

A Futurist's Reflections of Social Work's Systems Model Success

By

Linda Smith

**Presented to the centennial and final conference of the Canadian Association of
Social Workers, July 18, 2026 with the entire membership of 30,000 in
attendance**

For

Richard Ramsay

SOWK 333

Faculty Social Work , University of Calgary

December 1987

Note: The hardcopy of this paper scanned and digitalized. Hopefully, all related errors have been corrected. Minor editing was carried out.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is indeed a pleasure and an honor to be given the opportunity to make a presentation on this historical occasion. For a profession that is little more than a century old with a long history of dissonance and fragmentation, our membership is now able to boast remarkable success.

As I pulled into the parking lot on this fine July morning, I could not help noticing the reflection of the sun on the magnificent tetrahedral structure that adorns the entrance . . . a monument to our cohesive efforts and to a systems model that has been our practice framework these many years. I paused to smell the flowers that are no longer tainted with acid rain and I took comfort in the knowledge that threats of resource depletion and nuclear war no longer hang over our heads. Poverty and human desperation are behind us and we have achieved our ultimate goal - we have worked ourselves out of a job!

The topic that I have chosen for this occasion is, I believe, appropriate. As we all know, the history of our profession was wrought with inconsistency, fragmentation, and, essentially, trial and error. We began to make dramatic progress just prior to the turn of the century when the systems framework was introduced to undergraduate students in all schools of social work but it is essential for all of us to be aware of the history of our profession. For this reason, I will be presenting a “before and after” snapshot of the systems model as a conceptual framework for social work practice.

Before discussing the factors within and without the profession that led to the introduction of our present practice model, I will briefly present an historical account of the early years of social work.

Early Perspective:

Before industrialization, welfare concerns were the domain of the family, the clergy, charitable organizations and communities, but many transitions occurred at the turn of the 20th century. The welfare state in Canada progressed from its early roots of moral certainty and philanthropy to industrialization, urbanization and resulting issues of dependency. Throughout this period, there were two strong and opposing forces that had considerable impact on the early development of social work. Mary Richmond and Jane Addams were two practicing social workers who believed that scientific philanthropy could aid in resolving any existing social problems, but it was there that their consensus ended. Jane Addams was an advocate of social action, believing that social conditions were the main causal factor behind welfare concerns. Mary Richmond, on the other hand, supported rehabilitation of the individual. The debate between Richmond and Addams illustrated the polarization of the individual and the environment. In essence, one could say that while one was a generalist, the other was a specialist.

Amidst the ideological tensions between Addams and Richmond, another event occurred to further distort the beginnings of social work practice. In 1915, the esteemed medical education reformer, Abraham Flexner, delivered a paper to the National Conference of Charities and Corrections addressing the question, “Is Social Work a Profession?” Flexner’s response was a resounding “No.” He applied the sociological trait theory of a profession and concluded that welfare issues were too broad to be addressed by one professional body; moreover, he stated that social work lacked an exclusive knowledge base and framework from which to address such complex problems. Flexner’s findings led to an identity crisis among practicing social workers and a search for professionalism, which was to predominate for many years.

Mary Richmond proposed that the criteria for a profession could be met if the domain of social work was narrowed to deal strictly with individual casework. While this was the case for several years, group work and community work were eventually included as social work methods but social action

was almost always overshadowed by casework. Educational institutions did their best to provide a sound knowledge base in all areas but the “specialist” approach was dominant for many years. This led to tremendous fragmentation within the profession. In my own undergraduate days, I can clearly recall the dissonance among members of the faculty. Various interest groups held strongly opposing views about the practice and emphasis of social work. A few dying supporters of community action struggled against others who were firmly committed to specialization in such areas as individual and family casework, administration and research.

While the historical account that I have just presented is brief, it should give you some impression of the profession as it stood midway through the 1980s. The debate continued to rage and the body of social workers continued to “spin its wheels” in areas of domain, profession, method and basic framework. With this in mind, I will attempt to explain the internal and external factors that contributed to the establishment of the systems model of social work.

Internal Factors:

As mentioned previously, the main issues of social work in the 1980s were: 1) defining the social work domain; 2) establishing social work as a profession; 3) determining appropriate methods of practice; and 4) establishing a conceptual base or framework for all social workers.

