

March 1978

The Role of Cultural Anthropology in the Education of Social Service Personnel

James W. Green
University of Washington

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons, and the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Green, James W. (1978) "The Role of Cultural Anthropology in the Education of Social Service Personnel," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 5: Iss. 2, Article 5.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.1276>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol5/iss2/5>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.

THE ROLE OF CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE EDUCATION OF SOCIAL SERVICE PERSONNEL¹

James W. Green,
School of Social Work
University of Washington

ABSTRACT

Anthropology contributes to the education of social work students through its emphasis on the role of culture and of social context in the delivery of social services. Examples are provided with special emphasis on child abuse and protective services. While anthropology has traditionally been associated with the study of minorities, its role in the critique of other social work concerns is suggested.

Anthropologists have generally not looked to social work for an academic and intellectual ally. However, like social work, anthropology evolved late in the last century and became institutionally established early in the 1900's. Like social work, it grew in response to serious public problems, although they were often the problems of empire in exotic settings rather than problems of domestic turmoil. Like social work, anthropology grew from liberal, humanistic concerns for the integrity of individuals and the character and quality of their lives. But, whereas, social work undertook a rehabilitative mission based on case work in situ, anthropology became a descriptive and analytical social "science" operating out of academic strongholds. For social work and anthropology, the separation has prevented recognition of common grounds for discussion, planning, teaching, research and action. As a beginning toward overcoming that separation, this paper represents one anthropologist's view of how cultural anthropological concepts can contribute to social work practice not only in minority communities where anthropologists have been professionally active but among dominant groups as well.²

While anthropology has often been viewed as a discipline singularly concerned with the exotic and remote, it is important to note that anthropologists have for years worked in

industrial, urban settings along with other social scientists. One of the things that has marked their work as distinctive, however, is their effort to place data on "complex societies" into a cross-cultural, pan-human perspective. This concern with broad theoretical generalizations coupled with anthropology's parallel enthusiasm for the unique and distinctive, complements the interests of social work in the everyday problems of disadvantaged or handicapped people. In particular, the discipline's "comparative method" or cross-cultural approach offers a perspective of potential value to social work education.³

The comparative method is an attempt to describe and account for both uniformity and diversity in human societies, including our own. To handle the enormous range of data gathered over nearly a century of work in a variety of cultures, anthropologists have developed a number of concepts and research techniques which are distinctive to the discipline. Among these are first, the idea that to gain an appreciation of life in a particular society or segment of it, the investigator must learn to see the world as the members of a particular society view it; second, that the data suggestive of how people organize their world must be viewed "wholistically" or within a larger cultural context; and third, that any single culture is marked by diversity, technologically sophisticated cultures being more diverse internally than bands of nomadic hunters.

Diversity within cultures, sometimes referred to as cultural or social "pluralism," is of considerable significance in our society and has been a concern of social work. Pluralism has been described as a "sensitizing concept" which relates to how social variation is contained within a single system, how it is permitted or punished, who does the permitting and punishing, and with what effects on all concerned.⁴ Most urbanized societies are in some sense pluralistic. They may contain social classes, distinctive ethnic groups, regional subcultures, racial groups and often distinctive religious entities. In addition, there is differential allocation of resources and distribution of power, the conditions of social inequality. Consequently, we are confronted with the complexity of pluralistic social systems and the elaborate cultural rules for getting along in them. A traditional task of anthropology has been to describe and account for cultural pluralism.

Language and Behavior

Considering the first of the three distinctively anthropological concepts mentioned above, it is important to recognize that the discipline has traditionally concerned itself with what is basically "the native's point of view," be the native an Australian Aborigine or a corporate executive. This is a major methodological concern aside from its broadly humanistic implications and a bit of jargon has to be introduced to deal with it. Anthropologists speak of "emic" descriptions of behavior, the term coming from the word "phoneme." A phoneme is the minimal distinguishable unit of linguistic meaning for the users of a given language. For instance, to native speakers of English, the "c" of "cake" is distinguishable from the "c" of "cement," two phonemes or linguistic acts which no competent speaker of the language would fail to miss. A foreign speaker, however, might confuse them if he or she had only a textbook knowledge of English and the mispronunciation would be regarded by native speakers as a behavioral error.⁵

