

EVA SCHINDLER-RAINMAN
Interviewed by Charlotte S. Langley
January 10, 1992

ABSTRACT

Eva Schindler-Rainman, who obtained a doctorate from the USC School of Social Work, was a notable organizer of community training activities and pioneered many devices for training personnel and for training and using volunteers to complement the work of professionals. She authored and co-authored numerous articles and books addressing these subjects. She herself served numerous organizations in a volunteer capacity. She had professional association with Girl Scouts, Camp Fires, United Way, the UCLA School of Social Welfare, and the USC School of Social Work. She pioneered new programs at the University of California, Berkeley, and UCLA. For most of her life, she lived and worked in Southern California, but the scope of her activities in voluntarism and training extended nationally and internationally. This interview describes not only her various activities as a professional and as a volunteer, but also sets forth her philosophy about voluntarism and its important role in the field of social work as well as in other kinds of endeavors, such as school systems.

Dr. Rainman had moved to Truckee, California, during the last year of her life. She died in 1996.

EVA SCHINDLER-RAINMAN
Interviewed by Charlotte S. Langley
January 10, 1992

LANGLEY: Eva, tell me about your education and how you happened to go into social work.

RAINMAN: I graduated from Hollywood High School whence I went to three different universities to finish my bachelor's degree. First was Whittier college because I had been a counselor in a Quaker camp and met a lot of the faculty. I transferred from there to UCLA and then did my last two years at UC Berkeley in the School of Social Welfare, really. It was a major in Group Work.

And then I did my master's in social work and my doctorate in social work at USC.

LANGLEY: What was your first job in social work?

RAINMAN: You mean before I got the Master's? I was doing social work all along; group work.

LANGLEY: Well, start with that.

RAINMAN: Probably the first was the counselor in a camp sponsored by the Quakers up in Sequoia National Forest, which tried to integrate native-born (not American Indian, but US-born) children with newcomer children who came from all the European countries. Since I speak more than one language, I was recruited by the Friends Society to be a counselor. That's really where I got some of my interest in group work.

The next one was probably becoming Chair of the Christmas Drive at Hollywood High School. I was appointed, anointed, selected for that because the president of the student body

said he needed somebody who cared about poor people. How he got to me, I really don't know, because what I was really interested in at that point was athletics, being on the swimming team of the school.

Anyway, I became the Chair of the Christmas Drive. It was the most successful one they ever had. I became very interested in leadership. I recruited a great big committee around me to collect clothes and food, and I developed a plan to distribute all the things that we'd collected.

So, those were probably things that had something to do with my interest in social work. Plus my mother, who was a pediatrician, had me work almost every Saturday at whatever clinic she was working in. First it was in connection with Mount Sinai Hospital (later it was Cedars-Sinai).

Mount Sinai Hospital was in Boyle Heights at the time, and I used to go every Saturday and take care of all the kids in the waiting room while she talked to the parents. Later on I was her record keeper when she volunteered to be the physician for El Nido's school for girls, a camp for girls--an agency serving up here in the canyons, serving very underprivileged, acting-out girls.

So, I guess I've really been doing social work of one kind or another, volunteering and otherwise, for a very long time.

LANGLEY: Those were interesting days, when your mother was very active, and then you went along....

RAINMAN: Yes, and she was a volunteer. She was the Chief of Pediatrics for Sinai then, and they extended the retirement age from 65 to 75 so she could continue. I think she was there until she was 78.

My father was a physician who was senior consultant and senior volunteer physician. As well as having many patients at Cedars, he also did the rounds with residents and worked in the out-patient clinic very regularly.

LANGLEY: You were really in at the beginning of the development of many of the Jewish agencies in this community, along with your mother, weren't you?

RAINMAN: Yes, but I really wasn't involved with Jewish agencies very much; El Nido was the only one. I got involved with the Girl Scouts. I got involved with the National Conference of Christians and Jews, which was one of my first "pay" jobs, up in San Francisco, as a youth director. I roamed all over the United States and Europe doing that. I was not really involved with many Jewish agencies. I never have been.

You know, I did a thing here and there for Bert Gold at Jewish Centers Association. He would ask me to come into a staff meeting or something of that kind. But really involved with Jewish agencies?--I would say I wasn't.

LANGLEY: Which agencies were you involved with in their early development?

RAINMAN: Well, American Friends Service Committee, certainly, in Whittier. I was very active in developing a family program for the YMCA in Whittier. I was active in the Girl Scouts. I won't say I helped develop them, but I probably made some suggestions around girl leadership and things of that kind.

I never belonged to very much; I'm not really a "joiner." I belonged to the American Association of Group Workers in its heyday and then NASW, and the American Civil Liberties Union and the league of Women Voters, but I'm not a big "joiner."

I don't know that I helped develop as many agencies as that I helped change a lot of them,

from Family Service, where I did my (I think it was) first year master's field work and casework with Madeline Bennett, who wasn't at all sure that I was the right person for that field placement.

LANGLEY: Where was that?

