

Genevieve W. Carter
Interviewed by Maurice B. Hamovitch
In Office of USC School of Social Work
February 25, 1987

HAMOVITCH: Gen, let's go back to your early interest in research, particularly related to social welfare and particularly your experiences in Los Angeles and in California. Will you start by sharing something of how you got involved in research, social welfare research specifically?

CARTER: How I became involved in research is not too specifically related to social welfare because I had worked in animal psychology for quite a while before I discovered people. My earlier interest was in the issues that could be researched with animals, and I also looked at left and right handedness, which had direct relevance for human subjects. I was fortunate to have as my mentor an experimental psychologist, who had a great interest in students. When I was an undergraduate, he encouraged me and suffered with me while I co-authored with him two articles that were published in "Experimental Psychology." To see my name for the first time in print is something I will just never forget. I think the earlier that teachers can encourage and can lead students to publish, the more lasting are teachings in research methodology. It was sometime later that I left the graduate work and went in, during the war, to Manzanar, a Japanese Relocation Camp in California. That has been discussed in another interview with John Milner. Let us begin as I left Manzanar and came to the Welfare Planning Council in Los Angeles, where they were recruiting a research director. At this time, social sciences or educational psychology, which was one of my majors, was a fair background for the status of research in social welfare.

HAMOVITCH: What year was that?

CARTER: It was about eight or nine months before the war was over. I remember hanging out

the window of the Community Chest on Figueroa Street. I was watching balloons and firecrackers. Everybody wanted to get into some kind of action because the war was over and we could back away from all of the war deprivation and interest in what not to do on our jobs. We were thinking about planning and program development because such things had been at a standstill during the war, particularly in the field of social welfare and agency services.

HAMOVITCH: So this was late 1944, early 1945?

CARTER: Yes. If I were to go back and think where we stood at that time, I would say that our first influence in developing some kind of research base or interest in social work or social welfare was in statistics. A few things had happened in the late Twenties. The Children's Bureau had set up in their bureau what they call a reporting statistical project, which was a big step. Some said that is the beginning of the measurement of social work. This was a very early step. It did begin to count people served in either office visits or individual services. It did begin to get some idea what you could collect by numbers and then see comparisons in development in any one place and between places.

There were, I think, thirteen reporting areas across the country. Interestingly enough, at that time the public agencies and what we call the public welfare programs, didn't keep their own statistics. It was sort of a catch-as-catch-can, and the children's Bureau project had reporting forms. We collected these statistics for the public agency and published trends in and for them. Later on they said they would do their own; they thought they should do their own statistics. The public agency then began keeping its own statistics. By that time the federal government had begun to develop some forms for the states to report on their public welfare services. County interest in numbers began, I would say, with the interest of the Children's Bureau and the Census Bureau because

there were committees, for example, who worked together to get information about disabilities or retarded children or institutionalized children in juvenile homes. At that time we didn't go very far in delinquency statistics or in prison statistics. It was the beginning of trying to define qualification and, even today, we would claim that if you could define it, you probably could define it, you probably could quantify it. I think that is still good.

HAMOVITCH: Gen, what attracted you to the Welfare Planning Council job?

CARTER: Well, there were two things, I suppose. The war was over. I wanted to come back to Los Angeles. My husband was getting out of the service. We wanted to be here in Los Angeles. I didn't know much about welfare planning council work, but they explained it and the fact that they wanted a person to develop a research program. I think that is primarily what interested me because of my earlier background in experimental research. I will say that experimental method wasn't too useable at that time.

HAMOVITCH: How large a department was it? Were you it?

CARTER: No, there was Helen Dean, who was the former director and she wanted more time to do some writing. She was involved in doing a history of social welfare, but this was a very elusive kind of document to my knowledge. Nobody has been able to locate this history of social welfare in the Los Angeles area. It would be very important for your history project if this could be found. I liked the idea of the community organization and the committee work. One of my first tasks was to serve as chairman of the Japanese Relocation Committee. That wasn't too closely related to the work of the Research Department. It was certainly related to my experience in working with the Japanese Relocation Camp at Manzanar. One interesting thing that did come out of that was that the establishment of the Japanese Children's Home in Little

Tokyo raised an issue: some of the child welfare experts in the council would say that no longer do we segregate children in the institution by age, or particularly, by race. In this instance, because the Japanese who were coming from the camp where they had more or less been not rejected, but had lost a lot of their prestige, had wanted something positive and community-centered and to be identified with their own Japanese children's home. It did start that way. Later on it was integrated with the care of children generally. We had several conferences. At that time it was a matter of estimating how many children might be in the Japanese children's Home and the fact that at Manzanar we did have a center for all children of Japanese blood who were relocated from three different orphanages up and down the state. They were held in Manzanar and the people caring for them wanted to carry on the work and bring these children into a Little Tokyo center. I supported this purpose; it brought back pride to the Japanese participants.

