Domain Analysis of Social Work: An Example of an Integrated Methodological Approach

Chaim Zins* and David Guttmann**

* Department of Information Science, Bar-Ilan University, Email: chaimz@research.haifa.ac.il
** School of Social Work, Faculty of Social Welfare & Health Studies,
University of Haifa, Israel.

Dr. Chaim Zins is an information scientist, at the Department of Information Science, Bar-Ilan University. He is a former member at the Department of Human Services, University of Haifa. Dr. Zins' current research is focused on knowledge organization, foundations of information science, knowledge management, information and referral services, and information retrieval.

Prof. David Guttmann is a social worker. He is a Professor Emeritus and a former Head of the School of Social Work, at the University of Haifa.

Zins, Chaim and David Guttman. (2003). **Domain Analysis of Social Work: An Example of an Integrated Methodological Approach**. *Knowledge Organization, 30(3/4)*. 196-212. 41 refs.

ABSTRACT: This study exemplifies an integrated methodological approach to domain analysis. The study analyzes the field of social work. It is aimed at developing a systematic, comprehensive, and scientifically valid knowledge map, and its applicability as an efficient tool to adequately represent knowledge in the field. The map is composed of seven parts: foundation (meta-knowledge), social worker, environment, organization, area of practice, method, and client. The study followed a qualitative four-phase research methodology. The first phase was a phenomenological analysis of the basic characteristics of social work as a social service. The analysis resulted in a seven-facet subject classification. In the second phase the conceptual skeleton was elaborated, and adjusted to the field of social work by a grounded-theory methodology. The data used for grounding the model were 14 social work resources. The model was tested in the third phase by classifying 200 terms randomly selected from the *Dictionary of Social Work* (Barker, 1999). Finally, in the fourth phase we classified 197 papers published in two leading journals, *Social Work* and *Social Service Review*, in three successive years, 1997, 1998, and 1999. This exemplary study has implications for domain analysis. The paper discusses these implications.

KEYWORDS: domain analysis, knowledge map, social work, subject classification scheme, phenomenological analysis, scientific validity

1. Introduction

This study analyzes the field of social work. It is aimed at developing a systematic, comprehensive, and scientifically valid knowledge map, and its applicability as an efficient tool to adequately represent knowledge in this field. Knowledge mapping is the formulation of the boundaries of the knowledge domain and its division into major parts. The term 'knowledge map' in this study is a synonym for a subject classification scheme.

Exploring the boundaries and basics of social work is the core of this domain analysis research. What are the boundaries of the field of social work?

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

What are the basic building blocks of the profession? These key issues seem to be on the agenda of scholars and practitioners in the field of social work. They are reflected in numerous studies and position papers (see, e.g., Abbott, 1995; Bar-On, 1994, Gibelman, 1999, Haynes & White, 1999; Leighninger, 1987; Rosenfeld, 1983; Schneider & Netting, 1999; Tucker, 1996; Walz & Groze, 1991; Witkin, 1999).

Since this study is primarily based on an analysis of the phenomena of social work, followed by scientifically based structuring, it will hopefully be utilized for improving and evaluating social work academic programs, as well as for developing structured social work bibliographic resources, compiling reading lists and bibliographic collections, facilitating quick subject access to bibliographic resources in databases and web sites, and evaluating the coverage of knowledge in academic journals.

2. Subject Classification Scheme of Social Work

In order not to 'reinvent the wheel' we reviewed known subject classification schemes. The number of subject classification schemes of social work is large. In fact, almost any introductory book on social work presents an optional scheme in its table of contents (see, e.g., Compton & Galaway, 1994; Johnson & Yanca, 2001; Gitterman, 1991). Gitterman (1991), for instance, divided social work practices with vulnerable populations into two categories: (1) vulnerable life conditions, and (2), vulnerable life circumstances and events. *Vulnerable life conditions* include AIDS, alcoholism and other drug addictions, borderline personality, chronic physical illness and disability, depression, eating problems, learning disabilities, mental retardation, and schizophrenia. *Vulnerable life circumstances and events* include adolescent pregnancy, child abuse and neglect, children in foster care, crime victims, death of a child, domestic violence, elderly in need of long-term care, family caregivers of the frail elderly, homeless people, immigrants and refugees, imprisonment, suicide and suicidal behavior, and workers in job jeopardy. This presents to the reader an optional, though partial, subject classification scheme of the field of social work.

Subject classification schemes of social work can also be found in overviews and encyclopedia articles. Good examples are the articles of Brieland (1996), Hopps and Collins (1996), Popple (1996), and Turner (1996), which were published in the *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (Edwards, 1996). The sections' titles in these articles usually present thematic maps of the subject domains as the authors perceived them.

Another group of social work subject classification schemes includes schemes used for classifying bibliographic resources in libraries (e.g., *Library of Congress Classification*, 1998, *Dewey Decimal Classification* (Dewey, 1996), *Bliss Bibliographic Classification – Class Q: Social Welfare* (Mills and Broughton, 1977)), scholarly databases (e.g., *Social Work Abstracts*, 2001), and the Internet (*Social Work Gateway*, 2000). This group also includes the *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (1997), which is a thesaurus of keywords used for indexing bibliographic resources rather than a classification scheme. The Library of Congress classification scheme and the *Social Work Abstracts* classification scheme are the most comprehensive.

All the schemes presented above are based on, and reflect, thematic connections among the various topics. These are not mere arbitrary or alphabetical lists of topics. Therefore, without delving into the nature of these connections, we may agree to describe them as systematic. In addition, most of these schemes were formulated in the late 1990s, so they are certainly up to date. Though most of the schemes are incomplete, some are comprehensive and adequately cover the social work knowledge domain. Still, the scientific basis of these schemes is not clear. This study sought to develop a scientifically valid, as well as systematic, comprehensive, and updated subject classification scheme of social work. Accordingly, the significance of the study lies in the scientific validity of the structuring methodology.

Zins and Guttmann (2000) developed a subject classification scheme for the field of Logotherapy. We follow their methodological approach and explore the applicability of their model to the field of social work.

3. Methodology

A scientifically valid knowledge map is a map that was developed based on a scientifically valid structuring methodology. Note that the term "scientific methodology" has different meanings. Without delving into the definition of "a scientifically valid methodology" – which exceeds the framework of this study – one can agree that the scientific validity of a scheme depends on two necessary conditions. These are the scientific validity of the structuring methodology (whatever it is) and the fact that it is grounded in empirical raw material.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

This is crucial; the scientific validity of a knowledge map is primarily based on the scientific validity of the structuring methodology rather than on the structure itself. Since knowledge structuring is an intellectual activity aimed at organizing the knowledge domain, it is based on two generic elements, namely the relevant constitutive concepts and the content of the knowledge domain. Consequently, from the epistemological perspective knowledge structuring can be based either on a logical analysis of the relevant constitutive concepts (e.g., "social work") or on an empirical study of the field (e.g., what social workers actually do). In other words, domain analysis can be either conceptual (i.e., a typology) or empirical (i.e., a taxonomy). Typologies and taxonomies can be highly sophisticated. But to be acknowledged as scientific they need to be grounded in (or tested by) empirical data by means of scientific methodologies.

Hjørland (1998, 2002b) identified and formulated four methodological approaches to constructing subject classification schemes. These are *Empiricism*, *Rationalism*, *Historicism*, and *Pragmatism*. I suggest that the four approaches be arranged in two groups, based on the type of structure they generate. *Rationalism* generates typologies. *Empiricism*, *Historicism*, and *Pragmatism* generate taxonomies. Note that *Pragmatism* is based on personal or societal values and goals, so one may argue that it generates typologies. Still, *Pragmatism* stresses the benefits to individuals and societies in real-life conditions, so they are subject to empirical testing. For that reason, *Pragmatism* generates taxonomies rather than typologies.