Philip Popple addressed the issues of domain and profession in 1986 and his logic was clearly sound.¹ Popple believed that social problems, whether arising within microsystems or macrosystems, were the result of dependency. Examples of dependency problems could be seen everywhere. When we look, for example, at the changes that resulted from industrialization, dependency issues are obvious. Individuals found themselves without the resources that they once depended on and society had to respond to these problems. Popple’s theory then, is that society, forced to find a rational way of addressing these dependency concerns, looked to an appropriate occupation to meet the need. When an occupation evolved, a sort of imaginary contract was drawn up between society and that occupation--social work was that occupation. In essence, the domain of social work became the social assignment of managing dependency. Popple also pointed out that efforts to limit or narrow the domain led to nothing more than the resolution of fewer problems; the dependency issues were still larger than life. While there were those who did not recognize it immediately, the domain of social work was laid clear by Popple - the management of dependency. To many social workers, this domain seemed gargantuan in scope but it must be remembered that Popple wasn’t as much defining the domain as pointing out the facts.

Popple also addressed the eternal search for “profession.”² He was not a proponent of the sociological models of a profession and saw the concept of “profession” as little more than a need for power and prestige. My own interpretation of Popple’s views is that he seemed to be saying, “. . . if social workers want to believe that they are professionals, all they have to do is simply believe it, perform their social assignment as effectively and efficiently as possible, and society will follow suit.”

In short, Popple gave social workers a new way of looking at both domain and profession and his rationale was difficult to argue with. Those who saw the logic in Popple’s argument realized that there were two challenges facing them. Firstly, the domain of social work was indeed broad because dependency was everywhere. Secondly, it was recognized that if social workers were to tackle the management of dependency with the effectiveness and efficiency required, they would need a sound framework from which to begin.

Many people within the profession undertook the task of developing the needed framework. Our own systems model was finally developed through the combined efforts of Allan Pincus and Anne Minahan, Richard Ramsay and Maria Joan O’Neil. These people recognized that social workers had

to get away from seeing social problems in terms of linear relationships if the broad and complex problems were to be sufficiently addressed. They shared the belief that social workers could not just focus on the individual or on the environment but rather, on the two interdependently. In their view, one had to envision the many relationships involved in any system, whether it is an individual problem, a group problem or one of even larger scope. They illustrated how problems do not occur in a vacuum and that, in order to get the full picture, a social worker needed to see how every component in a system can affect another component in the same or other systems. They urged the profession to realize that in any system, we are really dealing with interdependency, mutuality and reciprocity.

From Pincus and Minahan, we got the Professional Model with the four components of Change Agent System, Client System, Target System and Action System.³ This model would assist the social worker to more concretely envision where any individual or group of individuals stood at any point in the process of change. By using this model, a social worker is able to train his or her mind to always see the relationships involved when dealing with a client. One can readily see the advantages of this model . . . there is far less oversight when one is aware of all the relationships within a system.

From O'Neil, we got a system or process of problem solving.⁴ This model was so flexible that it could be used despite the problem and despite the theory or knowledge base from which the problem could be addressed. O'Neil's model contained the six stages of engagement, data collection, assessment, intervention, evaluation and termination. Regardless of the size or complexity of the presenting social problem, this approach to problem solving allowed for a focus on the uniqueness and individuality of that particular problem.

Finally, from Richard Ramsay, we got the Societal Model which is yet another systems approach that included the four components of self, personal others, resources (both formal and informal) and value systems.⁵ Moreover, it was Ramsay who recognized that all three systems (professional, method and societal) could be combined to give the social worker the clearest picture of any client system, large or small. It was Ramsay's belief that a framework that included all three models would provide the best training for an effective social worker. Ramsay recognized that this framework is broad and general by its very nature and that the time necessary to teach this model would reduce a student's exposure to theoretical training.⁶ However, students were given a theoretical knowledge base in their first three years of studies. In addition, the code of ethics stipulated that social work education should be a lifetime pursuit for every social worker who is dedicated to his or her field.⁷ Moreover, practical experience in chosen fields of interest would further increase theoretical knowledge. The important point that Ramsay seemed to be making is that with a sound knowledge of the systems framework, every social worker, whether they choose to be a generalist or a specialist, would have the ability to see a problem from the same broad perspective. Such an approach would, therefore, remove the blinders that have historically prevented practitioners from seeing the problem in its entirety. In addition, it would provide the profession with the much-needed identity it had long been without.