The assumption here is that rules governing behavior are coded in people's heads just as are rules governing acts of speech. We all "know" the rules of correct behavior and proper speech whether we can specify them or not. The encoding begins at birth with the child learning to both act and speak in ways which are "grammatically" correct for the culture. Just as each language has its grammar and phonemes drawn from the infinite variety of possible combinations of speech acts, so each culture is composed of a distinctive "grammar" of behavioral acts which are meaningful and appropriate. To native actors, grammatically correct or incorrect behavior is as immediately apparent as is the mispronunciation of a word. Through research and analysis, an anthropologist attempts to isolate and describe a particular culture's language and definitions of appropriate behavior. These represent a set of rules and propositions which guide behavior, which have moral force to the actors, and which constitutes their own "theory" of their social relationships. These rules, like the rules of speech, are intuitively known by members of the culture and need not be articulated. In fact, they rarely are and that is one reason confusion about meaning and intent often results when members of two cultures or distinctive groups come together. Each interprets the behavior of the other by his or her own behavioral grammar. This "misinterpretation" is what is commonly known as ethnocentrism.

When an anthropologist attempts to elicit the behavioral grammar of the members of another culture, he or she is really asking: How do these people create and recognize order? What is reality to them? If a white American Protestant enters grass hut to watch a religious ceremony conducted in an unknown language, one employing carved sticks with unfamiliar designs, what could he or she possibly understand about the meaning of the ceremony to the participants? Virtually nothing, unless the visitor was familiar with the grammar of this event and its context within the culture as a whole. To draw conclusions about it in terms of one's own behavioral system or culture would be seriously misleading. Similarly, what does a white American Protestant social worker, fresh from college classes, understand when he or she confronts for the first time a client who is an apparent alcoholic, off-reservation male Indian with no job and is reported to have abandoned his family? Because Native Americans have recently become politically active and emphasized elements of their cultural heritage, the new caseworker may be increasingly sensitive to the importance of conveying respect for the man's ethnicity. "Oh, you're a Menomini. How interesting!" But what next? What has social work education trained the caseworker to look for that might be relevant to this client's problems?

This type of client presents a number of issues that challenge our hypothetical social worker's knowledge and skill. Returning to the concept of emics and behavior as grammatically appropriate to a context, what "emically" might be relevant for any intervention approach? It will mean, among other things, that treatment for this client will have to take into account the highly competitive and ritualized nature of drinking in many Indian communities. The role of the client within his community will have to be examined including his reputation, his role in any clan and ceremonial offices he may hold, and the "normality" of his family arrangements in terms of his community's expectations. Similarly, the social worker would need to know something about the migration stream between the client's home community and the urban center to which he came and what migration means to Indian men and their families. Certainly, the social worker would need to know the details of anti-Indian prejudice and discrimination in the local community. But he or she would also need knowledge and appreciation of the coping strategies of Indian men in urban centers and the organization and functioning of the social networks those men use to survive. Part of that knowledge would include the

fact that not all Native American groups are culturally the same and that local inter-tribal conflicts may interfere in a dozen subtle ways with the success of an intervention plan. Eliciting from the client his understanding of a proposed treatment plan and his understanding of how it may modify his habits and values in all these spheres of activity would be crucial in assessing the likelihood of compliance with an intervention strategy. To do all that may be time consuming for the new social worker; however, such an investment is necessary in order to deliver the kind of service that makes a difference to the recipient and his community.

