers are "working with volunteers" and "individual counseling."

His study indicated that the amount of time spent in certain job functions is closely associated with staff level. The higher the level, the more time allocated to Administration, Community Relations, and Work with the Boards of Directors.

The data seem to indicate that although Social Workers spent more time in working directly with the membership - (and probably are considered more professionally "qualified" for this task), bachelor degree workers spend more time in individual counseling than does any other group.

Training

In the area of training, the line workers stated that training was needed in the areas of casework classes, additional field work experience, courses in supervision, research, Jewish content, administration, human behavior, community organization, and group dynamics.

Bachelor degree respondents indicated that in regard to continuing education there was an emphasis on Jewish education, group dynamics, community organization and research.

There was a positive orientation toward practice-related courses, with several feeling that theoretical courses were not particularly important. It was interesting to note that considerable emphasis was placed upon the importance of courses dealing with group dynamics, and with research although, as was noted previously, a number of respondents felt that the research courses, in particular, could and
should have been far better.

**Career Plans**

Respondents were asked what they would like to be doing five years from the present time. The aim of Holmes' question was two-fold: first, it was felt that a picture of staff members' intentions regarding staying or leaving the Jewish Center field would be valuable of its own accord; second, it was felt that such a measure well could constitute a criterion of job satisfaction.

Among those of the line professional level who are working in "large" centers, there was the general desire to remain in the field. Several wished to become assistant Center Directors; several wished to become more involved with student training. A predominant general theme was the desire to become more involved with community work, e.g., community action programs. A much higher proportion of those working in "medium-sized" or "small" indicated that they were going to leave the Jewish Center field. Among the others, there was the desire to be working at the present level, with continued member contact, and some desire to be working in a supervisory position.

In terms of the goals as a Jewish Center, the emphasis was upon enhancing the social and emotional growth of Jews in a Jewish milieu, providing avenues for the expression of Jewish self-interest, providing specific knowledge relating to Jewish customs and traditions and thus making Judaism real, helping people to be comfortable as Jews, and providing Jewish role models for children and adolescents.

Virtually all of the respondents, either implicitly or explicitly, could not differentiate between social work goals and the goals of the
Center as a Jewish Center. Specifically, they felt that the difference between Jewish Center goals and social work goals lay only in the emphasis upon "Jewishness" in the Center - that if this particular emphasis were removed there would be little or no difference between the center goals and social work goals as implemented in common centers.

Holmes concluded in all centers visited, professionally-trained personnel at all levels could be characterized as manifesting less than optimum job satisfaction, at least in terms of the degree to which their tasks match what is felt to be the "ideal" job description.

According to the majority of respondents, this condition exists because of two basic highly-related reasons:

1. The disproportionately great amount of time required for some functions, e.g., administration, make it impossible to provide professional services to appropriate scope and depth, thus reducing the workers' overall effectiveness as professionals.

2. The lack of total competency in certain of these functions, again, for example, administration, leads to workers' feelings of inadequacy in relation to these particular functions which are, in turn, central to the job of many professionals.

Many of those interviewed evidenced considerable dissatisfaction regarding their inability to grow and develop as professionals; this was reflected in many instances, by the expressed desire to have more
time to participate in professional activities, and to read and teach.

Holmes concluded that:

1. Staff members of all levels should be encouraged to participate in continuing education programs. Their participation should be supported through full or partial subsidy, particularly for study in areas where individuals feel themselves either lacking in expertise, or falling behind current development in the social work field.

2. A library of current literature theory and practice should be maintained in each center. Periodic seminars should be held, among all members of the staff, for discussion and interpretation of new approaches found in the literature.

3. Considerably more attention should be given to establishing job descriptions which reflect accurately the actual nature of each position. Further, this job description should be related directly to the totality of center functioning, so that job incumbents can see how all aspects of their tasks fit into the overall purpose.

4. Wherever possible, a relationship should be developed with a school of social work so that qualified staff members could act as faculty at the school. Such a relationship could fulfill the desire expressed by many interviewees to teach, and to prevent, thereby, the eventual loss of trained personnel to academia.

5. A careful study of job functions should be undertaken, as a means particularly to defining those functions which could be assumed by non-MSW personnel, particularly sub-professional personnel.

6. Following the step immediately above, educative efforts must be aimed at re-orienting professional staff members in terms of inculcating a willingness to use sub-professional personnel; the need for a re-orientation is obvious.

7. Staff personnel at all levels must be kept informed of technological advances which could be of assistance to them in reducing their work load. There appeared to be, during the survey, a general resistance to the use of equipment such as dictating machines, electronic data processing equipment, etc. There are, however, many areas in which such equipment would be of tremendous
help, and could constitute, thereby, a means for reducing the work burden of staff personnel.72

The materials used in this chapter are believed to be representative of the literature that bears upon the problem of this study and offers much that is basic to its solution.
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CHAPTER IV

THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The first part of this chapter discusses the various demographic data gathered by the questionnaire. The variables of age, sex, marital status, tenure, education, Jewish education, religious affiliation and career plans will be discussed in an attempt to develop a profile of the bachelor degree worker.

A series of study questions was developed in Chapter I to guide the study. These questions were as follows:

1. How well prepared does the bachelor degree worker perceive himself for his level of practice?

2. Is there a difference between those bachelor degree workers who have discussed a career plan with their supervisor and those who have not and their perceived importance to the job of selected practice competencies?

3. Is there a difference between those bachelor degree workers who have attended The Jewish Welfare Board New Workers' Institute and those who have not and their perceived importance to the job of selected practice competencies?

Section I of this chapter will deal with the characteristics of the bachelor degree worker.

Section II will respond to study question I, How well prepared does the bachelor degree staff worker perceive himself for his level
of practice?

Section III will discuss study questions two and three which are concerned with perceived importance of various competencies and other variables.

Section I

Characteristics of Bachelor Degree Staff

If in-service training programs are to be based upon the background of bachelor degree workers and related to their job classifications, it is necessary to determine the characteristics of the workers. In addition, a profile of the bachelor degree workers in the field would have implications for recruitment, agency organization and future training.

This section is devoted to an examination of these characteristics. The data relate to age, sex, marital status, length of time employed, education, Jewish background, in-service training, and career plans. This section relates to objective one of the study, to identify the formal training and background of the new bachelor degree workers.

Table 10 shows that more than seventy per cent of the respondents were age thirty and younger. Of this group, 48.1 per cent were between twenty-one and twenty-five. If the average person are usually employed on their first job soon after graduating from college at age twenty-five or under, the majority of new bachelor degree workers appear to be entering the field directly from college.
TABLE 10

AGE OF NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 and Below</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 reveals that over sixty percent of the workers were male, and that over fifty-four percent of the workers were married.

It is apparent that the field is attracting many more males than females as a first full-time job.

TABLE 11

SEX AND MARITAL STATUS
OF NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows that 47.3 percent of the workers had been on the job up to seven months and 49.2 percent had been employed a year or longer.
It is apparent that a gap exists in the eight to eleven month range where the percentage of time on the job is the lowest. It is possible that employment decisions are made during this time frame. This assumption would have raminications for future research related to reasons for leaving the field and the time frame for an inservice training program.

**TABLE 12**

**LENGTH OF TIME ON THE JOB OF NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is apparent from Table 13 that the new bachelor degree workers came into Jewish Center work from a variety of undergraduate backgrounds. The data reveals that 31.6 percent of the workers majored in education, 22.8 percent received degrees in physical education, while 15.2 percent majored in sociology.

It is significant to note that only 5.1 percent came from the field of Social Work. Sanford Solender noted that "While the Center utilizes such other important fields...social group work is its central area of competence."

Table 13 also reveals that the largest number of workers, forty-eight percent were not involved in graduate education. Workers with an undergraduate degree in education were most involved in graduate study. Physical education respondents were the second largest group taking graduate education.

**TABLE 13**

UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE EDUCATION OF NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree</th>
<th>Involved in Graduate Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish studies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Saniford Solender, in his article titled "The Unique Function of the Jewish Center", stated, "...that workers who combine their talents of social group work with suitable Jewish preparations are best equipped to guide its service." 2

It is obvious that a Jewish background is considered important for all workers in the Jewish Center field. Workers were asked to respond to a series of questions concerning Jewish education. These included Jewish Education in general and specifically - Hebrew School,
Saturday or Sunday School training, Hebrew High School, and college courses.

Table 14 indicated that over seventy-seven percent of all workers had received some form of Jewish education. The largest number 59.5 percent, received a Hebrew School education.

