DEVELOPING NEW CAREERS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED AS NONPROFESSIONAL AIDES PERFORMING THE LESS TECHNICAL AND SPECIALIZED TASKS IN HUMAN SERVICES ORGANIZATIONS SERVES THREE PURPOSES--(1) IT FREES THE PROFESSIONAL WORKER FROM LESS CRITICAL DUTIES. (2) IT INCREASES DECENT EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR THOSE HAVING THE GREATEST JOB PROBLEMS. (3) IT PROVIDES INTERMEDIARIES BETWEEN THE PROFESSIONAL AND HIS "CLIENTS," THUS IMPROVING RAPPORT. HOWEVER, IT IS OFTEN THE CASE THAT THE NONPROFESSIONAL ACCENTUATES HIS NEW-FOUND STATUS AND ALIENATES HIMSELF FROM THE DISADVANTAGED GROUP OF WHICH HE WAS FORMERLY A MEMBER. IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION, IT HAS BEEN PROPOSED THAT 30 PERCENT OF THE PROJECTED BUDGETS FOR NEW TEACHERS THROUGH 1970 BE SPENT ON JOBS FOR NEW PROFESSIONALS AND 70 PERCENT, FOR HIRING NONPROFESSIONALS. NONPROFESSIONALS WOULD PERFORM THE TECHNICAL BUT LESS COMPLICATED ASPECTS OF CLASSROOM WORK AND TEACHERS WOULD BE FREED TO DO MORE TEACHING AND OTHER THOROUGHLY PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING TRAINING AND SUPERVISING THE NONPROFESSIONALS. THIS MODIFICATION OF THE EMPLOYMENT STRUCTURE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION WOULD CREATE A HALF MILLION NEW JOBS WITH NO ADDITIONAL COST TO THE TAXPAYERS. FURTHER RESEARCH IS NECESSARY TO DETERMINE WHETHER SUCH A POLICY WOULD ENHANCE INSTRUCTION AND LEARNING. (LC)
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Although we have begun to recognize that poverty is one of the most important problems of the poor, our War on Poverty has endowed the One-Fifth chiefly with a wealth of services. One of the most significant results of these programs is not their success in alleviating poverty but rather the recognition of the seemingly obvious: that the poor first and foremost need more money or the chance to earn it.

Posing the question of how more money can find its way into the pockets of the poor has evoked a fruitful debate. There are the advocates of increasing employment opportunities by devices such as developing new careers for the poor and the proponents of some form of income redistribution like the guaranteed income. One can only hope that the supporters of each type of approach will not allow their enthusiasm to impel them to phrase proposals in either/or terms.

Depending upon who among the poor are to be enriched, each type of strategy may be a means of reducing poverty. Mothers caring for young children, the aged, the disabled, and youngsters in homes headed by such persons require income-transfer programs to guarantee them more money. But for the poor who are available for work, the unemployed, the underemployed, those who cease to be counted because they no longer look for jobs, and particularly the young people in these categories, a job is a solution more likely to add to their self esteem and their sense of participation in society.¹ As Robert Shrank has re-

¹ The relatively low overall unemployment rates during 1966 should not obscure the high rates of joblessness that persist for young workers and for nonwhites in all age categories. In July, for example, the overall unemployment rate (seasonally
marked, "I would hate to say to youth who are unemployed today that our program for you is to get you on welfare or to get you entitlements."

An observer like Robert Theobold thinks it neither feasible nor necessarily desirable to approach the problem of poverty through the strategy of job development. He maintains that "it is already impossible to achieve appropriate employment of all human resources through the job route." And he does not consider widespread loss of work a frightening prospect: "It is not full employment that promises the achievement of America's potential but rather full unemployment with each individual striving to develop himself and his society." What such a position overlooks, however, is the fact that those least prepared to use their leisure resourcefully and usefully—the undereducated—are the first to face layoffs that they can hardly consider a blessing. As long as the poor are forced to be jobless, we shall persist in defining the lack of gainful employment differently depending on whether it is the chosen condition of the in-group or the lot of the out-group. The unemployed poor continue to be considered idle and the rich who do not work, privileged.

