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Introduction

ELFRIEDE G. SCHLESINGER, GUEST EDITOR

This special issue with its focus on the theory and practice of social work with minority and ethnic groups was first conceived at a time when the profession had begun to pay explicit attention to these matters in the literature and in the requirements posed by its accrediting body, the Council on Social Work Education. It seemed that past neglect had been supplanted by attention to the life styles and needs of minority and ethnic groups, with accompanying theoretical developments. The time was at hand for a review of some of the major theoretical and practice thrusts. The Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, long in the forefront of analysis and critique of major developments in the social sciences and social work, seemed an ideal place for such a review and synthesis. The articles that follow represent such an effort.

The first article by Ramakrishnan and Balgopal on the "Role of Social Institutions in a Multicultural Society" calls our attention to a number of issues not often attended to in the social work literature. That is, that the population composition of the United States has undergone dramatic changes in the past period, yielding a multicultural population heretofore unknown in this country. People from all over the globe, but especially from Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean have come to this country in large numbers. They come with diverse cultures, a myriad of needs and diverse perspectives on how and whether they want to become immersed in this country's mainstream, whatever that is. Retention of cultural attributes is important for many people at the same time as they seek a new life for themselves. The negative reception experienced by many newcomers parallels that long experienced by others who preceded them, especially minorities of color. How social institutions, especially those close to the profession of social work can and must respond to the diverse interests of various groups is the focus of this article and sets the stage for much of the subsequent work.
Wynetta Devore and I first published Ethnically Sensitive Social Work Practice in 1981. The term—which implies that social work practice must be mindful of the effects of ethnic group membership on social life and on the problems brought to social workers—quickly caught on and came to be used in a variety of ways including those we presented initially. The article looks back over the past 15 or so years, and reviews a number of matters: the commonly used definitions, the theoretical constructs brought to bear in analysis of these matters, the nature and extent of attention paid in our literature and the practice principles and interventive strategies that have emerged. The focus on a minority, rather than an ethnocultural perspective is evident, as we consider the implications of this thrust. While a rich literature has emerged we have a long way to go if social workers are truly to be able to develop the requisite knowledge and skills for ethnic sensitive practice.

The concept of culture is frequently used and often not clearly defined. Doman Lum in “Cultural Values and Minority People of Color” makes a superb analysis of the concept, digs into the anthropological and other literature, and presents us with a series of concepts that highlight the role of different elements of the majority as well as the minority culture in the lives of immigrants, as well as minority persons long resident in this country. He also comments on cultural attributes which in his view are shared by various minority people of color.

The debate on whether or not an “underclass” truly exists is ongoing and was the topic of a special issue of this journal some years ago. Zelly tackles the question by keeping a clear and narrow focus on how stratification theory has traditionally defined the concept of social class, stressing that social class position is ordinarily defined in terms of persons' relationship to the economic system. He points out that this construct is ignored as various analysts focus on the unwelcome behavior of certain persons left behind by the stratification system; the term comes to be used, in his view in distorted ways which may only be described as pejorative.

A number of critical practice issues—not as fully considered in the literature as one might hope—are highlighted in McMahon's and Gullerud's article "Native American Agencies
for Native American Children: Fulfiling the Promise of the Indian Child Welfare Act”. Whether practice with some members of some ethnic/minority group members is best carried out by indigenous workers is a question often asked, but one that we did not find clearly delineated in our review of recent practice literature. McMahon and Gullerud suggest that the promises of the Indian Child Welfare Act have not been fulfilled in the way it has been administered. They take a firm stand suggesting that the intent of the act will not be achieved unless the indigenous community has major responsibility for implementation.

Another practice issue is tackled by Ken Huang in his analysis entitled “Tripartite Cultural Personality and Ethclass Assessment”. He finds the mental health establishment wanting in how it has responded to the needs of diverse ethnic /minority persons, especially persons from non western oriented cultures who do not share western perceptions of mental health, often do not speak English and encounter all sorts of obstacles in their interaction with various helping professions. He develops a creative approach to incorporating what he terms “ethclass” assessments in to the multiaxial diagnostic system subsumed in the Diagnostic Statistical Manuals published by the American Psychiatric Association. His proposals are based on insightful discussions of the processes by which people with serious emotional difficulties, who are not familiar with the culture, encounter a hostile, insensitive system.

As I took to heart the editor’s charge to request submissions from various experts in the subject matter of interest I was reminded of my colleagues with experience in various parts of the world. It seemed clear that there are many commonalities as well as differences, and that these can add to our understanding.

In the ethnocentric fashion so typical of many of us who live and work in the United States, there is a tendency to neglect developments taking place in Canada, our neighbor to the north. From the perspective of issues focused on ethnicity and minority status, Canada is an exciting and diverse place. Chambon and Bellamy present a new, somewhat unique approach to studying components of the ethnic and minority experience in Canada. They depart from the customary modes of conceptual
and empirical analysis, and introduce us to discourse analysis as a way of using various documents, produced by members of different groups to highlight divergent approaches and needs. The mode of analysis, of intrinsic interest, also serves to shed light on the differing perspectives of ethnic subgroups in Canada.

One way of thinking about Israel might be as a laboratory for studying ethnic diversity, and intergroup conflict as well as intergroup collaboration. Eliezer Jaffe, thoroughly conversant with the issues extant in this country as well as Israel, reviews the Israeli situation at the same time as he identifies major points of congruence between the situation of that small country and the United States.

