CHAPTER 1

The Business of Social Work

Elizabeth J. Clark

Social Work Matters

During my social work career, I often have been surprised by the number of people who believe that social work should avoid the term "business" and that business principles do not apply to our profession. Somehow, the concept of nonprofit has been mistakenly defined as non*business*. This is a misperception that can limit the impact of what social workers do and on the services they provide.

If you examine the two concepts of for-profit business and nonprofit business, you will find that the differences are few. The main issue is the purpose for which an organization or corporation has been established. The designation of for profit or nonprofit is awarded by tax code, and to open a business, everyone needs a tax identification number (also called an EIN, or employer identification number). The determination of whether your organization is tax exempt is made on the basis of its purpose and its mission.

To be tax exempt, you must have a mission in the line of charitable or educational activities. The mission cannot be to make a profit for yourself, your company, or your stockholders. In fact, the dollars you make must mainly be used for your nonprofit activities. This does not, however, mean that you cannot make a profit or have a positive bottom line.

There are many similarities between for- and nonprofit businesses. Unless a business is owned by one person (sole proprietorship), it must be incorporated in a state. To incorporate, you need to have a board of directors and officers. You are required to keep specific data and records. You must pay employment taxes for any employees and, depending on size, must offer mandated benefits such as family medical leave and follow all required policies such as paying overtime for nonexempt employees. Regardless of tax status, you must adhere to antidiscrimination and other employee protections. You must also comply with occupational, health, and labor regulations (Edwards & Yankey, 2006). Both for- and nonprofit businesses may be challenged legally by individuals, groups, or the government, and it is important to have directors' and officers' liability insurance to protect nonprofits as well.

Regardless of purpose (for profit or nonprofit), an organization needs to conduct audits, file annual tax returns, and pay state and federal income tax. The form of filing differs, but the function is the same. For a nonprofit organization, management must file what is referred to as IRS Form 990. Because of the nonprofit status, this form must be made available to the public and is listed on a Web site called GuideStar (http://www2.guidestar.org). If a nonprofit has revenue from activities not considered central to its mission (for example, selling member address lists), it must pay UBIT (unrelated business income tax).

Just as for-profit businesses have varied forms (for example, privately held, publicly traded), nonprofits have numerous designations under U.S. Tax Code (U.S.C. 26, Sec. 501). We generally refer to these as "C" designations. There are 28 different designations, but it is the 501(c)(3) that is especially germane here.

The 501(c)(3) is a charitable designation. This designation means that an organization can give a tax-deductible receipt when funds (donations) are received. Most social service programs are 501(c)(3) organizations. This includes food pantries, shelters, and other community support programs as well as large national organizations like the American Cancer Society, the United Service Organizations, and the United Way.

The structure and funding of social work agencies and programs also vary. Some are government, community, or grant funded. Others depend on individual and organizational contributions. A few have endowments that earn enough annual interest to pay operational costs. Others are operated on a fee-for-service basis.

Assumptions about a program or organization can be faulty. Just as we have private and public colleges and universities, there are for-profit and nonprofit hospitals and nursing homes. About half of all hospices are now for profit. Most assisted living facilities are for profit. There are public and private adoption agencies, prisons, rehabilitation centers, and mental health clinics. Their stated goals may be similar, but their financial structures differ. It is the structure that dictates who is served, the way programs operate, the level and credentials of staffing, personnel policies, and the way outcomes are evaluated.

The one commonality is the bottom line. Whereas a large profit margin may not be the overarching goal, even the smallest nonprofit agency must have enough income to operate. They are all businesses. Business principles are seldom taught in social work programs. In fact, many social workers claim they chose social work because they did not want to be involved in business. We talk about social justice goals, about client and community advocacy, about helping others to have a better quality of life. These goals cannot be realized without adequate funding, and that takes us back to business.

So what do social workers need to know about business? Understanding the structure of and the funding stream for an agency or program is an important first step, because that dictates the mission and the program goals.

Next, every social worker should have a basic understanding of budgeting and should be able to read a "balance sheet" (for-profit term) or "statement of activities"

(nonprofit term). It is necessary to know what percentage of budget is spent on program activities versus what is spent on fundraising to keep doors open and a program operational. Understanding the difference between restricted funds that can only be used for a specified purpose and unrestricted funds that can be used as needed is critical for audit and fundraising purposes. All of these things are basic and should be a routine part of social work training.

Perhaps even more important is the ability to make a business case for the existence of your program or agency. Although anecdotes and case examples are helpful (particularly in public fundraising), they are not sufficient for most business decisions. What is important is data. Can you show the value of your work in dollar-and-cent terms?

Narrative

The Social Work Department at a large nonprofit medical center had been well staffed and well regarded for many years. The social workers were highly skilled and enjoyed a good reputation as problem solvers and team players. As the medical center experienced cutbacks in funding, management began to discuss cutting "nonessential" staff. Unlike many other professional health care workers whose services are billable, social work services in hospitals are not reimbursable. Instead, they are considered part of bundled services. That means they are not revenue generating.