If such observers as Theobold were correct in assuming that it is already impossible to employ everyone who wants to work, we would need to throw all of our weight toward the guaranteed income, accompanied by some form of attitudinal change to help the unemployed to accept themselves and to be accepted by the rest of society. It should also be observed that we do not know the rel-

adjusted) was 3.9%. However, for nonwhites the rate was more than doubled, 7.9%, and for the 14-17 age group it was more than trebled, 12.2%. Nor should one overlook hidden unemployment, the numbers not officially counted as unemployed because they are not recorded as unemployed because they are not recorded as actively seeking work."
ative weight of the two variables affecting attitudes toward the unemployed poor—lack of money and lack of work.

The position that increasing employment is not one of the viable means of decreasing poverty is based on the unwarranted assumption that there are no unmet needs in our society. Marcia Freedman is a manpower specialist who has questioned the approach to present problems of Theobald and others:

Those of our friends who envision the disappearance of the need for work may have an important insight for the future, but they have skipped over some of the present, particularly in terms of services to people, of expansion of cultural activities, and of a general enhancing of the quality of goods and services...the enormous growth of automation for some time at least, should not obviate the possibility of new roles.

When one takes into account the several variables of population growth, present manpower, and future demands for greater quantity and quality of services, it is difficult to estimate the numbers of workers needed in the fields of health, education, and welfare—the human services. Although inadequately documented and counted, the demand for new workers exists. For example, the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress estimated that expanded public service employment in six categories "where social needs are now inadequately met if they are met at all" could create 5.3 million new jobs for people "with relatively low skills." In one of the human services, social work, a high-level governmental Task Force on Social Work Education and Manpower concluded that "current efforts to meet rapidly burgeoning demands fall short of meeting the need." They warned that a greatly increased supply of social-work manpower must be developed during the latter half of the 1960's if a more serious, potentially dangerous situation
is to be avoided by 1970.

The New-Careers Proposal

The new-careers proposal has been inspired by recent experiments in which persons lacking the requisites for professional status in health, education, and welfare organizations have been employed in meaningful rather than menial service roles. Such workers have commonly been designated nonprofessionals, a term nearly as unfortunate as the epithet nonwhite. When nonprofessionals are drawn from the low-income client group or, more appropriately, from the disadvantaged neighborhood served by the organization in which they work, they are referred to as indigenous nonprofessionals. The motivation for using nonprofessionals has usually been to make services more responsive to low-income clients by employing staff more akin to the clients than middle-class professionals but has sometimes been rationalized in terms of rehabilitation of the workers themselves. Some of the early experiments utilizing nonprofessionals have been in the field of corrections where corrections officers have been trained to provide group therapy, for example; in education where teacher aides and school-community coordinators were employed in slum schools; and in the multi-service social agencies that preceded the War on Poverty where they performed in a variety of roles such as community organization, school-community relations, program planning, and the teaching of home-management skills.
Whether employed primarily to make programs more compatible with disadvantaged clientele, to professionalize services as in the corrections field, or to rehabilitate the workers themselves, nonprofessionals in a variety of innovating programs appeared to make a positive, in some instances unique, contribution to human services. Arthur Pearl's response to the community apprentices, disadvantaged youth trained as recreation, daycare, and research aides by the Howard University Center for Youth and Community Studies, is not atypical of initial reactions to the new nonprofessionals: "At first blush these youth exceeded even what the most optimistic expected of them."

Based on their experiences with and observations of some of the experimental uses of nonprofessionals in significant service roles, Pearl, Frank Riessman, Robert Rieff, J. Douglas Grant, and others began to think in terms of developing large numbers of careers for nonprofessionals in the human services as a means of coping with several social problems: the shortage of skilled manpower in these fields, unemployment, and the inadequacies of many professional services that stem from lack of participation of the low-income persons themselves. Of considerable importance also was what Riessman has characterized as the "helper therapy principle"—that persons offering help to others profit from their efforts, sometimes to a greater extent than the beneficiaries of their services. In their book, New Careers for the
Poor, Pearl and Riessman have emphasized that serious planning should involve the following considerations:

1. The creation of jobs normally allotted to highly-trained professionals but which could be performed by the unskilled, inexperienced, and relatively untrained workers; or the development of activities not currently performed by anyone but for which there is an acknowledged need;

2. not only the development of jobs but of permanent positions "incorporated into the matrix of the industry or agency;"

3. latitude for limited advancement without the requirement of extensive additional training;

4. opportunities for truly substantial advancement in job station; and

5. establishment of a continuum ranging from nonskilled entry positions, extending through intermediate subprofessional functions, and terminating in full professional status—thereby providing an alternate avenue for upward mobility to the present requirement, virtually inaccessible to the poor, of prior completion of from five to eight years of higher education.

Current Status of the New-Careers Proposal

Proposals that are attractive are often meted superficial enthusiasm rather than careful scrutiny, and the new-careers
plan, with certain notable exceptions, is receiving more of the former than the latter type of treatment. There are many new jobs for nonprofessionals but so far, very few new careers. It is, after all, one thing to employ the poor in service roles when "the maximum feasible participation of the poor" has become a platitude and it is often necessary to have some nonmilitant indigenous staff in order to qualify for federal funds. It is quite another matter to devise an alternate means of access to several professions. The educational implications of the new-careers proposal are broad, and the task is particularly difficult because some of the disciplines are insecure in their recently-acquired status as professions. It is not as though there is a lack of programs employing nonprofessionals but rather a dearth of carefully planned and coordinated action and research that would provide a means of evaluating the new-careers concept.

In the spring of 1966, over 8,000 nonprofessionals were being employed in Community Action Programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity in twenty-three large cities in the country. (One observer estimates that 24,000 nonprofessionals have been employed as a result of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.) Among agencies of the federal government, the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime and the Office of Manpower, Employment and Redevelopment have also supported demonstration programs employing many nonprofessionals. However, the lack of uniformity of job descriptions and titles in various agencies and
cities, the scant amount of systematic training in most programs, and the emphasis on ad hoc action programs rather than job and career development limit the learning that such experiences will afford. In addition, surveys now underway of nonprofessional programs in various agencies either have not reached the stage at this writing to provide answers to some of our questions, are not addressed to these issues, or themselves suffer from some of the handicaps to study to which we have alluded.

The Potential of the Poor

There is some evidence, largely impressionistic, concerning the capacity of the poor to assume new jobs in the human services, but, as would be expected from the nature of current experimentation, little knowledge of their ability to attain new careers. We are not, for example, gaining evidence concerning the potential of the adult poor to acquire education and knowledge considerably beyond their present achievement, although some of our experience suggests that such variables as meaningful employment, instruction related to job needs, and opportunities for higher education may be sufficient to effect upgrading. Inasmuch as indigenous workers were sought by many agencies in order to serve as bridges to disadvantaged target groups, the question also arises whether those most capable of mobility are unlikely to enhance services because they are already quite removed from the clientele.
Those who find the poor too limited to assume new roles in the human services stress the deleterious effects of poverty, while those with confidence in their educability and trainability either emphasize their strengths or base their assumption on the results of studies indicating that most human beings, including even the mentally retarded, have the capacity to perform at a higher level than they do. It is also maintained, based on some current training experiments in industry, that with some extension of training time, a very high proportion of persons with limited intelligence can be prepared for positions requiring semi-technical skills.

The negative position which emphasizes the "scars" of poverty has been stated by Sherman Barr:

> It is extremely difficult to vitiate the effects of the many years of poverty, brutalization, and discrimination endured by many poor indigenous persons. Expected limitations remain pervasive in spite of training efforts.

The corollary to this type of approach is the view, also held by Barr, that indigenous persons who have been less disadvantaged are more valuable—"...those who were most successful had in the main experienced less poverty, were better educated and had managed their lives with a reasonable degree of success and productivity."