England is often thought of as a relatively small, homogeneous country. The facts are otherwise. For centuries, and especially in the post World War II period, persons from all over the globe have settled in England. In this period many have come from the Caribbean, from India, from Pakistan and from other countries in the developing world. Some have been there long enough to be classified as "aging". How the human services establishment responds to this multicultural population is the topic of Devore's analysis—and suggests, as do so many of the other works, that some issues have applicability on an international basis.

Taken as a whole, the articles in this issue remind us of how increasingly diverse the United States is becoming and of the challenges these changes pose if social work is to be responsive to the values and needs of diverse peoples. The articles from Canada, from Israel, and from England remind us that the international social work community has much to learn from the experiences in all countries.

The review of the "state of the art" suggests that while we have come a long way much remains to be done to assure that our literature and our practice reflect the ever present changes. Not all of the questions raised in the initial call for papers have been answered. But we have begun a process.

In closing this introduction I want to express special thanks to Dorcas Bowles, from the University of Texas at Arlington, Doman Lum from Sacramento State University in California
and Wynetta Devore from Syracuse University for their careful and critical analysis of these papers. Thanks also go to Bob Leighninger and Gary Mathews of the *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare.*
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With the rapid change in the demographic structure of the American society, the United States is becoming a mosaic of multiculturalism. Such changes have dramatic implications for social institutions. To understand such changes an overview of the evolution of multiculturalism from a historical perspective is provided. The concept of cultural pluralism is discussed for delineating the role of social institutions. Also examined is the issue of affirmative action, and the role of social welfare institution.

In the present socio-political and economic international climate nations are multi-cultural and multi-ethnic. In the course of the relationships between the diverse people who settle in a country, a number of multicultural issues arise. These include conflict between those groups who want to maintain their cultural heritage and related practices, and those forces that push them into adopting dominant group norms and customs. Conflict between these two perspectives has long standing historical roots. Also important are issues of equity and equality, and the role of various social institutions in fostering harmonious relationships between different people.

For a systematic and rational examination of these matters it is essential to consider them within their historical context. It is necessary to ask how a particular society evolves into a multi-ethnic and multicultural society?
This paper asks these kinds of questions about the United States, and examines three important conceptual and political approaches that have traditionally been brought to bear on these issues—namely the concepts commonly referred to as “anglo-conformity,” the “melting pot,” and “cultural pluralism.” Because the United States has adopted a policy of affirmative action intended to ensure equity and equality for members of minority groups in regard to education and employment we also examine this issue and offer some suggestions and consider social work’s role.

Anglo-Conformity

The ambitious desire to create a one of a kind unique nation on earth prompted the early colonial leaders and the founding fathers to forge a sense of homogeneity among people who came to America. This took many forms. The history of race relations in America may be characterized as a process of “conquest, slavery and exploitation of foreign labor.” (Steinberg, 1989, p. 5). Native Americans were conquered and ostracized from all social and political aspects of the society. Much of the same was true of Mexicans in the Southwest. The history of the enslavement of millions of black Africans is well known and quite clear. Examples of the exploitation of foreign labor are legion. Among the exploited were the Chinese and millions of immigrants who were initially imported to build the industrial and economic infrastructure of the early American society. “It occurred to damned few white Americans in these years that Americans of color were also entitled to the rights and liberties promised by the constitution.” (Schlesinger, Jr., 1991, p. 15).

Viewed as a basic perspective on the relationships between diverse groups who come to the United States, anglo conformity is a broad term used to cover a variety of view points about assimilation and immigration. It assumes the desirability of maintaining English institutions (as modified by the American Revolution), the English language, and English oriented cultural patterns as dominant standards in American life (Gordon, 1978). The early colonialists who referred to themselves as “emigrants” and not as “immigrants” (Steinberg, 1989) came to
create a new England. The American Revolution was more than a Declaration of Independence. "The Revolutionary society had to make war against both the tyranny of England and profligacy of the American people themselves". (R. Takaki, 1990, p. 3). By 1790 the population was predominantly white, English, 75 percent from the British Island, and 99 percent Protestant (Steinberg, 1989, Pp. 7-8). Thus the American society was remarkably homogeneous both ethnically and religiously. The values and norms of the White Anglo Saxon Protestant completely dominated the social, political, and cultural institutions of the new nation. The conquered Native Americans, considered savages by the early settlers, were systematically removed to reservation wastelands, initially through force and later on through deceit and deception. For the Native Americans, acculturation has really been a euphemism for cultural genocide (Green, 1982). The enslaved African Americans, reduced to chattel slavery, were forced into perpetual servitude. Takaki (1990, pp. 3-15) captures the whites' views of African Americans and Native Americans as Calibans, savage, deformed slaves, dark devil, moral degenerates. Racial imagery of African American inferiority, their being ugly, libidinous savages predated slavery in English colonies (Jordan, 1987).

While many writers describe the exclusionary tendencies of whites towards all other ethnic and racial groups, Nathan Glazer (1978) sees a tendency of greater inclusiveness of all races and ethnic groups in the United States. Glazer delineates the American immigration pattern on three historical developments or "decisions" as he refers to them.

"First, the entire world would be allowed to enter the United States. The claim that some nations or races were to be favored in entry over others was, for a while, accepted, but it was eventually rejected. And once having entered into the United States—and whether that entry was by means of forced enslavement, free immigration or conquest—all citizens would have equal rights. No group would be considered subordinate to another. Second, no separate ethnic group was to be allowed to establish an independent polity in the United States. This was to be a union of states and a nation of free individuals, not a nation of politically defined ethnic groups. Third, no group, however, would be required to
give up character and distinctiveness as the price of full entry in the American society and polity." (Glazer, 1978, p. 5).