The Wholistic Perspective

The example of the Native American client suggests the second element of the anthropological point of view. However detailed a description of a culture an anthropologist might prepare, the purpose of the endeavor is an understanding of the culture in its entirety. This is sometimes called the "wholistic" perspective, the view that cultures are whole systems and the parts of these interrelate, often in subtle and unexpected ways. The integrity of cultural systems was graphically suggested to anthropologist Ruth Benedict by a Pueblo Indian who had seen his own world fall apart through contact with the technologically stronger white society of the American frontier. He explained that all cultures were like cups of clay with which to drink a way of life. Each group of people had its cup and it was different from all others. But the cup of his culture, its wholeness, was broken and gone.⁶

More recently, that issue has become overtly political with the appearance of pan-Indian organizations and the discovery by many Black Americans of pride in their African ancestry. Indeed, ethnicity is an issue which has never gone away despite white folkbeliefs about the "melting pot" character of the larger society and the casual assumption that assimilation to the American "mainstream" of institutions and values would solve the problems of stigmatized groups and so-called deviant individuals. But the wholistic perspective in anthropology is more than a principled humanism calling for appreciation of ethnic distinctiveness. To demonstrate this, and to show that anthropologists deal with groups other than so-called "ethnic" populations, it is useful to consider an instance where an anthropologist successfully used the wholistic principle in a community situation familiar to social workers.

In a study of Seattle skid roaders, James Spradley began with an emic perspective to get a picture of what his respondents regarded as the most significant elements in their environment.⁷ As might be expected, drinking was certainly one of those elements. But alcoholism was not a major problem in the eyes of most members of the community. Rather, what concerned them was their relationship with the police. Arrest for public drunkenness was common and seemingly capricious. It led to a series of legal entanglements in which civil liberties were often compromised. Far more important to Spradley's respondents than alcoholism was their loss of mobility due to arrest and incarceration. Survival in the skid road community depends on skill in dealing with police, jail personnel, employers, social workers and weather conditions. These skills exist to preserve mobility. Mobility was so important in the individual's social identity and life style that for many the traveling was more important than the destination. While some men are driven to skid road by what they and others perceive as personal failure, many are attracted there by the kind of "brotherhood of strangers" that is available to anyone who is marginal to the larger society. Being "marginal" may involve many things: lack of education or skills, poverty, or racial stigma. But it may also include dislike of long-term or uninteresting jobs, attraction to other than mainstream values, even personal distaste for mainstream institutions such as marriage and family life. This discovery called into question the common sense belief that these men were "failures"; many had rejected society, not the other way around. The threats to that community came from the outside, principally from police and the courts but to a lesser extent from service providers such as mission agencies and social workers. Spradley was so impressed by the significance of mobility and alienation from the values of the larger society rather than alcohol in the lives of these men that he referred to them as "urban nomads." To him, the life style of these urban nomads could more effectively be described and analyzed using the wholistic perspective of anthropology than, for instance, the "social problems" or personal deviancy approach. Indeed, recognizing that skid row men actually enjoyed a complex world of values and associations and that these were a source of comfort and pride to many of them challenged the conventional community wisdom and the assumptions underlying social services.

Recognizing this, Spradley was able to promote and finally secure needed legal and procedural changes for handling "Public drunks" in Seattle. Using the anthropological

perspective, the "problems" that this subculture presented to the larger society were redefined so that more humane "treatment" could be devised. Relations with the larger community, especially police, and not personal drinking habits, became the target of corrective activity. The wholistic perspective calls attention to the fact that all behavior occurs within groups and that it may be necessary to change the relationships between groups before rehabilitative efforts can succeed with individuals. Behavior, however deviant, is often adaptive in some sense and significant reform of a social problem may have to start with institutions and not just the presented symptoms of individuals perceived as problem-bearing clients. In this sense, then, the wholistic perspective provides an important and necessary complement to psychotherapeutic approaches to personal problems.

These two examples of anthropology's emic and wholistic perspective suggest that in pursuing its rehabilitative goals within a complex, pluralistic society, the social work profession confronts a serious policy issue: in dealing with a specific group of people, toward what alternative set of conditions should the social service system be directed? In a culturally heterogeneous community that question is never easy to answer. The issue is even more difficult where minorities are involved. It is compounded when we consider the social class and economic backgrounds of social workers, the rites of passage represented by social work educational programs, and the guiding values of social workers in large social service agencies. In a sense, the social work profession is itself a distinctive and roughly homogenous category of individuals, sharing a value system and lifestyle comparable to any other professional group in our society. As such, it could be called a "professional subculture." That subculture, like all subcultures of professionals, has its own history, habits and guiding orientations. It represents one among the variety of professional service groups in an urbanized society. But social workers are in the unique position of being able to use their professional value system in order to promote and, in some cases, demand changes in the lifestyles of individuals who are socially if not culturally different from themselves and from others. It is important to assess how the values and procedures of a professional subculture are used both to define the problems of others and to promote changes where problems are manifest. A number of important policy issues are involved, not the least of which is the privileged position of one group to demand lifestyle changes in another group in a pluralistic