When asked to defend retaining all 12 social work staff, the director's thoughts turned first to the wonderful successes that her staff had achieved that year. She asked each person to write one case example showing the benefits of his or her work. The anecdotes were touching—great human interest stories. The director went to the next management meeting thinking she had prepared a good argument. She was rather shocked when the president of the hospital said that her case examples were wonderful descriptions of "value-added" services but that the medical center could not afford that luxury any longer. Could she show him any convincing data about why they should keep the entire department?

The director brought her social work staff together again and said that they had to rethink their argument. Because social workers could not be revenue generating, they had to reframe their collective value in terms of cost savings. The department was required to keep annual statistics. How could they be used?

There had been several difficult placement cases that year. One was a young patient who had been paralyzed and was on a ventilator. Rehabilitation beds for this type of patient are difficult to find. Yet, working as a team, social workers had found a placement in record time, saving the hospital a great deal of money.

Another patient without insurance who needed ongoing care had no family in this country. The patient wanted to go home to his own country and his family wanted him to come home, but the family had no money for ambulance transportation. The social worker suggested that the hospital pay the expense. At first, this suggestion was met with resistance, but the social worker had been able to show that it would take less than two weeks of

unreimbursed inpatient stay to equal the cost of sending the patient home. The hospital paid, and the cost savings was significant.

The social workers looked at other activities such as helping patients acquire needed medications and other services so they could prevent unnecessary, and expensive, readmissions. They had documented the large number of patients they had assisted in this fashion. This was a timely example, because health care reform is mandating accountable care and will soon stop paying for patients who are readmitted within 30 days.

The Social Work Department also served a patient navigation function. It made certain patients got to their outpatient clinic appointments for assessment and follow-up. Missed appointments equal lost revenue for hospitals. Again, the department had kept good statistics on numbers of patients contacted and the ratio of kept-to-missed appointments. It was an impressive number.

Although the department's final report could not be stated in precise numbers, it was a good estimate. It was calculated that the Social Work Department had saved the medical center over $2 million in the past year. The department could now argue that social workers provided essential, not simply value-added services.

Policy Matters

Every social work program and agency keeps statistics, yet they are not always used effectively to highlight the importance of services provided. In a tight budget situation, this can be a major disadvantage.

At the second Congress of Social Work in 2010, social work leaders determined 10 imperatives for the future of the profession (Clark et al., 2010). One of these imperatives addressed the business of social work and recommended that we "infuse models of sustainable business and management practice in social work education and practice" (Clark et al., 2010, p. 5). This is especially true if we want our organizations to reflect social work values so that we can maintain and grow social work services. Many services traditionally offered by social workers are now being provided by other professionals, paraprofessionals, or volunteers. We must be able to explain why these services would be more effective clinically or more cost-effective if provided by a professional social worker. Managing nonprofit and human service organizations is not easy. Managerial positions require a combination of skills, many of which social workers already possess. Edwards and Austin (2006) noted that there are four sectors of skills needed by managers: (1) boundary-spanning, (2) human relations, (3) coordinating, and (4) directing skills. Other authors have added to this list. Menafee (2000) included innovation, evaluation, facilitation, team building, and advocacy. These, again, are skills that many social workers possess. What is not always present are the business and financial skills, such as budgeting, forecasting, financial operations and fundraising (Perlmuetter & Crook, 2004). Some schools of social work do offer macro practice and courses in administration. Another possibility is dual-degree programs

(for example, MSW/MBA, MSW/MPA) that help social workers acquire needed business expertise. For social workers already in practice, there are executive training programs available to help offset any gaps in financial planning and management knowledge and skills. Another excellent resource is the American Society of Association Executives, which offers a certified association executive certificate (see http://www.asaecenter.org). The business of social work is too important to be left to those without a social work focus.

Discussion Questions

1. Most of us came to the profession of social work to work with individuals and communities to bring about positive change and improve the quality of people's lives. If we are working in nonprofit organizations, why isn't being value-added enough? How can we maintain our value system if we have to worry about the bottom line?

2. The social work literature consistently speaks about evidence-based practice. How can we most effectively link evidence-based practice and nonprofit social service agencies?

References

Clark, E. J., Hoffler, E., Jackson, E., Loomis, R., Myers, R. S., Rothblum, M., et al. (Eds). (2010). *2010 Social Work Congress—Final report*. Retrieved from http://www.socialworkers.org/2010congress/documents/FinalCongress-StudentReport.pdf

Edwards, R. L., & Austin, D. M. (2006). Managing effectively in an environment of competing values. In R. L. Edwards & J. A. Yankey, J. A. (Eds.), *Effectively managing nonprofit organizations* (pp. 3–25). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Edwards, R. L., & Yankey, J. A. (Eds). (2006). *Effectively managing nonprofit organizations.* Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Menefee, D. (2000). What human services managers do and why they do it. In P. J. Rino (Ed.), *The handbook of human service management* (2nd ed., pp. 102–116). London: Sage Publications.