Glazer acknowledges the existence of cruelties to minorities. Nevertheless for Glazer such cruelties do not represent the "large direction," which is a tendency toward a greater inclusiveness in American history.

Some cast doubt on Glazer’s contention concerning the first "decision." Was the entire world permitted to enter the United States and extended equal rights to all citizens regardless of their means of entry? Even though Glazer was referring to "decisions" made from time to time after the Revolutionary war such a decision never really existed in writing before or even much after the Declaration of Independence. There is much to suggest that these decisions were never really implemented.

Assimilation of "Anglo conformity" has been the most prevalent ideology throughout much of American history. Assimilation is a process whereby subordinate individuals or groups give up their way of life and take on the characteristics of the dominant group and are accepted as a part of that culture. Assimilation could occur at four distinct though related levels (Marger, 1994, pp. 116–121). 1. Cultural assimilation involves adoption of cultural traits such as languages, religion, diet and so on. 2. Structural assimilation which occurs firstly through primary relationship with small and intimate family and neighborhood groups, and secondly through interaction and involvement within society’s major social institutions like the economic, political and educational institutions. 3. Biological assimilation occurs through intermarriage whereby the groups are indistinguishable culturally, structurally and physically. 4. Psychological assimilation occurs when members of the outgroup not only feel they are a part of the dominant culture but such self-identification is accepted by others as well.

In the United States the establishment of the English language as the lingua franca, English laws, Puritan moral codes were all steps towards cultural preeminence of the White Anglo Saxon Protestants who dominated the society economically, politically, and religiously. Non-English "aliens" were obliged to adapt to this new culture. A high value was placed on the

Clearly the early laws, which reflected the norms and values of the powerful elites during the founding of the nation and events thereafter reinforced Anglo conformity. The Germans, the Swedes, and others of the "old immigration" all came in for discrimination by the early English settlers but eventually became accepted because they were considered as a superior race of tall, blond, blue-eyed "Nordics" or Aryans. However, the people of Eastern and Southern Europe who began immigrating in the 1880's were not so lucky. The Italians, Slavs, and Jews were depicted as uncivilized, unruly and dangerous and were subjected to lynchings, shootings and killings (John Higham, 1987). Nevertheless, for these and other groups, assimilation in ways envisaged by the perspectives of Anglo conformity was relatively easy because of their European ancestry and white skin. The "Americanization" movement during World War I is also evidence of white American's insistence on assimilation well into the 20th century.

"Governmental agencies at all levels, together with many private organizations, acted to implement more immediately foreigners' adoption of American practices: citizenship, reverence of American institutions, and use of English language. Because this policy required all minority groups divest themselves of their distinctive ethnic characteristics and adopt those of the dominant group, George R. Stewart suggested that it be called the 'transmuting pot' theory." (Parrillo, 1994, p. 56).

Not all seek assimilation, and not all who seek it obtain it. The physically or culturally distinct groups such as blacks, Asians, Indians, Indo-Chinese, and Moslems have either not sought
assimilation or have not obtained it. Such groups have also encountered insurmountable barriers to assimilation.

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries most of the immigrants coming into the United States were from European countries. Today most of the new immigrants are from Latin America and Asia. Between 1960 and 1990, 15 million people were allowed entry into the United States or granted permanent residence (Marger, 1994, pp. 374–375). There appears to be a greater tolerance of ethnic minorities in the United States today than in the past (Marger, 1994, p. 388–389). However, we have a long way to go in fully acknowledging, accepting, and respecting the expression of ethnic differences. Following the Vietnam War, the Indo-Chinese refugees were located in training or “Americanization” camps before being released into the American society. Today, the racial and ethnic minority citizens have to often justify staying in this country. What country are you from? When are you going back? are questions the hyphenated Americans are often asked. Japanese “bashing,” “dot busting” of Asian Indians, and attacks on Asian businesses are telling reminders of a nation that is still divided on racial and ethnic lines.

Melting Pot

With so many people from so many different countries coming into the United States it is conceivable to consider American society not as a modified England but a totally new blend culturally. Eighteenth century writer and agriculturalist, J. Hector St. John Crevecoeur, after years of living in America, described America as a great crucible where people from different nations come and are “melted into a new race of men, whose labours and posterity will one day cause great changes in the world. (Gordon, 1978, pp. 190–191). The melting pot concept found expression and acceptance among late 19th and early 20th century writers. In 1908, Israel Zangwill’s drama, “The Melting Pot,” produced in the United States became a popular success. Thus, around the turn of the century the melting pot idea became embedded in the ideals of the age as one response to the immigrant receiving experience of the nation.
This concept of melting pot was largely confined to a few academics, historians, poets, and playwrights. The seeds of "melting pot" never came to fruition, though it still remains a dream for many Americans. The notion of Anglo-conformity was so strong that many ethnic groups especially those who were ethnically and racially different, such as, the Chinese, Japanese, African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans, were hardly allowed much of a chance to melt in the great American crucible.