Let me try to tie this together for you by borrowing an illustration from the author Jay Haley.⁸ While this example represents a smaller problem, it must be remembered that a systems model can be used in any size problem, merely by shifting one's perspective. The example revolves around a presenting problem of a child who is not attentive in school. Consider this:

When a parent says the problem is at school and the teacher is complaining that the boy will not mind or is not doing well, there are three possibilities. One may be that the problem is at the school; another may be that the boy is responding in school to trouble at home; and yet another may be that there is trouble between the parents and the school and the boy is caught between them and is responding to the situation.

Clearly, a social worker would be making a serious error to focus attention on only one relationship when, in fact, the problem may be arising from another relationship or a combination thereof. Let us look at a larger social problem. Thelma Lee Mendora presented a paper to the 23rd International Congress of Schools of Social Work in 1986 and she made a point in that paper which exemplifies how large scale systems problems can be approached.⁹ Mendora talked about how Japan was experiencing serious problems with its aged sector. One might immediately conclude that perhaps the reason for this problem resulted from economic cutbacks. If this were the case, the conclusion would be wrong. In actual fact, the problem arose not due to economics but due to a change in ideology; specifically, Japanese youth were experiencing radical changes in their attitudes toward the aged. While this society once held their elder population in great esteem and took responsibility for their financial well-being, this was no longer the case. Modernization and western attitudes were filtering into Japan and eventually resulted in a change in the values of Japan's young people. You can readily see how a social worker engaged in social and policy change might focus on the wrong relationship when seeking a resolution to this social issue.

So there you have it... Popple gave us a new way of looking at domain and profession and others gave us a solid framework from which to conceptualize practice. However, this didn't happen in a vacuum. Many other changes were happening within the profession that indicated the need for a framework common to all social workers.

In 1982, an international definition of social work was finally agreed upon. This definition emphasized the concept of interdependency. How else could this be approached, if not through a system which allowed us to conceptualize the interaction between person-in-environment? In addition, in 1984, a code of ethics specific to Canada (as opposed to her southern neighbor) was accepted by this association in nine out of ten Canadian provinces.¹⁰ This code spelled out a clear set of minimum standards for practice. In almost every one of the ten standards outlined in the code, we saw the need for an interdependent approach to seeing and resolving problems. Without going into the code in its entirety, let me give you an example to illustrate. One of the standards is that a social worker must be competent in the performance of the services and functions undertaken on behalf of the client. The commentary which detailed this particular standard pointed to the need for a social worker to recognize that there are times when a client problem is beyond his or her particular skill level to resolve. When one looks at a client system in the context of the large systems model, one is more readily able to recognize when this occurs. In addition, when a social worker is trained to see all problems in terms of systems and recognizes the complexity of the domain, he or she is less likely to be threatened by other professionals impinging on their "territory." This, after all, is what a system is . . . the combining of all efforts toward an effective resolution, i.e., seeing the whole picture to restore the whole person, if you will. The commentary under the same standard goes on to say that a social worker must have, and I quote:

... knowledge and understanding of human development and functioning, cultural and environmental factors affecting human life and the patterns of social interactions contributing to the interdependence of human behavior.¹²

Note again, the emphasis on interdependence. The authors of the code of ethics were not seeing person and environments as polarized entities but, rather, as mutually dependent.

In addition to all of the internal factors previously mentioned, I think that it is important for you to know what many writers were saying in the 1980s. Because of everything I have discussed thus far, it seems clear that the systems model was almost a natural evolution. In order to establish congruency within the profession and in order to address all of the internal characteristics of the profession, such

as values, purpose, central focus, etc. which I will be discussing later, it would seem that a systems approach basically had to happen. At the same time, I cannot overemphasize the contribution that writers within the field made to the ultimate establishment of the model. The following quotations are taken from various writers of the day:

Considerable interest has been expressed for a national model act that could be adopted by any or all provinces respect to the regulation of social work practice.¹³

The need for team building and case coordination and management is seen as basic for effective service.¹⁴

The profession cannot longer support a professional ideology that separates the public and private worlds...¹⁵

Without common bases of philosophy and practice, professions can lose their cohesion and distinctiveness, relinquishing functions to other professions and even dividing into smaller constituent parts.¹⁶

...the questions becomes not whether to specialize internally but how to coordinate these specialties into a comprehensive whole.¹⁷