It is significant to note that over thirty-one percent of the respondents were involved in Jewish education courses in their undergraduate education.

TABLE 14

COMPARISON OF KINDS OF JEWISH EDUCATION
OF NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Yes N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>No Response N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew school</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. or Sunday school</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N's indicate multiple responses

Table 15 reveals that 39.2 percent of the population surveyed indicated that they were of the Conservative faction of Jewish life while 22.8 percent of the workers considered themselves Reform and 5.1 percent Orthodox, 21.5 percent, although Jewish, were unaffiliated with any sector of Jewish religious life. Non-Jewish workers represented 11.4 percent of the respondents.

When respondents were compared to the Jewish population in the U.S. during 1974, both the Conservative (39.2 percent) and Reform
(22.8 percent) workers reflect a higher percentage representation than the national population. Orthodox workers show a 4.9 percent decrease and non-affiliated a 31.5 percent decrease below the national population percentages.

It would appear that the field is attracting more bachelor degree workers from the Conservative element of Jewish religious life.

TABLE 15

TYPE OF RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION
OF NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Jewish Population in the US in 1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-affiliated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Jewish</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each year, a one week Institute for New Workers is sponsored by the Bureau of Personnel and Training of the National Jewish Welfare Board. The purpose of the institute is to expose workers to the philosophy and goals of the Center, organization and administration, nature of the Jewish community and its institutions and methodology of Center work.

It is interesting to note that Table 16 indicates that 65.8 percent of the workers did not attend the institute. In reporting reasons for not attending the program, eighty-one percent of those who did not attend indicated that they were not informed of the
institutes while 8.9 percent who did not attend indicated no interest in attending.

It is obvious that information about the institute is not being shared with the worker. The reasons for this lack of communication should be investigated as this is the workers first formal introduction to the field and should be a pre-requisite for an in-service training program.

**TABLE 16**

**PARTICIPATION AT THE JEWISH WELFARE BOARD NEW WORKER'S INSTITUTE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Reasons for Not Attending</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>Not aware</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>Not interested</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lauffer, in a study of Jewish Centers, revealed that there was a significant difference in the career plans of workers with professional social work training as compared to workers without such graduate training; 31 percent of the social workers expected to remain as compared to forty-eight percent of bachelor degree workers.³

Scotch, (in a study of factors influencing professional turnover) found that loyalty to the profession was the single most important determinant of whether a staff member would remain with the agency.⁴
It is apparent from Table 17 that more emphasis needs to be placed on creating opportunities for the long range professional development of the bachelor degree worker. The bachelor degree worker demonstrates a higher rate of retention in the field and this fact should be explored both in terms of a progressive inservice training and in opportunities for professional advancement.

Table 17 reveals that 58.2 percent of the supervisors had not discussed the Center field as a career with the bachelor degree worker. The same table also points out that sixty-two percent of the workers considered making a career out of the Jewish Center field and that 12.7 percent were undecided.

It would appear that a planned effort or retention should be organized on both the agency and national level to encourage interested workers towards a career in the field.

**TABLE 17**

**CAREER PLANS PROJECTED**
**BY NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisor-Worker Career Discussion</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>The Center As a Career</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 indicates that 24.1 percent of the workers had aspirations for a supervisory position while 17.7 percent desired an administrative position after three years on the job. While 41.8
percent had aspirations for a higher position, 34.2 percent saw themselves in the same job after three years.

TABLE 18

DESIRED JOB POSITION AFTER THREE YEARS IN THE FIELD
AS DETERMINED BY NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data have implications for phasing an in-service training program and taking into consideration the workers' career plans.

Table 19 indicates that the largest number of respondents (32.9 percent) were assigned in the youth service area while 30.4 percent were working in the area of physical education. If camp, pre-school and youth services are considered together, it is obvious that the largest concentration of bachelor degree workers (49.4 percent) is in children and youth services.
### TABLE 19

**COMPARISON OF STAFF SERVICE CLASSIFICATION OF NEW BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural arts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth services</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is important to note that out of the 79 respondents only one fell into the administrative assistant classification. Therefore, while we have included this in all statistical tables, we will not attempt to analyze its significance.*

#### SUMMARY OF THE CHARACTERISTICS OF JEWISH CENTER BACHELOR DEGREE WORKERS

1. Bachelor degree workers are a heterogeneous group in terms of undergraduate education and are more likely to be from education, physical education and sociology.
2. The majority of new bachelor degree workers are male.
3. The majority are in the twenty to thirty age bracket and have been on the job less than twenty months.
4. The majority entered the field from the areas of education, sociology and physical education.
5. Over half of the workers were involved in graduate education.
6. A large majority had some form of Jewish education ranging from Hebrew School to college courses.

7. The largest percentage were from the conservative branch of Jewish life although a large percentage were unaffiliated.

8. The majority of the workers did not attend the Jewish Welfare Board New Workers Institute.

9. Although a large majority felt they would like to make a career of Center work, few had any discussion with their supervisor related to career planning.

10. Bachelor degree workers are involved in service to diverse age groups, but the majority are involved in service to children and youth.

Section II

Response to Study Question I

Based on the literature and research review in Chapter III, eleven competencies were established that were determined to be generic to Jewish Center professional workers. These competencies included, (1) administration and organization, (2) human development, (3) program development, (4) Jewish life, (5) communications, (6) research, (7) educational process, (8) social systems, (9) lay involvement and volunteers and (10) specialized programs and supervision.

Bachelor's degree staff workers were asked to evaluate these competencies on two levels. They were asked to evaluate their undergraduate education as to how well it prepared them for their present
job. This relationship was rated on a five point scale from "very well prepared" to "unprepared."

They were also asked to rate the eleven competencies as to how important they perceived them to be to their present hob classification. This rating was on a five point scale from "very important" to "unimportant."

**Method of Chi Square**

A chi square test was applied to determine the significance of difference between the two variables. The data were collapsed in order to produce a two by two table. Data were programmed as follows: $A_1$ (sum of very well and well prepared), $B_1$ (sum of poor and unprepared), $A_2$ (sum of very important and important), $B_2$ (sum of minimally and unimportant).

The degrees of freedom were derived from the number of cells that made up the table. Since all tables were two by two the degree of freedom remained constant at one.

Using the actual value of the chi square and degrees of freedom, the p (statistical probability) was arrived at by examining the chi square table.

For the purpose of this study, the statistical probability is at the .05 level and below.

**ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION**

This competency was defined as the ability to understand and direct a department or program in terms of budget, policy, structure and staff.
Table 20 indicates that 32.9 percent of the workers considered themselves somewhat prepared in this competency. Over 22 percent rated themselves as poorly prepared as compared to 3.8 percent who considered themselves very well prepared. Another 22.8 percent perceived themselves as unprepared as a result of their undergraduate education.

Over fifty percent of the respondents considered this competency as very important to their job while twenty-seven percent considered it important. Only 20.2 percent rated this competency from moderately important to unimportant when related to their present job.

It would appear from Table 20 that bachelor degree workers give a high level of importance to the competency of administration and organization and project a low level of preparation for this competency. This would indicate that the undergraduate education of bachelor degree workers, in general, did not give them sufficient background to practice in the area of administration and organization. Bachelor degree workers do consider this competency as being important to their job as over seventy-seven percent rated it important to very important.
TABLE 20
COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND
IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE
COMPETENCY OF ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=7.842\quad p<.01$

A chi square test of significance was applied and a $x^2$ value of 7.842 was found. This value was significant at the 0.1 level.

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

This competency is defined as the knowledge and understanding of the way individuals develop and how this process affects their behavior.

Table 21 indicates that 36.7 percent considered themselves as being well prepared on the basis of their undergraduate education. Over twenty-nine percent rate themselves as very well prepared while 26.6 percent were somewhat prepared. Over seven percent categorized themselves as poorly prepared and unprepared in this competency.

When this competency was compared to importance to job, 74.7 percent considered it as very important while 20.3 percent rated it as important. This total of ninety-five percent was the highest level of importance determined for all of the eleven competencies studied.
TABLE 21

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE COMPETENCY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=41.901 \ p<.001$

A chi square test of significance was applied and an $x^2$ value of 41.901 was found. This value was significant at the .001 level indicating that the differences were highly significant.

It would appear that the majority of the bachelor degree workers consider themselves well prepared in this competency that also has a very high level of importance to their job.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

This competency is defined as the ability to plan, organize, carry out and evaluate a program or event sponsored by the agency.