The subjugation of the Native Americans, the conquest of Mexicans and the enslavement of African Americans have all been explained using a conflict perspective. In the subjugation and exploitation of people those in power had a distinct economic and political advantage. De facto and de jure discrimination enabled the dominant white majority to continue to enjoy the advantage well into the late nineteenth century. Given the nature of Anglo conformity it is interesting to note why non-Britishers were allowed into this country. Steinberg makes a persuasive case of "economic necessity rather than a principled commitment to the idea of America as an asylum that the United States imposed no nationally restrictions on immigration, either before or after independence," (Steinberg, 1989, pp. 11).

Cultural Pluralism

Despite the fact that it was easier for white Europeans to blend with other white groups in the early stages of their immigration the non-English immigrants nevertheless created ethnic enclaves. For example, the formation of the Irish, the German, the Scottish societies, and others indicate the struggle of the different ethnic groups for preserving their cultural heritage. The Settlement House Movement, on the one hand appreciated and respected the culture of the new immigrants, but on the other hand inadvertently directed its activities towards the "Americanization" of these new arrivals. American society was receptive to culturally different people if they were motivated to become acculturated and abandon their cultural distinctiveness (Epps, 1974). Jane Addams did much to further the appreciative
view of the immigrants' cultural heritage and its usefulness to the society. By the early 20th century the theme of cultural pluralism was becoming slowly recognized. Arguments were being offered that "immigrants had ancient and honorable cultures that had much to offer an America whose character and destiny were still in the process of formation, and America which must serve as an example of harmonious cooperation of various heritages to a world inflamed by nationalism and war." (Gordon, 1978, pp. 199).

According to Milton Gordon, "The presumed goal of the cultural pluralist is to maintain enough subsocietal separation to guarantee the continuance of the ethnic cultural tradition and the existence of the group, without at the same time interfering with the carrying out of standard responsibilities to the general American civic life... within this context the sense of ethnic peoplehood will remain as one important layer of group identity while, hopefully, prejudice and discrimination will disappear or become so slight in scope as to be barely noticeable," (Gordon, 1964, p. 158).

Although the above definition fairly accurately fits the European immigrant groups, "it does not account for the maintenance of gross inequalities in the pluralistic system, particularly as it works for racial-ethnic groups." (Marger, 1994, p. 132). Cultural pluralism implies, "...mutual respect between the various groups in a society for one another's cultures, a respect that allows minorities to express their own culture without suffering prejudice or hostility." (Schaefer, 1990, p. 47).

Immigrants In Pursuit of a Dream

Immigrants came to America believing it promised freedom, and opportunity for success and prosperity. The same promise continues to attract millions of people from around the world to the United States especially the new immigrants from Latin America and Asia. America currently is "a more ethnically diverse society today than any time in American history. And this diversity will, in all likelihood, continue to expand" (Marger 1994, p. 384). Can America deliver these people what it promises? The riots in Los Angeles during May 1992 following the acquittal of four white policemen charged with the beating
of Rodney King, an African American motorist, brought home the stark reality of divisiveness and insecurity in the United States. Such expressions of hostility have raised the question "What is America?" Who is an American? Although, these questions have been asked since the founding of the nation, at the present time there are as many bewildering answers as there are groups of people answering them. Some have lamented over what America was and what it was meant to be. Others resent and react, sometimes quite angrily, over what America has become.

America has become a multicultural society at a time of shrinking resources, economic downturn, and rising insecurity. "Is the rising cult of ethnicity a symptom of decreasing confidence in the American future? asks Schlesinger, Jr. (1991, pp 16-17). Latest in the long tradition of protectionism, prejudice and discrimination is the surfacing of economic and social issues concerning the newest immigrants that "has provoked negative reactions from both native whites and nonwhites who perceive the new groups as a threat to either their jobs or their language or as an increasing pool of welfare recipients." (Marger, 1994, pp. 383-384). The looting by African Americans and Hispanics of Korean and other businesses in Los Angeles may be a resurgence of xenophobia and the reality of a heterogenous society. America has to recognize that it is a multicultural society. The different ethnic and racial groups' desire to preserve their cultural heritage does not make them less American, nor should they be seen as second class citizens. One can be a Chinese, German, Hispanic, Hindu, Moslem, Japanese, Jewish, Korean, etc., and still be an American. Furthermore, most developed countries in the world are now becoming multicultural and this trend is bound to increase. For these societies to thrive within the competitive global economy they have to awaken to the reality that their citizens come from diverse ethnic and racial background and are determined in preserving their cultural heritage.

Affirmative Action to Reduce Inequality

How did America get from a culture trying to build around a central national identity to one in which it is possible to wear buttons "celebrating differences." The effort to answer this
question is a challenging task. One has to be willing to examine
the issue from both spectrums of the metaphor “a glass of water
is half full or half empty.” America has come a long way in its
quest to preserve national identity, and is still struggling to un-
derstand, respect, and accept its cultural and ethnic diversity. In
this context a wide range of strategies have been developed to
reduce racial inequality and overt discrimination in this country
through enactment of Civil Rights Legislation. Although, spor-
adically enforced in the beginning, the enactment of new laws
or the enforcement of these existing laws gained momentum af-
fter the Civil Rights Movement (see Marlow and Rowland, 1989,
for a brief history of affirmative action in the United States).
Through various approaches such as the politics of confronta-
tion the Civil Rights Movement secured greater national and
international attention, especially during the 1960s. The United
States government took a number of legal and administrative
steps to reduce inequality and increase equality between ethnic
and racially different groups of people.