society. A brief look at a specific case--the problem of child abuse and neglect--will make clear the role of an anthropological approach in thinking about these issues.

Anthropology and Social Work

Child abuse and neglect would seem to be an unlikely problem area within which to make anthropological comments on social work practice. After all, protecting children from neglectful or damaging behavior by adult caretakers ought to be a straight-forward issue about which little debate would be necessary. Children either are or are not well treated and those who are not deserve protection. But if we begin with an anthropological cross-cultural perspective on a given issue it will become apparent how that perspective could enhance the education of social workers. The questions this perspective raise are: What kinds of variations in childrearing activity are common to human societies generally? How do these variations relate to child abuse or neglect in our own society? What conclusions about abusive behavior can be drawn and what do these mean for intervention and research.

To answer the first question requires a cross-cultural comparison using data from the mass of human societies or from some sample of them.⁸ Generally, the framework for generalization includes societies characterized as nomadic hunting and gathering bands, primitive agriculturalists and tribal societies, peasant societies which are appendages of urbanized systems, and urban (usually industrialized) societies. These have been the categories for understanding most of human history. Within this range of societies, virtually all forms of childrearing practices and preferences can be found from the most secure to the most lenient.

An example of one of the most extreme instances of harsh childrearing is that reported by Turnbull on the IK, a small African Group.⁹ Food is withheld from children who must forage on their own after age three. Adults aggressively compete with children for resources: water, shade, sleeping space and the like. No one would be so foolish as to give preferential treatment to a mere child. At the opposite end of a continuum of severity in childrearing, many Pacific Island cultures are noted for their indulgence. Striking a child for any reason is prohibited and members of the community-at-large would feel free to intervene should an adult mistreat any child. In my own research in the West Indies, the attitude

toward children is an ambivalent one. Both men and women take pride in a large number of offspring and an individual's reputation in the community is dependent, in part, on having been a parent many times over. But children can also be untrustworthy companions. They carry gossip (often unintentionally) between households, are believed to lie and steal regularly, and make excessive demands on a parent's time and patience. Children commonly "get licks" from adults with sticks, belts or whatever is handy and lifelong scars are evident on many school age children. Due to international migration by adults for jobs, children are often shifted from household to household in informal foster care arrangements and some, who have lived on a number of islands, may not have seen their parents together in years.

Assuming we had descriptions of childrearing practices for a large number of societies, descriptions ranging along a spectrum of child treatment, we could approach that information with hypotheses derived from research about the problems of childrearing and child abuse in our own society. This step would involve the second question in an anthropological approach to the issues, that of how our own society compares to others. Do we have more or less abuse than others? Are the effects on children of abusive treatment always the same? Is abuse always perpetrated by parents who were themselves abused as children? How are abuses perceived and treated in other societies with what results?

In going to the cross-cultural record to examine questions such as these, we are immediately confronted with a number of problems, problems which ought to alert us to similar difficulties to be faced when examining these questions in our own society. First, there is no obvious category of behavior called "child abuse" which will be applicable to all societies. Not only do the norms of childrearing preferences vary widely, but so do the permitted variations in practice. Societies may be harsh or lenient in their standards but they are also variable in terms of how rigidly they adhere to those standards. Lacking a clear definition of abusive behavior, it becomes difficult to know how widely abuse exists despite the common assertion that child abuse is as old as human history.