Perlmuetter, F. D., & Crook, W. P. (Eds). (2004). *Changing hats while managing change: From social work practice to administration* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Rau, J. (2011, June 28). *For-profit hospices keep patients longer, push costs up*. Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/blogs/health/2011/06/28/137477133/for-profit-hospices-keep-patients-longer-push-costs-up

Social Media for Social Workers:

An Imperative for the Profession

Elizabeth F. Hoffler and Ebony Jackson

We don't have choice on whether we do social media, the question is how well we do it.

—Eric Qualman

Social media is the number one activity on the Web (Qualman, 2010). The U.S. Census Bureau has observed (Grunwald Athat over 50 percent of the world's population is under 30 years old, and 96 percent of those in this younger half have joined a social network (Grunwald Associates, 2007). The United Nations stated that it took radio 38 years to reach 50 million users and television 13 years to reach the same number, whereas it took the Internet four years to accomplish that feat (Qualman, 2010). According to social media Web site Socialnomics (see http://www.socialnomics.net/), Facebook is the number one Web site in the world, with almost one billion users; it took less than one year for 200 million users to join the site. Facebook outpaces Google for weekly traffic, and if it were a country, it would be the world's third largest and would be twice as large as the United States. Furthermore, there are over 200 million blogs on the Web, and 34 percent of bloggers post opinions about products and brands (Qualman, 2011).

In response to the rapid emergence and development of these "Web 2.0" tools, most nonprofit organizations, large and small, are seeking to define, or refine, their organizational presence on the Internet, particularly through social media outlets. Having an online presence was once just an option, and added value to an organization's efforts to market and inform potential members and other stakeholders about programs and initiatives. However, participation in a variety of Web sites is now a requirement for relevancy as competition in every field, and for every dollar, becomes increasingly fierce. For instance, 78.6 percent of consumers have joined a company's

online community to get more information about that company, and 66 percent of those users are more loyal to the brand as a result (Universal McCann, 2011). Businesses and organizations must go further than the standard Web site to have a significant impact online today, particularly if they expect to be embraced by younger generations. However, the concept that only younger generations engage online is quickly becoming outdated—the fastest growing segment on Facebook is 55- to 65-year-old women (Smith, 2009). The expectations of Web-savvy users of all ages are formed by their online experiences as whole, and they assume that companies and organizations will be up to par in terms of Web offerings and digital communications.

Social Work (and Nonprofit Organization) Matters

To be seen and understood, nonprofit organizations (many of which are run and staffed by social workers) must have profiles, feeds, group pages, fundraising efforts, and professional presences on numerous Web sites. These new channels do not replace traditional methods, like print media and e-mail, but serve to give nonprofits reach and visibility within the social media world.

Social media expectations are high, regardless of whether you are running a Fortune 500 corporation or a small nonprofit organization. Although nonprofit organizations may have limited finances and smaller staffs than their corporate counterparts, they are still responsible for presenting professional, timely, and constantly updated social media presences. This includes communicating everything from the overall management and direction of the organization to governance, marketing, communication, advocacy, and membership efforts. Along with staffing and time resource challenges come new legal and privacy concerns and new considerations involving digital publications, e-commerce, and mobile app technologies.

The following narrative provides a glimpse into the online opportunities and challenges faced by many nonprofit organizations and employees as they navigate the ever-evolving world of social media.

Narrative

A national nonprofit organization with 50 staff members and a tight budget was behind the curve in terms of their social media efforts and online presence. For the past decade or so, the organization functioned under the assumption that their official Web site would be enough to educate the public about their services and convince individuals and organizations to donate to support their work. Furthermore, they believed that their solid reputation and quality services would be enough to sustain them. The organization's executive director and staff members were extremely busy with their day-to-day responsibilities, and, thus far, college interns were tasked with creating and updating the organization's Facebook page, which was its only attempt at web 2.0 engagement.

As other organizations launched Twitter feeds, YouTube accounts, RSS feeds, and Linke-dIn pages, it became increasingly obvious that the organization could no longer expect individuals to simply find its Web site for information. Its paltry Facebook page basically went untouched when the interns finished their placements. The expectations of consumers and the public had shifted, and the organization now had to deliver information to them.

First, the organization decided to reevaluate its Facebook page and determine how it could best leverage its "brand" on this major social networking Web site. It focused on engagement and increasing the amount of content it posted, including activities and events it was involved with, fundraising and Facebook Causes promotional efforts, photos, and relevant news stories. Another tactic the organization used was "liking" other Facebook pages that were similar to it in focus and posting information to those pages to attract atten-tion to its own page and build relationships with page owners. By using the link-shortening service Bit.ly and Facebook's "Insights" analytics reports, the organization was able to see the metrics on how much reach its Facebook presence was creating. It quickly gained more "fans" and found that the exposure created by its Facebook presence interested reporters, students, potential funders, policymakers, and consumers, among others. The organization was thrilled that its efforts appeared to be paying off.

It did not take long, however, for staff to realize that Facebook posed an opportunity for people to post unfiltered opinions, good or bad. Every now and then, someone disagreed with a stance of the organization or posted misinformation about its work on the Facebook wall. This feedback was often instantaneous and sometimes encouraged others to contribute to the conversation. Occasionally, people would disagree with each other's comments and engage in arguments. Initially, this seemed like terrible publicity, and the executive direc-tor immediately directed staff to delete these comments. However, that quickly backfired, encouraging the naysayers to post more commentary about the organization on their own Facebook pages and blogs.