HAMOVITCH: What was the function of the Research Department within the Welfare Planning Council, and how did it relate to the Community Chest?

CARTER: The Research Department did carry on some functions for the Community Chest, primarily connected with campaigns. It was also connected with the distribution of the services by geographic locations. This served as information and fact-gathering to indicate if everybody gave, everybody received: this was the slogan of the chest. It was to bring together the statistics that were being collected at that time. That was part of the core of the Research Department when I first came in.

Very soon there were committees, and there were several requests for studies of need and for evaluating the programs of Chest agencies as to their effectiveness and the distribution of their

services. There were a few requests regarding need for a certain type of service. At that time, there was just beginning to be an interest in distribution of services in relation to age groups, ethnicity, race, and all. At first we heard that services and agencies are not influenced by color, which meant you didn't *know* anything, but you accepted the idea of protecting people from being classified by some racial group. To gather the statistics is the only way you can ever find out if you are doing the right thing or not.

I was thinking of some of the other kinds of requests. One mechanism was in use that we don't have anymore. One of the studies determined that it was time for the Social Service Exchange to go. Social Services Exchanges are not heard of so much anymore because of professional reasons; if the client couldn't give you the correct information himself, then you couldn't make very much use of the exchange. That anyway was one of the claims, and it outweighed a concern about duplication in the use of relief money or financial assistance. Later on, as the public agencies began to pick up and index clients, and there was less reliance on the voluntary agencies and the Chest, there was less for the voluntary agencies to do. You saw, at that time, one of the important studies was youth services in the divisions of the Council because voluntary agencies were providing over half of the youth services and recreation services in the county and in the Los Angeles area. As I left the Council about fifteen years later, we found that at that time, the public agencies and the government (federal, state, county), were providing in public welfare 85 percent of the services for the people. The big role of the voluntary agencies had changed during my years there.

Planning then began to be a little more specialized, with hospital planning, and then time planning, translated into reimbursement of federal dollars for moneys expended, or planning for requests for

federal dollars to help in a new building and new services, particularly in the health area.

I think the health area and health services, medical and so on, actually broke away from planning, first as an integrated center for an urban area like this. Then later on, the child welfare, health, and the recreational services, and the family services began to splinter off. Perhaps one of the pioneer things for the Los Angeles area that contributed so much was the Youth project; the Research Department did much of the work that was the basis for the planning and developing of the project. In addition to statistics and counting, the volume of people and services, demography was one of the avenues of research and techniques and methods that we used at that time. For the first time we were interested in the distribution of services. They were coded for the addresses of who was receiving youth services: YMCA, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, and so on. They found that services were the heaviest when the families were middle income and middle class families. Where there were the poorest and the largest families, the demographic data showed that there were fewer services--although there were more and the poorest people.

At that time, I have to mention too, that the technology has certainly changed; most people have forgotten what the back beat cards looked like. They had the little holes around the card. It was the predecessor of the computers today. It was used to quantify data into yes, no, or how many spaces, and then using knitting needles (that's what they looked like) to count, you always had to make your cards come out even or you would lose out. We used to call that processing sorting. It would be like idiots' delight. Also, we used a sorter. The sorter would take classes or categories and sort them and then you would have to pick them up, count them, and how many cards fell into these various little cubicles. We had what was called a gang punch. The gang punch was something like a foot pedal. You put your cards in the top and, if you wanted to

punch a whole group of cards for yes or no, or boy or girl, you could just go right through a big stack. That would save you a lot of hand punching, where you had to handle each card separately. It proved satisfactory for that time. Then, after a while, we began to move into more technical kinds of machinery. I think those days were kind of interesting because we used to sit in committee meetings with our knitting needles and cards, listen with one ear and then punch through the holes with our hands while the meeting went on.

HAMOVITCH: When we started the interview, you started to mention how many people were in the Research Department?