A model should avoid conceptualizing social work practice in such dichotomous terms as person/environment, clinical practice/social action, and microsystems/macrosystems. We believe the strengths of the profession lies in recognizing and working with the connections between these elements.¹⁸

Let us now look at some of the characteristics inherent to the social work profession to further illustrate why the adoption of a systems framework made the most sense. The value base of social work is twofold. Social workers believe in the promotion of integrity and wellbeing to all individuals in society and adhere to the basic beliefs of equality for all. In addition, social workers believe that society, as a whole, has a responsibility to promote the same. The systems model can assist social workers in the realm of values in many ways. Pincus and Minahan dedicated a whole chapter in their book on social work practice to the need to differentiate between values and knowledge.¹⁹ We all recognize how easily the two can be confused which can often bring the process of problem—solving to a halt. If a social worker were able to “eye the relationships” within his or her own societal system, with knowledge being the resources available, it would then be possible to see the clear differences between the values and knowledge he or she possesses.

Consider yet another aspect of values. As we are all aware, the social worker is often faced with clients who, for whatever reason, have touched a sensitive nerve in our belief system. Perhaps you might have a personal issue with rapists or child molesters, for example. In such a case, it is essential to see the individual within a larger systems framework and recognize how relationships within that client’s own “person in environment” context could have been dysfunctional thereby contributing to the presenting problem. In essence, the systems model gives us a way of adhering to the basic beliefs that led us to social work initially. There is, on the other hand, a potential for a social worker who is pursuing a strict specialist approach, i.e., one with no general systems knowledge, to ignore the basic values of social work; specialists tend to have “tunnel vision” and are, therefore, open to the risk of having their value base shaken.

In terms of the central focus of social work, Pincus and Minahan told us that it is, “on the interactions between people and systems in their environments” tell us.²⁰ Note that the focus is not just on people

and not just on the environment but on the interface. Doesn't it seem obvious, then, that a systems model would be the best conceptual tool for achieving this focus? Once again, the linear specialist, by definition, would focus on either the person or the environment but never on the interdependence of the two.

The purpose of social work follows naturally from the value base, addressing both individual and social change. The code of ethics states clearly that change is for the benefit of both.²¹ Once again we see that the individual and society are not seen in isolation but rather, are interdependent. How could one possibly see how and where this interdependence occurs without taking a broad systems perspective? A strict specialist approach, on the other hand, looks at one type of change or the other in isolation.

When one looks at the spectrum of ways in which the social work practice is sanctioned, one is immediately struck with the need for flexibility. Social workers are not merely self-regulated, despite the fact that many of them would like to be. They must always adhere to the standards of practice as outlined by the code of ethics, to legislation, to the agency with whom they are employed and, above all, to the clients themselves. It is, therefore, essential to have at our disposal, a variety of ways to approach problem resolution--the system characteristic of equifinality makes this possible. A specialist, on the other hand, is faced with tremendous restrictions and, at the same time, no restrictions at all. A specialist, by definition, has basically one route and one route only from which to approach problem solving. More importantly, the sad fact is that without a systems framework, this one route is often the only one they see; the old adage applies, "if all you have to work with is a hammer, every problem is going to be a nail."

While I am sure that there are numerous other factors within the profession that contributed to the development of the systems model, I believe that I have hit on some of the primary ones. I will now move onto the external variables, which led to the recognition of a need for a broad systems approach.

External Factors:

Disparity and diversity are the two words which best describe the external factors which contributed to the establishment of a systems framework for social work practice. Glenn Drover, a Canadian social worker, wrote an article, which described the existing diversity and disparity in Canada.²² He, pointed out that issues of disparity and diversity are prevalent in Canada geographically, politically and economically. In addition, the rate of immigration into Canada was mounting annually and Canada was rapidly becoming a multicultural society. It was the belief of Drover, as well as many others, that if social workers were going to effectively perform their social assignment, a framework from which to do so was a major priority need.