Each approach creates a different structure since it stresses a different perspective. The *Rationalist* stresses the meaning of the relevant concepts. The *Empiricist* stresses the current content of the subject domain. The *Historicist* emphasizes the development of the knowledge domain from a historical perspective, and the *Pragmatist* stresses the benefits to individuals and societies. Consequently, the four approaches generate four different knowledge maps of social work. The *Rationalist*'s map stresses the meaning of "social work" and comprises social work key elements, such as the social worker, the environment, the client, and so on. The *Empiricist*'s map stresses the contemporary state of social work. This includes, for example, the types of social problems and therapeutic methods employed by social workers. The *Historicist*'s map stresses changes in social work conceptions; for example, the shift from charity to social justice, and the shift from idealistic and ideological engagement to the social worker-client professional relationship. The *Pragmatist*'s map stresses the overall value of social work to individuals and society. Hence, a *Pragmatist*'s map includes, for example, human needs, social ideologies, and social policies.

In this study, the structuring followed a qualitative four-phase research methodology, which combines the rationalistic and the empirical approaches. The first phase utilizes a rationalistic methodology; the second, the third, and the fourth utilize empirical methodologies. Following Hjørland's classification of structuring methodologies, one can characterize the first phase as *Rationalism* and the other phases as *Empiricism.*

The first phase was a phenomenological analysis of social work as a social service. It resulted in a seven-facet subject classification scheme. A phenomenological analysis is a conceptual analysis, since a phenomenon is a concept in the individual's mind, which mirrors real or imaginary objects, activities, and events. A phenomenological analysis relates to the meaning of the concept, while ignoring the question of reality. *A Phenomenologist* studies the meaning of the studied phenomenon rather than its "real" nature. The reader should note that this interpretation of "Phenomenology" is rooted in the writings of the philosopher Edmond Husserl (e.g., Husserl, 1972). From an epistemological perspective, a phenomenological analysis of "Unicorn" relates to the notion of a unicorn as an animal, regardless of the fact that a unicorn is an imaginary animal. Similarly, a phenomenological analysis of "social work" is a study of the meaning of "social work" rather than its realization in real social work practice. Moreover, a phenomenological analysis differs from a scientific study in focusing on the meaning of a concept rather than on the real nature of the phenomenon. Scientific studies, on the other hand, try to capture the reality by means of empirical explorations. Here this was undertaken in the second, the third, and the fourth phases of the study.

In the second phase, the seven-facet conceptual skeleton was elaborated and adjusted to the field of social work by a grounded-theory methodology. This is a general research methodology for developing theory – in this case, model structuring – grounded in data systematically gathered and analyzed (Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The data used for grounding the structuring were the 13 classification schemes deduced from the resources mentioned in the previous section and the Table of Contents of the *Encyclope-*

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

dia of Social Work (Edwards, 1996). Note that the list of encyclopedia articles is set in alphabetical order and not by subject classification. Nevertheless, it provides a detailed coverage of the field.

In the third phase we tested the model by classifying 200 terms randomly selected from the *Dictionary of Social Work* (Barker, 1999). We selected only terms, omitting names of people and organizations. The model evaluation was part of the structuring process, and resulted in refining the model. The rationale of the evaluation lay in the assumption that the validity of the model required that every one of the 200 terms be placed in at least one relevant category. Each term had indeed at least one category. However, some of the terms were placed in several categories.

Finally, in the fourth phase we classified all 197 papers published in two leading scholarly journals, *Social Work* and *Social Service Review*, in three successive years, 1997, 1998, and 1999. The two journals cover the various perspectives of social work theory and practice. Of these papers, 124 were published in *Social Work* and 73 in *Social Service Review*. The classification was based on a textual analysis of the papers. We independently analyzed the papers and then discussed the disagreements. Each paper was placed in at least one relevant category. Some papers were found relevant for several categories and they were sited accordingly on the map.

The knowledge map is presented in figure 1. The 200 exemplary concepts and 197 papers published in *Social Work* and *Social Service Review* are presented in figure 2.

4. The Model

Overview. The four-phase research methodology produced a seven-facet hierarchical three-level subject classification scheme (see Figure 1). The seven facets are (1) Foundation, (2) Social Worker, (3) Social Environment, (4) Organization, (5) Area of Practice, (6) Method, and (7) Client. Most facets are composed of a three-level hierarchical structure. For example: *Foundation* (1st level) – *Theory* (2nd level) – *Definition* (3rd level); *Social Environment* (1st level) – *Settings* (2nd level) – *Day care* (3rd level). In some cases we used fewer levels of sub-classification, or we refined the classification by adding a fourth level of topical sub-division, as in the following case:

Foundation (1st level) – *Theory* (2nd level) – *Disciplines* (3rd level) – *Anthropology* (4th level). The level of subdivision of each facet is grounded in the empirical raw material. The hierarchical sub-division structure in each facet is a product of the social work academic and professional knowledge.

Meta-knowledge. The Foundation section is unique. It includes the meta-knowledge of the field of social work. Its rationale rests on philosophical grounds rather than on the phenomenological analysis of social work, as is the case with facets (or sections) 2 through 7. The necessity of a specific meta-knowledge section is derived, as a philosophical implication, from Kurt Gödel's *Incompleteness Theorem* (Gödel, 1931). From Gödel's theorem one can conclude that it is logically impossible to form an axiomatic system without assuming additional postulates. By accepting this implication, we realize that it is theoretically impossible to formulate a self-sufficient explanation based exclusively on the phenomenological analysis of social work. Consequently, an additional meta-knowledge section, which in the model is titled "Foundation," is a necessary basis in the knowledge construction of the field. Meta-knowledge is knowledge on knowledge. It includes epistemological, methodological, conceptual, theoretical, historical, and practical postulates, and principles and guidelines regarding the relevant body of knowledge.

Six basics of social work. As noted, sections 2 through 7 are based on the phenomenological analysis of social work as a social service. The conception of social work as a case of social service paves the way to define the six basics of social work. Zins (2001) identified six key elements common to all human services. These are the service provider, the recipient, the environment, the organization, the need, and the method. Every social service is an interaction between the provider and the recipient effectuated through four media: the environment, the organizational framework, the needs addressed by the service, and the method. By adjusting the generic terminology to the context of social work, one can define six basics essential for characterizing the social work phenomenon: the social worker, the social environment, the organization, the area of practice, the method, and the client. These six basics, together with the *Foundation* (i.e., meta-knowledge) section, establish the theoretical ground for the seven-facet classification of social work.

Foundation. The Foundation section is composed of theory, history of social welfare and social work, education, and research and evaluation. The theory sub-section is divided into two categories: definition/conception and disciplines. In a concepts map,

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

the "definition/conception" category includes the concepts "social work," "social welfare," and "human services." However, in a bibliographic resource that utilizes this classification scheme the definition/conception category includes the papers mentioned above in the Introduction, as well as this paper. The "disciplines" category is composed of nine bodies of knowledge that establish the theoretical basis of social work; these are anthropology, economics, law, medicine, philosophy and ethics, political science, psychology and psychiatry, religion, and sociology. The education section refers to academic education in social work and to professional training of social workers. Social work education embodies theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge. The research and evaluation category includes concepts and resources on social work research and on evaluation and assessment of policies, techniques, and programs. Research on social work theory and practice is composed of two types, theoretical and empirical. Empirical research is divided into quantitative and qualitative. Note that scientific research and program evaluation are two different activities. Nevertheless, they are interrelated and utilize similar methodologies.