CARTER: I would say about three or four professionals. There was a librarian, who also usually did some of the clerical work; there was also a secretary. This was a fairly good-sized department for that time. I think it was an interesting time in social work, too, because social workers were certainly very clinically oriented and most of them had somewhat of an aversion to figures and numbers and statistics, even fractions and division. You would have to go back through some of the basic math if you were teaching a class in statistics. Some would identify research just with statistics or just with demography. It wasn't until the theory from various social sciences began to pour in, that the concept of what was research or what was research methods began to enlarge and increase. That was true across the country. Historical method, I think, was more advanced for social work research at that time, in the 1940s and 1950s. There were still such projects going on. If you can recall, there was that Hall project and the Family Center Project, and there was a Family Court Project. That was something where some of the statistics were kept that you could count and get the volume and variations and differences between parts of the city, or about the services that were available or utilized. That study led

others to follow. We concluded: "Five to seven percent of the people get 95 percent of the services." Some of these findings have been repeated around the kinds of issues that we see over and over, like reinventing the wheel. The 1960s, particularly, were the years that I was in Washington as director of the research program in Health, Education and Welfare, welfare reform was a big thing, and so was poverty. There were numerous demonstration projects. It is interesting how this keeps coming back in this second or third round on welfare reform. The answer has been almost the same each time. We have training programs. We have the women's programs. We evaluated the differences. There were some very ingenious and some very challenging kinds of demonstrations. We kept bringing out that there were no jobs at the end of this tunnel. We were trying to see how much better, how much the situation improved. It seems to me that there lies a philosophy. You don't cause your own poverty or your own unemployment. If you cause it, you can be corrected, or your parents can be. You modify a little bit your ambitions and your motivation, and so on. We did a lot of motivation studies, where motivation is always inside the person and not in the setting or in other kinds of things. Or is there a social economic structure or influences where the same kinds of things are happening across the country that cause people to lose their job, the industry to change? The ones who tried to find their way in the economy and become unemployed, I suppose, will be getting into the next round of studies in welfare reform. I don't know why it is that every time it appears that the cause probably lies in the economy or the social system or something else, that we stop our examination and nobody wants to pursue it further--and it keeps coming up the same.

HAMOVITCH: Going back to the research work in the Welfare Planning Council: you told me about the role of the community Chest. What was the role of the Research Department in the

Welfare Planning Council and, as director, what were your roles? What were you able to do and what were you not able to do that you would have liked to have done? What were some of the accomplishments?

CARTER: Well, that is a lot. I have to break it up. I would say first, we tried to set goals for the department in thinking that a research project or a study project would produce findings. This was shown over and over again. We used to say if this is the policy or direction, and you do have a good research study to back it up, then you are on your way. If you have a research study that is not in line with current policy and funding, it would be a great one. It doesn't motivate per se, or bring about any change. I think we learned to temper our goals a little bit; at least, I know I did. You present certain facts and information and, usually, Council method. The Council method was to have a study committee of volunteers and leaders and professionals from agencies. It would be a variety of people representing different interests, who were interested in the survey or the research. They would be the sounding board to receive progress reports and, particularly, the final report of findings of an inquiry or of just observations that are systematic. The staff role was fairly well defined, too.

The technical staff person, if we were getting into a study that requires a questionnaire, would first work with the committee group, and the committee would have its input and would begin to offer questions and learn about all the data available. Then a technical person, after having a draft and getting some of these things noted down, would go off and do the questionnaire construction. It takes one integrated brain to pull a questionnaire together. You learn that early. Constructing a questionnaire is not a function of a committee. The technical person has to be very brave and say, when people have contributed enough, it is time to go off and put the thing together. The

technical people have to know when to go off and get the questionnaire constructed and whatever other instruments are going to be used. Then, I think, other important help you should get from a committee of this nature is two things. One is that they are the sounding board when some of the bugs begin to show that there must be something wrong, that something doesn't fit. Common sense is brought to the table and in the writing on the report, particularly in the interpretation. It doesn't affect the figures and the numbers so much. Then, the committee is also very important in terms of implementation if it has to go to the budget committee for funds, or if it has to be to interpret the results to agencies that are in jeopardy of losing some of their money--or perhaps even their place as a Community Chest member. This is important. The committee can be called in, and you'll have other people, other voices, to add to the credibility of what has been written. That is a pattern that is used quite frequently and is still used in a state task force. It can be in a local county committee. The planning councils across the country, more or less, use this participation method along with the studies. It isn't like a three-year study where a large research staff is busy producing more or less a theoretically-based study or one that has several middle-range hypotheses. The product is strictly very much the research team's. They may have just a committee to hear about it or sponsor it. It does incorporate the opinions--and the tempering sometimes--of the committee in the interpretation. The names are always on the publication. I don't know if that continues so much today as it did in the Forties and Fifties. I think the participation in the study was a very good experience for everyone.