The uncertainty over conceptualizing abusive behavior for purposes of comparative research, then, is a signal that a satisfactory definition may also be difficult to find for our own society. And indeed, that is the case. The definition

of child abuse remains controversial even after several decades of research. State laws which mandate that child protective social workers find, report and treat abusive parents and abused children are also vague except in the most extreme instances, those where bodily harm are obvious. The usual injunction to social workers--that abuse involves acts of commission while neglect refers to acts of omission--is of little help. Most caseloads are not made up of the extreme cases reported in newspapers but rather of "gray area" cases where the social worker must make a judgment without benefit of clear standards or definitions.

Second, given the absence of a uniform, dependable definition of child abuse or neglect, how are we to interpret harsh behavior toward children in our own society or in others? For instance, is it always the case that harshness is evidence of parental failure? One of the most widely held and often repeated assumptions in this field is that abusing parents were themselves abused as children.¹⁰ This statement is now almost a cliché although the research data on which it is based is often very shaky. Breaking the cycle of abuse, the argument runs, requires "reparenting" adults so that they do not pass on this legacy of violence to the next generation. Consequently, "parent effectiveness" programs have been developed by both public and private agencies, usually at considerable expense and effort, and these are widely pursued as one important deterrent to abuse. But is there any evidence in the cross-cultural record that abuse is the result of unlearned or failed parental skills?

The answer is a qualified no. Where harsh treatment of children occurs, it is usually within highly controlled, often ritualized contexts. Young male initiates are subincised in Australia and in the past, Eskimo female babies were sometimes destroyed but these events were always under the close scrutiny of the community and represented a collective decision. What of the individual Eskimo parent who took action without community consent? Where this happened, and the data on it is sparse, the individuals involved had already reduced their ties to the community at large so that community regulation of violent or deviant behavior was already minimal. This observation should provide some insight into our understanding of child abuse in our own society.

The evidence that child abusers were themselves abused is very thin. A recent re-examination of the issue has suggested that "the available data on the generational hypothesis

do not stand the test of empiricism".¹¹ If that is the case, is "reparenting" the most useful attack on the issue? The cross-cultural record would suggest that one's ties to the community at large are more important regulators of personal deviancy than are personality attributes or interpersonal skills acquired intergenerationally. This too is a hypothesis but it is one strongly suggested in studies of suicide and of incest. Child abuse is of much more recent interest but probably is comparable. The idea warrents serious exploration and its implications for rehabilitation efforts are enormous.

What does this mean for research and teaching? It means that an examination of the cross-cultural record can alert us to conceptual difficulties in the "emic" categories used in our society. "Child abuse" is not an objective referrent except in the most obvious cases. It also means that when behavior is viewed "wholistically", we cannot rely on psychological categories as full explanations of what is going on. Nor can we fully depend on programs which are limited to altering cognitive or affective states in clients. A full attack on the issue involves research on behavior in context and development of rehabilitative programs which involve both the client and context as targets for change. In the child abuse literature, for instance, there has never been an adequately controlled, community based study to clearly distinguish abusers from nonabusers. Until that happens, we will go on repeating the unqualified assertion that abusers were abused as children and that personality and skills re-programming will solve the problem. An expanded understanding of abuse and redesign of treatment efforts must give attention to the social conditions of families and their relationship to the community at large as well as to the psychological conditions of abusers.

In stressing the importance of the social context of abuse and of the "natives" emic view of it, the anthropological approach complements the psychological approach of "reparenting" programs and the sociological systems change notions related to such major social institutions as the family or the mass media. Using the anthropological approach, the following set of culturally relevant questions about abuse can be suggested:

1. What general cultural assumptions relating to child rearing and child discipline prevail within a community?¹² The question is not easy to answer since such assumptions will vary not only between social classes but between regions and

between ethnic groups. Knowledge of popular childrearing preferences in a variety of communities is a prerequisite to drawing any inferences from the facts in a given case. Students and researchers would need to refer to sociological and anthropological sources for adequate data on communities of interest.

2. How much variation is permissible by the standards of the community in question? To be aware of this as a research or casework issue requires not only identification of a community and its interests in relation to all other communities, but sensitivity to permitted variance in childrearing practices. Some groups may be much more tolerant of wide variations than others.