Social worker. This section addresses three aspects related to the social worker, namely the social worker's personality traits and value orientation, his or her theoretical knowledge, and his or her applied knowledge and work experience. Generally, it is expected that the social worker be humanitarian and egalitarian. Note that this section relates to the personal therapist. It differs from the *Foundation–Education* section, which refers to social work education, namely academic and professional programs.

Theoretical knowledge should consist of general humanist knowledge, general social work knowledge, and professional knowledge in the field of expertise (e.g., medicine, psychology, etc.). In addition, the social worker is expected to have relevant applied knowledge and work experience.

Social environment. This section refers to the therapeutic and service environment. Usually it refers to social policy on welfare issues, ethnic and cultural milieu, religious perspectives, and the setting. We identified nine distinctive settings: (1) correctional social work, (2) day care, (3) foster care, (4) hospice care, (5) hospital social work, (6) industrial social work, (7) military social work, (8) occupational social work, and (9) school social work.

The reader might wonder why we have omitted mental health from the list of nine settings since mental health institutions are common arenas for clinical social workers. Certainly, mental health is an important area of practice. We have acknowledged its place by designating a specific sub-category, category 5A(11)b (*Areas of Practice – Social Problems – Health Care – Mental Health*). Mental health is perceived as part of health care, besides physical health. Consequently, mental settings, such as mental health hospitals, are represented by the *hospital social work* category (5D(5)).

Organization. The "organization" category relates to the organizational aspects of the social service provision. The organizational perspectives are divided into two sub-categories: organizational type and membership type. Theoretically, social work can be affiliated with governmental, public, and private sectors; with nonprofit (i.e., governmental and public), and for-profit (i.e., private) organizations. The membership-type classification is divided into two sub-categories: sectarian and voluntary.

Area of practice. Social work areas of practice are divided into two broad categories: social problems and promotion of social justice. We identified 20 major types of social problems that social workers usually deal with. These are (1) addictions (e.g., alcoholism, drug abuse, etc.), (2) AIDS/HIV, (3) adoption, (4) aggression and violence, (5) crime, (6) disabilities, (7) disasters (earthquake, flooding, etc.), (8) displacement, (9) family malfunction, (10) family planning, (11) health care, (12) immigration, (13) losses and bereavement, (14) poverty, (15) prostitution, (16) rehabilitation, (17) retirement, (18) sex abuse and rape, (19) suicidal behavior, and (20) social deviance.

Three of the social problems listed above are further divided into a fourth level of sub-categories. Family malfunction is divided into four categories: adolescent pregnancy, child abuse, runaway, and women abuse. Health care is divided into physical health and mental health. Finally, poverty is classified into three classes: housing, hunger, and unemployment. These three basic human needs seem to be the most significant for defining poverty. Note that AIDS/HIV is currently a major social problem; therefore, we decided that it would be more appropriate to treat it as a unique category, rather than a sub-category of physical health.

Social workers often act to promote social justice in four areas: (1) distribution of social and economic resources, (2) human rights, (3) minority rights, and (4) client rights. Note that some of the concepts listed in figure 2 in the four sub-categories of "pro-

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

moting social justice" (e.g., affirmative action and antipoverty programs) are also implementations of social policies. Therefore, they can also be classified as "social environment – social policy (category 3A)."

Method. Traditionally and logically, professional interventions can be direct or indirect. The classification is based on the level of the social worker's involvement and his or her connection with the client. However, we could not ignore a significant group of technology-based interventions. Although in practice we could have characterized these interventions as direct and indirect, it seemed reasonable to formulate a specific category. Therefore, social work methods are divided here into three classes: direct intervention, indirect intervention, and technology-based social work.

There are thirteen major types of direct interventions: (1) advocacy, (2) case management, (3) clinical social work, (4) community organization, (5) conflict resolution, (6) counseling, (7) crisis intervention, (8) empowerment, (9) family therapy, (10) group work, (11) guardianship, (12) interviewing, and (13) referring. The indirect interventions are divided in six major categories: (1) administration and management, (2) consultation, (3) fundraising, (4) information and referral services, (5) planning/program development, and (6) supervision.

Note that two pairs of similar sub-categories are found (i.e., counseling vs. consultation, and referring vs. information and referral services) that belong to both types of interventions, direct and indirect. "Counseling," as a direct method of intervention, refers to advising clients, while "consultation" refers to peer consultations and to counseling given to professional social workers. "Referring," as a direct method of intervention, means referring specific clients, in the course and as part of the intervention, to obtain assistance from other helpers. "Information and referral services," as an indirect intervention, is the creation and operation of an information resource or an information service primarily aimed at meeting the information needs of professionals, clients, and the general public.

The technology-based category is currently composed of two sub-categories, namely computer and Internet-based interventions, and telephone-based interventions (e.g., emergency helplines).

Client. Different criteria serve to classify the clients. A quantitative criterion may classify clients into three major categories, individuals, groups, and communities, each of which requires different therapeutic and treatment techniques. A descriptive criterion may characterize the nature of the clients. The clients can be characterized by their need, gender, age, and cultural and ethnical identity. As one can see, there are different ways to map the "client" section. This section is divided into two major categories "individuals" and "groups and communities." The "group and community" category is divided into four sub-categories: age-based, culture and ethnicity-based, gender-based, and need-based groups and communities. Detailed classifications of need-based groups can be found in *Taxonomy of Human Services* (Sales, 1994).

5. Discussion and Conclusion

A systematic, comprehensive, and scientifically valid map. We have succeeded in developing a systematic scheme that enables information professionals, as well as social workers, to understand the structure of the social work knowledge domain and the conceptual relations among its major parts. This is because the structuring was essentially based on a phenomenological analysis of the diverse characteristics of social work's manifold phenomena. The phenomenological analysis provided the theoretical basis of the classification. Still, the fundamental significance of this study goes even farther. It culminates in the scientific structuring methodology, which grounded the model on empirical data, and established its scientific validity. Evidently, the combination of rationalistic and empirical research approaches emerges as a powerful tool for developing systematic, comprehensive, and scientifically valid subject classification schemes. The model that has been developed in this exemplary study is indeed systematic, comprehensive, and scientifically valid. This integrated methodological approach sets an example that may be followed in other subject domains.

Academic integrity. Still, this is definitely not the one ultimate model but an optional one. It is clear that the model reflects personal interpretations of the concept of social work and its related concepts. The phenomenological analysis is based by its very nature on the philosophical, professional, and ideological tenets of the expert in the subject matter. The subjective interpretations inherent in the phenomenological analysis, as well as in the grounded-theory qualitative research methodology, do not mean that the model is arbitrary and irrational. Yet the real question is what constitutes the logical and the scientific validity of subject classifications. Obviously, logical validity and scientific validity are based on es-

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

tablished criteria. Nevertheless, one cannot avoid the fact that, at the end of the day, the ultimate criterion is the researcher's impartial academic integrity.