HAMOVITCH: You are describing studies that the Research Department got involved with that are initiated by the planning staff. Were there studies that you initiated, and was there the same instrument of the planning staff?

CARTER: Not always. I think one of the most interesting things that we did was in the earlier days before the census data began to be placed on computer systems, particularly at a university where you could go in and get any kind of run that you wanted. It took a lot of manual figuring to work up the census data in my planning tracts for the county, to summarize this and have some kind of an interpretation of and for the community. We would have the planning areas and we, would more or less interpret the findings demographically for that county. This little publication that was a staff publication. We used to have market people come in. They wanted to know where the young families were that they could sell silverware to. Then later on we were not the keepers of the census data for the Los Angeles area. Ours was a pioneer effort. Later on, the census data would be housed in a university setting where there is much more use of computer programming. We did other studies that might be compiling research results and the knowledge base of perhaps new methods in institutional care or adoptions or something along that line that would be informative for a particular area. If it involved decisions for action about developing and enlarging a program and meeting a new need or decreasing funds or encouraging an agency to change its purpose to another purpose that would merely meet the needs today where actions should follow, then it was more likely that there would be a committee or a task force attached to it. We did feel that in some instances the research staff on their own credentials could bring out a publication that had importance for a new look or new methods or the results of demonstrations that wouldn't be heard about unless somebody brought it together and made it available.

HAMOVITCH: Can you think about some of the major studies that came out of it? As I recall, there were a number of outstanding studies that came through during that period.

CARTER: I think the first research study that I know of to go into what was to be called time

studies. It is interesting that some of the things that came out in the earlier pioneer days were better done by private firms or opinion polls types of firms. The things that we did then were picked up by others with more expertise and we would deal more with work that was in the form of demonstrations like Homemaker Service. We had been involved with public agencies and some of our pioneers there were interested in it. Frances Feldman was one, connected with the first program of Homemaker Service. We were doing follow-up studies with the Homemaker project clients, and that was also new. We were following up and asking clients how they liked the service, or did it help any, and so on. This one father we interviewed told us that he had gotten a homemaker. We asked him how it was, and he started to tell us about how he and his wife had gotten a divorce. All of his responses went from bad to worse, and then he said, "I figured that this is a demonstration and you folks make mistakes now and then and we just happen to be one of them." So we found out new things by going to what we call the horse's mouth so that the field was wide open for whatever you wanted to try out for experimentation or demonstration. That was the one nice thing. Now I think things are much more precise. When you get grant money for a particular project, everything is spelled out now.

HAMOVITCH: Didn't you pioneer in terms of some of the needs assessment studies and the methodology?

CARTER: Yes, we did some work with it, and it factors in what we call community need. It would be in relation to how many children are on the poverty level and so forth. You could quantify with four or five factors that most people agreed would influence things. We would take the concept and then break it down into these influences that more or less affected need. You could map it geographically, too. That type of community need in planning would be much

different from what we now would call a clinical assessment. The factors that go into the need of an older person at home for support help so that he could stay at home and delay institutionalization is still the same kind of conceptualized thinking.

HAMOVITCH: Do you feel that is going on now? Where is it being done? Is it being done in Welfare Planning councils or other places?

CARTER: No, not in Welfare Planning Councils now. I would say it is being done more program by program. I think we did learn over the years that if a planning council or a central place for planning extends too far and over too many diverse interests and disciplines and so on, that it falls of its own weight. There are more of what we call domains of planning: hospital planning, institutional planning, and planning for health facilities; planning for taking a sort of a system approach in adoptions. You see where the sources of referral are and the connections with the various institutions that would be involved together. You are drawing from a system-delivery domain and taking one at a time or taking major areas, though they may be sequential or at the same time. We aren't trying to do anymore the great community survey and needs assessment, and the great community plans to fulfill community needs. I think the expression used to be that community organization is really balancing needs and resources. It is real simple. We have done some distinguishing about knowledge building and accruing knowledge, and so on, haven't we? This is something a little different about knowledge or fact finding that we do for action and for social policy. We didn't use this until around 1960. What did we call what we call social policy now? We did call it more in terms of legislation, and we had procedures, and we had regulations. We had advocacy, even back in the days of the rock-making surveys, or whatever, the snake pit studies and the prison studies were called. A board or a group of citizens would go

in to visit and then collect some facts in districts of a county. We then found out that you couldn't use just a case study; you had to have some numbers.