RAINMAN: That was when Family Service was on Sixth Street. I enjoyed it. I had asked Dean Johnson for a year of casework because I wanted to learn interviewing. I knew I could do groups. I'd done a lot of group work with the Girl Scouts and with the United Way (then called the Community Chest), and the Council of Social Agencies--I really rather enjoyed it, but I didn't quite fit the mold. She was not totally happy with me because I wore bright clothes and long earrings. Josephine Di Paola and Madeline Bennett tried to get me into the mold, but they weren't very successful.

LANGLEY: They didn't turn you into their mold of a social worker?

RAINMAN: No. But I had a good time, and I didn't have any trouble with grades. I think I did all right. And the casework has stood me in good stead in my interest in sensitivity training groups. I was very glad I took it.

LANGLEY: After that, where did you go?

RAINMAN: Well, now let's see--where did I go after that? I went to school for my master's on a scholarship from the Girl Scouts, so I had to go back for a year. It was called the Langendorf Scholarship: \$1500. By that time I had a son whom I was supporting. I was doing a number of things other than going to school, but I had that scholarship, so I went back to the Girl Scouts.

While in school, I taught Modern Dance at Westerly Psychiatric Center because--I had always tried to figure out whether I wanted to be a social worker or a dancer. I think if I could

have made a living as a dancer, that really would have been my first choice. But since I couldn't do that.... I was very active in the Lester Horton Dance Theater. I directed their children's dance groups for a long time.

LANGLEY: That was before there was a sequence in dance therapy?

RAINMAN: Yes. Right. And so I did dance (I think I called it "body movement") at the Westerly Psychiatric Sanatorium in Culver city, where I just worked with depressed patients particularly, just trying to get them off the floor or off the chair, to move. I enjoyed that and I got paid for it. I modeled for art classes up at Barnsdall Arts Center.

And when the good Dean discovered that I was doing all that and going to school and taking care of a young son, she was not totally pleased. But my answer to her was, "What has that got to do with anything as long as I'm in class and I make good grades and my papers get in on time?" I wasn't worn out. So she got off my case. But for a while, she was really on my case. She wasn't at all sure about the modeling. Part of me comes out of the art world, so that wasn't anything that bothered me a bit. And I happen to have a lot of artist friends.

I visited one of these people up at Barnsdall who was teaching a pottery class. The painting teacher saw me and asked me what I was doing there. One thing led to another, and I ended up being his model. I enjoyed it. I had done some modeling as an undergraduate up at Berkeley, so I kind of knew the ropes.

I went back to the Girl Scouts as the Director of Personnel in Training. That was the Los Angeles Girl Scout Council. That I really enjoyed. That was a wonderful job.

I did a lot of innovation. I wrote an article about good board meetings. It was published in the Girl Scout Quarterly, or whatever, nationally. But I wasn't allowed to sign it because staff

members were to be seen but not heard, so to speak. And I remember I was totally annoyed and said I would never write another article if I couldn't at least sign my name to it. And I wrote to National; that changed their whole policy, eventually. Staff could write articles, volunteers could write articles, we could write articles together, but names were attached.

I developed a thing--you know that I co-authored a book called Taking Your meetings Out of the Doldrums many years later.* I developed a thing at the Girl Scouts which got a lot of fame. It was a little thing called The Agenda Line. What it was, instead of writing a boring agenda, was that I strung a laundry line across a boardroom and hung colored cut-outs with clothespins on that laundry line, and as people came in, they were to guess what the agenda items were, and they were to put them in the order they thought they ought to be. That was absolutely unheard of.

LANGLEY: That made for lively board meetings.

RAINMAN: Yes. Board meetings really changed. They always wondered what I was going to do next. I had been assigned to board meetings by the executive because the chair was called the Chair of Personnel in Training, whatever that was called at the time; she was the lady I was working with. Her name was Mrs. Toni. She thought that was a great idea. She wasn't sure it would work, but she went along with all my crazinesses. That was kind of helpful.

From the Girl Scouts, where I got bored, I left and I was recruited by Dr. Robert Bartlehouse at UCLA. I had met him through my interest in role-playing. I had taken a course that he was teaching but also taking; he was co-training. He and I did some consulting--it was at the beginning of my consulting career--for the Department of Mental Health. We did some role-playing and one day he said to me, "You know, my assistant, Fay Smitter, is going to India

for a

*In collaboration with Jack Cole, 1988

year. How would you like to come to UCLA and be the Assistant of Education Extension if I can work it?"

I said, "I'm ready to leave the Girl Scouts. That's great. I'll come." And we worked it out rather easily. That got me into, then, working with school districts. My major job was to develop a coordinating council of interest--mostly counties, school districts, who wanted to improve their in-service training. We not only programmed all that, but Bob and I did a lot of the in-service training when it was relevant for us to do it. As a result of that, I was asked to do things for the L.A. City school system and for the Health Department and, you know, one thing led to another. I also was asked to do some training of the United Way--loaned executives--in how to work with people. Now we call it "human resource development."