Overlaps. Categories of systematic schemes are mutually exclusive. However, the reader might find overlapping among some of the categories. We dealt with these overlaps, and were aware of their rationales, as evidenced with health care and AIDS/HIV. Yet we decided to set a special category for AIDS/HIV, although it is part of health care, in order to reflect its dimensions and severity. Note, however, that in most cases the so-called overlaps arise from different interpretations and emphases. Taking, for instance, the phenomenon of mental health – social work, one can emphasize the general perspectives of mental health as a specified area of practice (i.e., category 5A(11)b), the institutional setting (i.e., category 3D(5)), or the therapeutic method (i.e., category 6A(3)). Another example is the phenomenon of community social work. The environmental perspective of the community is represented in section 3, *Social Environment*. The methodological perspective is represented in category 6A4, *Community Organization*. The cliental foci are represented in the four sub-categories of the 7B category, *Client: Groups and Communities*. The nuances are inevitable. Nevertheless, they do not negate the validity of the model, but rather exemplify the diversified perspectives of the social work phenomenon and its diverse foci.

Representing knowledge. The classification process of the exemplary 200 concepts and the 197 articles was a means to test the validity of the model, as well as its applicability. We succeeded in placing each one of the 200 concepts and the 197 papers in at least one relevant category, thus substantiating the validity of the model, and demonstrating its applicability as a powerful tool to represent knowledge in the field of social work.

Delimitation. The classification of the concepts and the papers was primarily aimed at exploring the capacity of the knowledge map to represent accumulated knowledge in the fields of social work, rather than at evaluating the two journals or the dictionary. Therefore, in many instances we placed the papers and the concepts in the most relevant category, while ignoring other options. Furthermore, the reader might disagree on the place where a specific paper is assigned. This does not refute the validity of the model, but only reflects disagreement on the proper place of the specific paper. However, if the reader cannot place the paper in any of the given categories, the inference is crucial: it means that the model has to be revised. Since social work is constantly changing, we expect this development to be inevitable.

Subject classification. The subject classification emerged here as an efficient tool for organizing bibliographic resources and facilitating intelligible representation of accumulated knowledge in the specific field based on thematic relations. Zins and Guttmann (2000) noted the existence of several models for organizing bibliographic resources, among them chronological order of publications, alphabetical order of authors, and subject classification. In May 2000 they surveyed a randomly selected sample of 100 web sites of scholarly journals and found that 96 journals (96%) utilized the chronological order of publications, 11 (11%) utilized the alphabetical order of authors' names, and only one (1%) followed a subject classification of the relevant field. The superiority of the subject classification scheme, which represents thematic relations, over the chronological order of the publication and the alphabetical order of authors' names, which reflect arbitrary connections, is self-explanatory. It arises from a comparison of Figures 2 and appendixes A and B. Note that Appendix A presents the alphabetical order of papers published in *Social Work*, and Appendix B presents the alphabetical order of papers published in *Social Service Review*. The chronological order of the papers is indicated by the numbers attached to the authors' names in the appendixes and in figure 2.

Evaluating knowledge coverage. Obviously, the model is a powerful tool for evaluating the knowledge coverage of academic and professional journals of social work. Reviewing Figure 2, one can at once draw three conclusions in respect of the coverage of the journals in the three relevant successive years. First, the two journals differed in their coverage. For example, they differed significantly in the coverage of *Area of Practice* (section 5) and *Method* (section 6). *Social Work* covered these two perspectives relatively more extensively than *Social Service Review.* Second, the 197 papers published in the two journals together generally covered the seven perspectives. However, and this is the third conclusion, the accumulated coverage was not exhaustive and left some uncovered "white holes," for example, *Information and referral services* (category 6B4).

One can see that *Social Work* covers all seven facets of the model, though in most of them the coverage is minimal. Clearly, *Social Service Review* is focused on the meta-knowledge of social work, with extensive coverage of the theoretical basis of the

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

field, its history, and research and evaluation. Although the journal addresses the other six facets of the model, their coverage is minimal.

Structured Thesauri. The classification of the 200 concepts presented in Figure 2 demonstrates the applicability of the knowledge map as a tool for developing structured thesauri. Structured thesauri are integrated in bibliographic resources. Thesauri construction is an important application of domain analysis (McIIwaine and Williamson, 1999; Hjörland, 2002a) Information professionals and lay users too, use structured thesauri for formulating improved search queries.

Classification as a tool for professional education. Subject classification is a powerful tool for professional education as well. Subject classification is aimed at assisting the reader to follow the thematic links among the various concepts that are included in the knowledge domain. Since this specific subject classification scheme is based on a phenomenological analysis of the complex social work phenomenon, it is assumed that it reflects fundamental conceptual relations among its various components. As Hjörland (1998, 2000, 2002a) puts it, classifications always reflect (consciously or unconsciously) the theoretical and philosophical approach of the field being classified. In our case, we launched the structuring with the conception that social work is a social service. This can help social workers to acquire a clearer conception of the social work profession, and as Bowker and Star (1999) made clear, "classifications are a key part of standardization processes that are themselves the cornerstones of working infrastructures."

Furthermore, social work educators can utilize the knowledge map for developing introductory courses and compiling reading lists and bibliographic collections based on the conception of social work (see Haythornthwaite, Bowker, Jenkins, & Rayward, 1999 as an example of implementing knowledge mapping in LIS education).

Facet classification. In the paper we use the term "facet classification" several times. The reader should not confuse it with the notion of facet classification that is connected with the facet-analytic approach (e.g. Mills (1957), Mills & Broughton (1977), and Vickery (1960)), and is implemented in Ranganathan's Colon Classification (CC) and Bliss' Bibliographic Classification (BC)). The term "facet classification" refers here to any classification whose structure is composed of categories that represent distinctive aspects of the subject. These categories are usually exhaustive and mutually exclusive.

Analytico-Synthetic Classification. We also adopt the term "Analytico-Synthetic Classification," which is closely related to CC and BC, but we implement it differently. Generally, a systematic classification construction is an Analytico-Synthetic process. The analysis is a means to the synthesis, which culminates in the structured scheme. The domain analysis enables us to define the key elements of the subject, but we still need the synthesis in order to capture the logical relations among them, and the boundaries of the subject domain.

Conclusion. To conclude, this study exemplifies an integrated methodological approach for domain analysis. We have succeeded in developing a systematic, comprehensive, and scientifically valid knowledge map, and illustrated its applicability as an efficient tool to adequately represent knowledge in the field. We demonstrated that the map is an efficient tool for evaluating the coverage of knowledge in social work journals. This bodes well for future implementations of the map for compiling reading lists and social work bibliographic collections, and facilitating access by subject to bibliographic resources and databases, such as *Social Work Abstracts* (2001), and in web directories, such as *Social Work Gateway* (2000). It also paves the way to the development of structured thesauri and improved web sites and bibliographic resources. We hope that the methodological approach implemented in this study will set an example for domain analysis and synthesis in other subjects as well.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

Figure 1: Knowledge Map of Social Work

1. Foundations (Meta-knowledge)
- A. Theory
  - (1) Definition/conception
  - (2) Disciplines
    - a. Anthropology
    - b Economics
    - c. Law
    - d. Medicine
    - e. Philosophy/Ethics
    - f. Political Science
    - g. Psychology/Psychiatry
    - h. Religion
    - i. Sociology
- B. History of Social Welfare/Social Work
- C. Education
  - (1) Theoretical
  - (2) Practical
- D. Research & Evaluation

2. Social Worker
- A. Personality Traits & Value Orientation
- B. Theoretical Knowledge
- C. Applied Knowledge & Work Experience