We did do social surveys. I think we improved on that process and they went on for quite a while--until it got too burdensome. We tried to do too much with one kind of survey. Now we are more specialized. For example, Medicaid funds pay for both the elderly in their own homes and family care; also Medicaid pays for disabled handicapped. We try to put them together saying we want to integrate the services and then do the study and survey together, but they are so different in their clinical base. The professionals who provide the content for rehabilitation, and vocational rehabilitation especially, are very different from the gerontologist group. The knowledge base for the elderly is so much that we can't put it all together and come out with any kind of clarity. Their advocacy is different, and their constituencies are very different when they go to the legislature or to the community Chest or wherever, to get funding. It is the same thing at the federal level, which is guided a lot by the constituencies of various groups of services and needs, by the advocacy pathways and the connections and linkages, to get the money. I think we are more money conscious.

HAMOVITCH: Yes, but I think we always have been.

CARTER: In the Community Chest days it seems that there were sort of established things. Maybe we claimed too much for things. We were more naive in our beliefs about issues and providing certain services. We would forget delinquency or recreational delinquency. We have gone through all of those things and we really can't find the connection as cause and change our behavior. We don't make the claims that we used to make. Maybe in that way each has to go his own way and the sources of funds and also what moves people in one decade to give money for

the next decade.

HAMOVITCH: What I wanted to ask you, Gen, was something about your experience in regard to other parts of the community. We have talked about the Community Chest. We have talked about the Welfare Planning Council and the way in which you interacted with those organizations. What about other parts of the community, like the academic community, the social work or other community and also in relation to what contributions you made in terms of your staff. Who did they interact with and what happened them?

CARTER: I think there is a lot that can be said there in terms of pioneering and influencing and developing students and developing research skills, and also, some of the practical aspects of research and survey work. Let's pick one that most people in this locality know. Ernest Greenwood came to Los Angeles after publishing his book and getting his doctor's degree in experimental sociology, which is a notch or two away from doing the time study in a family service agency or bringing a group of executives together to determine whether or not family case work can be done more effectively. Bringing somebody who has some advanced skills, particularly in theory, we are always searching for the point when we began to connect up with some social science theory. Someone like Ernest--I used to call him my orchid because there were only certain kinds of things that he was ready to start with because of a certain sense of purity he had in carrying out his goals and methodology. The problem so often in where we all strive, not just one person, to follow the model of experimental method and the control approach. The problem is that we just don't have the concepts defined. It takes a little digging and a little grubby work to begin to get ready to even do a social survey. Ernest brought us a very helpful background in the social sciences and social theory. I think he began to like it whenever he found

a direct association with people and in watching some of the findings that we produced being implemented in the agencies. He went on back to academia, and I think that he took with him lot of practical ideas, particularly about social welfare services, agencies, and clients. In one way, it was interaction with the staff and with the social scientists who were brought in. Then we had block placements. There were at least two universities who offered a doctor's degree in social work or social welfare. The clinical people had a year of internship in a field work placement at a higher level, more or less as an intern. One of them was Sid Zimbalist. We had another one, Irving Allen. He was a very creative young guy with lots of ideas. One of them was to pay delinquents; it would work better than all of the casework that we would do. Just pay them off, they will behave. The field work students then took on quite a bit of responsibility. They would have a little committee for study. They would, at the same time, do some of the work in demography and service statistics and some of the routine things of the Council. The important thing that I think they did learn was something about the community agencies and community behavior, and the flow of money, and how agencies stayed in business or they did not stay in business. These were some of the practical things. Including the USC School of Social Work and the master's level placements, there were probably five, six, seven or more researchers who went through the Planning council Research Department for their training and their development. I used to call them Carter's boys. I would say, "Well that was one of Carter's boys." I was proud to have these young men that I had worked with go ahead and advance. Most all of the people who were associated with Planning Council research, especially the administrators, also had quite a scholarly attitude. They were already teaching at the universities. They all taught classes. I was teaching community organization and research methods. These were two classes that I

taught off and on. I taught even when I went to Washington. I still taught one class. Sometimes I call it my mental health exercise because it was good to have these eager students to welcome you for what you had to offer when you had to be always in an applied situation where you were exposed to the community. You had to work hard to get your relationships established, whereas in a class it is already there for you. All you have to do is to develop it. Furthermore, I would say, some of us who were in the Planning Council research business at that time were very interested in seeing the development of research in schools of social work, particularly in the faculties. For a time the schools of social work brought in a person with research discipline to teach general research methods. That wasn't easy in those days. I remember one, we didn't have the content very well organized for research methods class. Social workers weren't just eager not asking and crying to have some more statistics or research methods or to have a Master's thesis or to get involved in group research. Somehow, at sometime in an earlier stage, measurements and statistics or a qualification was deemed unprofessional in the sense that it didn't really lend itself to individualization. Working toward individualization and then working toward categorized groups and classifications is sort of helping it, sometimes using opposite sides of your brain. This was part of the thinking, and really the ambitions, of most of us: to see the people of social work getting their own faculty and developing research teaching to not just something important every now and then, but as a part of the core curriculum and the faculty. I think that the Welfare Planning council research people served a purpose--a transition while schools of social work were building up and developing research teaching within the faculty.