One such step to reduce inequality and eliminate discrimina-
tion in education and the workplace was the affirmative action
program. Affirmative action refers to positive efforts needed to
eliminate racial and gender discrimination in education and em-
ployment. Affirmative action has come under severe criticism
due to preferential hiring policies and quota systems which has
cau sed, some say, reverse discrimination. One of the criticisms
offered by Glazer (1978) is that by giving special preferences to
groups the law undermines the interest of individuals. Glazer
believes that the state should outlaw racial discrimination and
that racial minorities should follow the example of European
makes a strong case for the failure of preferential policies of
various governments, including the United States. Sowell fur-
ther advocates that blacks shun reliance on government “hand-
outs.” Sowell (1981) suggests that neither politics nor education
were key to ethnic mobility and success in the United States
but rather their middle class orientation and values of disci-
pline, hard work, thrift, diligence and self-reliance. Shelby Steel
(1990) argues that affirmative action programs create a kind of
implied inferiority among African Americans and other minori-
ties who are made to feel that they have acquired their positions not because of their knowledge and competence but because of preferential treatment.

Takaki (1987) faults Glazer for "twisting" history to serve his ideology and questions Sowell's interpretation of data. For Takaki the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was only a beginning step towards equality of conditions. He doubts that poverty, poor education, occupational stratification, and inner city ghetto problems could be solved without government acting affirmatively and promoting opportunities for racial minorities based on group rights. According to Takaki, criticism of affirmative action overlooks the fact that "there has always been affirmative action for white men." (Takaki, 1987, pp. 231-232). Furthermore, "preferential treatment is already given certain groups, such as veterans or athletes, in employment or education" (Marger, 1994, p. 371).

Admission to educational programs and securing better jobs are crucial elements in working towards integration. For this reason elimination of economic discrimination has been considered as a prerequisite for achieving equality and harmonious intergroup relations (Wilson, W.J. 1987, Featherman and Hauser, 1976). Achieving educational equality between different people is also crucial. Lower educational attainments lead to poorer jobs, lower incomes, and lower living standards. Poor education accentuates the perpetuation of inequality from generation to generation as well as ignorance and prejudice against members of outgroups in the society. Affirmative Action programs raise complex questions about achieving equality. Enactment of the law is only a first step towards changing prejudiced attitudes and practices. It is only one of the steps towards creating intergroup harmony.

Prejudices and biases based on racial and ethnic differences frequently manifest on individual as well as on institutional levels. A society committed to the principle of cultural pluralism has to convince its members that every one has to be treated equally and with dignity, respect and justice. Bringing about such attitudinal transformation is an arduous task. This task becomes more difficult if institutional policies and procedures are not in place to complement treatment of everyone equally.
It is in the market place where minorities end up getting the "short end of the deal." It is not sufficient for an establishment to say that it is an equal opportunity employment place. It has to ensure that its personnel practices at all levels are fair and equal irrespective of race, gender, religion, sexual orientation, age, and national origin. It is in this context that affirmative action officers are appointed to ensure that fair personnel practices are in place.

Affirmative action, in many cases, has become a middle class, bourgeois procedure rather than addressing the issue of equality and equity across the board in the spirit of cultural pluralism. Current policies have done little to bring about structural changes or and end to institutional inequities. The emphasis on economic values has led some powerful members of the dominant group, often time, to placate or coopt individual members of minority groups who are not necessarily the best. Such tokenism is a half-hearted piecemeal attempt at providing equal opportunity to minorities of color and gender to advance themselves. Some members of minority groups who advanced to managerial and administrative positions, for fear of unwarranted charges of favoritism or self-interest, do little to enhance the positions of other minorities. It has been suggested that some "African Americans have seized control of the city halls, but their rise has done little to ease the plight of their most downtrodden constituents," writes Jack E. White in TIME (May 11, 1992, pp. 38-40). Supreme court judge Clarence Thomas, who is an African American, is another example. None of his rulings or actions up to now suggest any move on his part to advance the cause of African Americans or improve intergroup relations. In a recent interview, 'Justice Thomas said that, "discrimination or special treatment on the basis of race" was wrong. "I'm trying to uphold that standard, and I disagree with the prevailing point of view of some black leaders that special treatment for blacks is acceptable," he added.' (New York Times, 1994, YP. 7)

Cultural pluralism is by no means the definitive solution for dealing with prejudices, hatred and conflicts stemming from ethnic and racial differences. But it does provide a viable option for multicultural societies to operate without bigotry and
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racism. In emphasizing the importance of cultural pluralism, William Greenbaum (1974) makes four points. They are:

1) support for positive bi-cultural and multi-cultural identities may encourage not only renewed respect for this country but also encourage the development of true universalism in which the merits and faults of different belief systems can be more intelligently assessed because the individual and the group deeply understand more than one culture their own. 2) There is a human need for self consciousness and self-awareness, and by taking responsibility for one's own institutions and communities, the different ethnic groups can preserve their heritage and culture and use them for the benefit of its members. 3) Recognition of past and present Anglo-American practices to significantly reduce great societal inequities fits the spirit of cultural pluralism. 4) Pluralism can offset the poverty of cosmopolitanism and antagonistic individualism. Supporters of pluralistic groups emphasize the interdependence between individuals, families, co-workers, groups, and communities. These groups seek to alter the roles of the economy, science, technology, and government to service people rather than dominate them, and pluralism must be accepted because for many Americans irrevocable cultural and linguistic diversity already exists and provides firm foundations for strong institutions, human service delivery systems, and respectable communities in which to live (Greenbaum, 1974).