Staff determined that they had to set organizational policy to deal with these negative comments. They petitioned the executive director to allow any comments as long as they were not offensive or inappropriate. They concluded that it was best to have access to the concerns and opinions of individuals and would provide factual rebuttals when necessary. They also recognized when they made a mistake, admitted it, and worked to rectify their missteps. A Disclaimer and Code of Conduct was created for the page so that page fans would have some guidelines and understand the organization's stance on comments in general and on disagreements among page members. If a post was removed, the individual was notified and provided with an explanation.

After it felt more comfortable with Facebook, the organization branched out into Twit-ter with an official presence. It found that Twitter provided a simple and quick method to update followers. The organization provided information on breaking advocacy updates and national conference developments and even engaged with its followers who tweeted about the organization. It was difficult to communicate the complex issues the organization dealt with in 140 characters, but it provided succinct and abbreviated information and

linked to Web sites where more information was available. The organization also launched its own organizational blog where it could elaborate on its tweets.

The organization launched a LinkedIn page, which served as a professional networking tool and was geared toward colleagues, job seekers, and other professionals. All of these avenues created additional opportunities for interaction and feedback, which served to improve the organization as it adapted and evolved in response.

Many staff members also maintained professional social media profiles in an effort to disseminate information about the work of the organization as broadly as possible. Different staff provided more detailed information on their areas of expertise, such as research, advocacy, fundraising, and publications. The organization set policy mandating that staff be respectful at all times, cite external references, refrain from posting any confidential or legal information, and provide information only within their realms of expertise. Staff found that their pages provided additional promotion for the organization as well as exposure for their own careers.

Unfortunately, one staff member in the Government Relations Department posted information about a controversial advocacy issue that was outside the scope of the organization. Because of the staff person's affiliation with the organization, the executive director received numerous e-mails and phone calls from individuals who did not agree with the staff person's opinion and were offended that the organization was taking a stand on an issue that was outside of its mission. A funder even called to express dismay and explore the possibility of pulling funding if the situation was not remediated. The executive director determined that staff with professional profiles, claiming to represent the organization, had to refrain from posting their personal opinions and information about controversial issues with no relevancy to their work. Social media presences were also clearly posted on the official organizational Web site and in all staff e-mail signatures. Further, staff members were free to maintain personal profiles without organizational affiliation.

One staff member decided that she would not affiliate with the organization but had maintained her own personal profile for several years. Vivian enjoyed using her profile to keep up with old friends and colleagues. She was also a licensed clinical social worker and ran a private practice on nights and weekends. It did not take long for Vivian's clients to begin trying to "friend" her on Facebook. Vivian did not post anything inappropriate on her page, but she still felt that this situation posed an ethical dilemma for her. She was concerned about crossing boundaries, but when she did not respond to client requests, they would ask at their next session why she had not accepted them as friends on the Web site. Vivian was concerned that they might not understand why she could not accept their seemingly innocuous request, but she determined that she had to outline her own social media policy and present it to all clients on their first session. This helped her to meet her ethical responsibilities and decrease any ambiguity or confusion with her clients regarding her role as a clinician.

Vivian also refrained from "friending" her coworkers and professional contacts. She wanted to keep her professional and personal lives separate and was clear regarding her

personal boundaries when discussions about social networking sites arose at work. She set her privacy settings to reflect this decision and felt relatively insulated as she responded to friends' comments or posted pictures. However, Vivian did not take into account that her interactions with friends on their public profile pages or pictures that they posted could be found easily by others.

At a bachelorette party, she was not concerned about the constant flash of cameras and cell phones as she celebrated with close friends. However, the following Monday, a coworker made a flippant comment and laughed regarding Vivian's "wild weekend." Vivian asked what he meant, and he informed her that he was a friend of a friend and had viewed the pictures on Facebook. She was mortified and realized that she had to be more careful with her online presence. She realized that the lines between professional and personal lives had become blurred, and she had to be more cognizant of the image that she wanted to project to others at all times. She also realized that not only would coworkers and clients find her online, but potential future employers could easily form an opinion about her based solely on her online persona.

Conclusion

Social media provides outstanding, and often free (in terms of belonging to an online community, although $4.26 billion will be spent on social media marketing globally in 2011 [Esposito, 2011]), opportunities to engage with stakeholders, disseminate information, and promote the products or services of nonprofit organizations or individuals. It is a natural extension of the work that social workers do on a daily basis; reaching out to communities, guiding people to information and resources, and promoting good in as many ways as possible. However, these outlets also pose some risks and can reduce the ability of individuals or organizational staff to control the conversation. In addition to those depicted in the narrative, there are a range of ethical concerns to address for professional social workers and nonprofit organizations when engaging with the public through social media. Issues for individual practitioners include privacy, confidentiality, duty to warn, boundary concerns, and personal safety. Challenges for organizations include constantly developing current and relevant content and developing policies and protocols to guide outreach efforts.