Table 22 indicates that 34.2 percent of the respondents considered themselves being somewhat prepared in this competency, and a large number of workers (27.8 percent) considered themselves as well prepared.

The majority of the respondents rated the competency of program development very important (64.6 percent) while the next largest
group rated it as being important to their job.

It appears that this competency is important to the job of new bachelor degree workers and that they are generally well prepared to practice it.

TABLE 22

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE COMPETENCY OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 9.492 \quad p < .001 \]

A chi square test of significance was applied and an \( x^2 \) value of 9.492 was found. This value was significant at the .01 level indicating that the differences highly significant.

It would appear from Table 22 that a high level of importance is indicated for the competency of Program Development while the preparation level indicates that workers are well prepared for this competency.

JEWISH LIFE

This competency is composed of an understanding of Jewish culture, the composition and organization of the Jewish community,
Jewish institutions and Jewish law as they relate to the determination of programming for a Jewish Center. Over thirty-nine percent of the respondents considered themselves as being unprepared in the competency, according to Table 23, while nineteen percent were rated as poorly prepared.

Only 11.4 percent of the workers felt that they were well prepared as a result of their undergraduate education.

Table 23 indicates that the largest percentage of the workers rated themselves as being unprepared, (39.2 percent). When this competency was related to importance to job 32.9 percent rated it important while 31.6 percent felt it was very important. A total of 35.4 percent of the workers list this competency in the moderately to unimportant part of the scale.

TABLE 23

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE COMPETENCY OF JEWISH LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 30.905 \quad p < .001 \]

A chi square test of significance was applied and an \( x^2 \) value of 30.905 was found. This value was significant at the .001 level.
indicating that the differences between preparation and importance to job scores were highly significant.

COMMUNICATIONS

This competency was defined as the ability to counsel with clients, speak to groups, write evaluations, publicity letters and project proposals.

Table 24 indicates that over sixty percent considered themselves from well to very well prepared in this competency. Over twenty-nine percent felt that they were very well prepared due to their undergraduate education. None of the respondents felt that they were unprepared.

When the competency of communications was related to importance to job, Table 24 indicates that 92.4 percent of the workers rated it important or above. This reflected the highest level of importance of any of the eleven competencies in this study.

It would appear that while this competency reflected the highest overall level of importance, it also was one of two competencies with no rating of unprepared.
TABLE 24

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE COMPETENCY OF COMMUNICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance to Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 7.171 \ p < .01 \]

A chi square test of significance was applied and an \( x^2 \) value of 7.171 was found. This value was significant at the .01 level indicating that the differences were highly significant.

RESEARCH

This process involves the understanding of research methods analyzing data, understanding and writing research reports and the ability to design and implement research projects.

According to Table 25, the largest number of respondents, (32.9 percent) considered themselves as being somewhat prepared in this competency. Thirty-eight percent rated themselves from poorly prepared to unprepared while 27.8 percent felt that they were from well to very well prepared.

The table also indicates that the largest number (35.4 percent) of the workers considered this competency as minimally important to their job. It also was rated at the highest percentage at the
unimportant level (15.2 percent).

It would appear from Table 25, that research is not considered important to bachelor degree workers in their present jobs and that their preparation level for this competency was one of the lowest of all competencies rated.

**TABLE 25**

**COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE COMPETENCY OF RESEARCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2=0.240$  \(p > .50\)

A chi square test of significance was applied and an $x^2$ value of 0.2408 was found. This value was not statistically significant at the .05 level, indicating no significant differences between level of preparation and importance to the job.

**EDUCATIONAL PROCESS**

This competency is defined as the ability to understand the educational process and psychology of education in working with both members of the Center and the community at large.
The greater percentage of workers (30.4 percent) considered themselves as very well prepared in this competency while 29.1 percent and 26.6 percent rated themselves from well to somewhat prepared. Over thirty percent of the respondents considered this competency as very important to the job while 26.6 percent and 24.1 percent rated it important and moderately important respectively.

It would appear that the preparation level and importance to job level are similar in ratings for the competency of educational process.

TABLE 26

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE COMPETENCY OF EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance to Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.6758 \quad p > .50 \]

A chi square test of significance was applied and an \( x^2 \) value of 0.6758 was found. This value was not significant at the .05 level, indicating no statistically significant difference between level of preparation and importance to the job.
SOCIAL SYSTEMS

This competency relates to the ability to understand and deal with basic social systems such as family, community and religious groups. It involves being able to understand the relationship among these groups and how to utilize these systems in relation to the job of the Center worker.

Table 27 indicates that the largest number of workers (36.7 percent) considered themselves as being somewhat prepared in this competency. Over twenty-five percent felt that they were well prepared while 11.4 percent considered themselves unprepared for their present job.

When related to importance to job, 41.8 percent considered social systems an important competency, while 32.9 percent considered the competency as very important to their job.

It would appear that the importance to job level is rated higher than the preparation level of the bachelor degree worker.

TABLE 27
COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE LEVELS AS RELATED TO THE COMPETENCY OF SOCIAL SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ²=12.790 p<.001
A chi square test of significance was applied and an $x^2$ value of 12.790 was found. This value was significant at the .001 level indicating that the differences were highly significant.

LAY INVOLVEMENT AND VOLUNTEERS

This competency involves the ability to identify and develop volunteers and to train leaders within the agency. It involves the understanding of the role of laymen in Center work.

Although Table 28 indicates that 29.1 percent considered themselves as being somewhat prepared, 26.6 percent felt that they were unprepared in this competency as a result of their undergraduate education.

In relation to importance to job, Table 28 reveals that 46.8 percent of the workers rated this competency as very important while 27.8 percent listed it as important to their present job. It would appear that the preparation level of the workers was low while the majority consider this competency as being important to their job, thus indicating a major need for in-service training.
TABLE 28

COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO
THE COMPETENCY OF LAY INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Unimp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[x^2=37.074 \quad p<.001\]

A chi square test of significance was applied and an \(x^2\) value of 37.074 was found. This value was significant at the .001 level indicating that the differences were highly significant.

SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS

This competency relates to the workers' ability to lead and teach basic program skills which are utilized in Center work. These include camp crafts, cultural arts, dramatics, organized games and other leisure time skills.

The larger percentage of the respondents, (34.2 percent) according to Table 29, indicated that they were very well prepared in this competency. Over twenty-two percent felt that they were from poorly to unprepared as a result of their undergraduate education.

When related to importance to their job, 78.0 percent of the workers rated the competency of specialized programs important to very important. There appears to be a close relationship between the
higher ratings on both scales.

TABLE 29
COMPARISON OF PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO
THE COMPETENCY OF SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance To Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Well</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.843 \quad p < .05 \]

A chi square test of significance was applied and an \( x^2 \) value of 3.843 was found. This value was significant at the .05 level indicating that the differences were significant.

SUPERVISION

This competency involves the ability to provide direction to lay leaders, advisors and instructorsto help them develop as people and to translate the goals of the agency in their activities.

Table 30 reveals that 34.2 percent of the respondents were somewhat prepared in this competency. It is interesting to note that thirty-three percent of the workers could be found on both ends of the preparation scale. This table reflects a relatively normal distribution of preparation levels in this competency as it relates to their present job.
On the importance of job scale, fifty-seven percent of the workers rated this competency as very important while 27.8 percent considered it as important to their present job. It is obvious that this competency reflects a high level of importance when related to importance to job, and there appears to be a need to emphasize this competency in an in-service training program.

### TABLE 30

**Comparison of Professional Preparation and Importance to Job Levels as Related to the Competency of Supervision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Importance to Job</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>Moderately imp.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>Minimally imp.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 32.038  p < .001

A chi square test of significance was applied and an χ² value of 32.038 was found. This value was significant at the .001 level indicating that the differences were highly significant.

It would appear that when preparation based on undergraduate education is related to all workers, the competencies of human development, communications and educational process exhibit a high level of preparation. The competencies of Jewish life, organization and administration and research appear to have poor or low levels of preparation. Communications, program development and human
development receive the highest ratings when related to importance to job.

One of the purposes of this dissertation as set out in Chapter I is to provide a differential model which indicates areas of training need for the various classifications of new bachelor degree workers. In order to achieve this goal and present the data in a form which is readily understood by laymen as well as professional Center administrators the data will be evaluated in a slightly different way.