Those who are impressed by the special knowledge and style which nonprofessionals bring to a program for low-income populations are less likely to use professional criteria to evaluate nonprofessional performance and are also more prone to stress
that those who appear to be poor risks in terms of delinquency and lack of formal education, perform as well as persons who by ordinary personnel standards appear more promising. While critics may find the poor lacking in verbal skill, adherents to the nonprofessional trend point to the fact that many poor persons are articulate although few are well-spoken.

Many residents of slum neighborhoods, including some of the very poor and those dependent upon public assistance, know their neighborhoods well and are often quite canny in managing well in difficult circumstances. Such knowledge and know-how can be a valuable asset in human-service programs, both in familiarizing professionals with the problems, behavioral modes, and expectations of the clientele and in providing direct service, particularly to newcomers. In the latter respect, some of the traditional self-help patterns of the poor can be incorporated into the professional service. However, Barr appropriately warns that we must guard against glorifying a plucky approach to deprivation and its con-comitant acceptance of the status quo.

Persons who have themselves endured poverty and slum life sometimes offer a perspective on behavior which may enhance professional understanding. Although some nonprofessionals are able to interpret behavior in psychological terms, they are more likely to find external rather than intra-psychic explanations of behavior. Their tendency to react strongly to material
deprivations, lack of food, clothing, heat, often tempers our penchant to emphasize psychological variables but on the other hand may sometimes reflect their lack of training.

It has been maintained that the knowledge as well as some of the know-how of the indigenous workers is not so special and can be learned by good professionals. Such a position deals with part of the rationale for indigenous staff, their ability to enhance a program as a result of their proximity to the clientele; however, it overlooks the manpower issue which is whether nonprofessionals can acquire some of the skills and perform some of the tasks now done by professionals. And, in addition, while professionals may be able to learn the styles of the poor, present preparation is not, in fact, geared to inter-class communication.

Among the disadvantages of some nonprofessionals is their lack of empathy and understanding of the clientele. They tend sometimes to look down on deprived persons and to be contemptuous of persons who manage less well in what they consider to be comparable circumstances. Although it is sometimes assumed that proximity to slum life will free neighborhood workers from negative attitudes toward clients, many persons who have lived in poverty have some of the prevailing middle-class attitudes toward the poor, indeed are, as studies have shown, less liberal as a group than the upper classes. Those who have been the victims
of social inequities themselves may nonetheless feel that persons are individually responsible for their circumstances and that recipients of services have relinquished the right to make demands on the dispensers of aid for which they do not pay. But such attitudes are not always as damaging to relationships as would be expected, perhaps because certain nonprofessional roles permit workers to be so helpful to clients—assisting with child care, shopping, and serving as translators and escorts on clinic visits to schools, clinics, and other institutions. Also, the attributes of some nonprofessionals, their spontaneity, warmth, and informality as well as a relationship more akin to reciprocity than that of donor-donee compensate for some of the attitudinal factors.

Riessman and Rieff have suggested an expediter role for some nonprofessionals in which their ability to communicate across class lines can be utilized to put clients in touch with community resources and to influence such institutions in the direction of greater responsiveness to low-income clientele. However, the problems which many lower-income persons have in dealing with authority and their experience in jobs that discourage and even punish initiative inhibit their ability to affect institutional policy.