So, at the end of the year at UCLA, where incidentally, I started probably a dozen new programs, among which was a program in parenting, for which I recruited Roz Loring as a project director. But as a result of that, Dr. Sheets--Paul Sheets--asked me to stay in Extension. When Fay Smmitter came back, I had to leave the education extension. He recruited me for the Department of Conferences, which was still an extension. There I was working with Warren Schmidt and the late Chuck Parkinson. Chuck and I were the associate directors and Warren was the director.

Paul, though, had particular designs on me. The National Adult Education Association was having its first national conference on the West Coast and that was going to be in San Diego.

As part of my conference job--since he was chairing that (he was the president of the AEA)--he asked me to become the administrator of that national conference. That led to some of my interests in national conferences.

It was very exciting because no woman had ever done that. That put me on the executive planning committee of that conference and put San Diego on my heels; that is, the media were always on my heels because they wondered how I'd done it. I don't really know, either, but it worked. It was a very good conference. I had a wonderful time. I like organizing those things. And I was also a major speaker.

So, I stayed at UCLA in the Department of Conferences and then--and I think this is relevant for this interview--there developed a program at the University of California in Berkeley which was started by the late Gertrude Wilson. It was a certificate program in social welfare for employed social workers. Paul Sheets became very interested in that and so did the late Abbott Kaplan. They sent me up to Berkeley to talk with Gertrude. We knew of each other, but we had never met. I developed the local certificate program in social welfare at UCLA, so that my job sort of changed. I was in conferences and became the "head," I think I was called--of Social Welfare Extension.

That led to Dean Howard at the UCLA School of Social Welfare, saying, "We need somebody in group work on the faculty. I'm gonna see if I can bargain with Abbott Kaplan to get you half-time on the faculty, and you can continue to develop Social Welfare Extension. We want to have something to do with it anyway, more than we have." And so I did that for a while--I don't know--a year or two. I taught group work as part of the UCLA faculty and also developed, together with Ralph Wagner, who was in casework, a whole new admissions

procedure for UCLA where we interviewed potential students. One year he did half of the individual interviews, and I did group interviews, because we found we got better data. So far as we know, that hadn't been done before in any schools of social work or social welfare. I had a lot of fun because group interviewing became, later, one of my real interests. I've written a monograph, together with Ron Lippitt, about it, which may be out of print by now, I don't know.

I got tired of UCLA and also all the changes on the faculty. After a while, I applied to the USC School of Social Work and applied for an NIMH scholarship and went on for my doctorate. While in school for my doctorate, I again taught dance and did a whole variety of things because the NIMH, though much better than Langendorf, was still not a very good stipend for someone who was fully supporting a child. I've forgotten all the things I did, but whatever I enjoyed doing and it paid money, I did it. I did a lot of modeling. And I did some teaching at USC School of Social Work as part of that stipend.

LANGLEY: Was that in group work, too?

RAINMAN: Group work and community organization. And then I stayed for a year after, getting my doctorate to finish that commitment. I got the doctorate in rather short order; I think it took me two years, something like that. I was, I believe, the first woman and maybe the third or fourth person to get a doctorate at USC.

LANGLEY: Do you remember what year that was?

RAINMAN: I think it was 1964, but it could have been a year earlier. I can look it up, but I don't remember.

Then I was asked if I'd like to stay full time. I decided, Charlotte, that I don't really like

full-time university life. I don't like the politics. I had published more than most of the faculty by that time anyway, so the publishing didn't bother me. Most of my publishing was in reputable journals and all that kind of good thing, although all over the map, you know, from the Dietetic Journal to the Adult Education Association Journal known as Leadership, too. You name it. But all were professional journals. And I had probably written or co-authored at least one book by then.

Anyway, I decided I didn't like that, so I went into full-time freelance consulting and, until this Depression, have been busier than one can possibly be. But since September 1, 1991, it's been much quieter than I'm used to.

It's interesting because I've come full circle. My biggest project, at the moment, is one with USC and the Department of Children's Services, developing an assessment and then a certificate training program, module in design, for the upper management and executive staff at the Department of Children's Services. The UCLA School of Social Welfare is collaborating in this, and so is the Long Beach State University Department of Social Welfare. UCLA is working with middle management and Long Beach with the direct service workers. It's a grant that has been given collaboratively. So, it's kind of interesting how you come full circle.

LANGLEY: How do you think you became so closely identified with the field of voluntarism?

RAINMAN: Oh, that's very easy. I became identified with that because my parents were such good volunteers, because I was an avid Girl Scout. And in the particular troop and group (later) that I was in, we did a lot of volunteering, from going to nursing homes and singing at Christmas time, to working with children. It was just a belief system in my family. I can't imagine a day going by in the Schiff (the family name) household where there wasn't some mention of

volunteering.

My father was very active, not only at Cedars, but also with the Jewish Community fund or Drive, I don't know exactly. I remember his battles around, "I do not wish my name published and the amount that I've given." I think that is just terrible. It certainly turned me off of Jewish agencies for quite a while because both he and Alice (my mother) were very unhappy with the process, not with the services, but the process that was used to acknowledge donors. I didn't like any part of it, so I stayed away.

I became very interested because I really realized that the health of this country can be measured by its citizen action. If you really want a change, you get volunteers into it--even if it is volunteers within an industrial system or a bank or, you know, whatever.