In this analysis of the data, each area of competence was cross-tabulated against the various Center staff groups in terms of competency and preparedness. These cross tabulations provide a differential look at the relationship of each staff group in terms of competency, preparedness, and importance to job. From these cross tabulations, the mean score for each group (by area of competency) was computed for its scale response. These mean scores provide another level of comparative data from which training models can be generated.

ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION

The preparation mean score range in Table 31 of 2.00-4.25 indicates a wide range of professional preparation levels by staff groups. Both adult services and cultural arts staffs are on the lower level of the preparation range (2.00).

In the importance to job scale, pre-school was the highest staff group on a range of 3.00-4.67.

In the mean disparity scale, which reflects training needs, the youth staff group listed the highest mean score. The lowest need for training can be seen in the camp group with a disparity of .17.
The pre-school staff group indicates a disparity of 1.67, the second highest groups' need for training.

This competency appears to reflect a general high need for training in physical education, cultural arts, pre-school, youth and adult staffing groups.

### TABLE 31

**COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF ADMINISTRATION AND ORGANIZATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Preparation N Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Table 32 indicates a positive disparity of means for all staff groups. Adults Services staff reflects the highest disparity (1.00) indicating a greater need for training in this competency. The pre-school staff group, although indicating the highest mean score in the importance to job scale also shows the highest level of preparation for this competency.

The physical education staff group was second in the disparity scale (.88) with the camp group only .03 below them.
Cultural arts showed the lowest disparity of all staff groups due to the lowest mean score on the importance to job scale.

Adult services staff reflected the lowest mean score on the professional preparation scale for the competency of human development.

**TABLE 32**

**COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF HUMAN DEVELOPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Preparation Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT**

Table 33 indicates that all staff groups had a positive rating on the disparity of mean scale. The highest mean disparity score can be found in the camp staff group. The second highest mean disparity is in the adult service staff. While the camp staff indicated the highest mean score on the importance to job scale, the adult service group had the lowest mean score (2.67) on the professional preparation scale. This group feels less prepared in this competency than all others.
TABLE 33

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Preparation N</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JEWISH LIFE

It would appear from Table 34 that the youth staff group reflected the highest disparity of all other groups. Although it is fourth on the importance scale, it is rated lowest on the professional preparation scale (1.60).

The adult services staff is rated lowest on the disparity of mean preparation scale. This is due to both fairly high preparation and importance to job level.

The youth staff group is rated at 4.67 on the importance to job scale, the highest rank of all staff groups.

The lowest mean score on the preparation scale belongs to the cultural arts staff group while the highest score (3.14) is reflected by the camp staff.

There appears to be a strong need for training for all staff groups in this competency.
TABLE 34

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO
STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF
JEWISH LIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Preparation Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMMUNICATIONS

It appears from Table 35 that the physical education staff group has the highest disparity based mainly on the lowest mean score on the professional preparation scale.

The pre-school staff group lead all other staff in the preparation mean score while cultural arts is the highest rated staff group in the importance to job scale.

Only the camp staff group falls below the importance to job mean level of 4.0.

It appears that the physical education staff group indicates the highest mean disparity indicating a higher need for training in this competency. The youth group's disparity score of .84 would indicate a need for training in this competency.
TABLE 35

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO
STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF
COMMUNICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean Scores</td>
<td>Mean Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESEARCH

Table 36 indicates that three of the six staff groups rate the competency of research as a minus mean disparity. The greatest move toward a negative disparity in the pre-school staff group (-1.00). This is apparently due to the highest rating by the group on the professional preparation scale.

While the youth services staff group has the lowest mean score in preparation, the adult services group rates the competency of research the lowest (1.83) on the importance to job scale.

The highest disparity, which would reflect need for training, is by the physical education staff group (.33).

It would appear that the competency of research reflects a fairly high level of professional preparation and a low level of importance to the job.
TABLE 36

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO
STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF
RESEARCH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>Preparation N</th>
<th>Preparation Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

An examination of Table 37, which deals with the competency of educational process, indicates no general trend as had been evident in previous tables. Both physical education and cultural arts staff groups have high mean scores on the professional preparation scale.

On the importance to job scale both pre-school and physical education indicate a high mean score compared to the other groups.

This competency details the highest number of negative mean disparities of any competency in the study.

Pre-school reflects the highest difference between the preparation and importance to job scale (.93).

Table 37 indicates a general low level of training need for the competency of educational process.
TABLE 37
COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Preparation Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>- .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>- .16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>- .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>- .33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOCIAL SYSTEMS

Table 38 which examines the competency of social systems indicates a preparedness mean score range of 3.0-3.6 and an importance to job range of 3.6-4.5. The camp group reflects the greatest disparity between the preparation and importance scales (1.28). It appears that the camp staff considers this competency more important than all other staff groups.

Physical education and adult service staff groups both rate their professional preparation level on the lower end of the scale (3.0).

Although both the camp and physical education staff group indicate a need to emphasize training in this competency, other staff groups do not appear to reflect this need.
### TABLE 38

**Comparison of Mean Scores for Professional Preparation and Importance to Job Levels as Related to Staff Classification and the Competency of Social Systems**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Preparation Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LAY INVOLVEMENT

It appears from Table 39 that there are a low range of professional preparation mean scores (2.00-3.00) and a high range of importance to job mean scores (3.83-4.60). This difference reflects a series of high mean disparities.

While the camp and pre-school staff groups both have the highest preparation mean scores they have the lowest disparities thus indicating less need for training in this competency than all other staff groups.

The cultural arts and adult services staff groups were at the lower end of the preparation mean range and toward the upper range of the importance to job scale. Cultural arts staff reflects the highest mean disparity of mean scores.

Table 39 appears to reflect general need for training for the competency of lay involvement.
TABLE 39

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO
STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF
LAY INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Preparation Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS

Table 40 which examines the competency of specialized programs indicates a mean preparation range of 2.17-4.80 and an importance to job range of 2.50-4.60. Only the cultural arts staff groups shows a higher preparation mean score than an importance to job mean score indicating a negative disparity.

Pre-school staff indicate the highest mean disparity of all groups indicating the greatest need for training in the competency. All other staff groups are well below the disparity mean of the pre-school, although both camp and youth staff groups show a relatively significant disparity of means.

It would appear that there is no general need to emphasize training in the competency of specialized programs with the exception of the pre-school staff group.
TABLE 40

COMPARISON OF MEAN SCORES FOR PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB LEVELS AS RELATED TO STAFF CLASSIFICATION AND THE COMPETENCY OF SPECIALIZED PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Preparation Mean Scores</th>
<th>Importance Mean Scores</th>
<th>Disparity of Mean Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Arts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPERVISION

Table 41 shows a preparation mean score range of 2.62-3.25 and an importance to job mean score range of 4.16-4.83. This importance range appears to reflect the highest range of all of the competencies in the study.

Both the adult service and youth group can be found on the lower level of the preparation scale. The highest level of professional preparation is indicated by the physical education staff.

On the importance to job scale the pre-school and camp staff are found on the upper level. The adult service staff indicate the lowest level of importance to job.

When related to training needs, the pre-school group indicates the highest need (2.00) with the youth service and camp staff group next at 1.60 and 1.57 respectively.

It would appear that there is a need for training in this competency on all staff levels.
Table 42 identifies the training needs of the new bachelor degree workers by staff classification. The differences in the mean subscales were correlated by staff group and competency. Differences in the means were computed on a ten point scale, with one being the highest priority and ten the lowest.

CAMP STAFF

It would appear from Table 42 that the highest priority of training need for camp staff is in the competency of program development. Table 42 also indicates that a heavy emphasis should be placed on supervision.

The competencies of Jewish life and social systems both had a positive disparity between preparations and importance of 1.28 indicating a strong need for training.

Only the competency of educational process had a negative disparity in this staff group indicating an adequate level of preparation in relation to its importance to the job.
It is interesting to note that the competency of program development exhibited a higher disparity for the camp staff than any other staff classification.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION STAFF GROUP

Table 42 identified as the highest ranked competency for the health and physical education staff group the competency of lay involvement. This indicates a very high priority for training. As for camp staff, the need for training in the competency of supervision ranked second, indicating a strong need for training.

The competencies of Jewish life and program development were rated as three and four respectively in training priority. The competencies of Jewish life and program development were rated as three and four respectively in training priority. The competency of administration and organization was rated fifth in training priority only .01 below program development in priority of training need.

CULTURAL ARTS

Table 42 indicates the greatest need for training for this staff group is in the competency of lay involvement. The disparity 2.60 is the largest of all six staff classifications in this competency. Administration and organization was rated second at 1.20. Three competencies tied for fourth with a need for training rank of 1.00. These were program development, supervision and social systems.