At the same time, across the country, those of us who were engaged in research departments and planning councils organized ourselves into a group called a SWRG, Social Work Research Group.

I think that is probably an unknown group of letters to most social workers now in the NASW. This was an attempt then to nationally include the membership of social workers in the beginning integration of research and practice. For fifteen years I went back and forth from Los Angeles to New York and later, I think, a couple of times to Washington with the National Association of Social Workers. That was always an important goal to those of us who served on the board and who served as chairmen of the various sections. Community organization, for instance, was a separate section at that time and earlier, and was very involved in community surveys and in studies of integrated service, coordination, and so on for a particular client or community wherein the services the agencies were integrated and cooperating and could work together. Back then we called them service systems or delivery systems. SWRG continued for maybe eight or nine years. It developed at that time a grandfather clause. I think those who had not completed a master's degree in social work were incorporated into the membership organization. Later on that didn't seem to make much difference. As time went on, you were seen as something different, or a different kind of person than those who came through casework. Casework was a major part of social work at one time. Later on, the schools of social work brought in people who had a wide range of skills and experiences in field work. Some were more adapted to research and wanted to continue it; some worked better and wanted to continue in casework practice. SWRG does have a place in the history of the development of research, and a large part of SWRG's development on the research for the profession had its base in the Planning Council Research.

HAMOVITCH: You mentioned that you were active in SWRG. You were also active in the community organization group. How would you identify the research director in the Planning

Council or the Community Chest? Research or community organization or hybrid, or what?

Were you equally accepted in both groups?

CARTER: I think so. At that time I was very curious about this area called community organization. It was not considered at that time as a method of social work. But social work deals with casework, group work, or community organization. The group worker can be just as interested in research, and so can a caseworker. The community organization worker has more demands to also be able to identify a problem, to define it in terms of what kind of fact-finding information is needed for action, or to give help in program development, and to determine with what resources you can do a survey or validate needs. Usually that involved some kind of systematic inquiry; whether or not you use 110 percent research, it has to be systematic. I would say about the qualifications of a researcher in the Planning Council work or in a community organization setting, you would be a rather lonesome person without knowing how to organize and how to get the people together who had a problem. You needed to define it, to define the kind of units that you were going to be involved with, and then to predict what kind of a report you have about facts and information that the decision-makers need about budget or resources, in order to make good decisions about program development or delivery of services.

HAMOVITCH: Am I remembering correctly that you were director of Welfare Planning Council for a while?

CARTER: Yes, that is right.

HAMOVITCH: How did that come about and how were you seen? Isn't that unusual? I mean the connection is there as you point out, but do you know of any other research directors who ever became directors of the planning part of a council?

CARTER: That is like asking do I know of another woman across the United States who ever became a planning director. No, not at that time. There was one in Eastern Canada who was director of a welfare planning council. Women just were not too acceptable at that time, I think. I have to say I was probably more of an interim person. That was really blazing of a trail. The primary volunteers are going to be president of Telephone and Telegraph or one of the three or four banks put together, and to be able to meet them at the California Club, or somewhere exclusive like that, to prepare the agenda. Their business associates will ask, "Who is this lady you were with at lunch the other day?" It was still a societal type of problem where the woman staff person as director would be having conferences and so on with the big businessman. Those were the people who were the leaders in most community chests and planning councils—usually the president, the vice president, and especially the treasurer. I would say that it was an unusual situation, but I don't think that is true anymore. For one thing, the councils aren't as strongly tied to the business interests as they used to be, and women are certainly more acceptable in all kinds of administrative position now.

HAMOVITCH: As I recall, as research director, you involved a lot of these same people on committees to work with you in terms of the research. I remember Bob Dockson from Security Pacific, and there were a couple of other people. The Tax Payers Association didn't seem to have that attitude. Did they?

CARTER: No. First of all, they were younger and more accustomed to reform than the substantial business leader, who is sixty-five years old, or somewhere in that age group. They were not on the study committees and task forces. It was the younger leadership in the community--the younger businessman came on a committee. We had quite a few of those. We

were beginning to get them. I think it was an emerging thing. If it was continued, we could have continued to get in more of the middle-age business people or those who were really tough. They were the top leadership, but we were getting the young ones coming up.