So I just got very interested in it and began to read and write and began to be asked to do a whole variety of things. Of course, in the Girl Scouts, volunteers are terribly important. I never liked the notion that staff members enable volunteers--that was the nomenclature at the time. I used to get into big battles when I'd say, "No, it's more of a partnership; sometimes volunteers enable staff. It depends on who you're working with." And then they would say, "No, no, no, Eva. You don't get it." Well, I just don't believe in this. Now, of course, you know, the whole notion is that it is a team. I think I wrote the first article: instead of volunteer-staff relationships, I wrote about teamwork; volunteer-staff teamwork.

I worked with--Marian Jeffreys was one of the people I worked with. I helped her develop her volunteer program in the Department of Mental Health. We had a terribly good time trying to figure out who were the kind of people that were needed and how do you get them to volunteer in a public agency. This was about the same time that the late Had Naylor was

doing something with volunteers in large federal public agencies on the East Coast. So, you know, one thing kind of led to another. I'm sure I'm leaving out pieces.

Voluntarism became really my major hat for a long time. There were people who were very important in that: Mary Ripley felt I had a lot to offer in this field. She got me connected with the Volunteer Center, and then I was hired to develop the Volunteer Bureau in the Watts-Willowbrook-Compton areas. That led to national visibility with letters or, I don't know what I got from President Johnson, but something. More importantly, it led to a keynote at a National Social Welfare Assembly meeting in New York, where I talked about hidden volunteers in the inner city. That got tremendous visibility.

As a result of that, Camp Fire Girls (now called Camp Fire) needed somebody who could work with inner city Camp Fire directors to get them to learn how you recruit volunteers in something other than white WASP, middle-class areas. It was a very interesting thing that happened because that also led to my meeting Ron Lippitt, with whom I worked for many years.

Helen Northen was the chairperson of a search committee to find a seminar director--the head of project director, a social worker who was doing that--under the late Helen Rowe. Helen Rowe heard me at that Social Welfare Assembly meeting and evidently phoned Helen Northen and said, "Have you ever heard of....?" "Yes, I have....oh, my God, I never thought of her." I only lived on the same hill as she did, quite aside from being one of her students. "Oh, yeah. Well, you can go ahead and interview her."

So Helen Rowe and Martha Allen, the national executive of Camp Fire, asked me to stay in New York. I was staying at the Junior League rooms at the Waldorf. They were perfectly happy to have me stay another night for \$21 or something. Very inexpensive.

I stayed, I think, two more days and got interviewed by Helen Rowe, but she also had Gordon Lippitt, Dick Beckhardt, Ron Lippitt, Clovis Shepherd, among others, from the National Training Labs, come down from Washington, D.C. to look me over and to talk with me.

Well, of that whole group, I knew Dick Beckhardt very well. And Ron and Gordon knew of me because Gordon Lippitt was a good friend of Warren Schmidt's. But I really didn't know the group. Helen didn't fly East for this at all, but she knew me, after all. We had a great good time. I got interviewed in Greenwich Village, and we went to dinner....

I knew very well how to do that, more intuitively than anything else, but I knew, from my Watts-Willowbrook experience, what people coming into an inner city (like immigrants) from the outer city needed to learn.

And it was also the time that Frank Riessman's book came out on the culturally deprived, or something like that.* I had had some interchange with Frank Riessman: in fact, I later recruited him for my first seminar, to come and talk. And I was hired, obviously.

Ron Lippitt did the piece on action research. The project was called The Metropolitan Critical Areas Project, funded by the federal government. I think it was probably the Department of Labor, but I won't swear to that. And the pilots were in New York, Boston, Baltimore, and the Roxbury area of Boston, and then a particular area in Washington, D.C. Later on we had some areas in the West and in the Midwest.

That was a very exciting project. I worked on that three or four years, not full time, but I'd fly between New York and California. My role was to design and lead the seminars and get the necessary resource people and to plan those things together with Pat Keith and Helen Rowe. The latter two enjoyed all the crazy things that we did. They were very helpful and very

supportive.

I had, by that time, been exposed to group dynamics because I had gone to the first training laboratory that NTL ever did in the West, in Idlewild. I was convinced that if learners

*Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child (New York: Harper, 1962)

participate, they're going to learn better. Also, in the meantime, I'd met Malcolm Knowles (back

in Chicago) and been exposed to the whole notion of adult learning, which I certainly didn't get in the School of Social Work--adult behavior, yes, but not learning. And I put all that together in my mind as a way of helping social workers and others that were educators and psychologists who were directors for Camp Fire. I put all that together to say, "How do we really 1) enter a community of which we are not a part and 2) how do we recruit volunteers?" That's what you have to do.

LANGLEY: You wrote a book on that, too, didn't you?

RAINMAN: Yes. Well, wrote a number of monographs and books and a big report for Camp Fire from which they eventually took their whole training manual. They wanted to use dramatic pictures. I said, "You know, it'll go out of date because we have Armenians and Blacks in Rocksbury, and all Blacks in Washington, D.C., and who knows who else? Why don't we use stick figures." I can draw a stick figure; it's about the only thing I can draw. We got a fine artist to help so that the whole manual had girls and adults, men and women, but all stick figures so that any group could use them. Now we have all this stuff on diversity, but this was long before all that kind of....