America has come a long way in respecting cultural diversity, but not far enough. We are becoming more tolerant more often of cultural diversity, but many have not accepted it as a reality and a necessity. We respect and strive to protect the civil rights of all citizens. However, when a large proportion of our minorities, subjected to discrimination, suffer due to poverty, ghetto living, inferior education, low-paying dead-end jobs, and ill health, we inadvertently negate the basic human rights of all citizens.

"The extravagant overrepresentation of African-Americans among the unemployed, the poor, the sick and prison inmates in this country is not accepted even by the minimum standards of the so-called 'first' world. There is no way of understanding and changing the dehumanizing conditions in the ghettos of our inner cities
without confronting and challenging the racist attitudes and policies that help foster them,” according to Arno J. Meyer, a Princeton University, Dayton-Stockton Professor of European History (1992).

The problems of a multicultural society are as complex and diverse as its population. America will need to develop solutions within a democratic value system. In the management of a diverse multicultural society, social institutions, the educational, economic, political, religious and social welfare—have significant roles to fulfill. Social institutions are structures that develop over time in societies to organize important activities in ways that uphold cultural values.

The institution of education has the responsibility of not only setting straight the distorted history written by the Eurocentric writers of the past but also make sure that current writers, do not get carried away in debunking European legacy and distorting history to serve a new purpose. A need for critical self-evaluation of one's own history and culture is of importance in understanding and appreciating one's own and other cultures. Debunking myths and eradicating prejudices through education will help create respect and dignity for all people.

Religious institutions can strive harder to create an environment of tolerance and respect for people of all faiths. Its leadership, rather than feeling threatened by other religious faiths, must create a climate whereby people of different religious denominations can respect and appreciate other religious beliefs.

Economic institutions need to accelerate creation of conditions of equality of employment opportunity and job freedom not solely based on economic interest but also based on the values of dignity and accompanied by respect of fellow humans. A prosperous workforce is a sign of not only a health economy but of a more hail, hearty and harmonious society.

Political institutions while recognizing the primacy of the individual must continue to be involved in the implementation of Civil Rights laws, enforcement of affirmative action programs and other programs that leads to equality of opportunity, freedom and equality of conditions for all the citizens.
Role of Social Welfare Institutions

The institution of Social Welfare has an important role to play in the preservation of our multi-cultural society. Social Welfare institutions have many functions. One is to fill the gap in services that the other need-meeting institutions fail to provide. The function of social welfare institution includes maintenance, development and change activities which are geared towards the improvement of intra-societal human relations and the overall quality of life of all people. Social welfare institutions because they interface and inter-connect with the other social institutions and because of their emphasis on the primacy of the individual, stand in a unique position to create a better understanding between and among people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds in the society. However, the social work profession is in a predicament. Its professional values, code of ethics, and mission are often challenged by the values of the other social institutions. In this context social workers need to keep in mind the following factors:

1. In virtually all societies dependence on any social welfare assistance is not looked upon favorably, and in some instances it even carries considerable stigma.

2. In most societies social welfare professionals are seen as do gooders, and when they champion the case of vulnerable and oppressed groups they become the recipients of stigma—the scapegoat.

3. In most societies ethnic, racial, and cultural minority groups often experience overt as well as covert prejudice, discrimination, and oppression.

4. Because of the economic crunch prevailing provision of social services has become a low priority item in many countries. Privatization of social services is emphasized. Sentiments of “no more free lunch” are often heard.

5. The financial factor and the sentiments expressed towards the social work profession is eroding the zeal and enthusiasm established by the pioneers in the profession. Some of the new breed of professionals would prefer to be autonomous clinical practitioners rather than be involved in racial and ethnic cultural warfare.
Many new immigrants who come to this country come with the kinds of perspectives on social work and social welfare discussed above. Social workers working with members of these groups need to be aware of such factors as they approach their task. The social work profession has begun to make great strides in helping social workers to develop these kinds of understanding as in the work of Devore and Schlesinger (1991), Green (1982) and the development of new journals. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work*). The fact that the Council on Social Work Education mandates the inclusion of content on racial and ethnic minorities, oppression and advocacy in schools' curricula is also an indication of the social work profession's move in the right direction.

**Recognition of Diversity**

Even though de jure discrimination seems to have been reduced in our society de facto discrimination continues to exist. Institutionalized racism, which is usually built into the nature of social institutions and where business goes on as usual, is difficult to prove and eradicate in a society where diversity dominates. In the management of change diversity will need to be recognized and seen as a strength and not as deviance. Diversity will grow to be seen as a reality and not just an ideal. Diversity will be desired at all levels along with an end put to institutional racism and sexism.

As social and behavioral scientists, if we truly believe that every human being needs to be seen as worthy and having dignity, then we need to take a proactive stand in advocating for and championing the needs of all ethnic groups in their efforts to preserve and practice their cultural heritage. For a society to be truly multicultural it is imperative that its policies at all levels reflect this sentiments. The social work profession needs to ensure that the policies go beyond rhetoric. There are numerous regions of the globe where ethnic violence and bloodshed are an everyday occurrence. Some minority persons, in order to protect themselves, lash out. In a recent interview United Nation Secretary-General Boutros Ghali warned that by the end of the century the world may splinter into 400 economically-crippled
mini-states unless the rights of minorities receive top priority (The Straits Time, 1992).