Regardless of the potential risks, social media is no longer just an option. Individuals and organizations must behave in an ethical and transparent manner, using these tools to fulfill their mission and goals.

Discussion Questions

1. Why is it important for organizations and agencies to set social media policies to guide their efforts?

2. What are some examples of excellent social media efforts by nonprofit organizations? What did the organizations get out of these efforts?

3. What are some pros and cons to engaging consumers in social media outreach? Policymakers? The public? The media? Potential members and donors?

References

Esposito, J. (2011). *23 social media facts to share with executives.* Retrieved from http://jeffesposito. com/2011/02/14/social-media-facts-share-executives/

Grunwald Associates. (2007). *Kids social networking study.* Retrieved from http://www.grunwald. com/reports/sn/index.php

Qualman, E. (2010). *Social media revolution.* Retrieved from http://www.socialnomics.net/2010/ 05/05/social-media-revolution-2-refresh/

Qualman, E. (2011). *10 WOW social media statistics.* Retrieved from

Smith, J. (2009). *Fastest growing demographic on Facebook: Women over 55.* Retrieved from http://www. insidefacebook.com/2009/02/02/fastest-growing-demographic-on-facebook-women-over-55/

Universal McCann. (2010). *Wave 5: The socialization of brands* [Slide]. Retrieved from http://www. slideshare.net/Olivier.mermet/universal-mccann-wave-5-the-socialisation-of-brands

CHAPTER 3

Fundraising as Social Work Practice

Marilyn Flynn

We make a living by what we get, we make a life by what we give.

—Sir Winston Churchill

In 2008, individuals and corporations made charitable gifts exceeding $307 billion dollars, or 2.2 percent of U.S. gross domestic product—the highest level of giving in the world (Bond, 2009). The majority of these donations were made by individuals, particularly through estate bequests; foundations provided approximately $47 billion. Human services ranked first among all beneficiary groups, receiving about 27 percent of funding. These gifts acted as an engine for policy and program innovation in the nonprofit sector, mitigated some of the worst immediate effects of the recession, and filled in some of the gaps left by deficient social policy.

The nature of philanthropy has changed in some dramatic ways over the past century. Beginning from the general idea of helping people with their expressed needs for relief from pain or poverty, foundations and donors have grown more concerned with underlying causes, testable interventions, and policy solutions. Government has also followed this trend, moving well beyond public assistance, social security, and charity hospitals as responses to social need. The newest generation of private philanthropists has taken on the mission of reducing some of the world's most intransigent problems, such as HIV/AIDs in Africa and failing urban schools in the United States. New collaborations between foundations and government have made long-term, complex social projects more viable than ever before. Charitable resources are being used in ways that reflect the influence of social science, professional social work, and savvy investment strategies, increasing the likelihood of positive social benefit. Social policy experimentation is now possible on a scale and in forms never previously imagined. Fundraising by social workers has never been more important, nor has it been more potentially consequential.

Social Work Matters

Parallel with these developments, fundraising has emerged as a recognized profession with technical, legal, and ethical dimensions and demands. Social workers have, throughout this period, emphasized the need for expertise and scientific understanding of society in charitable work. They have helped both government and private charities maintain a focus on *why* programs or policies are necessary. Today, fundraisers are expected to understand existing policy contexts and arrays of services, identify emergent or unaddressed social problems, offer scientific rationales for interventions, and ensure that interventions will be sustainable. The making of this case is one of the most important responsibilities of modern fundraisers and requires a level of expertise that many social workers possess. Fundraising has become a vital aspect of social work practice, and an exciting means of driving social change. It is one of the most formidable tools for actualizing a vision and affecting social policy.

Fundraising Defined

The concept of fundraising includes allocations or gifts from private individuals for private purposes; grants from private organizations, such as foundations; grants from governmental authorities; and almost every other kind of exchange between people in which there is no expectation of formal return. The goal of fund raising is to generate interest in, and perhaps ongoing commitment by others, to a civic or social purpose.

The goal of fund raising is, of course, to increase resources. It is easy to forget that there are other kinds of resources—for example, volunteer time, activities and events that build credibility and social acceptability for a cause, free media exposure, and personal help with connections to new supporting networks in the community. These nonmonetary "gifts" produce expanded relationships, legitimacy, and broadened social engagement for a program or project. They represent an implicit but critical aspect of fundraising success.

Fundingraising, Social Policy, and Social Change

Social policies serve both as guidelines for action and as statements of social aspirations—to end poverty, for example. Together with leadership and vision, there is perhaps nothing more potent for achievement of policy objectives than adequate resources. Successful fundraising, at its best, helps to ensure that policies are implemented in the most timely, effective, and compelling ways.

For more than a century, social workers have understood the importance of resource development and have been central in the creation of some of today's most enduring community philanthropies. The United Way of America stands as one widely recognized example in which social work leadership, at both the local and national level, has

played an essential role for almost a century. Social workers serve as program officers in many of the nation's most important charitable foundations, work as advancement staff in universities and other nonprofit organizations, and are lead fundraisers in organizations which they administer. Social work executives often are the single most compelling spokespersons for the problems and populations with which their agencies are associated. When they speak, donors often listen.