HAMOVITCH: After you left the position as director of the Welfare Planning Council, you went to an interesting job in Washington. Could you share some of your experiences with that? What were you able to bring to that Washington job from California?

CARTER: That was a big jump because my experience had been so wrapped up in social work education interests and in voluntary work. To be plunged into government at the federal level with big time finance like the House Finance Committee holding what you could call the black book, that is all the facts and figures to brace the Commissioner when giving testimony or giving testimony myself, sometimes, and having what is really picking out studies and research that would influence a budget of millions and millions, rather than just a small budget. It was a really big jump. I think what I brought from the local level to the federal government was a multi-disciplinary understanding, and I was not fearful about jumping right into almost any kind of service that was on the agenda. That was anything that was financed or consumed or being produced as a bill or a program to be followed. For example, mental retardation came in with a big burst at that time. I had mentioned most any kind of service and this little micro-world right here in the Los Angeles area had a sample of everything. This was a big urban area and I brought a very broad experience in terms of a whole range of services. I wasn't confined to any one.

HAMOVITCH: Gen, excuse me for interrupting. What year was that and what was your exact title?

CARTER: I was Director of the Research Division in the Office of the Commissioner for the

Welfare Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I was not in education, nor was I in the health end. I was in the broad welfare administration that had Medicaid and Medicare and programs on the aging and family services and the Children's Bureau and the agencies familiar to most of the social workers.

HAMOVITCH: That was what year?

CARTER: It was 1963. At that time the theme was implementation of the 1962 Social Security Amendments. A social work approach was to be implemented throughout the AFDC programs, where the workers at the local level were to have some training in the work place, at least some social work methods, and many of them, began to employ some social workers. The results were somewhat over promised, shall we say. The AFDC case load, instead of being reduced, expanded and expanded. We understand why. It is that whenever a program is revised and improved and makes public its eligibility criteria, it takes three or four years to build up the program to a level of stabilization. Nobody had figured on that, so that it wasn't our evaluations and some of our analysis about what was happening. It was a little on the crises side because of the way the case load was going at that time. I learned, sometimes through the hard way, about social policy and what kind of information and knowledge would influence the budget at the federal level. Part of the time we would deal with, let's say, unmarried mothers—which was certainly one of the programs of the Los Angeles area. How the terminology has changed is interesting. We talk about teenage pregnancy now. We have different names for what were the same kinds of concerns that were present in the Thirties and Forties on welfare reform models. I don't know how anyone could think up anything new, but maybe they can. All of them were tested at the expense of millions of dollars. It was shown rather clearly that it does not affect employment, that

people will not quit their jobs and that the AFDC case load will turn over one third each year generation after generation, no matter how much training is done for jobs, unless there are jobs at the other end and there is work for people. We saw this in wartime. The number of people that went to work meant that unemployment just wasn't there; everybody was working. These lessons that we have learned come in cycles. You can see them very plainly from the federal level, but just on a bigger scale. I'd say the same kind of tensions were there. The studies were vigorous. The amounts available for study and for research and surveys in the Sixties and early Seventies were a delight to work with. You can't even find the remains of those grants anymore. They have just gone. They melted away.

In time of expansion there is always an effective use of research for planning programs. In a time of retrenchment, of cutting, there is really not nearly the amount of research and fact-finding necessary because there are other kinds of rational used for cutting rather than information and facts about needs or utilization. One other area that opened up in the Sixties that I think has affected social work, and has certainly affected research, is the whole area of gerontology and, especially, social gerontology. In previous years, when we looked at our figures, no matter what kind of figures we saw about population, most of the studies referred to those sixty-five plus. This means that you don't bother after sixty-five; all are cut from the same cookie dough and if you see one old person, you have seen them all. Now, with the lengthening life span, people are living longer. Therefore, we have this increasing number of elderly in the eighties and the Nineties. I think it was very clever to have introduced the notion that eighty-five is the old old. You have the young elderly and sort of the middle elderly, and we have the old old elderly. This way we don't see them as just one big blur now or as a statistical ghost; they are real people, and

they are increasing all around us.

Now we are especially facing up to the utilization of hospital and medical care and the proportion of resources that are going to older people. Studies are particularly important now as to how we are going to handle the long-term care programs and old people who don't have a family to help take care of them. What is going to happen with them? So some of these issues are new and particularly the issues where the need for care of the elderly is increased by deterioration and mental status; Alzheimer's, and related disorders. We have these problems before us and there is a whole wide arena for research and study with not too much money being turned loose for research or for trying to find answers. Each community now uses its own creative challenging efforts to handle their own issues. I don't know what is going to happen as more and more the federal government says the state should handle these problems, and the states say the localities must handle their own problems. Nobody passes along any money to do this, so for those who come after me maybe the creative work and the challenge will be more important than it has ever been.