It is interesting to note that the competency of specialized programs received a minus rank indicating a higher level of preparation than importance to the job. It received a very low rank in the training priority of this staff group.
PRE-SCHOOL

The competency of supervision appeared to exhibit the greatest disparity of mean scores and therefore the greatest need for training for pre-school staff. This group rated the need for training in this competency higher than any of the six staff groups.

Administration and organization and Jewish life were rated two and three respectively in priority of training need. A heavy emphasis for training is indicated for the competency of specialized programs.

The pre-school staff demonstrated the greatest of all staff groups in the competency of specialized programs.

All competencies, with the exception of research, appeared to exhibit some need for training for the pre-school staff group.

YOUTH SERVICES

According to Table 42 the competency of Jewish life received the highest priority of training in the youth staff group. Administration and organization and supervision were rated second and third respectively. A high level of training need was identified in the competencies of lay involvement and program development.

Negative rankings were indicated in the competencies of education process and research. This staff group exhibited the highest priority for training in Jewish life of all staff classifications.

ADULT SERVICES

Lay involvement appeared to be the area of greatest training need for the adult staff group. Program development and supervision were rated second and third respectively in priority of training needs. High emphasis for training was also indicated for administration and
organization and human development according to Table 42.

As in the case of the youth group, there appeared to be no need for training in research and educational process. Research received the highest negative disparity among all staff groups and competencies.
TABLE 42

COMPARISON OF DISPARITIES BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION
AND IMPORTANCE TO JOB MEAN SCORES RELATED TO
STAFF CLASSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Staff (MD)</th>
<th>(R) Education (MD)</th>
<th>Cultural Arts (MD)</th>
<th>(R) Pre-school (MD)</th>
<th>Youth Services (MD)</th>
<th>Adult Services (MD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Development</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Life</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>10.5T</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Systems</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.5T</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>10.5T</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Involvement</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Programs</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD - Mean Disparity
R - Rank

All scores are positive unless indicated
While in-service training may be structured for a specific staff group, Table 43 revealed an interesting similarity in training priorities.

When the priority rankings were totaled they provided a scale of training need related to competency and staff group.

It would appear from Table 43 that the core of the training program consists of the competencies of supervision, Jewish life and lay involvement. The second component of the core could be program development and administration and organization. It would be from this "training core" that a differential in-service program training for staff groups would be formulated.

TABLE 43
SUMMATION OF RANK OF PRIORITIES FOR TRAINING BY COMPETENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Sum of Rank Orders</th>
<th>Training Priority Rank Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish life</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay involvement</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program development</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and Organization</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human development</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social systems</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized programs</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational process</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the influence of the size of the preparation and importance to job mean scores indicated that there was no
difference in the rank order of the priorities when these were taken into consideration.

**Study Question Two**

In order to consider study question two, (Is there a difference between those bachelor degree workers who discussed the Center field as a career with their supervisors and their perception of the importance of the practice competencies to their job and those who have not?), the responses of the workers to the importance to job scales were scored. These scores were statistically related to question seventeen of the questionnaire.

Twenty-six cells were collapsed to five cells. A chi square test of significance was performed showing $x^2$ of .3679 with one degree of freedom. To be significant at the .05 level a value of 3.841 was required. The data indicated a very low level of significance of differences.

Table forty-five reveals that those bachelor degree workers who have considered the Center field as a career scored about the same as those who did not in their perceived importance of the competencies to the job.

It would appear that a projected career plan has little relationship to the importance of the practice competencies to the job.


TABLE 44
DIFFERENCE IN PERCEPTION OF IMPORTANCE TO JOB RELATED TO A PROJECTED CAREER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Plan</th>
<th>Importance to Job Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered</td>
<td>N 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Consider</td>
<td>N 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.3679 \quad p > .90 \]

Study Question Three

Each year, the Jewish Welfare Board sponsors a five-day training institute for new workers. Study question three asks if there is a difference in perception of the importance of the practical competencies to the job between those workers who attended the institute and those who had not.

The responses of the workers to the importance to job scales were scored. These scores were statistically related to two groups, those who attended an institute and those who had not.

Twenty-six cells were collapsed to five cells. A chi square test of significance indicated an \( x^2 \) of 0.0046 with one degree of freedom. To be significant at the .05 level a value of 3.841 was required. The data indicated a very low level of significance of the differences between the two groups.
Table 45 reveals that those bachelor degree workers who attended the new workers institute did not perceive the practice competencies more important to the job than those workers who did not attend.

It would appear that attendance at the Jewish Welfare Board's New Workers' Institute has little relationship to the perceived importance of the practice competencies to the job.

**TABLE 45**

DIFFERENCE IN PERCEPTION OF IMPORTANCE TO JOB RELATED TO ATTENDANCE AT THE JEWISH WELFARE BOARD'S NEW WORKERS' INSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Importance to Job Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>N 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 0.0046 \quad p > .95 \]

**Summary**

An individual's training needs as a bachelor degree worker in Jewish Centers is related to many factors. An attempt has been made to isolate and evaluate some of these factors. In addition, it was deemed necessary to construct a profile of the bachelor degree worker, to include his Jewish background and career plans related to the field.
Study question one attempted to determine if those bachelor degree workers who considered the Center field as a career perceived the competencies more important to the job than those who did not. There was no significant difference between the perception of the two groups. It was apparent that a career choice had little relationship to the importance of the competencies.

In study question two, bachelor degree workers who attended the Jewish Welfare Board's New Workers' Institute showed no significant difference in perceived importance of the competencies than those workers who had not attended the institute.

Bachelor degree workers were able to differentiate between competencies they thought were important to their job, their professional preparation level for these competencies, and the priority of these competencies for an in-service training program.

Eleven major competencies were rated by the bachelor degree workers. The three competencies identified as a very high priority for in-service training for all of the six staff groups were lay involvement, supervision and Jewish life.

The other eight competencies were distributed in priority among the six staff classifications as follows:

1. Camp staff indicated a high need for training in the competencies of program development, social systems, and human development. Specialized programs, organization and administration, and communications received the lower priorities for training in this staff group.
2. Physical education staff members indicated that organization and administration, program development, and communications were high priority areas of training need. On the lower level this staff group listed educational process, social systems, and a tie for research and human development.

3. Cultural arts staff rated organization and administration, human development, and communications as their highest priority of training. Specialized programs, research, and educational process received lower priorities in this staff group.

4. Pre-school staff rated organization and administration, specialized programs, and program development as high priority competencies for in-service training. Educational process, social systems and human development were considered as lower priorities for training.

5. Youth services staff put a high priority for training on organization and administration, program development and communications. Human development, social systems, and specialized programs received lower priority for training.

6. Program development, organization and administration, and human development were rated as high priorities for training by adult services workers. Social systems, research and communications received a lower ranking for training by this staff group.
NOTES TO CHAPTER IV


2 Sanford Solender, "The Unique Function of the Jewish Center", (New York, National Jewish Welfare Board), 1955.


CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter includes reviews of the purposes and objectives of the study, describes the nature of the study and examines the study questions. The chapter also summarizes the major findings and arrives at conclusions based on the data. The chapter concludes with recommendations for additional research.

Purpose

As a result of the interest expressed in the need for a training program for bachelor degree workers in the Jewish Center field by various Center directors, program supervisors and from the workers themselves, the need arose for a differential in-service training model. Thus, the purpose of the study was to determine the extent, nature and level for a training program focused specifically on needs of the new bachelor degree worker.

From the adult educator's point of view, training for any client group should be based on recognized educational needs and should involve the participants in identifying those needs.

Objectives

In order to fulfill the major purpose, the following specific objectives were used to direct the study:

1. To identify the formal training and background of new bachelor degree workers in Jewish Centers.
2. To determine how well they felt their undergraduate training prepared them for the field.

3. To determine the bachelor degree workers' evaluation of competencies considered important to their staff classifications.

4. To identify by staff classification the training needs of new bachelor degree workers in the Jewish Center field.

**Nature of the Study**

This was an exploratory and descriptive study. As such it was limited to full time, Jewish Center bachelor degree workers located in the United States.

Due to the small numbers of bachelor degree workers who entered the field during the study period, the total population was involved. The data were collected by use of mail questionnaire.