LANGLEY: Cultural diversity.

RAINMAN: Yes. Let's say, "raised consciousness" about it. That was a manual I wrote. I wrote quite a few other manuals. I don't remember them all. I got into the *National Education NDEA--National Education Defense--and something--at training inner city teachers then, both here and the Midwest and for Head Start. All of that led to quite a lot of writing.*

I think actually the first book I co-authored was The Volunteer Community: Creative Utilization of Human Resources, where the co-author was Ron Lippitt.* But I was the senior author because I had been active and very visible in the volunteer world.

In the meantime I also helped found the International Association for volunteer Effort. It was first called International Association for Volunteer Education. It was founded in 1970 at UCLA, and there were four or five of us who were kind of the founding mothers: Eleanor Wassen, Mary Ripley, Randy Anderson, and I, and a few others. The real forward-looking person who had caused that to happen was a Canadian woman by the name of Frank, who was active in the Cancer Society in Canada and said, "Why don't we do some things together." She'd said that to Eleanor Wassen, who said it to me.

That organization has become rather powerful. It is now all over the world. It has changed its name, which we did in Oxford, England, in the middle or late '70s, I don't remember exactly when, maybe later. The present president is an Australian woman. We've now had meetings everywhere. The so-called less developed (I don't think they are) countries are members. It's a very "going" concern.

And an offshoot of that was the American women for International Understanding in which I was active from the very beginning, but I'm not a member anymore because it became too elitist for my taste. That organization took well-heeled American volunteer women and

gave them opportunities to travel abroad and meet other leadership volunteer women. You have to have some money to do that, although the organization is trying to raise some scholarships.

So there were a lot of offshoots of all of that, you know. Then I spoke at the National

The Volunteer Community: Creative Use of Human Resources (Washington: Center for a Voluntary Society, 1971)

Association of Social Workers' meeting and at various and sundry national conferences. That gave the whole field of voluntarism a raised consciousness and raised visibility.

LANGLEY: Where do you see voluntarism going?

RAINMAN: Right now? Well, I think one of the things that's happened, and it will continue to happen, is that--I've always fought for equal opportunity to volunteer because in this country as elsewhere volunteering that was seen and heard and written about really started with middle- and upper-middle class, largely white (at least in this country), middle aged, middle class, middle spread, middle everything women. And if you go back to David Sold's book about voluntarism, when he was looking at the March of Dimes, that's well supported and documented.

I think what's happened is finally, because of the War on Poverty, among others, where we looked at maximum feasible participation on boards and in decision making.

Finally, voluntarism is a much more ubiquitous opportunity. We have many school districts where it is now required that students take--as part of their civics course--a course about community work and do some community work. It's interesting that in runs of my book, we suggested that in the first chapter. That book came out in 1971. It is that children from kindergarten on ought to learn about voluntarism and be given a chance to volunteer.

One of the things that he and his wife, Peggy, and I instituted was across-age volunteering

in school systems where young kids taught and tutored younger kids. There was a kit and some discipline to it.

I see it becoming even more available, and I see that the cause-oriented volunteer groups are going to grow, whether we're taking the oil off the birds because you are worried about ecology, or you're worried about human pollution, or you're worried about peace and war, or you're worried about equal housing. The sad thing is that so much of it is based on worry and concern.

I'm beginning to see some voluntarism based on visions: a vision of an art center that will serve all people in the community, (which is one of the later books that I co-authored chapters of which--by the way, as of this morning--are going to be in a book by Marvin Weisbord on frontier kinds of community-wide efforts. He's taking a whole piece out of my book as well as a new chapter I've written on, twenty years later).

LANGLEY: What about funding for these volunteer programs? Is that of concern at this point?

RAINMAN: It's always of concern, but I think it's also always possible; it depends on what it is you want to do. There are foundations who believe that volunteer efforts should be funded, or volunteer-staff efforts.

For instance, the new funding that was just announced on Wednesday--when I went to a Kellogg Center board meeting, on which I have to sit--the California Community Foundation is funding an effort by Kellogg Center to bring into collaboration all the organizations that are working on the AIDS question and helping them train their board so that they do better decision making.

Now, a lot of that money, of course, will go into administering that program and some of it will go to help with the salary of the director of the Kellogg Center. But an awful lot of it, really, will go far because volunteers are going to be enabled to do what they're doing but to do it much better. I think that's the way it's going to go where you have one or two highly skilled staff people who work with large groups of volunteers to either heighten their skills or support them or to teach specific skills.

Take the art museums--just to get away from the topic of homelessness and abused children for a minute--the art museums would be closing if they didn't have docents and other volunteers who are trained and then available to take children on tours. Never mind that they have an audio tape. You can walk around with those things plugged in your ears, you may still not know what you're looking at. You know, you can't ask an audio tape any questions.