Another change I think of as my own life span moves along is in these concepts of privatization of the medical industry, the home service industry, the contract bids for prisons, and care of delinquents. It is moving along as if it were a marketing type of operation and enterprise. This is a new look at something we have to adapt to for those of us who thought of social work and social welfare services in the Forties, Fifties, and Sixties, and so on. It is here to stay. We were talking about HMOs and how to compute capitalization rates, how to compute the risks, how to compute insurance rates. Those issues were unheard of back in the Welfare Planning council days. Each hospital just figured out how much it costs and tried to make good by sending out the

bills. Now everything must fit in to the reimbursement formula and the regulations and the bureaucratic procedures that must be followed or there are not fund to take care of the service. These are new things coming along and that there have to be changes and this affects what the kind of research is being done or the kind of investigations. The use of the work "marketing" is very common now in every private agency, with the formula that any private agency should have at least seven percent or five percent profit. It is sort of like rewarding paid executives and administrators of health facilities if the costs are kept contained. If the cost is kept within a certain level, then the bonus comes at Christmas time for the administrator and the executive, not the rest of the staff--but for the ones who manage to keep the cost capitation at a certain level. These are things that now are part of the whole social work and welfare picture. It is for others to pick up the torch and carry it. I think one of the things I learned most at the federal level is that the research study as a research project is very important when it is taking the direction of the policy. It reinforces it; it moves it along fast; and it works well. No matter how good the research product is or how appropriate or opportune, if it is not in the direction of the policy that controls the budget and the money, then nothing is going to happen, and the money expended has really been wasted. You have knowledge, but too often the information and knowledge are not properly brought together so that the next decade can use it. If we have a strong administration that does some very excellent work, then the next administration at the federal level and think, "Well, you know the previous administration couldn't possibly have done anything very good." So we just began over again and ask the questions a little differently and then we will provide the knowledge. This goes on from one administration after another and the continuity and the integration of a continuation on the research stream, on the factual and information stream, is lost.

A lot of money is lost because there is no way of retaining this knowledge. If I move back from the federal level, come back to the community at USC and the research center there, the work is primarily on a grants-administration basis. It was a more contained and simplified type of program, at least in volume, than we were conducting at the federal level where there were fifty people in the in-house research program and twenty-five PhDs keeping you hustling all the time in different areas. The university was a pleasant atmosphere, where you had time to do a little thinking and where you could also teach again. It was also a level where it is more face-to-face so that for several years there, it was on grants; social welfare primarily, the WINN programs and other training programs. Training-program research is still a big supporter to some extent. I don't know what is going on now in terms of the grants available.

HAMOVITCH: Excuse me. That was the period from what? Nineteen sixty-eight to nineteen seventy-three or something like that?

CARTER: Yes, 1969-1974, I believe. Of course in the interlude I was a visiting professor at Melbourne in Australia. It was the most pleasant and happy year. I came in as a scarce commodity with an occupational permit so that I could work at the University with a social survey and learn through doctoral dissertations. They had federal funds for the School of Social Studies. I had been back to the Gerontology Center in Los Angeles and again this brought in the story of the elderly population. My interest was particularly in case management and integration of services for the individual person, and in the development of the informal support system and the family helpers. This is a very interesting and productive area to study and then to use in program development. It works so well in a community where you have the home health agencies. There was some budgeting for family services to augment the family help. That has

been an academic interest, sharing authorship for one textbook and really focusing my interest. When I moved back to New Mexico after I had three retirements practically, my interest was as a volunteer, to give service. I have done proposals, I set up reporting forms; I did evaluations--very much the same things I used to do in the Welfare Planning council. I work with task force groups and do some committee reports. I was giving the time so that as this volunteer career moves along and comes to a close, my rewards are not in money, but satisfaction of giving in a constructive way. It was nice to receive the state award for outstanding volunteer in New Mexico. I was very proud when I was voted into the Hall of Fame for Senior Citizens in the Albuquerque area. Then there have been numerous certificates and letters of thanks. There is always something that you can continue doing and actually it is modeled pretty much after the old Welfare Planning Council research pattern, with a study and research and community participation.

HAMOVITCH: Wonderful. Thank you very much, Gen. I really appreciate this.