The entire questionnaire was pre-tested for clarity and understanding with selected staff from Jewish Centers, professional consultants on a regional and national level of the Jewish Welfare Board, faculty members of The Ohio State University's School of Social Work, and Adult Education faculty members at The Ohio State University. In addition, the competency section was pre-tested with bachelor degree workers who were not included in the study population.

The study was open to all bachelor degree workers who entered the field from September, 1973, to December, 1974. Two hundred twenty-one questionnaires were mailed and 123 workers responded. Of this group, twenty-four were rejected as they were not beginning bachelor degree workers. A certified total of seventy-nine
respondents represented a return of forty-four percent.

A follow-up study to non-respondents indicated no significant differences between respondents and non-respondents.

**Study Questions**

The project had three study questions:

1. How well prepared does the bachelor degree worker perceive himself for his level of practice?

2. Is there a difference between those bachelor degree workers who have discussed a career plan with their supervisor and those who have not and their perceived importance to the job of selected practice competencies?

3. Is there a difference between those bachelor degree workers who have attended The Jewish Welfare Board's New Workers' Institute and those who have not and their perceived importance to the job of selected practice competencies?

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions were considered basic to the study:

1. Bachelor degree workers in Jewish Centers would be able to determine honestly which competencies were important to their job classification.

2. Bachelor degree workers in Jewish Centers would be able to determine how well prepared they were to practice these competencies.

3. Competencies could be ranked by the workers in terms of importance to their job and their professional preparation level. This difference in rank could be an indication of
training need.

**Limitations**

The following limitations were recognized as this study was designed and conducted:

1. The population was limited to those workers who were working on a full time, year round work schedule and were salaried.

2. The population was limited to workers who entered the field between September, 1973 and December, 1974.

3. The study was limited to workers in Jewish Centers located in the United States.

4. The study was limited to the degree that respondents accurately interpreted all segments of the questionnaire.

**Conclusions**

1. The characteristics of the new bachelor degree worker were as follows:

   Age - The majority of the bachelor degree workers in the field during the study period were thirty years of age and under with over twenty-seven percent between the ages of twenty and twenty-five.

   Tenure - Over twenty-seven percent were on the job from sixteen to twenty months while over forty-six percent had seven months or less in the center field.

   Undergraduate Education - Over fifty percent entered the field from undergraduate training in allied fields of education, over fifteen percent entered the field with a major in sociology. Almost one half of the workers had no graduate education.
Jewish Education - Over seventy-seven percent of the workers had a Jewish education of which fifty-nine percent was of the Hebrew school type.

Religious Affiliation - The majority were from the Conservative element of Jewish religious life while over twenty-one percent identified with none of the three religious factions. Eleven percent were not Jewish.

In-service Training - A limited number of workers, thirty-four percent, participated in the Jewish Welfare Board's New Workers' Institute. The main reason for the low attendance was lack of knowledge of the program on the part of the worker.

Career Plans - While sixty-two percent of the workers planned to make a career of Jewish Center work, only forty-one percent had ever discussed this possibility with their supervisor. Most respondents planned to be in the same position after three years in the Jewish Center field. Over twenty-four percent stated aspirations for a supervisory position after three years in the field.

Service Classification - Bachelor degree workers were in two major staff classifications: physical education and youth services. Assignments as camp staff, pre-school staff and adult services followed in that order. A small percentage of respondents listed multiple staff classifications.

2. Bachelor degree workers in Jewish Centers were able to determine their perceived needs for in-service training.

3. A differential need for in-service training based on staff classification was demonstrated. The analysis of the data indicates
that a need for in-service training exists for all bachelor degree workers in three core competencies: (1) supervision, (2) Jewish life and (3) lay involvement.

4. The lowest expressed needs for in-service training were in the areas of research and educational process.

5. Administration and Organization - In the competency of administration and organization defined as the ability to understand and direct a department or program in terms of budget, policy, structure and staff, three staff groups (cultural arts, pre-school and youth services) perceived a high degree of need for training.

6. Human Development - Camp staff placed a higher priority for training in the competency of human development than all other staff groups. This competency is defined as the knowledge and understanding of the way individuals develop and how this process effects their behavior.

The staff groups expressing the lowest priority for training in this competency were pre-school and youth services.

7. Program Development - The competency of program development which was defined as the ability to plan, organize, carry out and evaluate a program or event received a very high priority for training from camp staff. Both adult and cultural arts staff groups rated this competency as a high priority for in-service training.

8. Jewish Life - The competency of Jewish life, which was designated as a core subject, is composed of an understanding of Jewish culture, the composition and organization of the Jewish community, Jewish institutions and Jewish law. All staff groups
except adult services rated this competency in the top half of the priority rankings. Youth services staff ranked this as their top priority for in-service training.

9. Communications - This competency which is defined as the ability to counsel with clients, speak and write evaluations, publicity, letters and project proposals received a ranking in the lower fifty percent of the priority scale for all staff groups.

10. Research and Educational Process - As indicated by the data, the competencies of research and educational process generally receive the lowest rank in the priority of an in-service training program for all staff groups.

11. Social Systems - This competency is defined as the ability to understand and deal with basic social systems such as family, community and religious groups. Two staff groups (camp and cultural arts) rated it as a third priority for in-service staff training. Youth and physical education staff rates the competency in eighth place on their priority for in-service training.

12. Lay Involvement and Volunteers - Three staff groups (physical education, cultural arts and adult services) rated this competency as the top priority for in-service training. The competency, defined as the ability to identify and develop volunteers and to train leadership within the agency, was rated as a core subject.

13. Specialized Programs - This competency is defined as a worker's ability to lead and teach basic skills such as camp crafts, dramatics, organized games and other leisure time activities. Preschool staff ranked this competency in fourth place in their training
model while both youth and adult staff groups rated it ninth.

14. Supervision - Based on the data, this competency defined as the ability to provide direction to lay leaders, advisors, instructors, students, was rated as a core subject for all staff groups. The competency was rated as top priority for pre-school, second priority for camp and physical education staff and third priority for cultural arts, youth and adult staff groups.

15. Based on the data, there appears to be no difference between those workers who had discussed a projected career plan and those who had not and the perceived importance to the job of selected practice competencies.

16. Participants who attended The Jewish Welfare Board's New Workers' Institute exhibited about the same perceived importance to the job of the selected practice competencies as those who did not attend.

Recommendations

The recommendations arising from this study speak to both the local agencies and the Jewish Welfare Board. They are a product of the study and the judgment of the writer.

1. There is a continuing need for in-service training programs for staff as expressed by the agencies and the Jewish Welfare Board.

2. Three competencies should be emphasized for all bachelor degree workers entering the field. These are Jewish life, lay involvement and supervision.

3. Certain competencies should be differentially emphasized for in-service training. These should be based on the staff
classification of the bachelor degree worker.

4. After a successful probationary period in an agency, discussion between the worker and supervisor should begin on a projected career plan.

5. It is the author's opinion that the Jewish Welfare Board should develop packaged instructional material emphasising the priority competencies referred to in this study. These materials would aid in-service training for staff in both small and large agencies.

6. Committees on a regional and national level that are responsible for professional in-service education should have membership that includes both bachelor degree workers and staff group representatives in order to guarantee total involvement in the planning process.

**Additional Research Needed**

Recommendations for additional research are based on research data, a study of related research, and the judgment and experience of the writer.

It would appear that more bachelor degree workers with varied educational backgrounds will be entering the field of Jewish Center work. At present, there is no basis for certification of a Jewish Center worker. A study is needed to determine the need for such certification. Questions that would relate to certification and for future research are:

1. What would constitute professional certification and who would be responsible?
2. How would the priorities for training determined in this study be phased as to time sequence?

3. What incentives would there be to become a certified "Jewish Center Worker?"

Other recommendations for future research would include:

1. A replication of this study.
2. A study of supervisors' responses concerning the need for the in-service training of bachelor degree workers.
3. A study of the training needs of social workers in Jewish Centers.
Dear Center Worker:

I am doing a research project for my Ph.D. dissertation related to training needs of bachelor degree workers in Jewish Center work. The enclosed questionnaire will take only 10 minutes of your time but it is imperative that you fill it out completely.

If you are a MSW please so indicate and return the questionnaire blank.

It is my hope that the results of this project will help to enhance and upgrade training for you and new workers entering the field.