While ethnic strife and communal tension have torn apart Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and other nations and unions, the United States, which prevented the legal recognition of ethnic groups as polities, stands in, what some view as, an unenviable position of creating a multi-cultural "Salad Bowl" society where every ingredient retains its flavor and identity. Yet blended together with a variety of spices, a new taste can be added to the whole. Commitment and a conviction from the leadership of social institutions may be the necessary social glue, may be the "dressing," that will provide the sum and substance of a new United States of America.
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The social work literature of the past ten years has paid increasing attention to the ideological, theoretical and practice issues related to ethnic sensitive practice. Major focus has been on the life styles, needs and oppression of people of color, with minimal attention paid to other ethnic groups. A literature focused on adapting prevailing practice modalities to work with diverse groups is beginning to emerge.

In the preface to the first edition of *Ethnic Sensitive Social Work Practice* (1981) we suggested that the time had arrived when social work could comfortably integrate the profession's long standing commitment to the uniqueness of individuals with knowledge about ethnic and class related response. We also suggested then that as a result of the ferment of the 60's social work was finally paying more attention to poverty, to the liberation struggles of various groups and to how minority status, ethnic group membership, and social class status affect problem generation and resolution. The title of the book seemed to strike a cord. Soon after its publication the term ethnic sensitive social work practice quickly came to be used by a broad spectrum of social workers who seemed to be in agreement with the perspective implied by the term—that social work must be mindful of the effect of ethnic group membership on the problems people experience.

It was no longer possible to ignore these issues as a new convergence of forces compelled attention. Among the factors that emerged in the wake of the liberation movements of the sixties was recognition that pluralistic perspectives, not the
ideology of the melting pot were a more realistic reflection of the American experience. This sense was reinforced with the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 which raised earlier immigration ceilings and gave priority to those joining families and those with particular job skills. Large numbers of people came from Asia, and Latin America, as well as the Middle East and the then Soviet Union. For all of these reasons the time had arrived for increased social work attention to related issues.

More attention has been paid. It is time to review, to critique, to analyze. This paper represents an effort at such appraisal. Our aim is to examine the state of the art of ethnic sensitive practice. We draw on our own fifteen year immersion in this work and on diverse material in the literature.

Major sources are the several books on ethnic sensitive, and cultural and minority practice published in the last 10 to fifteen years, as well as related materials found in some of the leading social work journals between 1983 and 1993. The journals selected were Social Work, Social Service Review, Social Casework/Families in Society, and Health and Social Work. Select material from the Journal of Multicultural Social Work, a new journal specifically devoted to the matters of interest here was also considered.

Our examination includes the definitions of ethnic groups, minority groups, people of color, race, social class and culture; a review of some of the major theories and concepts that have been introduced; and synthesis of reviews of the literature carried out by others as well as by us.

Summary and analysis of the various practice approaches and interventive strategies conclude the work.

Definitions and Definitional Issues

The issues subsumed under the rubric of ethnic sensitive social work practice are often intense, affectively charged and subject to considerable debate and disagreement. For these reasons, it is critical that we begin by systematic examination of the most commonly used terms.
Ethnic Groups and Ethnicity

Most definitions of ethnic groups focus on a number of themes, including a common religion, culture, physical appearance or some combination of these. Gordon (1988) defines an ethnic group as

a population entity which considers itself to have a common historical ancestry and identity—a sense of peoplehood, of constituting a 'people'—and is so regarded by others. It may be co-extensive with a particular nation, or it may be a sub population within a nation. It may be based on a common religion, a common language, a common national background, or a common racial ancestry or frequency, or some combination of several of these factors (p. 129)

Culture¹

Culture is a commonly used concept used to refer to the fact that human groups differ in the way they structure their behavior, in their world view, in their concept of the essential nature of the human condition and how they view the rhythms and patterns of life.

Distinctions Between Culture and Ethnicity

In our view cultural phenomena are an integral but not the only component of the ethnic experience. Brookins points to the distinction.

Ethnicity refers to group membership in which the defining feature is the characteristic of shared unique cultural traditions and a heritage that spans across generations. Membership in an ethnic group provides the cultural identity and lens through which the developing child comes to understand and act upon prescribed values, norms and social behavior. (Brookins, 1993, p. 1057)

Minority Groups and Minorities

The term "minority" has been used to identify people who tend to be located "at the lowest end of the spectrum of power and advantage". (Hopps, 1983, p. 77) A combination of racism and poverty sets apart many African Americans, Native Americans, Native Alaskans, Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans.
(Hopps, 1982) suggests that the term minority has come to be used to refer to people other than members of ethnic groups that are especially oppressed, and proposes that the terms "people of color" or "minorities of color" more accurately describe the persons whose lives are being considered.

Some have questioned the use of the term ethnic groups to refer to members of minority groups. Jaynes and Williams (1989) reject the view that African Americans constitute an ethnic group in the same way as do people of European origin. They suggest the "uniqueness of race as an irreducible category has emerged from the debate". (p 56) We disagree, and suggest that a review of the classic definition of an ethnic group points to the contrary. Nevertheless, political and other considerations may persuade representatives of different groups to use terms which more accurately reflect their sense of themselves and the issues of importance to them. (Asamoah et. al., 1991)

**Race**

It is difficult to define "race" in objective terms since the term has a "long and tortuous history" (Jaynes and Williams, 1989 p 565). They point out that "differences in skin color, type of hair and facial features that are biologically trivial have been used as markers for ascribing great differences in power and privilege." (p 565) They use the term as "a social construct that relies on common understandings and self definition rather than scientific criteria" (p. 566).