To make matters even more complex, the political and economic systems in Canada were extremely interdependent. For example, the political ideology of the times was moving quickly in the direction of neo-conservatism. The belief system that prevailed was that the welfare state was becoming too dependent on government and society in general. In was, therefore, not surprising to see major financial cutbacks in both federal and provincial funding to social welfare programs at the first hint of a national deficit. These funding cuts were indeed a reality and social workers were confronted with an urgent need to find creative and flexible ways to approach the social problems that existed. It took this crisis before the systems model began to receive the recognition that it deserved. This is essentially the theory of Thomas Kuhn who felt that a crisis "requires a discipline to dismantle its existing model of activities and to replace it with another" ... the historical paradigm shift.²³ At any rate, the systems model was undeniably creative and flexible and it restored the welfare state as nothing else could. But ... I am getting ahead of myself.

Let me attempt to pry the economic system away from the political system and hence, give you a better picture of the reality of the times in the 1980s in Canada. In terms of economics, the country was, or so they told us, in a financial slump. Unemployment was steadily rising in all classes of Canadian society. In Calgary, Alberta, where much of the city depended on the oil industry in one form or another, the oil prices suddenly dropped radically. The “domino effect” of this caused loss of jobs, marital problems, an increase in alcoholism, family violence--the list goes on and on. At the same time that this was occurring, the government was making the drastic cutbacks previously referred to. The problems that faced the entire welfare system in Alberta were overwhelming. It is little wonder, in view of the economic status of the province, that when Richard Ramsay presented the three-system model framework to the Alberta Association of Social Workers, it was welcomed with open arms.

In terms of politics, Canada was in a rather unique but inherently complex position. Social welfare matters, while being designated to the jurisdiction of the individual provinces, depended to a large extent on federal funding. This division, in and of itself, created a great deal of disparity and, oftentimes, confusion. In addition to this, the ideology was strongly conservative and there was a major thrust underway to promote privatization and deinstitutionalization. Members of the social work profession were acutely aware of the danger of such action, particularly if it were allowed to proceed as rapidly as the government aimed to proceed. Canadian social work standards, which had only just been solidly established, were in danger of being worn away by such a drastic move. In a public forum held in Calgary to deal with the issue of the future of social work in Alberta, Pam Barrett stated that deinstitutionalization was proceeding in a vacuum without looking at building supportive resources to catch the inevitable “fallout.”²⁴ She went on to say, “We’re not looking at something in isolation and we can’t just treat the immediate hurt with a band-aid.”²⁵ Her words were heard loud and clear by the body of social workers who sat in the audience and the groundwork was laid for the systems framework; ultimately, the most appropriate model for looking at the possible repercussions of drastic government action.

The geography of Canada also contributed to great disparity. Canada is a very expansive country with both rural and urban societies. Maria Joan O’Neil illustrated how the task of performing our social assignment might be easier in the city than it is in rural areas where there are not formal delivery systems in place.²⁶ O’Neil recognized that those social workers with training in the systems approach could go to a geographical area with “. . . more realistic expectations and preparation.”²⁷

O’Neil also illustrated how diversity exists in Canada and elsewhere in the world in more areas than geographically. She pointed out several other variables which all social workers must be knowledgeable of.²⁸ A systems model which allows for the efforts of both generalists and specialists could best address these variables. Among the variables that she listed were those of culture, class, sexual orientation, gender, age, developmental stages, personality and value systems. When considering all of these variables, one can readily see that the expansiveness and complexity of social issues required a broad approach that could conceptualize the expanse in its entirety--a systems model.

While there are undoubtedly many other external factors worthy of mention, I am aware that I am dangerously close to imposing on your imminent retirement. With this in mind, I will hasten to a conclusion.

Conclusion:

The factors that I have just discussed were extremely influential to the birth of the systems model, as we know it today. Its introduction did not mean the demise of specialization but what it did mean was

that every social worker was first a social worker because they were all working from the same conceptual framework.

This model first took shape for me when I did my first undergraduate practicum at a shelter for battered women in Calgary. Essentially, I was there to assist women with their relationships and I was able to use the systems model to clearly visualize all of the relationships involved. With the societal model, I was able to recognize how the values held by many of these women were instrumental in convincing them to remain in destructive relationships. The “personal other” system almost always involved the abusive mate and assisting a woman to either mend or break this relationship was rarely easy. However, if I did not have a model that helped me to visualize this relationship, my efforts would have been pointless. The resource system was scarce but through the use of the systems model, I was able to better understand the ways to best tap the resources that did exist. The Professional Model allowed me to keep my finger on the pulse of the progress of each individual and family system that I worked with. I knew who to target to achieve the required results. I was able to turn these models around and about in my mind's eye, almost like a tetrahedral rubic's cube, with ease and confidence. To this day, if I had to tell you a disadvantage to the use of the systems model in that particular practicum, I couldn't do it.