Sincerely,

Howard Banchefsky
Assistant Director
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR BACHELOR'S DEGREE WORKER

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name__________________________________________________________

2. ______________________________________________________________

3. Job Title - Check List:
   Check off Job Classification or Position Most Closely Approxi-
   mately Yours:
   ___Executive Director   ___Pre-School Teacher
   ___Ass't. Executive Dir.   ___Children's Activities Dir.
   ___Branch Director   ___Children's Activities Worker
   ___Program Director   ___Twee (Jr. High) Activities Dir.
   ___Dir. of Group Services   ___Twee (Jr. High) Activ. Worker
   ___Resident Camp Director   ___Teen (Sr. High) Activities Dir.
   ___Day Camp Director   ___Teen (Sr. High) Activ. Worker
   ___Health & Phys. Ed. Ass't.   ___Adult Activities Director
   ___Aquatics Director   ___Adult Activities Worker
   ___Aquatics Teacher   ___Sr. Adult Activities Director
   ___Cultural Arts Director   ___Sr. Adult Activities Worker
   ___Pre-School Director   ___Administrative Assistant

4. Male_____ Female_____ (5.) Married_____ Single_____ (6.)____

7. Please rank order the following groups as to the percentage of
   professional on the job time you spend in regard to each group
   (be sure that the percentages add up to 100%).
   ___Up to 5 years old   ___Young Adult (19-30)
   ___Elementary   ___Adult
   ___Jr. High (6th,7th,8th)   ___Older Adult (60 and over)
   ___Teen (9th through 12th grade)

8. How many months have you been on your present job?
   ___0-4   ___5-8   ___8-12   ___12-15   ___16-20
   ___Over 20

9. What was your Undergraduate Major?_________________________________________

10. Did you receive any graduate education?   ___Yes   ___No
    If yes, in what area? ___________________________________________
    Did you complete the graduate program?   ___Yes   ___No
11. Please check all of the Jewish Education programs which you have completed:
   a) None b) Saturday or Sunday School
   c) Hebrew School
d) Sunday High School or Hebrew High School
e) College courses or seminars in Jewish Studies or Hebrew Education
   f) Seminars in Jewish Studies or Hebrew Education outside the University

12. Synagogue Affiliations:
   ___Orthodox ___Conservative ___Reform
   ___Non-affiliated ___Not Jewish

13. Did you attend the Jewish Welfare Board's New Worker Institute?
   ___Yes ___No

14. If the answer to 13 is no, did you not attend because:
   a) Did not know about it b) Was not interested
   c) Financial problems d) Work conflict
   e) Other

15. When did you attend the Institute?

CAREER PLANS

16. Have you ever discussed a long range plan for your development
    as a Center Worker with your supervisor? ___Yes ___No

17. Are you considering Jewish Center work as a permanent career?
    ___Yes ___No
    If not, Why?

18. What position would you see yourself having 3 years from now?
    ___Present ___Supervisory ___Administrator
    ___Others (specify)

COMPETENCY

In the following section you will find a number of statements
describing basic competency for Jewish Center Workers. We would
like you to respond to these statements in 2 ways: (1) Were
you, through your undergraduate education, prepared for Jewish
Center work in this competency area; (2) How much importance
does this competency area have in your present job.

19. ADMINISTRATION and ORGANIZATION
    The ability to understand and direct an agency or one of its
departments or programs in terms of budget, policy, structure
and staff.
Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared ___ Very important
___ Well prepared ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared ___ Unimportant

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

20. Understanding the way people develop and how this process effects their behavior. This competency is utilized in every situation where you relate to another person.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared ___ Very important
___ Well prepared ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared ___ Unimportant

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

21. The ability to plan, organize, carry out and evaluate a program or event within your agency. The backbone of Center work is the ability to develop program.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared ___ Very important
___ Well prepared ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared ___ Unimportant

JEWISH LIFE

22. It is important for any Center worker to have a full understanding of Jewish culture, the composition of the organized Jewish community, Jewish life, and Jewish law, in determining programming and administration of Jewish Centers.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared ___ Very important
___ Well prepared ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared ___ Unimportant
COMMUNICATIONS

23. The ability to communicate well is of extreme importance in Center work. Workers are called upon daily to counsel, speak, and write — all which require an understanding of the communications process.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared ___ Very important
___ Well prepared ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared ___ Unimportant

RESEARCH

24. The area of research has generally been neglected for Center workers. The research process involves understanding of research methods, analyzing data, understanding and writing research reports and the ability to design and implement research projects.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared ___ Very important
___ Well prepared ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared ___ Unimportant

EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

25. The ability to understand the educational process and use this process working with people in the Agency and the community. To be effective as a teacher you must have insight into and experience with educational methodology and teaching programs.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared ___ Very important
___ Well prepared ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared ___ Unimportant
SOCIAL SYSTEMS

26. The ability to understand and deal with basic social systems, family, community and religious groups. This involves being able to understand the relationship among these groups and how to utilize these systems in relation to your job as a Center worker.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared    ___ Very important
___ Well prepared          ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared      ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared        ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared              ___ Unimportant

LAY INVOLVEMENT AND VOLUNTEERS

27. The ability to identify and develop volunteers and train leaders within your agency. This involves understanding the role of the volunteer in Center work.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared    ___ Very important
___ Well prepared          ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared      ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared        ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared              ___ Unimportant

SPECIALIZED PROGRAM

28. This relates to your ability to lead and teach special program skills which are utilized a great deal in Center work. These include campcraft, cultural arts, dramatics, organized games, etc. In addition to teaching the skill, program skills are important in working with people and relationship building.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

___ Very well prepared    ___ Very important
___ Well prepared          ___ Important
___ Somewhat prepared      ___ Moderately important
___ Poorly prepared        ___ Minimally important
___ Unprepared              ___ Unimportant
SUPervision

29. The ability to provide direction and guidance to either lay or professional workers. The supervisory role is one in which you enable the supervisee to grow as a person as well as a professional.

Undergraduate preparation: How important is this competency to your present job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate preparation:</th>
<th>How important is this competency to your present job?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well prepared</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat prepared</td>
<td>Moderately important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly prepared</td>
<td>Minimally important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprepared</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bertram Gold and Arnulf Pins translated the competencies of knowledge of individuals, of the Center and its services, of working with individuals and groups, understanding of self and knowledge of Jewish life into educational objectives as follows:

A. Knowledge of individuals, groups and society (general and Jewish).

1. understand the essential wholeness of the human personality with the recognition of the interdependence and interplay of physical, intellectual, emotional, spiritual and social influences and attributes; 2. understand the social structures (e.g. families, groups, organizations, communities, and societies) and the social process in which men are involved, and appreciate the importance of these structures and processes for the behavior of individuals and groups and for the achievement of socially desirable goals; 3. develop a basis for objective assessment of those whom the social worker serves through knowledge and understanding of: the individual's capacities for effective social functioning; the dynamics of the behavior of groups of varied composition and in varied settings and the significance of the group for its members; the forces in the community that bear on human welfare and on relationships between ethnic, religious and other groups in the community.

B. Knowledge of and positive attitudes towards goals of Jewish Center and its service. The content included by schools of social work in the curriculum area of "Social Welfare Policy and Services" is designed to:

Enable students to identify, analyze and appraise:

1. the problems and conditions in social institutions of social work; 2. the programs and agencies characteristically involved in the treatment, control or prevention of problems of the individual and society; 3. the movements and form to social welfare goals, nationally and internationally, with assessment of the contributions of the professions' spokesmen and leaders; 4. the social policies that condition the authorization, financing and programming of social welfare services and 5. the responsibility of the social work profession and the methods through which the social worker helps develop social policy and contributes to positive social change.
C. Knowledge, positive attitudes and skills in working with individual groups and community in and through the employing agency toward achievement of specific goals. The schools' objectives for the concentration of students; class and field instruction in one method of social work practice are designed to help the student:

1. use in disciplined professional relationships the knowledge, values, self-awareness and skills developed through the total basic curriculum; 2. deepen knowledge and understanding of the clientele, the constellation of tasks or problems, the types and characteristics of agencies and programs with which a particular method may be associated; 3. learn the orderly and systematic procedures of a particular social work method in the definition and assessment of the problems or tasks; 4. develop professional judgment and skill in the delineation of goals of desired change and engage effectively with recipients of social work service in movement towards goal-directed change; 5. uses and assesses community resources in the helping or problem solving process and develop appreciation of the responsibility and role of the social worker in contribution from professional knowledge to the improvement of social welfare policies and services; 6. apply principles of collaborative activity in participation with other professional or non-professional personnel and volunteers in the provision of a service; 7. develop potential for assessing the effectiveness of his own professional performance in helping or problem solving activities; and 8. learn how to evaluate the opportunities and program and through other community services and achievements of goal-directed change.