An important issue related to the capability of the poor is that of "creaming." This is a particularly salient question
when one thinks in terms of employing large numbers of the poor, a requisite for affecting employment problems and manpower shortages. Are we, it is asked, skimming off only the most competent members of the lower-income groups who are less in need of new jobs. More to the point, is there a saturation point very close at hand beyond which most of the poor have qualifications too thin to warrant hiring. When career mobility is a factor, creaming becomes even more important. We have already alluded to conflicting opinions as to whether the less well educated and those who rank lower on a variety of socio-economic variables are less able workers in human services. Perhaps, despite the findings of several competent groups like the Howard University Center and the National Committee on Employment of Youth—that our criteria for assessing the capacity of candidates is not particularly relevant to performance—even the low-risk candidates have been creamed with respect to attributes important for jobs in the human services. That is, they are probably superior to most other poor people in their capacity for warm and positive social relationships. That we are creaming in terms of hiring the most middle-class oriented slum residents and therefore the less disadvantaged is suggested by the findings of Charles Grosser who analyzed the results of a survey administered to a community sample, professional staff, and indigenous workers at Mobilization for Youth. Despite efforts to hire a set of workers that
when one thinks in terms of employing large numbers of the poor, a requisite for affecting employment problems and manpower shortages. Are we, it is asked, skimming off only the most competent members of the lower-income groups who are less in need of new jobs. More to the point, is there a saturation point very close at hand beyond which most of the poor have qualifications too thin to warrant hiring. When career mobility is a factor, creaming becomes even more important. We have already alluded to conflicting opinions as to whether the less well educated and those who rank lower on a variety of socio-economic variables are less able workers in human services. Perhaps, despite the findings of several competent groups like the Howard University Center and the National Committee on Employment of Youth—that our criteria for assessing the capacity of candidates is not particularly relevant to performance—even the low-risk candidates have been creamed with respect to attributes important for jobs in the human services. That is, they are probably superior to most other poor people in their capacity for warm and positive social relationships. That we are creaming in terms of hiring the most middle-class oriented slum residents and therefore the less disadvantaged is suggested by the findings of Charles Grosser who analyzed the results of a survey administered to a community sample, professional staff, and indigenous workers at Mobilization for Youth. Despite efforts to hire a set of workers that
was representative of the community, nonprofessionals, although more like community respondents than professional staff in social attitudes, were closer to the middle-class staff than to the community sample in outlook.

Most of the issues concerning the capacity of the poor can be rationally considered, perhaps resolved, if we recognize that nonprofessional jobs require various levels of competence and that there is a wide range of capability and trainability among the poor. George Brager has, for example, stressed the need for determining program goals and in turn the different kinds of social and technical competence required.

Several schemes for determining roles of professional and nonprofessional personnel in social work have been developed and are applicable to other human services, as well. In 1961, William Richan devised a scheme for four categories of personnel, professional, specialist or technician, subprofessional, and aide, based on two variables—client vulnerability and worker autonomy. Perry Levinson and Jeffry Schiller have recently suggested another useful typology. Three levels of workers, preprofessionals, semiprofessionals, and subprofessionals are proposed, each with different kinds of tasks, training, and career expectation.

The typology of Levinson and Schiller helps to clarify an important issue concerning nonprofessionals, their marginal
status between client and professional and the tendency of some nonprofessionals to be jealous of and competitive with professionals. One group of workers would be geared toward professional channels such as supervision, training of other nonprofessionals, or through significant increments. (It should be noted that a job is not necessarily a means of averting poverty unless the salary is above poverty level. Yearly incomes for nonprofessionals tend to be about $4,000, an amount only slightly above the poverty level for a four-person family with two children according to the calculations of the Social Security Administration.) The professional's proximity to the clientele would by definition be decreased by acquisition of middle-class status but he would gain professional knowledge and training. As Emmanuel Hallowitz has observed, one need not be identified with the poor to have a commitment to them, an attribute which many professionals possess and which former preprofessionals would be likely to retain, particularly if training were geared to maintenance of these attributes. For the subprofessional who would be engaged in routine tasks now performed by professionals and who may not even have client contact or an office in the slum community, the problem of losing identification with the poor as a result of employment in an established community organization, is not relevant to adequate performance. Role discrepancy for the semiprofessional, who would be upwardly mobile as
a result of a new career but whose job requires continued close-
ness to the community, would be high but perhaps mitigated if 
agency rewards are in contrast to most current practice, no 
longer solely associated with professional status.

New-Careers Training

As was probably apparent from our discussion of some of 
the pros and cons of employing nonprofessionals in human-service 
roles, it is impossible to assess potential without specifying 
the types of training which new workers will receive. Particu-
larly because nonprofessionals are by definition not trained for 
their jobs, their capabilities to a different degree than those 
of professional workers are the responsibility of those who 
employ them, unless, as has been suggested, their training 
is integrated into the educational-vocational system or carried 
out by independent training institutes, perhaps with university 
connections or auspices. Because hiring organizations are now 
called upon to make substantial commitments of staff time and 
money to prepare the new workers, employment of nonprofessionals 
makes demands upon an agency different from those required by 
other types of staff and can, as a result, negatively influence 
attitudes toward hiring them.