Although fewer in number, social workers also act as lobbyists with local, state, and national legislative bodies, helping to generate funds through direct appropriation and other political mechanisms. This goes well beyond advocacy and combines knowledge of policy gaps, ability to communicate needs to a variety of audiences in spoken and written form, understanding of political and appropriations processes, ability to listen, and capacity for relationship building at the highest levels.

NARRATIVE

As an example, I would point to fundraising initiatives that I began with the U.S. House of Representatives in 2008. By that time, it had become clear that there were no effective policies in place to ensure adequate treatment for soldiers returning from the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The problem was not so much poor policy as the absence of organized public and private attention. Further, it was unclear how national policy leadership could be established, because responsibility was divided into so many disparate parts—the Pentagon, the individual regular armed forces, the Reserves and Guard, the benefits and health divisions of the Department of Veterans Affairs, state governments, and other veterans organizations. In general, public institutions such as schools, mental health clinics, and legal services for the poor were negligibly oriented to military experience. Equally serious, it was unclear how a national professional workforce could be rapidly prepared to address the special needs of veterans with posttraumatic stress or other combat-related reactions, the problems of their families and children, and the general issues of community reentry.

Over a period of six months, I prepared a white paper that highlighted policy issues, especially those related to social work and behavioral health workforce development. I met with staffers from the appropriations committees in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, representatives from the state of California, where my university was located, Pentagon officials—including the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—research leaders in the National Institute of Mental Health, the newly created Defense Centers of Excellence, and the Army. I talked with strategic workforce planners in the Department of Defense and policy analysts in key Washington think tanks. I hired a social worker newly retired from the Air Force Academy to work with me in this effort and to give a credible military face to this issue.

As a result, Congress subsequently allocated nearly $15,000,000 within the space of about 18 months to support innovative training approaches in graduate social work education and model data-based interventions for children with deployed parents. Subsequently,

two major foundations contributed an additional $4,000,000 to strengthen these programs. At present, these are the largest community-based, civilian projects in the United States and give social work a continuing role of advocacy on behalf of the nation's returning service members.

Discussion

This example is meaningful because it is emblematic of the powerful impact social workers can—and do—have in the shaping of policy solutions; creation of new resources desperately needed by vulnerable populations; and, ultimately, implementation of these solutions. In this case, fundraising brought together both public and private resources; combined new clinical interventions for returning soldiers with community-level public, university, and military partnerships; advanced innovative teaching technology; and undergirded all with a solid scientific research core.

Fundraising in this case was particularly effective, because it brought a social work perspective on family and community to the nation's dialogue on military issues. The need for service providers to understand military culture as part of culturally competent professional practice was stressed. The involvement of civilian community institutions as partners in the social reintegration of soldiers and their families to civilian life was highlighted, and the particular psychological vulnerability of Reserve and National Guard members was emphasized. All of these individual elements had, of course, been part of the national dialogue, but the disciplinary framework of social work brought these themes together in a compelling way that attracted both public and private support.

Social Work Matters

Fundraising in the hands of a social worker is quite distinct from the same activity conducted by a professional fundraiser. At its best, resource development is never an end in itself but, rather, is driven by a compelling idea concerning human need. The best fund raisers do succeed in obtaining money, volunteers, and enhanced reputation for the organizations they serve. However, perpetuation of the organization itself is the least valuable aspect of their work. The enhancement of human life and strengthening of human potential, expressed in program ideas and policies, is the true objective. Social workers often excel at fundraising, because they are so closely in touch with human stories at the grassroots level and can translate these experiences in a convincing way to larger audiences. And social workers are often among the first to recognize unmet need, as was the case in the narrative.

Fundraising is also connected to an honest appreciation and use of data. The presentation of an idea, together with a request for financial support, requires deep ethical commitment, a hallmark of the social work profession. When resources are limited,

social workers have increasingly recognized that appeals for help must be tied to defensible purposes, not simply ideology. Calls for funding must be supported by adequate evidence, with the promise of consequential outcomes, and where possible, grounded in science. This is consistent with the historic grounding of social work from its inception in research and systematic understanding of social behavior.

Relationship building lies at the core of fundraising. A gift represents a donor's response not only to the inherent worth of a cause but to a fundraiser's ability to make an appealing connection to the donor's values or priorities. Because social workers are highly skilled at relationship building, they bring an indispensable skill to grant making and grant development.

Conclusion

Fundingraising is an integral aspect of policy development and clinical intervention, the underlying pump-priming element that makes social transformation and innovation possible. As a process, it draws on long-established social work values and skills. As a highly evolved professional activity, it reflects the influence of social work leadership in both public and private sectors.

Over the coming decade, the continued advancement of human welfare and social justice will depend to a far greater degree than ever before on a mix of resources from government, philanthropic organizations, and private donors. Jostling for fiscal support among competing needs will only intensify. With their ability to understand complex environments, their relationship-building proficiency, and their keen eye for human need, social workers will continue to occupy key roles in the fundraising arena—roles that will perhaps be more important than ever before.