3. Social Environment
- A. Social Policy
- B. Ethnic/Cultural Milieu
- C. Religious Milieu
- D. Settings
  - (1) Correctional SW
  - (2) Day Care
  - (3) Foster Care
  - (4) Hospice care
  - (5) Hospital Social Work
  - (6) Industrial Social Work
  - (7) Military Social Work
  - (8) Occupational Social Work
  - (9) School Social Work

4. Organization
- A. Organizational Type
  - (1) Governmental Sector
  - (2) Public Sector
  - (3) Private Sector
- B. Membership Type
  - (1) Sectarian
  - (2) Voluntary

5. Areas of Practice

A. Social Problems
- (1) Addictions
- (2) AIDS/HIV
- (3) Adoption

(4) Aggression/Violence
- (5) Crime
- (6) Disabilities
- (7) Disasters
- (8) Displacement
- (9) Family Malfunction
  - a. Adolescent Pregnancy
  - b. Child Abuse
  - c. Runaway
  - d. Women Abuse
- (10) Family Planning

(11) Health Care
  - a. Physical Health
  - b. Mental Health
- (12) Immigration
- (13) Losses & Bereavement
- (14) Poverty
  - a. Housing
  - b. Hunger
  - c. Unemployment
- (15) Prostitution
- (16) Rehabilitation
- (17) Retirement
- (18) Sex Abuse/Rape
- (19) Suicidal Behavior
- (20) Social Deviance

B. Promotion of Social Justice
- (1) Distribution of Social & Economic Resources
- (2) Human Rights
- (3) Minority rights
- (4) Client rights

6. Method

A. Direct Intervention
- (1) Advocacy
- (2) Case Management
- (3) Clinical Social Work
- (4) Community Organization
- (5) Conflict resolution
- (6) Counseling
- (7) Crisis intervention
- (8) Empowerment
- (9) Family Therapy
- (10) Group Work
- (11) Guardianship
- (12) Interviewing
- (13) Referring

B. Indirect Intervention
- (1) Administration & Management
- (2) Consultation
- (3) Fundraising
- (4) Information & referral
- (5) Planning/Program Development
- (6) Supervision

C. Technology-based Social Work
- (1) Computer/Internet-based
- (2) Telephone-based

7. Client

- A. Individuals

B. Groups and Communities
- (1) Age-based
- (2) Culture/Ethnicity-based
- (3) Gender-based
- (4) Need-based

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

Figure 2: 200 Exemplary Concepts and 197 Articles Published in Social Work and Social Service Review

			Exemplary Concepts	Papers in *Social Work**	Papers in *Social Service Review**
1. Foundations	*A. Theory*	**1.Definition**	"Soft sciences".	Gibelman 109, Hayner 84, Stuart 112.	
		2. Disciplines	**a. Anthropology**	**a. Anthropology**	**a. Anthropology.**
			b. Economy.	**b. Economy.** Rank & Hirschl 104	**b. Economy.** Brinton 46, Midgley 52, Reitan 40, Stoesz & saunders 67, Vartanian 23, 58, Wakefield 51.
			c. Law.	**c. Law.** Kauts, Netting, Huber, Borders & Davis 28, Regrhr & Antle 24	**c. Law.** Linhorst & Dirks-Linhorts 55.
			d. Medicine.	**d. Medicine.**	**d. Medicine.**
			e. Philosophy/Ethics. Basic need, bioethics, deontology, norms, Utilitarianism.	**e. Philosophy/Ethics.** Jayaratne, Mattison & Croxton 16, , Manning 17, Myers & Thyer 23, Reamer 83, Regrhr & Antle 24.	**e. Philosophy/Ethics.** Maluccio 7, Stoesz & Saunders 67.
			f. Political Science. Basic need, classical liberalism, laissez-faire.	**f. Political Science.** Abramovitz 85, Ozawa 91.	**f. Political Science.** Boisjoly, Harris &Duncan 48, Dodenhoff 41, Gibson 8, Hudson 47, Midgley 52, Wakefield 51.
			g. Psychology / Psychiatry. Adlerian theory, basic need, behaviorism, cognitive models, disengagement theory, Kohelberg's moral development.	**g. Psychology / Psychiatry.**	**g. Psychology / Psychiatry.**
			h. Religion.	**h. Religion.**	**h. Religion.**
			i. Sociology. Norms, organizational theory.	**i. Sociology.** Jenson & Howard 71, Warren, Franklin & Streeter 74, Queralt & Witte 82.	**i. Sociology.** Chaskin 22, Dodenhoff 41, Reitan 40, Vartanian 23, 58.
	B. History of SW		Indoor relief, philanthropy, relief, settlement houses, softrage, "unworthy poor".	Carlton-Laney 46, 110, Gibelman 109, Haynes 84, Huff 90, Johnson 111.	Abel 26, Fisher 60, Hurl & Tucker 21, Knupfer 70, Machtinger 57, Morrison-Dore 59, Morton 33, Reisch 34, Twiss & Martin 62.
	C. Education	**1. Theoretical**	In-service training, psychosocial study.	Okundaye, Gray & Gray 115, Schneider & Netting 113.	Fisher 60,Reisch 34, Shoemaker 35.
		2. Practical	Case method system.	Haj-Yahia 14, Okundaye, Gray & Gray 115.	Shoemaker 35.
	D. Research & Evaluation		Applied research, cost-benefit analysis, Delphi method, descriptive study, feasibility study, inference, inventory, multivariate analysis, needs assessments, null hypothesis, operational definition, pilot study, qualitative research, quantitative research, randomization, replication, validity, analysis of variance (ANOVA).	Andrews & Ben-Arieh 97, Depoy, Hartman, Haslett 123, Faul & Hudson 45, Fredriksen 100, Greenley, Gorey, Thyer & Pawluck 67, Greenberg & Brown 19, Padgett 75, Reese, Ahern, Nair, OwFaire & Warren 122, Rubin, Cardenas, Warren, Pike & Wambach 78, Staudt 9, Stocks 79, Weaver 105.	Bolen & Scannapieco 63, Kost & Ersing 45, Meyers & Heintze 54, Morton 33, Queralt & n Witte 29, 72.
2. Social Worker	**A. Personality Traits & Values**		Activist role, altruism, "bleeding heart," burnout, deductive reasoning, eclectic, egalitarianism, ethical conduct, genuineness, malfeasance, motivation, passivity, paternalism, reformer, role model, self determination, strength perspective.	Berkman & Zinberg 25, Csikai & Sales 64, Collins, Tourse & Kamya 12, Jayaratne, Mattison & Croxton 16, Manning 17, Schneider & Netting 113.	Kagle 38, Karabanow 65
	B. Theoretical Knowledge		Person in environment, scientific method, second opinion.	Timberlake & Sabatino & Martin 29.	Kondrat 69.
	C. App. Knowledge & Work Exp.		Advice giving, direct practice, second opinion.	Timberlake & Sabatino & Martin 29.	Kirk, Wakefield, Hsieh & Pottick 56.