As I see it, the key to the wide acceptance of the systems model was continual use and practice, first, on my part, and eventually, on the part of every social worker worldwide. This is what ultimately “put to bed” all of the arguments against the adoption of a systems model. There were basically two opposing arguments. Firstly, it was said that the systems model was too idealistic. To this argument, I refer the audience to the original concepts of Buckminster Fuller, who urged us to accept ambiguity while searching for the absolute truth.²⁹ It was Fuller who recognized that a combination of components can turn out far stronger than the combined strengths of their individual components--this he termed ephemeralization. We have all seen this in action and we now know it to be true. The systems model allows for a process of synergy whereby two people working interdependently can always achieve more than one person working alone. In fact, it has been found that the results can often be far more profound than initially anticipated. Pincus and Minahan pointed out that “. . . because of the interactional (or transactional) nature of the linkages that exist within, between, and among people and their resource systems, a specific activity or task of the worker that creates a change in the nature of one linkage may set off reciprocal changes in several of the other linkages and thus accomplish other functions.”³⁰ In essence, then, the systems model may not have been the ideal but it was a damn site better than what the profession had been working with previously.

The second argument opposing the systems model was that it was too general and abstract and, thus, lacked specificity as a guide to intervention.³¹

In terms of it being inappropriate as a guide for intervention, I believe that the opposite is true. The model was so flexible that it indicated which intervention was appropriate for each individual client system and reduced the danger of applying interventions that were ineffective. The argument that it is abstract is also clearly wrong. It would be difficult to convince this audience who all carry around a clear mental picture of one tetrahedron balanced atop another that the model is abstract! In fact, the giant tetrahedral structure that stands at the portals of this building may once have seemed bizarre to the untrained eye but this is no longer the case. Abstract is one thing that this model is not!

To begin to tell you what this model has given us is a major task and one that I will not attempt. However, I would be remiss without listing a few of its pluses:

1. As the country singer, Kenny Rogers, once said, “You have to know when to hold and when to fold.” The model helps us to recognize when our skill level is inadequate to meet a particular problem

and it is time to call in a specialist.

2. We finally have a model that is flexible enough to provide many routes to a solution.
3. With the systems model, we were able to include macrosystems within the domain of social work; it was recognized that we had to “eye the relationships” in all levels of systems, big or small. In this way, we could make some choices. Rather than letting individual systems destroy each other, we saw the problem in time to correct it. Rather than letting the environment be destroyed through pollution and depletion of resources, we were able to use the systems model to conceptualize the forthcoming event and, thereby, prevent it. Rather than letting our nations destroy each other through nuclear war, we were able to intervene in time.
4. When the profession was able to look at its own system, it recognized that social reform could only be achieved through a strong and cohesive membership and this is precisely why I am addressing 30,000 today instead of 3,000.
5. Through the use of a systems model, we were able to convince the political powers that bureaucracy was not the only approach to social welfare. Rather than allowing privatization and deinstitutionalization to prevail, bipartite and tripartite approaches were given a fair chance.
6. Diversity was finally seen in its broadest possible sense by way of the systems model and disparity was taken in hand.
7. Social workers were finally able to tell their friends what it is that they actually do, i.e., we work within a systems framework to tackle a social assignment of managing dependency. We do this by “eyeing” the interdependent relationships between person-in-environment.
8. Linear relationships are no longer the only form of relationships available to us. We can now approach a problem through the visualization of rotational and synergic movement as well.³²

The systems model as a conceptual framework was a long time in coming. Just as Fuller stood on the banks of Lake Michigan a century ago, contemplating suicide the world was practically doing the same before it was realized that a systems approach was the best approach to social work practice. Nevertheless, just as Fuller finally found some insight into the “rightness” of his future, our profession acknowledged the “rightness” of the systems model.

Richard Ramsay asked, almost a century ago, “How will the snapshot of social work practice at the end of this century be described?”³³ Unfortunately, Ramsay did not live long enough to see his model in use. He died of a massive coronary at a follow-up to the public forum previously mentioned. The doctors said that his heart failed from overexposure to the asinine remarks of the Honorable Connie Osterman who was then Provincial Minister of Social Services. In his memory, let me say, ladies and gentlemen, enjoy your vacation. All systems are clear ...

resounding applause ...