3. What is the social role of a suspect adult within the community? Some effort will be required to assess how a potential client functions in relation to his or her community and how they are perceived by others. Individual motives would have to be considered within the context of the individual's social resources including family, friends and institutional affiliations.

4. How does the child perceive his or her role within the family and the community? A child's perceptions of normality and of stress may be at considerable variance from the perceptions of parents or service providers. These perceptions need to be given serious consideration when treatment options are considered and represents here the ultimate emic issue. An example of childhood culture research is that of Goodman.¹³

Large, contextual questions such as these suggest the framework within which a culturally sensitive educational program can be developed. Beyond that, however, we need to formulate specific training objectives which would be meaningful to students about to enter the profession. The objectives listed here would be useful in a variety of social work education programs in which cultural sensitivity is to be given some emphasis. A student in training for work with child abuse clients, for example, ought to be able to do the following:

1. Identify the potential client community, its sociological characteristics and variations, its geographical distribution, and its cultural values as they relate to childrearing and child discipline.

2. Describe the organization of the relevant social service system and explain why the system is more likely to detect potential child abuse clients in certain segments of the community.

3. List common perceptions held by child abuse clients of social service providers.

4. Describe perceptions held by social workers of client types and identify the stereotypes.

5. Identify approaches to effective intervention in the client community in a manner consistent with community expectations and standards.

6. Demonstrate communication skills appropriate to those procedures and in conformity with the cultural standards of the client community.

7. Devise an evaluation mechanism for identifying those intervention strategies which lead to a satisfactory resolution of abuse or neglect problems.

It should be specifically noted that this brief and incomplete list of training objectives says nothing about marriage and family counseling, group therapy, behavior modification, psychodrama, parent education or any of the other treatment techniques variously used in abuse situations. These "therapeutic modalities" undoubtedly have value for some clients and are most certainly useful tools. But they do not answer the question we posed at the beginning of this paper: toward what ends should social workers direct their clients? Placing training priorities on specific techniques without consideration of the cultural characteristics of the clients who might be the subject of those techniques seems to be both naive and professionally ethnocentric.¹⁴

Conclusion

Anthropologists have developed the emic and wholistic perspectives in order to control ethnocentrism in research activity. Ethnocentrism can and ought to be controlled in service delivery activities as well. This means training students to appreciate the tremendous impact of cultural and class variables in rehabilitative work, as well as client's perceptions of their problems and proposed solutions. It

also means that service providers learn to self-consciously articulate the prevailing values of their professional subculture, giving attention to where these may or may not conform to the values of the client community. Without well researched and clearly understood cultural information on client populations, ethnocentrism must persist, protected and reinforced by the institutions and professional subculture in which people spend their working lives.

None of us can effectively understand the behavioral grammar of individuals outside our self-selected groups without making a concerted attempt to do so, an attempt which is more intellectually and emotionally challenging the more socially distant another individual is perceived to be. This is especially true where individuals are attempting to communicate across racial or ethnic boundaries. But it is especially true where social workers deal with clients suspected of harsh if not vicious treatment of children. What we are proposing here is not cultural relativism. It is rather the design of services sensitive to the social context of abuse and the perceptions of the client of that context. Taking these factors into account is likely to improve the effectiveness of child protective programs as well as social services generally.

Footnotes

1. The author is Director of the Cultural Awareness Training Project, Center for Social Welfare Research, School of Social Work, University of Washington. Opinions expressed are those of the author alone. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Michael Austin for encouragement in the development of this article.
2. Despite the differences, there are important areas of similarity in the development of anthropological and social work concerns. For instance, during the 1930s and 1940s, both disciplines showed considerable enthusiasm for Freudian based explanations of behavior. Margaret Mead, Ruth Benedict, Abram Kardiner and Geoffrey Gorer all developed psychocultural analyses intended to link child rearing practices, adult personality types, and major institutions. So-called national character studies, particularly of the Russians and Japanese, were one result. The social work analogue was a focus on intra-psychic process and the development in clients of latent personality strengths as a basic therapy style. Psychological insight became a pre-requisite to problem resolution in clients just as in anthropology it served to reveal the characteristics of national cultures. A second area of overlap between the two