D. Understanding of self and ability to use self consciously.

Conscious use of self is one of the major hallmarks of any profession and the special achievement of social work education. Self-understanding is a pre-requisite for conscious use of self. Concentration in a method of social work practice is designed to help the student "achieve self-awareness and develop an orderly and systematic approach to the helping and problem-solving tasks of professional practice." In addition, one of the basic educational goals of total social work curriculum is to have every student "incorporate the discipline of self-awareness of the professional social worker..." Much of this self-awareness is achieved with the help of supervision by the field instructor.
E. Knowledge of and positive attitudes toward Jewish history, 
life, beliefs, practices, culture and literature. The content of the 
social work curriculum in the area of "Human Behavior and Social 
Environment" draws upon theory and research to help students. 

Toward a recognition, understanding and appraisal of a 
number of items including: 1. the process of human growth 
and personality development, with emphasis on endowment, 
growth, change, and maturation of the individual within the 
social context of the family group relationships, and 2. the 
nature and changing character of social and cultural structures, 
their influences on behavior and the processes and consequences 
of their interaction between the individual and his social 
environment.

Competencies developed by the Jewish Welfare Board Commission on 
Training were categorized as Jewish purpose of the agency, supervision, 
consultation and teaching.

The first area discussed by the Commission was that of the 
Jewish purpose of the agency. It was felt that the following 
was necessary in the way of knowledge skills and attitudes:

1. Knowledge of the Jewish community.
2. Knowledge of Jewish culture, religion, Jewish life style 
   and aspects of Jewish history.
3. Knowledge of relationships between the non-Jewish and Jewish 
   community.
4. Knowledge about the average life experience of the Jewish 
   family with a particular emphasis on those things related 
   to Jewishness.

Among the skills listed as those for which training should be 
provided are the following:

1. Skill in identification of Jewish resource material, Jewish 
   organizations, Jewish personnel related to meeting program 
   needs.
2. Skill in diagnosing social problems, community problems, 
   individual problems as they relate to Jewish dimension.
3. Skill in developing a plan based upon which some modification 
   of the problem would be made.
4. Skill in evaluating the result of the plan.
In the area of Jewish purpose of the agency, it was felt that the following attitudes should be trained for:

1. Attitude toward favorable acceptance of sectarian purpose by the Jewish Center as well as sectarian purposes of other religious groups.
2. A positive attitude toward continuity of the Jewish group, both for themselves and the encouragement of Jewish continuity.
3. An attitude which accepts various levels of Jewish identification and the free choice of individual Jews or Jews as a group to make determinations about their Jewish identification.
4. A positive attitude toward the Jewish Center as an institution which encourages and enhances Jewish identity. This issue was raised in light of the view of some people that only the synagogue is an appropriate institution in this regard.

In the general area the following is the knowledge base which should be trained for:

1. A knowledge of individual growth and development.
2. A knowledge about group behavior.
3. A knowledge of the American society.
4. A knowledge of world issues.
5. A knowledge of inter-group and minority group relationships.
6. A knowledge of social systems.
7. Some knowledge of the cultural arts.

The following skills should be developed:

1. Capacity for relationship with individuals.
2. Capacity for diagnosis of needs of individuals.
3. Capacity for using relationship program or inter-personal relationships positively to help individuals to meet their needs.
4. Capacity to develop relationship with the groups so that they see the worker as a helping person.
5. Skill in diagnosing group needs.
6. Skill in planning for use of program relationship, peer relationships, relationship with other groups to meet group needs.
7. Skill in evaluating stages of growth of groups and their next developmental needs.
8. Skill in administrative knowledge.
9. Skill in encouragement of people to consider social change actions.
10. Skill in developing political participation.
11. Skill in sensing a political or conflict situation.
12. Skill in being known as a helpful person.
13. Skill in use of resources and referral to appropriate resources.
14. Skill in engaging in cooperative resource utilization toward a common goal.
15. Skill in goal setting and selecting alternatives.
16. Skill in developing relationship with power resources and working with power blocks.
17. Skill in evaluation.
18. Skill in mechanics.
19. Skill in access of minority groups and in relationship with such groups.
22. Skill in when and where pressure should be appropriately used, in planning, in climate setting, and in encouraging involvement.

The following are appropriate attitudes that should be developed in regard to the general functioning of workers in the Jewish Centers:

1. An attitude which believes as fundamental to practice in the Jewish Center the nature of the democratic process and its full utilization.
2. An attitude that respects the rights of individuals to be self-determining, to be different, and to attempt to meet their needs.
3. An attitude favorable toward a desire to help others.
4. An attitude that self-help is most effective process.
5. An attitude favorable to sharing responsibilith with colleagues, with membership in the community.
6. An attitude of trust in a relationship.
7. An attitude of concern about society.
8. An attitude favorable to changes in society of these are desired by individuals or groups.
9. An attitude of willingness to take risks.

The next area of knowledge was related to supervision, consultation and teaching. The knowledge base involved here is as follows:

1. Knowledge of the meaning of supervisory relationship, knowledge of material to be transmitted.
2. Knowledge about the nature of the supervisory helping process.
3. Knowledge of resources which enable the supervisory helping process.
The skills necessary to be developed in this area were deemed to be the following:

1. Skills in the development of the relationship with the supervisee; skill in diagnosing the supervisee's need.
2. Skill in planning for use of worker's role; program experience, work experience, which tends to be directed to meet the supervisee or group's learning needs.
3. Skill in listening; skill in partializing.
4. Skill in offering support.
5. Skill in setting limits.
6. Skill in being recognized as a helpful person.
7. Skill in freeing the supervisee to use what they have.
8. Skill in referral.
10. Skill in resource provision.
11. Skill in giving recognition.
12. Skill as a supervisory model.
13. Skill in use of tools such as recording, research and data gathering.
15. Skill in priority setting.

The following attitudes were deemed important for workers in Jewish Centers as regards supervision and teaching:

1. An attitude which accepts the need for help of the supervisee or learner.
2. A respect for people who reject help.
3. An attitude of acceptance of strengths and limitations which the supervisee or learner brings to the situation.
4. An attitude which is favorable toward the maximum utilization of self-help.
5. An attitude of trust in the supervisory relationship.
6. An attitude that the supervisee or learner should fully participate in the learning process, in the goal setting process, and the delineation of problem and need.
7. An attitude which sees supervision as a helpful process.
8. An attitude which sees supervision as an agency responsibility to hold for accountability and quality control.

The following were felt to be skills needed in consultation:

1. Skills in problem definition.
2. Skills in being known as an appropriate and approachable and competent consultant.
4. Skills in using consultative abilities of others.
5. Skill in identification of resources.
6. Skill in establishing the consultative contract or relationship.
7. Skill in setting the time for consultation.
8. Skill for withdrawal so that the consultee might pick up on his own.
A study of Tables of Organization of 56 Jewish Centers by Harry A. Schatz, Jewish Welfare Board Director of Administrative Services

indicated the following:

In the Jewish Center field staff structure varies in accordance with the size and complexity of the Center. In a small community there is usually one professional person who has responsibility not only for Center program and administration but also for the work of the Jewish Welfare fund, community areas, the Center executive may have some full time or part time program staff, none of whom are likely to be a social worker. He is most likely to have a full time or part time physical education director who is also responsible for the summer day camp.

In the metropolitan cities there is usually an association of Centers with an organizational superstructure of an executive vice-president, an associate director and sometimes professional staff who either head city wide projects or serve as resource and consultants to the branch Centers. There is also central administrative staff in the areas of finances, central purchasing, planning and research. In the branch Centers there is usually a director, and depending on the size of the branch, either a program director or a program director and an administrative assistant. The program director supervises the program department heads and the administrative assistant supervises the clerical and maintenance operations.

The staff structure of a Center characteristic of the intermediate and large size communities is one that may be regarded as basic or classic. The executive has two major assistants—one who is called assistant director or program director who supervises the program departments, and the other who may be called administrative assistant, business manager or controller. The program director is usually a social worker. In some cases, the administrative assistant is a social worker. However, more frequently he is a person trained in business administration and has a bachelor's degree. Most frequently the heads of all program departments are supervised by the program director. However, there are a significant number of instances in which one or more program department heads are directly responsible to the executive. This is particularly true in such cases as when the physical education director is a mature person with long years of association with members of the board of directors and other lay leaders, and especially when the program director is relatively a newcomer to the Center and with fewer years of professional experience.
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