* The numbers adjacent to the authors' names reflect the chronological order of the papers.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

			Exemplary Concepts	Papers in *Social Work*	Papers in *Social Service Review*
3. Social Environment	*A. Social Policy*		Incrementalism, quota system, residency law, social security.		Arhangelsky 39, Baker 3,.Jimenez 2, Smith & Yeung, 28, Usui & Palley16.
	B. Ethnic & Cultural Milieu		Culture shock, minorities of color.	Delgado & Barton 73.	Savaya & Malkinson 10, Venkatesh 24.
	C. Religious Milieu				
	D. Settings	**1. Correctional SW**	Community-based corrections.	Spergel & Grossman 36.	
		2. Day care			Queralt & Dryden Witte 29.
		3. Foster care	Orphanage.	O'Donnell 117.	Bilaver, Jaudes, Koepke & Goerge 68, Berrick , Barth , Needell & Jonson-Reid 12, Usher, Randolph & Gogan 53
		4. Hospice care	Palliative care.		
		5. Hospital SW	Medical social work.	Marley 80.	
		6. Industrial SW			
		7. Military SW			
		8. Occupational SW	Occupational health.	Iversen 88.	
		9. School SW	Career counseling.	Astor, Behre, Fravil & Wallace 5, 63, Dupper & Poertner 32, Richman, Rosenfeld & Bowen 70.	
4. Organization	**A. Organizational Type**	**1. Gov. Sector**	Section of housing, sheltered workshop, skilled nursing facilities.		
		2. Public Sector	Sheltered care facility, skilled nursing facilities.		Felty & Jones 36, Hudson 47, Silberberg 30.
		3. Private Sector			Felty & Jones 36.
	B. Membership Type	**1. Sectarian**			
		2. Voluntary	Self-help organizations.		Hudson 47.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

			Exemplary Concepts	Papers in *Social Work*	Papers in *Social Service Review*
5. Area of Practice	A. Social Problems	**1. Addictions**	Alcoholics Anonymous, drug addiction, dual diagnosis, nicotine dependence, pathological gambling	Barber & Gilberston 6, Burke & Clapp 44, Davis & Jansen 60, Faul & Hudson 45, Johnson, Bryant, Collins, Noe, Strader & Berbaum 69, Kauffman , Silver & Poulin 18.	El-Bassel, Chen & Cooper 44.
		2. AIDS	AIDS/HIV	Dunbar, Mueller, Medina, & Wolf 58, Marcenko & Samost 93, Poindexter & Linsk 94, Somlai, Kelly, Wagstaff & Whitson 50.	
		3. Adoption	Adoptive parents, open adoption.	Bausch & Serpe 11, Brooks, Barth, Bussiere & Patterson 102, Hollingsworth 55, Hollingsworth 118.	
		4. Aggression & Violence	.	Carlson 7, Guterman & Cameron 39, Roberts & Brownell 114	
		5. Crime	Juvenile offenders, parole, resocialization group.	Roberts & Brownell 114.	Linhorst & Dirks-Linhorst 55, Maxson, Whitlock & Klein 31, Smith & Stern 17.
		6. Disabilities			Meyers, Lukemeyer & Smeeding 37.
		7. Disasters	Bridge housing.		
		8. Displacement	Bridge housing.		
		9. Family Malfunction	**a. Adolescent Pregnancy.**	**a. Adolescent Pregnancy.**	**a. Adolescent Pregnancy.** Corcoran & Kunz 13.
			b. Child abuse. child neglect.	**b. Child Abuse.** Mulroy 20.	**b. Child Abuse.** Beeman 18, DePanfilis & Zuravin 61, Knepper & Barton 14
			c. Runaways.	**c. Runaways.** Twaite & Lampert 1.	**c. Runaways.**
			d. Women Abuse.	**d. Women Abuse.**	**d. Women Abuse.**
		10. Family Plan.	Abortion, planned parenthood.	Jackson 101.	Baker 3.
		11. Health Care	**a. Physical Health.** Catastrophic illness, dual diagnosis, prenatal SW, right to refuse treatment, triage.	**a. Physical Health.** Loveland-Cook, Selig, Wedge & Gohn-Baube 99, Mitchell 77, Monahan & Hooker 22, Perloff & Jattee 98.	**a. Physical Health.**
			b. Mental Health. Acrophobia, dual diagnosis, eating disorders, right to refuse treatment.	**b. Mental Health.** Carlson 7, Marley 80,.Mitchell 77, Vourlekis, Edinburg & Knee 89, Yamashiro & Matsuoka 15.	**b. Mental Health.**
		12. Immigration		Chow 96, Padilla 48.	
		13. Losses & Bereave.	Logotherapy.		
		14. Poverty	**a. Housing.** Antipoverty programs, "bag lady", bridge housing.	**a. Housing.** Pollio 43, Shepard 47, Vissing & Diament 3.	**a. Housing.** Entner Wright, Caspi, Moffitt & Silva 32, Twiss & Martin 62, Wong, Culhane & Kuhn 19
			b. Hunger. Antipoverty programs.	**b. Hunger.** Seipel 116.	**b. Hunger.**
			c. Unemployment. Antipoverty programs.	**c. Unemployment.** Raheim 4.	**c. Unemployment.** Laseter 4, Schreiner 71.
		15. Prostitution			
		16. Rehabilitation			
		17. Retirement			
		18. Sex Abuse & Rape		Finerman, & Bennett 54, Sloan, Edmond, Rubin & Doughty 53.	
		19. Suicidal Behavior			
		20. S. Deviance	"Coming out"		
	B. Promotion of Social Justice	**1. Distribution of Social & Ec. Res.**	Affirmative action, antipoverty programs, income test, preventive SW, social development, social justice, transfer payment, unemployment compensation, welfare rights, categorically needy.	Domanski 59.	Brodkin 1, Hudson 66, Scharlach, & Grosswald, 15, Sherraden & Barrera 25.
		2. Human Rights	Preventive right to die, right to life movement, social justice.	Poindexter 49.	Trolander 6.
		3. Minority rights	Preventive SW, social justice.	Haight 62, Weaver 61.	Savaya & Malkinson 10.
		4. Client rights	Alimony, legitimization, patients' rights, preventive SW, right to refuse treatment, social justice, citizen participation.		Maluccio 7.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

			Exemplary Concepts	Papers in *Social Work*	Papers in *Social Service Review*
6. Method	A. Direct Intervention	1. Advocacy	Advocate role, child advocacy.	Litzelfelner & Petr 31.	
		2. Case Management	Background investigation, case record, contracting, "door knob communication", micro practice.	Resnick & Gelhous-Tighe 8, Rock & Congress 108.	Brock & Harknett 49, Martin, Peters & Glisson 50.
		3. Clinical SW	Brief therapy, casework, concurrent therapy, contracting, "door knob communication", dual relationships, environmental treatment, facilitation, poetry therapy, rational.	Alexander 30, Swenson 86.	Morrison-Dore 59, Reid 9.
		4. Community Organization	Bargaining, "broken window theory", broker role, community development, change agent, enabler, generalist, linkage, macro practice, mobilizer role, negotiation, outreach, systemic requisites.	Barton & Watkins & Jarjoura 38, Carter 95, Chaskin, Joseph & Chipenda-Dansokho 34, Cohen & Phillips 37, Delgado 35, Dupper & Poertner 32, Finn & Checkoway 72, Morrison, Howard, Johnson, Navarro, Plachetka & Bell 42, Mulroy 20, Mulroy & Shay 41, Naparstek & Dooley 40, Page-Adams & Sherraden 33.	Silberberg 30.
		5. Conflict resolution	Arbitration, experiential therapy, mediation, role playing, progressive SW.	Mackey & O'Brien 57, McMillen 119, Strom-Gottfried 76.	
		6. Counseling	Spiritual counseling.	Voss, Douville, Little soldier & Twiss 106.	
		7. Crisis intervention	Bridge housing, crisis sequence, logotherapy.	Wilhelmus 56.	Johnson 5.
		8. Empowerment	Concurrent therapy, couples group therapy, joint custody, mirror technique, multi-problem family, paradoxical directive, relabeling, scapegoat, side taking, audio feedback.		
		9. Family Therapy		Briar-Lawson 87.	
		10. Group Work	Action sociogram, art therapy, closed group, movement therapy, open group, participant observation, reality therapy.		
		11. Guardianship	Joint custody.		
		12. Interviewing	Coaching, paraphrasing, selective attention.		
		13. Referring			
	B. Indirect Intervention	1. Administration & Management	Affirmative action, case integration, community development, cost sharing, indirect practice, exchange model.	Resnick & Gelhous-Tighe 8.	Waldfogel 20.
		2. Consultation	Case conference, collaboration.		
		3. Fundraising	Charitable gambling, joint funding, matching grants, philanthropy.	Marx 52, Page-Adams & Sherraden 33.	
		4. Information & Referral	Clearing house.		
		5. Plann/Program Development			
		6. Supervision			
	C. Technology-based SW	1. Computer-based	Computer-mediated intervention, interface ,video feedback.	Gelman, Pollack.,& Weiner 107, Giffords 65, Rock & Congress 108.	
		2. Telephone - based	Postplacement contact, telephone reassurance, hot line.	Schopler, Abell & Galinsky 66,Wiener 68.	