Although agencies must supply more training for entry jobs 
to nonprofessionals than to professionals, nonprofessionals are 
not currently accorded privileges for career mobility comparable
to those offered professionals. The latter can often acquire considerable education and training at agency expense; indeed they may receive stipends or remain on staff during the entire period of graduate or professional study. Lest status inequities be abetted by organizational practices, these practices must be extended to nonprofessionals. Such educational opportunities for nonprofessionals would include the means to acquire high-school equivalency, associate of arts, bachelor, and graduate degrees.

Perhaps the best argument for devising training resources independent of the employers is that it would make the new workers less dependent upon the organization and therefore freer to represent the community concerns that conflict with agency plans. The danger of being co-opted by the organization through reliance on it not only for a job but for training would also be somewhat mitigated. Training could also become more generic, less tied to a particular work situation and therefore more conducive to job and career mobility. Training for upward mobility, which has not received much thought thus far is much more likely to get careful consideration if training is the province of groups whose major role is training rather than direct service. For example, the California Center for the Study of New Careers and the Howard-University group, neither of which have primary interests in direct service, have made significant contributions to the analysis and development of training.
strategies and to the question of implementing the new-careers plan.

Some of the assumed learning needs or attributes of nonprofessionals suggest that proximity to a work situation, if not a particular job, is important. If one is not employed in the very job for which he is being trained while he receives that preparation, experiences in employment programs for disadvantaged persons, particularly youth, have suggested the advisability of a close relationship between training and the job as well as the promise of work following apprenticeship. But there is nothing about these requirements for training nonprofessionals that could not be incorporated into a training institute which has close working relationships with the agencies hiring nonprofessionals.

The more careful programs involve an intensive formal training reinforced by close on-the-job supervision and in-service training. Typically there is a two or three-week orientation to the particular professional discipline, the agency and service, and some introduction to basic knowledge required to do the job. Following is a period of combined supervised field work and instruction, the latter dealing with specific skills and information to perform the task, general knowledge required of all human service roles such as an understanding of human behavior and of social problems, and individual and group exploration of problems encountered in the work situation.
Because the nonprofessional is the untrained worker, emphasis until recently has been on training the nonprofessional. Yet, the preparation of large numbers of disadvantaged persons for careers in human services would necessitate re-training of professionals and development of some apparatus to train the trainers.

As Joan Grant has noted, there is little in the way of formal programs to orient professionals to work with nonprofessionals but rather attention tends to be focused on issues of professional resistance such as concern over giving up parts of the professional job or fear over lowering standards.

While some professional resistance to nonprofessionals stems from factors other than their capability, the difficulties which their employment poses to professionals who supervise and train them should not be overlooked. Their resentment of professionals, which is most likely to be openly expressed in a setting that encourages the independence of nonprofessionals, is often related to difference in social class and, frequently by ethnicity or race. These status differences are frequently aggravated by the organization of many human-service institutions. The hostility of nonprofessionals toward professionals may be a projection of past bitter experiences but may reflect ongoing mistreatment including the prejudices of many professionals toward the poor and members of disadvantaged minority groups. Furthermore, the nonprofessional
does not belong to the professional culture and is prone to question many of its basic assumptions. Such behavior may also pose a challenge to the professional who must justify his practice.

The professional who can learn to face these various assaults and to deal differentially with biases that are his own, that of the nonprofessional and of the institution, is likely to become a much more competent worker, particularly with clientele whom the nonprofessional resembles. It is, however, the usually confident professional who can respond rationally to such challenges, particularly those which pertain to his own discrimination against the poor. As has been suggested by several observers, competence in supervising and working on a team basis with nonprofessionals should be developed during the period of professional study as well as subsequently through in-service training after graduation.