disciplines was the "culture of poverty" concept promoted in Oscar Lewis' studies of Mexicans and Puerto Ricans. It was an attractive way to "explain" poverty, even though the deficiencies of Lewis' concept were almost immediately apparent to most social scientists. In particular, it was grist for those inclined to find things to correct in the life ways of others. In his Culture and Poverty (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), anthropologist Charles Valentine exposed the limitations of the "culture of poverty" concept. These included its failure to take fully into account economic restrictions and political disabilities imposed by the larger community and their consequences for people within the "culture." Similarly, some social workers of minority backgrounds have moved beyond the stereotypes and justifications suggested by the Lewis model. In particular, see Barbara Solomon's Black Empowerment (New York: Columbia University Press, 1976).

3. There are a number of good surveys of anthropology. An important source is John J. Honigmann, Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology (Chicago: Rand McNally) 1973. Although highly polemic, a major survey of the field will be found in Marvin Harris, The Rise of Anthropological Theory (New York: Crowell) 1968. Sol Tax and Leslie G. Freeman, Horizons of Anthropology (Chicago: Adline, 2nd edition) is a collection of current articles summarizing each specialty within the discipline. An older but solid work written in an engaging style is that of Melville Jacobs, Pattern in Cultural Anthropology (Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey) 1964. David Kaplan and Robert Manners, Culture Theory (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall) is a sophisticated, compact study that is demanding but well worth the effort. In addition, there are a large number of introductory texts that cover the field. One, Roger M. Keesing, Cultural Anthropology (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston) 1976, is a better than usual example of the genre in the attention it gives to contemporary issues.
4. Pierre L. van den Berghe, Pluralism, in John J. Honigmann, ed., Handbook of Social and Cultural Anthropology (Chicago: Rand McNally) 1973:959-77.
5. A useful summary of the relationship of language to culture will be found in Carol M. Eastman, Aspects of Language and Culture (San Francisco: Chandler and Sharp) 1975.
6. Ruth Benedict, Patterns of Culture (New York: Houghton and Mifflin) 1934.
7. James P. Spradley, You Owe Yourself a Drunk (Boston: Little, Brown) 1970.

8. Sampling is usually done using the Human Relations Area Files system which is available in the libraries of most large universities. The data on several thousand cultures are available as are pre-selected samples which represent the known range of human societies in terms of history, language, economy, social organization and geographic dispersal. The literature on sampling techniques appropriate to the Files is highly developed. Potential users are advised to consult Robert O. Lagace, Nature and Use of the HRAF Files, A Research and Teaching Guide (New Haven: HRAF Press, 1968). The journal Behavior Science Notes contains studies based on the Files. While the Files are valuable for research, they can also be used as the basis for class projects. For the novice, a good reference librarian can assure a painless initiation into the subtleties of the system as well as the substantial literature developed around it.
9. Colin M. Turnbull, The Mountain People (New York: Simon and Schuster) 1972. Turnbull's book has been controversial and the lifestyle of the IK is probably as much due to the political and ecological pressures they face as to their own preferences. The issues in this debate will be found in Current Anthropology 16:3:343-358, 1975.
10. Typical statements of this thesis will be found in David Gill, Violence Against Children (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970) and Ray E. Helfer, The Diagnostic Process and Treatment Programs (Washington, D.C.: HEW, 1975). However, virtually all researchers repeat this theme.
11. Srinika Jayaratne, Child Abusers as Parents and Children: A Review. Social Work 22:5-9, 1977.
12. My thinking on these points has been stimulated by a useful manuscript by Jill Korbin, Anthropological Contributions to the Study of Child Abuse, due to appear in the International Journal of Child Abuse and Neglect. She is one of the very few anthropologists active in this area and her paper is a valuable pioneering effort.
13. Mary Ellen Goodman, The Culture of Childhood (New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University) 1970.
14. Apparently, the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect agrees. After several years of needs assessments (the needs of service workers, not clients) and production of training materials based on those assessments, that agency has shifted its program focus to such issues as the social and cultural context of social services, the social significance of children in different socio-economic and ethnic groups, and the role of families in planning service policy and delivery.