I think you're going to see a lot more volunteers, not just in the not-for-profit arenas but in the public museums, school systems. Even our governor has said that school systems cannot possibly teach unless volunteers are available to help teachers in a whole variety of ways. We're now looking at school volunteers by the thousands in the L.A. system, many of whom are teaching. They are not the teacher, but they do what you could call instructional aiding or assistant teaching and therefore, make it possible for the teacher to focus his or her attention on the children who need it most. And they can work as a team with the teachers so that children really are exposed to more than one adult, particularly in the elementary schools.

I think volunteers are here to stay in school systems, and they don't have to be parents. Many of them are grandparents. In fact, I helped start a program in L.A. called DOVE (Dedicated Older Volunteers in Education) where we really recruited older people--and older was

a relative term--who would bring their expertises to the classroom, whether that was teaching German or Spanish or woodworking or helping in the machine shop or athletics, it didn't really matter. As you know, the volunteer program in the L.A. City schools has something like 30,000+ volunteers.

What I think the future holds is a much greater variety of volunteer jobs with many more people volunteering. The Thousand Points of Light (President Bush) gives it some national impetus because the Bush Administration, as the Reagan Administration before them, feels that citizen participation is very important. They don't do much about how you implement that, but at least you get some philosophical support.

LANGLEY: What do you think of the combination of Points of Light with the National Volunteer Action Program?

RAINMAN: I'm not happy about it. I think that the combination is very indicative of mergers in this country. I'm not happy about Security Pacific and BankAmerica merging either, not that anybody asked me.

I really think that the original voluntary action center notion--and I was in on that, in fact, the original National Volunteer Center funded and published the first edition of The Volunteer Community, and it was starting the center and the book being launched that was kind of simultaneous. And I think that we need a not-for-profit national center and not have it tied into the politics of the federal government. The politics are very heavy. Where the administration says you put effort, that's where it goes. They have millions of dollars that are at the moment going into what I consider to be a good thing, which is to train high school and junior high school students to become volunteers and use service corps, and so forth.

But I think that when you get the government all involved in what was a not-for-profit, privately funded and private-thinking agency, you have a different kettle of fish, and I don't like the new kettle at all.

LANGLEY: You know, it occurs to me that there are going to be more and more volunteers, but it also raises the question of adequate training and who's going to train them. Do you see any connection between the field of social work, training, and volunteers?

RAINMAN: Well, you're getting into what I consider to be a very sore subject with me, which is that I've always seen a connection between social work and voluntarism, but social work hasn't seen it. When I have really pleaded that the Council on Social Work Education--and this was at the time when I was on a faculty--to look at the need to integrate something into the curriculum around how you work in the community with volunteers, I didn't get very far.

As you may know, even in the library that's going to house this very tape, every time I wrote or co-authored a book (twelve copies, signed, went to the library) they were usually put--including *The Volunteer Community*, which, after all, has become the text--in some corner of the library. Certainly no faculty knew about it. It certainly wasn't utilized until much, much, much later when Dean Roberts kind of brought me back into the fold of the School.

I believe that social work has everything to give to the training of volunteers because social work humanizes human interactions, from my point of view. In fact, probably one of my better articles is called, "Humanizing the Workplace." It was given at a totally non-social work occasion and published by University Associates, who are not known to publish social work.

I think what's needed first of all are faculty members who know something about voluntarism and consider that part of organizational development, part of community

development, part of human development, and so it get taught. I think field placements--whatever they are called in the future--need to include clinical, sure, but also experience with volunteers, and so far very few people have that. Thirdly, I think that schools of social work ought to be asking the efforts to train directors of volunteers or administrators of volunteers of which there is now a legion; they serve in hospitals, and in probation departments, in banks, and you name it. They may have the title of community service, but we're not training these people. We ought to be.

So then they come out of an M.B.A., or they come out of religion or recreation or psychology or education. Even here, when I've talked to the powers-that-be about, "Why don't we start a sequence for experienced administrators of volunteer agencies?" I haven't gotten very far. But I have a date next week to try one more time, because now we're going to have a continuing education branch for the USC School of Social Work with Helen Nedelman. I'm having lunch with her, and I'm going to push it again. When that doesn't happen is that the administrators of volunteer programs get trained by the Recreation Department at Long Beach State University of sociology at Northridge, etc., etc., etc.

Right now, if you look at the very latest study published by independent sector there are programs all over the map for volunteer administrators. I didn't count whether there are any in the schools of social work. If there are any, there are very few. I don't know for sure. But it hasn't been something that we have thought to be important. I have wanted to teach a course, whether it was an extension or whatever. I do it everywhere but in Los Angeles.

I see the need for training to be very great, but I see the need, Charlotte, that must be satisfied by collaborative efforts of agencies in which volunteers, work; otherwise, it's going to

be very costly.

Every city department, let's say, the City of Pasadena, has a volunteer director. They train their own volunteers, called VIPs: Volunteers in Pasadena. The Recreation Department of the City of Long Beach has volunteers; they train their own, etc., etc., etc. Add to that, then, MedCross, Girl Scouts, boy Scouts, YM, YW, Camp Fire, all the family service agencies, and then all the Catholic, Jewish, Muslim, Lutheran, Buddhist, whatever, agencies that utilize volunteers. Look at the churches. There have been a couple of books written recently just for volunteers in churches. I did an international conference for the Baha'i Faith on better utilization of volunteers.