Training of nonprofessionals for human-service careers may well become a new area of concentration for professionals in the human services. For example, graduate schools of education may offer a course of study in training nonprofessionals in the schools. However, such formal recognition of the new specialty should not preclude the use of nonprofessionals themselves as trainers. Probably the most extensive work with trainers of nonprofessionals is underway at Lincoln Hospital in New York City.
where persons are being prepared as trainers of mental-health aides on a citywide basis and where careful manuals of training materials have been prepared.

Implementing the New-Careers Plan

Implementation of the new-careers plan depends upon whether the public can be convinced that it is worth supporting (since new careers will be mainly in the public sector) and on a couple of factors related to the organization of the human services. To a certain extent public support will be forthcoming if it can be argued convincingly that the employment of the poor in some tasks now performed by professionals and in others which are not currently assumed would improve the quality of services and alleviate manpower shortages. The question of competence and organizational factors such as attitudes of the professions or of the incumbents of service bureaucracies are frequently reciprocal. Professionals may, for example, resist redistribution of service tasks for a variety of reasons unrelated to efficiency of service, and their attitudes may in turn seriously undermine opportunities to test the potential of new careerists. The question of competence, as we have already noted, is not being systematically addressed in most of the experimental programs with nonprofessionals and, as a result, despite considerable activity, we are not in a position to argue that nonprofessionals can do the job.
J. Douglas Grant, Director of the New Careers Development Project of the University of California, suggests that there are three major ways in which money could be funded for new careers: utilization of existing budgets, budget conversion, and new budget sources.

One proposal for adding nonprofessionals to the educational system focuses on utilization of existing budgets. Arthur Pearl has proposed that thirty percent of the projected budgets for new teachers through 1970 be spent on jobs for new professionals and seventy percent, for hiring nonprofessionals. Nonprofessionals would perform the technical but less complicated aspects of classroom work and teachers would be freed to do more teaching and other thoroughly professional activities, including training and supervising the nonprofessionals. This modification of the employment structure in the field of education would create a half million new jobs with no additional cost to the taxpayer. But the question which we have not answered for the legislative and executive departments and their constituents is whether such a policy would enhance instruction and learning. Some would say that reduction of the projected number of professionals is not desirable under any circumstances. The alternative to restructuring in response to manpower shortages has often been to do nothing. As experts at the National Committee on Employment of Youth have observed: "The tendency is to make do within the system, primarily at the expense of service to the client."
On the other hand what might happen, as population growth increases the demand for teachers is that even greater scarcities of trained personnel would occur and that the more qualified teachers would be employed in Scarsdale and the new-careers plan would be tried in Harlem, not because it is desirable but because it is better than nothing. Critics such as Sherman Barr have warned that the use of nonprofessionals may be just one more instance of offering lower-quality services to the poor.

Conversion of budgets involves the use of monies allotted for one purpose, for example, national defense, for the human services instead, assuming of course, that some of the funds would be used for hiring nonprofessionals. The prospect of converting part of the national defense budget, which is reckoned in digits unknown to expenditures for health, education, and welfare seemed a possibility a few years ago but now seems to have been buried in the Viet-Nam debacle. Indeed one wonders what factors other than foreign policy and military exigency are involved in the escalation of the war in Asia. Perhaps military means of alleviating structural unemployment seem more expedient than the uncertain course of redefining tasks in the human services and increasing the demands for such civilian programs. A more likely source of reconversion, albeit much smaller, is funds already being spent for welfare.

The third means of financing new careers is to increase expenditures in the human services irrespective of reductions
in existing budgets. It is very difficult to determine whether increases in welfare spending are the result of reconvension or new spending, short of large decreases in expenditures in other sectors of the economy and an announced government policy concerning reconvension. However, the amounts of money spent on Head Start and Medicare, both of which increase the demands for medical and teaching personnel, probably represent new monies for human services, some of which could be used for hiring non-professionals.

Even if funds are available, as they have been in some cases, the present organization of the human services may hinder the development of new careers or of experimentation to determine their feasibility. In New York City, the availability of funds did not appear to be the factor preventing restructuring. In June 1964, former Mayor Robert F. Wagner issued an Executive Order on the subject of "Restructuring to provide greater utilization of all city departments and agencies." Agencies were to "study functions performed by professionals, technical and other skilled employees for the purpose of determining those job tasks which can be performed by personnel with lower skills." On the basis of the studies they were to "reassign functions and duties and restructure jobs to maximize the utilization of persons with lesser skills." In the eighteen months remaining of the Wagner administration scant restructuring was accomplished and only where experiential rather than educational qualifications were
lowered for new entry jobs.