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

			Exemplary Concepts	Papers in *Social Work*	Papers in *Social Service Review*
7. Clients	A. Individuals				
	B. Groups & Communities	1. Age-based	Elderly, frail elderly, juvenile offenders, latchkey child, minorities of color.	Burnette 92, Delgado & Tennstedt 10, McQuaide 51, Potts 27, Reinardy & Kane 124, Siebert, Mutran & Reitzes 120, Smith 26.	Courtney, Piliavin & Entner Wright 27, Foster & Furstenberg 73, Maxson & Whitlock & Klein 31, Smokowski 42, Smith & Carlson 11.
		2. Culture and Ethnicity-based			
		3. Gender-based			
		4. Need-based	Alcoholics Anonymous, caregiver support group, "coming out," inpatient, marathon group, minorities of color, mutual-aid group, sensitivity group, support group, task groups.	Applewhite 2, Barber & Gilberston 6, Burnette 92, Kamya 13, Dore, Nelson-Zlupko & Kaufmann 103, Kelley & Clifford 21, Reese, Ahern, Nair, O'Faire & Warren 122, Savaya 81, Toseland, McCallion, Gerber, Dawson, Gieryic & Guilamo-Ramos 121.	Jackson 43, Johnson 5, Venkatesh 24.

Appendix B: Papers Published in *Social Service Review*

(The numbers in the square brackets reflect the chronological order of the papers)

Abel, 71(4) Medicine and morality: the health care program of the New York Charity …**[26]**
Arhangelsky, 72(2) Modern Russian social security **[39]**
Baker, 71(1) Parental benefits policies and the gendered division of labor **[3]**
Beeman, 71(3) Reconceptualizing social support and its relationship to child neglect **[18]**
Berrick, Barth, Needell, & Jonson-Reid, 71(2) Group care and young children **[12]**
Bilaver, Jaudes, Koepke, & Goerge, 73(3) The health of children in foster care **[68]**
Boisjoly, Harris, & Duncan, 72(4) Trends, events, and duration of initial welfare spells **[48]**
Bolen, & Scannapieco, 73(3) Prevalence of child sexual abuse: a corrective metanalysis **[63]**
Brinton, 72(4) From high school to work in Japan: lessons for the United States? The social …**[46]**
Brock, & Harknett, 72(4) A comparison of two welfare-to-work case management models **[49]**
Brodkin, 71(1) Inside the welfare contract: discretion and accountability in state welfare … **[1]**
Chaskin, 71(4) Perspectives on neighborhood and community: a review of the literature **[22]**
Corcoran & Kunz, 71(2) Do unmarried births among African-American teens lead to adult … **[13]**
Courtney, Piliavin, & Entner Wright, 71(4) Transitions from and returns to out-of-home care **[27]**
DePanfilis, & Zuravin, 73(2) Epidemiology of child maltreatment recurrences **[61]**
Dodenhoff, 72(3) Is welfare really about social control? **[41]**
El-Bassel, Chen, & Cooper, 72(3) Social support and social network profiles among …**[44]**
Entner Wright, Caspi, Moffitt, & Silva, 72(1) Factors associated with doubled-up housing…**[32]**
Felty & Jones, 72(2) Human services at risk **[36]**
Fisher, 73(2) "Speaking for the contribution of history": context and the origins of the Social …**[60]**
Foster & Furstenberg, F. F. (1999), 73(2) The most disadvantaged children: trends over time **[73]**
Gibson, 71(2) Facing off on social policy: can the right and left find middle ground? **[8]**
Hudson, 72(4) The voluntary sector, the state, and citizenship in the United Kingdom **[47]**
Hudson, 73(3) Conflict in today's aging politics: new population encounters old ideology **[66]**
Hurl & Tucker, 71(3) Homer folks and the minimization of the Michigan County agents **[21]**
Jackson, 72(3) The role of social support in parenting for low-income, single, black mothers **[43]**
Jimenez, 71(1) Concepts of health and national health care policy: a view from American history **[2]**
Johnson, 71(1) Professional help and crime victims **[5]**
Kagle, 72(2) Are we lying to ourselves about deception? **[38]**
Karabanow, 73(3) When caring is not enough: emotional labor and youth shelter workers **[65]**
Kirk, Wakefield, Hsieh, & Pottick, 73(1) Social context and social workers' judgement of… **[56]**
Knepper & Barton, 71(2) The effect of courtroom dynamics on child maltreatment proceedings **[14]**

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

Knupfer, 73(3) Professionalizing probation work in Chicago, 1900-1935 [70]
Kondrat, 73(3) Who is the "self" in self-aware? Professional self-awareness from a critical …[69]
Kost & Ersing, 72(3) Options and obstacles of county-level data in planning and monitoring … [45]
Laseter, 71(1) The labor force participation of young black men: a qualitative examination [4]
Linhorst & Dirks-Linhorst, 73(1) A critical assessment of disposition options for mentally ill … [55]
Machtinger, 73(1) The U.S. Children's Bureau and Mothers' Pensions Administration, 1912-1930 [57]
Maluccio, 71(1) Time for an ideological shift in child welfare? An essay review [7]
Martin, Peters, & Glisson, 72(4) Factors affecting case management recommendation for …[50]
Maxson, Whitlock, & Klein, 72(1) Vulnerability to street gang membership: implications for … [31]
Meyers & Heintze, 73(1) The performance of the child-care subsidy system [54]
Meyers, Lukemeyer, & Smeeding, 72(2) The cost of caring: childhood disability and poor…[37]
Midgley, 73(1) Growth, redistribution, and welfare: toward social investment [52]
Morrison Dore, 73(2) The retail method of social work: the role of the New York School in the …[59]
Morton, 72(1) Cleveland's child welfare system and the "American dilemma" 1941-1964 [33]
Queralt & Witte, 72(1) Influences on neighborhood supply of child care in Massachusetts [29]
Queralt & Witte, 73(3) Estimating the unmet need for a middling approach [72]
Reid, 71(2) Long-term trends in clinical social work [9]
Reisch, 72(2) The sociopolitical context and social work method, 1890-1950 [34]
Reitan, 72(3) Theories of interorganizational relations in the human services [40]
Sandfort, 73(3) The structural impediments to human service collaboration: the case of welfare …[64]
Savaya & Malkinson, 71(2) When clients stay away [10]
Scharlach & Grosswald, 71(3) The family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 [15]
Schreiner, 73(3) Self-employment microenterprise, and the poorest Americans [71]
Sherraden & Barrera, 71(4) Family support and birth outcomes among second-generation … [25]
Shoemaker, 72(2) Early conflicts in social work education [35]
Silberberg, 72(1) Balancing autonomy and dependence for community and …[30]
Smith & Carlson, 71(2) Stress, coping, and resilience in children and youth [11]
Smith & Stern, 71(3) Delinquency and antisocial behavior: a review of family processes…[17]
Smith & Yeung, 72(1) Childhood welfare receipt and the implications of welfare reform [28]
Smokowski, 72(3) Prevention and intervention strategies for promoting resilience in … [42]
Stoesz & Saunders, 73(3) Welfare capitalism: a new approach to poverty policy? [67]
Trolander, 71(1) Fighting racism and sexism: the Council on Social Work Education [6]
Twiss & Martin, 73(2) Conventional and military public housing for families [62]
Usher, Randolph, & Gogan, 73(1) Placement patterns in foster care [53]
Usui & Palley, 71(3) The development of social policy for the elderly in Japan [16]
Vartanian, 73(2) Adolescent neighborhood effects on labor market and economic outcomes [58]
Vartanian, 71(4) Neighborhood effects on AFDC spells: examining the social isolation… [23]
Venkatesh, 71(4) The three-tier model: how helping occurs in urban poor communities [24]
Wakefield, 72(4) Foucauldian fallacies: an essay review of Leslie Margolin's *Under the Cover…* [51]
Waldfogel, 71(3) The new wave of service integration [20]
Wong, Cuthanc, & Kuhn 71(3) Predictors of exit and reentry among family shelter users in NYC [19]