Discussion Questions

1. How does the approach of a social worker to fundraising differ from that of any professional fundraiser in general?

2. Why is fundraising such a powerful tool for connecting social policy and clinical work individuals?

Reference

Bond, S. (2009). *U.S. charitable giving estimated to be $307.65 billion in 2008.* Retrieved from http://www.givingusa.org/press_releases/gusa/GivingReaches300billion.pdf

CHAPTER 4

Workplace Bullying

Tracy Robinson Whitaker

The world of work is full of interesting dynamics. Not only is it a place where people earn a living, but it is also often the place where people define themselves as adults. It is a place where people invest their time toward a common goal and the place where they craft and hone their professional skills and reputations. Work provides income, structure, and an environment where people interact with a relatively constant group of individuals for extended periods of time.

Across all settings, employers have expectations of workers, and, likewise, workers have expectations of their employers. Whether in blue collar or white collar environments, employers generally expect that workers will be honest about the skills they possess, that they will provide a fair day's work for a day's pay, and they will not engage in behaviors that are illegal or dangerous. On the other side, workers expect fairness in compensation, hiring and promotions, scheduling, and workload. In addition to these expectations, workers also expect to feel safe at work. However, despite numerous worker safety regulations, the workplace can be an increasingly hostile and, in some instances, dangerous place.

Coupled with the daily stresses associated with earning a living, countless employees also experience a range of hostile behaviors from incivility to violence. The perpetrators of these noxious behaviors are not strangers but, rather, bosses, colleagues, and subordinates of employees. These hostile interactions can occur in all work environments, including those of helping professionals; however, they are not all equally harmful. For instance, incivility (such as rude and obnoxious behavior, withholding information, or checking e-mail or texting during a meeting) can be annoying and irritating, but it is usually harmless. In fact, most employees encounter some form of incivility in their jobs. However, numerous employees experience more serious hostile workplace interactions that involve nonphysical, psychological violence that have been generally described as "workplace bullying" (Namie, 2003). The Workforce Bullying Institute defines *workplace bullying* as "status-blind interpersonal hostility that is deliberate, repeated, and sufficiently severe as to harm the target's health or economic status" (Namie, 2003, p. 1). Workplace bullying can manifest as physical assaults and threats, sexual harassment, and verbally and emotionally abusive interactions.

Bullying is an equal opportunity offense. Bullying is not limited to high-powered corporate environments—it can occur anywhere. In fact, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) (2004) found that one-quarter of the 516 U.S. companies surveyed acknowledged that some degree of bullying had occurred in their organization. Despite common views about nonprofits being "warm and fuzzy" work environments, workers in these settings, including social workers, can also be subjected to bullying behaviors (Whitaker, in press).

Targets of workplace bullying can experience health problems such as depression, insomnia, ulcers, posttraumatic stress disorders, anxiety and migraines, and suicidal thoughts (Bond, Tuckey, & Dollard, 2010; McKay & Fratzl, 2011). For some employees, workplace bullying is a severely debilitating experience. And unlike random criminal violence, workplace bullying is particularly harmful because of the continuous and economic relationship with the target. Targets of workplace bullying may fear they will lose their jobs in ways that make finding another job very difficult, and many often do (McKay & Fratzl, 2011; Namie, 2003). They may also be ostracized or isolated in the workplace by colleagues (Whitaker, 2011). In addition, workplace bullying is not prohibited under federal employment discrimination laws, leaving targets with few avenues of redress.

Part of the dilemma facing targets of workplace bullying is the minimization of what they are experiencing (Namie, 2003). However, when people are derided or humiliated by their employers, an abuse of power occurs that closely resembles the phenomenon of domestic violence (Namie, 2003). Like domestic violence, workplace bullying is a repetitive behavior. Targets and victims are subjected to repeated attacks that occur over time. Some of the same problems that plague victims of domestic violence likewise are experienced by targets of workplace bullying. Domestic violence was once considered a *personal* problem, whereas workplace bullying is often considered a *personnel* problem. Victims of partner violence are often blamed for instigating the violence; targets of workplace bullying are often scrutinized by friends and colleagues for their roles in antagonizing their bullies. Domestic violence victims are often blamed for staying in abusive relationships; similarly, bullying targets are often advised to find another job and blamed when they do not leave their current place of employment. In addition, both groups experience societal indifference and silent bystanders (Workplace Bullying Institute, n.d.).

Narrative

The following example illustrates some of the dynamics of workplace bullying.

Kelly Drexler was an ambitious, confident social worker. She'd been on a fast career track, and she was thrilled when she accepted a management position at a nonprofit organization reporting to a manager who had worked at the organization for over 20 years. However,

she soon found herself in an untenable situation. Despite having a stellar work history before this position, she was unable to meet her boss' increasingly unreasonable demands in her new job.

Within months of starting her new job, she experienced a series of incidents that initially seemed inconsequential but left her feeling disrespected and confused. She was excluded from important meetings in her department, her work was criticized publicly, other staff members were given credit for her work, she was given impossible deadlines, and her boss spoke to her in a rude and disrespectful tone. When she was at work, Kelly often felt humiliated and isolated.