There is need for collaboration amongst the different systems in order to deliver training to volunteers. I think that's going to mean that whoever initiates it has to know something about the competencies of collaboration because collaboration doesn't just happen; it's different from coordination and cooperation.

So I think we have a way to go, but I really feel strongly that social work has a lot to offer if we set our minds to it, and if we really believe in voluntarism. Sometimes I wonder if we do believe in voluntarism as a profession, even though our own professional organizations would be nowhere if we didn't volunteer, but that has a kind of different motivation behind it.

LANGLEY: Looking at the long view, Eva, what have you seen as the main developments in the field of social work?

RAINMAN: Well, I guess for me the exciting developments (I don't know if they're the main ones) that I've seen have been more integrations or that kind of specializing and living in a parochial world of only dealing with one-on-one, called casework, be it psychiatric or otherwise.

We have moved to the notion that all social workers need to have a philosophy, need to have certain kinds of skills, some of which will be delivered to individuals, some in groups, some to total organizations and some to organizations in the community. I think those are the really good changes. I think the addition of the whole field of organizational development and group dynamics, as written about and developed by people outside of social work, has broadened our whole field; that is, we've become more interdisciplinary. When I went to school, the word "group dynamics" was considered dirty; you could quote Gertrude Wilson but you couldn't quote Kurt Lewin, not comfortably.

I think saying that we're part of a much larger world is really wonderful. Certainly, industrial social work, whatever it ends up getting called, is a big addition. Long before employee assistance programs, some of us were suggesting that companies ought to be looking at child care. I know that I did a futuring conference in Pasadena in the '70s, called The Pasadena Connection, where one of the action teams that came out of it was a group of people from the YW and other places who were going to sit together with Parson's Engineering and develop a child care program. Polaroid was doing the same thing on the East Coast, and we didn't know it.

So I think social work is more exciting to see in a lot of different places. The concern that the media portray human beings in human ways, whether these human beings are ill or their lifestyle is different from the major lifestyle or they're volunteers. I'm involved right now in a phone call around an episode in one of the television shows where I thought volunteers were portrayed in an extremely bad way and in an old-fashioned way.

LANGLEY: You worked through the CNN and the NASW?

RAINMAN: Yes. With Susan

I think social work has come a long way. I'm glad we're really into meaningful research, that we really believe that social workers can be social workers and administrators at the same time, that we have something to offer to humanize the workplace. I don't know what all the various schools are doing; I think we've got a long way to go. But it's time to thank our forebearers and see them as historically important, and to look at the very changing world and how we're going to look at Marvin Weisbord and Roger Harris and the Lippitts, some of the people who've written in the field of change and organization, who don't come out of our own discipline but from whom we can learn a lot. I'm glad to see that.

I'm also glad to see the really heavy efforts that are being made at least by a piece of the field to say, "If we believe that all people should have access to education...." that we are beginning to try to practice that, whether it be in education or in our hiring practices, so that this business of valuing the beauty of differences becomes more real, although I think we have a long way to go.

LANGLEY: It interests me--when you'd talked about being interviewed for your first job--how important dress was and how you looked and what you did outside your work experience was then considered important. In many respects, maybe social work is becoming more human.

RAINMAN: I think so. I think it's becoming more human, and I think we are practicing more what we preach, which has to do with acceptance of difference. To me diversity is much more than skin deep. I go back to Carey McWilliams who wrote about that, lo, many years ago.* We're beginning to say, "If a gentleman wears an earring in one ear, that's okay." And if he has a ponytail--it may not suit our taste, but he may still have a chance at getting a job or doing a job.

I think we've just got a long way to go where we really value difference as a resource, as a beauty, as something from which we can learn rather than trying to mold people. I think it's going to be a long time before we really do that well.

LANGLEY: Well, I'd like to see what you're talking about in courses on voluntarism in the schools of social work. I think if volunteers are going to take on a greater role--and I'm afraid

*Carey McWilliams, Brothers Under the Skin
(Boston: Little, Brown, 1946).

they're going to--I think they need to have people working with them who understand them.

RAINMAN: Yes. I'm not afraid, Charlotte, at all that they're going to have a greater role.

I'm much more worried about some of the reasons, you see. I think that when volunteers are recruited and given opportunities to serve as a way of augmenting budgets or as a way of displacing professional people, then I get very worried about it. When volunteers are recruited to extend services, to humanize services, to individualize services, then that is very different for me.

I think at this moment we're walking on a tightrope because a lot of budget committees are saying to agencies, "Okay, you get yourself more volunteers and then you can manage with fewer staff," when in reality, really good volunteer programs are so good because they have very competent staff as the resource for the volunteers.

LANGLEY: I was thinking of it in terms of how the field is increasing and how volunteers can add to what people need.

RAINMAN: Tremendously.