That the Mayor's order was not implemented, despite staff shortages, nation-wide interest in employing disadvantaged persons, and at least impressionistic evidence of the value of low-income nonprofessionals, indicates that there are important obstacles to their employment in the large public bureaucracies characteristic of the human services. Although careful study is required to define the precise nature of these barriers they are assumed to stem from a variety of sources, some inherent in large organizations and others related to professional, union, financial, and legal factors.

There may be both legal and quasi-legal problems in restructuring, the former resulting from the enabling legislation and the latter from civil-service, licensing, or departmental regulations. Either federal, state, or local laws may stipulate that only certain kinds of tasks can be performed by certain kinds of people. A type of related difficulty pertains to the inviolability of job descriptions rather than of laws.

Chief among professional qua professional concerns is the attitude, to be found in all professions, that no matter how simple a task appears it demands a worker who has a total understanding of the client's, patient's, or pupil's situation and is thus able to recognize, as it were, both the symptom and the underlying problem. A resistance to the division of tasks and/or emphasis on the generalist rather than the technician naturally
would give rise to fear on the part of professionals that the employment of less well-educated workers in a service capacity would necessarily represent a lowering of standards.

Another serious obstacle to restructuring may grow out of the status concerns typical of bureaucratic employees. These fears may be reinforced by their membership in unions and may therefore become a more powerful source of resistance to restructuring. The supervisors of the present entry staff may fear that their status and salary scale would be lowered, since in large bureaucracies, supervisors tend to be paid on the basis of the level of staff they supervise. Thus if they were to be supervisors of investigator aides rather than of social investigators, they might have less prestige and a lower salary. Present line staff also anticipate that their status would be diminished if persons with less education were hired to perform some of the tasks that they formerly did. Related to these points is the objection often raised by administrators that the introduction of persons with a special status is likely to destroy or lower morale of existing staff.

Conclusion

The appeal of the new-careers plan, that it is a single strategy for coping concurrently with three social problems, may contribute to a confusion of the issues involved. Eagerness to employ the poor and to alleviate manpower shortages should not
hinder us from evaluating their service potential. And since some of us who are most interested in developing new careers are also concerned with professional services for the poor, the issues are all the more likely to be obfuscated. In the long run, embarking on a wide-scale new-careers program before we have determined the capability of the new nonprofessionals would not only be a disservice to the clients but to the new workers as well, for we may, as a result, soon let them down by laying them off. Although there is a great deal to be said for creating new jobs, regardless of their utility, something we have been accustomed to do under the guise of national security, making false claims for potential of nonprofessionals may lead to a further downgrading of the poor, additional proof that they are incompetent. Still another aspect of the employment issue may be confusing. We are urged to consider the service professions as sources of employment because they are relatively resistant to automation. However, other types of government programs, particularly public works, which would provide jobs in the short run but probably not on an extended basis, may be more valuable to the poor as a client group. If a choice must be made, new housing is more beneficial to the poor than a homemaking service to help someone manage better in her one-room hovel.

Whether the intent is to develop new roles for the poor in education, health, or public-welfare, there is a need for careful demonstration programs that do not necessarily result immedi-
ately in direct service. We need to know what kinds of service roles can be performed by persons with less than professional training and who among the poor can be recruited for these new jobs and for new careers as well. The manner and auspices of training and the preparation of trainers and supervisors are additional areas of study. Similarly, we need further investigation of the means of implementing the new-careers plan, which in turn depends on an understanding of the institutional barriers to restructuring as well as further exploration of the capacity of the poor and the kinds of education and training required for various levels of new service roles. Above all, we must recognize that the simplicity of the plan may obscure the complexity of the issues it evokes. Approached simplistically, it could be a strategy for failing simultaneously to cope with three social problems.
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