References

Abbott, A. (1995). Boundaries of social work or social work of boundaries? *Social Service Review*, 69 (4), 545-562.

Barker, R.L. (1999). *The Dictionary of Social Work.* Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Bar-On, A. A. (1994). The elusive boundaries of social work. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 21 (3), 53-67.

Bowker, G. C. & Star, S.L. (1999). *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Brieland, D (1996). Social work practice: history and evolution. In: Edwards, R. L. (Ed.-in-Chief), *En-*

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

cyclopedia of Social Work (19th ed., vol. 3, pp. 2247-2257) Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Compton, B. R., & Galaway, B. (1994). *Social Work Processes* (5th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/ Cole.

Dewey, M. (1996). *Dewey Decimal Classification and Relative Index* (21st ed.). Mitchell, J. S., Beall, J., Matthews, jr., W. E., & New, G. R. (Eds.). Albany, NY: Forest Press.

Edwards, R. L. (Ed.-in-Chief) (1996). *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed.). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Gibelman, M. (1999). The search for identity: defining social work – past, present, future. *Social Work*, 44 (4), 298-309.

Gitterman, A (1991). *Handbook of Social Work Practice with Vulnerable Populations.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Godel, K. (1931). *On Formally Undecidable Propositions of Principia Mathematica and Related System I.* In K. Gödel (1986), *Collected Works.* Vol. I: *Publications 1929-1936* (pp. 145-195). New York: Oxford University Press.

Haynes, D. T., & White, B. W. (1999). Will the "real" social work please stand up? A call to stand for professional unity. *Social Work*, 44 (4), 385-391.

Haythornthwaite, C., Bowker, G., Jenkins, C., & Rayward, B. (1999). Mapping the dimensions of a dynamic field. *Journal of American Society for Information Science,* 50 (12), 1092-1094.

Hjorland, B. (1998). The classification of psychology: A case study in the classification of knowledge field. *Knowledge Organization* 25 (4), 162-201.

Hjorland, B. (2000). Review of Wallerstein, Immanuel et al (1996). Open the Social Sciences, report of the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press. I: *Knowledge Organization*, 27(4), 238-241.

Hjorland, B. (2002a). Domain analysis in information science. Eleven approaches – traditional as well as innovative. *Journal of Documentation, 58*(4), 422-462.

Hjorland, B. (2002b), Epistemology and the socio-cognitive perspective in information science. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 53(4), 257-270.

Hopps, J.G., & Collins, P. M. (1996). Social work profession overview. In: Edwards, R. L. (Ed.-in-Chief), *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed., vol. 3, pp. 2266-2282). Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Husserl, E. (1972). *Cartesian Mediations*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, the Hebrew University (Hebrew).

Johnson, L., & Yanca, S.J (2001). *Social Work Practice: A Generalist Approach* (7th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Leighninger, L. (1987). *Social Work: Search for Identity*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Library of Congress Classification (1998). Littleton, CO: F.B. Rothman.

Library of Congress Subject Headings (20th ed.) (1997). Washington, DC: Library of Congress.

McIlwaine, I.C. & Williamson, N.J. (1999). International trends in subject analysis research. *Knowledge Organization*, 26 (1), 23-29.

Mills, J. (1957). The Classification of a Subject Field (in: Proceedings of the International Study Conference on Classification for Information Retrieval held at Beatrice Webb House, Dorking, England 13th-17th May 1957. London: ASLIB, pp. 29-42.

Mills, J. & Broughton, V. (1977): *Bliss Bibliographical Classification. 2nd ed. Introduction and Auxilliary Schedules*. London: Butterworths.

Mills, J. & Broughton, V. (1977): *Bliss Bibliographical Classification. 2nd ed. Class Q: Social Welfare*. London: Butterworths.

Popple, P.R (1996). Social work profession: History. In: Edwards, R. L. (Ed.-in-Chief), *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed., vol. 3, pp. 2282-2292) Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Rosenfeld, J. M. (1983). The domain and expertise of social work: a conceptualization. *Social Work,* 28 (3), 186-191.

Sales, G. (1994). *Taxonomy of Human Services: A Conceptual Framework with Standardized Terminology and Definition for the Field*. 3rd ed., El Monte, CA: Information and Referral Federation of Los Angeles County.

Schneider, R. L., & Netting, F. E. (1999). Influencing social policy in a time of devolution: Upholding social work's great tradition. *Social Work,* 44 (4), 349-357.

Social Work Abstracts (2001) [CD-ROM document] (accessed June 6, 2001). Silver Spring MD: Silver Platter Information.

Social Work Gateway (2000) [WWW document] (accessed June 6, 2001). URL: http://www.chst.soton.ac.uk/webconn.htm.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. In Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.

Tucker, D. J. (1996). Eclecticism is not a free good: Barriers to knowledge development in social work. *Social Service Review*, 70 (3), 400-434.

Turner, F.J (1996). Social work practice: Theoretical base. In: Edwards, R. L. (Ed.-in-Chief), *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (19th ed., vol. 3, pp. 2258-2265) Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Vickery, B. C. (1960): *Faceted Classification. A Guide to the Construction and Use of Special Schemes*. London: ASLIB.

Walz, T., & Groze, V. (1991). The mission of social work revisited: An agenda for the 1990s. *Social Work*, 36 (6), 500-504.

Witkin, S. L. (1999). Identities and contexts. *Social Work*, 44 (4), 293-297.

Zins, C, (2001). Defining human services. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 28 (1), 3-23.

Zins, C. & Guttmann, D. (2000). Structuring Web bibliographic resources: An exemplary subject classification scheme. *Knowledge Organization, 27 (3)*. 143-159.

https://doi.org/10.5771/0943-7444-2003-3-4-196
Generiert durch IP '18.226.87.163', am 12.10.2024, 11:11:59.
Das Erstellen und Weitergeben von Kopien dieses PDFs ist nicht zulässig.