LANGLEY: But volunteers also need to have some directions....

RAINMAN: Well, if they want direction and they need to be certificated, or whatever, at the

end of the effort so that they know they have a little piece of paper that says, “You learned the following things,” or “You came to so many sessions of X,” whatever it is, it means a lot to people.

But I would like to see volunteers in schools of social work. I’ve suggested to our own School--and so has Kay Bixby--that there are a lot of things with which volunteers could help. They could be alumni, they could be retired social workers. There are lots of people to draw on, and I don’t think we do well, drawing on our alumni for anything but a good social occasion and some money.

LANGLEY:and money.

RAINMAN: I can see volunteers in the School, working in the library, to help, to become specialists at certain topics with which they can then help students. Yes, I know you can press a button and get it on the computer, but that is very different from sitting down with somebody and saying, “I’m interested in how Spanish-speaking people are being integrated into agency services.” And to have somebody who knows a lot about that sit there and talk with you instead of pressing more buttons and waiting for the librarian when she has time.

I could see volunteers helping with admissions. I think we have lost the call--sure, we have a very good video tape and some of us certainly helped think it through and critiqued it, and I’m glad we have, and I’ve used it, used it successfully. But we don’t have a core of volunteers in a number of communities around the country whom we can call on to say, “Go and talk to college seniors who are looking at what they’re going to do. Meet with them and really help them to see what a school of social work is all about.” We don’t do that.

And I bet you that in most communities in the United States you could find some alumni,

if not from our school, make it a collaborative effort. Who cares whether they graduated from Smith or Berkeley or Columbia or Chicago or USC or UCLA? A group of people who would see their volunteers out to interpret what the field of social work has to offer. We don't do that.

We not only don't teach potential professionals or experienced professionals how to work with volunteers or the value of voluntarism, we don't utilize volunteers that we have under our noses. We don't give opportunities to people to really do meaningful things.

Just yesterday I was talking to a professional organization--not a social worker organization--of which I am a member. (I have a lot of belief that we need to change the curriculum of certain seminars and workshops that we're doing.) The question was (this is in Washington, D.C.): if we provide flight and a hotel, would you be part of core group to help develop that? And it would be a volunteer job, but at this point, the air fare would probably keep me from going. I said, "Of course."

We don't have to take volunteers as 99-year lease people; we can give opportunities for short-term service. Some of us, of course, with the development office in the past, did some of that with Lennie Glidson, for example. She had us meet and give ideas, then we did some contacting of people and groups where we thought we might do some interpretation. Some of us did it better than others. But that, I thought, was a relevant volunteer job for the School.

I wonder how many of the professors, as I talk--of whatever rank, from full professor on down--have really thought about utilizing experts in their fields as volunteers to enrich the classroom. When I teach The Art of Consulting, I have two or three people during the semester who have a specialty in some arena (that I may also know about), but it gives a new voice, it gives them, the specialist, a chance to see a school of social work. It really enriches the whole

experience for students.

LANGLEY: It seems like you have a very busy future.

RAINMAN: I don't know whether I personally do, but I think there is a busy future in the field. I volunteer a great deal of time to try to get it going.

I think that one of the things that I've learned is when to volunteer and when to say, "This has to be a professionally paid job," because I could be busy every day from 9:00 A.M. to 9:00 P.M. and not make any money. I can't live that way.

So, part of it has to be: where does the expertise really need to be contracted for at a professional basis, and where is it important to help make change as a fellow sister volunteer? I think I can sort those things out fairly well.

I sit on a couple of boards where I think that I can make a difference and do a variety of things. For instance, I'm going to moderate the first collaborative meeting between the Pasadena and Los Angeles Junior Leagues at the end of February. They've had real heavy work to collaborate. It's going to be a meeting around the importance of diversity to all of us. I'm going to be the moderator/facilitator because I don't belong to either league. I've worked with both of them. It's going to be a hot session. I volunteered my time because I want it to be a successful session. I am a community advisor for the L.A. League at the moment, so I'll do it as a part of that.

I think that it's important for professional people to volunteer. I think it's important for social workers to learn how to work with volunteers and to see the value.

LANGLEY: Right. That's what's important.

RAINMAN: You said earlier, utilize. No. It's to give opportunity to facilitate the inclusion

of people, but for so long, we've seen it as a "using" that it's become a very negative concept. But volunteers enrich the whole picture, provided you have thought through how you're going to do that, what their particular tasks are going to be, and how they're going to relate to the paid people, be they professional staff, support staff or whoever.

LANGLEY: What message do you want to leave for posterity on your tape?

RAINMAN: Oh, I don't know. I don't think I have any messages for posterity except that I think social work is a very good field to be in. If you are willing to take risks, you can be as creative as the world will let you, but you also--and I think it'll be true in the future--will have to be ready for lots of criticism from people who see any profession as walled in instead of as open and free. I would hope that people coming into the field come with courage and risk-taking ability and a willingness to try new frontiers because there really are no boundaries to social work, as I see it, except as we construct them. I hope we tear them all down.

LANGLEY: Good. I thank you very much.

RAINMAN: You are very welcome.