At first, Kelly thought that she was being overly sensitive; however, these incidents quickly grew into a pattern of hostile and abrasive interactions. Hoping to turn the situation around, Kelly threw herself into the work, working longer hours and weekends, but the situation became worse.

Kelly was dismayed to learn that she had been labeled a troublemaker and that her boss was gossiping about her to other coworkers. Her colleagues, afraid that the wrath of their boss would turn on them if they associated with Kelly, began to isolate her. They also seemed to benefit from the disproportionate amount of attention directed at Kelly, as it allowed them more freedom and less oversight in their positions. Kelly was confused about why she had been singled out for such hurtful behavior.

She contemplated leaving the job, but the economy was bad, and good jobs were hard to come by. She also contributed significantly to her family's income. Kelly had never encountered anything like this in her professional life, and she tried to counter the hostility in traditional ways. On several occasions, she talked to her boss about these behaviors, assuming that there had been a misunderstanding, but these discussions were futile. She kept meticulous records and met with the human resources (HR) department. Because she was not in a "protected status group" of employees, the HR department had no recourse to offer her except "try to deal with it."

Kelly sought the advice of an attorney but was told that there was no legal recourse available to her. She also talked to friends and family members, who sympathized but conveyed the sentiment "that's why they call it work." Lacking legal, organizational, and informal supports, Kelly began to blame herself. She became discouraged and depressed. She struggled with insomnia and had constant headaches. Her confidence plummeted. She lost interest in hobbies and began to be reclusive on the weekends. After a year on the job, Kelly's husband insisted that she quit to protect her health. Afraid that she would encounter more bullying in her next position, Kelly's efforts to find a new job were inconsistent.

POLICY MATTERS

Public policy can be a powerful tool for prevention and intervention. Legislation not only provides motivation to change behavior, it also provides consequences for unacceptable behavior (Bent-Goodley, 2011; Namie, 2003). For instance, negative

workplace behavior, including sexual harassment and racial discrimination, were rampant until state and federal laws provided sanctions for such actions. Just as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration ensures safe and healthful working physical conditions for working men and women by setting and enforcing standards , attention needs to be paid to the safety of the psychological environment of the workplace (NIOSH, 2006).

To this end, 21 states have introduced the "Healthy Workplace Bill" (Workplace Bullying Institute, n.d.). This bill fills the gap in current state and federal legislation by defining an abusive work environment and giving employers the power to terminate or sanction offenders. In addition, adoption of this legislation would hold employers accountable for health-harming cruelty at work and provide an avenue for legal redress for such behaviors.

Not only are social workers called on to help professionals who encounter workplace bullying, they can also be targets of such bullying themselves (Whitaker, in press). As such, the social work community can play an important role in addressing this insidious issue as advocates, employee assistance program (EAP) specialists, employees, and supervisors As advocates, social workers can support legislation that addresses the harm that workplace bullying can cause. Occupational social workers and EAP specialists can help individuals and organizations identify bullying behaviors and develop policies and programs that promote healthy work environments. As supervisors and employees, social workers can uphold their ethical obligations by refraining from engaging in bullying behaviors and by assisting colleagues who are targets of bullying (NASW, 2008). Social workers also can do what they have always done in the face of injustice—identify perpetrators, acknowledge the harm, affirm the targets, and strive to make a difference.

Discussion Questions

1. In addition to limiting harm to individual employees, what other arguments can be made in support of bully-free workplaces?

2. Would passage of healthy workplace legislation result in frivolous or unfounded litigation? Why or why not?

References

Bent-Goodley, T. B. (2011). *The ultimate betrayal: A renewed look at intimate partner violence*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Bond, S. A., Tuckey, M. R., & Dollard, M. F. (2010). Psychosocial safety climate, workplace bullying, and symptoms of posttraumatic stress. *Organization Development Journal, 28*(1). Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa5427/is_201004/ai_n53078459/

McKay, R., & Fratzl, J. (2011). A cause of failure in addressing workplace bullying: Trauma and the employee. *International Journal of Business and Social Science, 2*(7), 13–27.

Namie, G. (2003, November/December). Workplace bullying: Escalated incivility. *Ivey Business Journal,* 1–6.

National Association of Social Workers. (2008). *Code of ethics of the National Association of Social Workers.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health. (2004, July 28). *Most workplace bullying is worker to worker, early findings from NIOSH study suggest.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/updates/upd-07-28-04.html

National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health. (2006). *Workplace violence prevention strategies and research needs.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/docs/2006-144/pdfs/2006-144.pdf

Whitaker, T. (2011). The high costs of workplace bullying. *NASW Specialty Practice Sections Inter-Sections in Practice, 1*(1), 20–21.

Whitaker, T. (in press). Social workers and workplace bullying: Perceptions, responses and implications. *WORK: A Journal of Prevention, Assessment and Rehabilitation.*

Workplace Bullying Institute. (n.d.). *The Healthy Workplace Bill—Quick facts about the legislation.* Retrieved from http://www.healthyworkplacebill.org/bill.php