Notes

1. A Kahn & S. Kamerman. Comments on “The Social Work Profession: A Reconceptualization,” *Social Service Review* (Dec. 1986), 644-646.
2. Ibid.
3. A. Pincus & A. Minahan. *Social Work Practice: Model and Method*. Itasca, Ill.: F.E. Peacock

- Publishers, Inc. 1973, 54-63.
4. Maria Joan O'Neil. *The General Method of social Work Practice*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1973. 54-63.
 5. Richard F. Ramsay. "Social Work's Search for a Common Conceptual Framework," *Proceedings*, (August 1986), 53.
 6. Richard F. Ramsay. Personal communication. July, 1989.
 7. Canadian Association of Social Workers. *Code of Ethics* (1983), Section 3.6.
 8. Jay Haley. *Problem-Solving Therapy*. New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, London: Harper Colophon Books, 1976, 34.
 9. Thelma Lee Mendora. "Peace and Social Work Education in the Asia-Pacific Region," *Proceedings*, (August 1986), 28.
 10. Canadian Association of Social Workers. *Code of Ethics* (1983)
 11. *Ibid.* (section 3.1)
 12. *Ibid.* (section 3.6.1)
 13. G. Drover. "Policy and Legislative Perspectives," *The Social Worker*. 1984, pp.6-10.
 14. Maria Joan O'Neil, p. 4.
 15. E. Maxine Ankrah. "Social Work Education in Africa," *Proceedings*, (August 1986), 27.
 16. Leslie Leighninger. "The Generalist-Specialist Debate in Social Work," *Social Service Review*, (March 1980), 7.
 17. *Ibid.*
 18. Pincus & Minahan, vii.
 19. Pincus & Minahan, 37-52.
 20. *Ibid.*
 21. *Code of Ethics*, p.2.
 22. G. Drover, pp. 6-10.
 23. Donna L. Franklin. "Mary Richmond and Jane Addams: From Moral Certainty to Rational Inquiry in Social Work Practice," *Social Service Review*, (December 1986), pp. 504-505.
 24. Pam Barrett. Public Forum on "What is the Future of Social Services in Alberta?", October 6, 1987.
 25. *Ibid.*
 26. Maria Joan O'Neil, 70.
 27. *Ibid.*
 28. *Ibid.*, p.71.
 29. Richard J. Brenneman, *Fuller's Earth*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
 30. Pincus & Minahan, p.15.
 31. Richard F. Ramsay. "Snapshots of Practice in the Twentieth Century," *The Social Worker*, (1984) p.14.
 32. *Ibid.*, p.15.
 33. *Ibid.*, p.14.

Bibliography

Ankrah, Maxine (August 1986). "Social Work Education in Africa." IFSW Proceedings, Tokyo, Japan.

Brenneman, Richard J (1984). *Fuller's Earth: A Day With Bucky and the Kids*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Drover, C (1984). "Policy and Legislative Perspectives." *The Social Worker*, 52 (1), 6-10.

Franklin, Donna L (June 1986). "Mary Richmond and Jane Addams: From Moral Certainty to Rational Inquiry in Social Work Practice." *Social Service Review*, 60 (4), 504-525.

Haley, Jay (1976). *Problem-Solving Therapy*. New York, Hagerstown, San Francisco, London: Harper Colophon Books.

Kahn A, Kamerman S (December 1986). "Comments on 'The Social Work Profession: A Reconceptualization'." *Social Service Review*, 60 (4), 644.

Leighninger, Leslie (March 1980). "The Generalist-Specialist Debate in Social Work." *Social Service Review*, 54 (1), 1-12.

Mendora, Thelma Lee (August 1986). "Peace and Social Work Education in the Asia-Pacific Region." *IFSW Proceedings*, Tokyo, Japan.

O'Neil, Maria Joan (1984). *The General Method of Social Work Practice*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Pincus A, Minahan A (1973). *Social Work Practice: Model and Method*. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Ramsay, Richard F (August 1986). "Social Work's Search for a Common Conceptual Framework." *IFSW Proceedings*, Tokyo, Japan.

Ramsay, Richard F (1984). "Social work in Canada: Snapshots of Practice in the Twentieth Century." *The Social Worker*, 52(1), 11-16.