**Oppression**

The dictionary (Webster, 1984) defines oppression as "keeping down by cruel, or unjust use of power or authority." In this context, it is oppression of minority groups that is the focus of attention.

**Diversity**

The terms diversity and difference are often used as being synonymous. Focus is on dissimilarity and on variety. Here the term diversity is used in reference to the various populations that live in this country, understanding that many people from
many lands and cultures live in the United States in an exciting, heterogeneous context.

In practice, social workers need to recognize the joy and beauty of diversity while struggling to eliminate oppression.

*Ethnic Sensitive Social Work Practice*

The term "ethnic sensitive social work practice" once introduced came to be used by social workers when referring in a broad, general sense to practice that is mindful of the effects of ethnic and minority group membership in social functioning and seeks to incorporate this understanding into practice. Used this way, the term is not limited to any single or particular definition or approach. Longres (1991) exemplifies this use of the term when he suggests that "ethnic sensitive models . . . are proliferating" (p 55). He also suggests that for the most part these models emphasize differences in cultural norms.\(^2\)

There is, of course the multifaceted approach to ethnic sensitive practice, with specific definitions, theoretical formulations and practice approaches introduced by the present authors and variously considered in this paper.

Another use of the term has been introduced by McMahon and Allen-Meares (1992). In the effort to answer the question "is social work racist?" these authors reviewed segments of the social work literature and concluded that "ethnic-sensitive practice ultimately focuses on change in the social worker, not the client nor the client's external conditions. Thus, by itself, without regard for client's social and economic contexts, ethnic sensitive practice reinforces the racist conditions that oppress clients". This is a distortion of the approach introduced initially by the present authors and subsequently reiterated (Devore and Schlesinger, 1981, 1987, 1991) Emphasis on simultaneous attention to psychological and systems change strategies were and remain an integral focus of the approach. Our own review of the literature surfaced no exclusive focus on "changing" the social worker at the expense of systems change, nor have other reviews identified such a thrust.\(^3\)
Ideological, Theoretical and Conceptual Formulations

Ideological Considerations

Theoretical/conceptual as well as ideological formulations have been introduced as the basis for ethnic sensitive practice. Lister (1987) suggests a distinction between an ethnocultural focus on ethnic group values, history, family structure and family functions related to ethnocultural identification, and a minority perspective focused on racism, powerlessness, prejudice, discrimination and other types of oppression.

In their critique of the minority perspective Montiel and Wong (1983) suggest the perspective represents a reaction by minority persons to “the assault of racist institutions” (p. 112) They contend, however, that the grievances are presented in an “ad hoc” fashion, don’t explain the structural sources of minority life and don’t deal adequately with theories of racism. Further, there is no theoretical framework for analyzing a number of issues facing minorities, including the consequences of acculturation, assimilation and adoption of positions motivated by individual pursuit of self interest.

Our analysis, based largely on the review of the literature found in subsequent sections of this paper, suggests that the profession has responded to earlier criticism of neglect of minority issues by focusing largely on issues arising out of a minority perspective. Considerably less attention has been paid to an ethnocultural perspective, especially in respect to persons currently not defined as minorities. The major exception is the work of the present authors. (Devore & Schlesinger, 1981, 1987, 1991)

The Curriculum Policy Statements of the Council on Social Work Education (1984, 1992) have contributed to this ideological stance. BSW and MSW programs have had to include materials on people of color since the 1970’s. This position is reaffirmed in the most recent Curriculum Policy Statement adopted in July 1992. Schools have more choice about which other groups on which to focus-suggesting that they be selected on the basis of their relevance to any particular program’s mission.

Chau (1991) suggests that three ideological perspectives have shaped social work’s response to minority concerns: 1) the
cultural deficit perspective which views as deviant any variations of cultural patterns from mainstream norms; 2) the minority perspective which has resulted in a shift in social work practice toward affirmative action and social change strategies and 3) the ethnocultural perspective. Longres' (1991) critique of prevailing models bridges ideological and theoretical perspectives. In his view many of the emerging models have within them the themes of culture and cultural differences. This focus is more appropriate for work with recent immigrants than minority group persons long resident in this country who think and act in accord with the core value system. Social workers should pay more attention to the subordinate position of minority persons and the negative consequences than to their cultural attributes. Helping minority clients means changing stratification systems.

Theoretical Perspectives

Diverse theoretical perspectives—from sociology, anthropology, social psychology and political theory have variously focused on individual behavior, on the function of groups and social systems and on relationships between diverse groups. Lum (1992) points to concepts of race, class, ethnicity and power; therapeutic approaches with minority families, gender, perspectives on mental health and minority perspectives on human behavior and the social environment. Pinderhughes (1989) shows how power, ethnicity and race contribute to problems and how understanding their effects and interplay can contribute to effective practice.

The Dual Perspective  The concept of the dual perspective (Norton 1978) grew out of the effort of the Council on Social Work Education to develop conceptualizations that would facilitate the preparation of students to provide effective services to minority clients. The concept derives from the view that all people are embedded in two systems—the dominant or sustaining system which is the source of power, economic resources and status, and the nurturing system consisting of the social environment of family and community. The individual sense of
identity is developed in the nurturing system. Drawing on socialization theory, Norton suggests that the sense of self is developed via a process Mead described as taking on the attitude of the wider society, the generalized other, through role taking. Through this process children discover that “the roles belong to their own nature . . .” (p 4) This attitude of the generalized other gives unity of self to individuals as they incorporate society's responses and react accordingly. Drawing on the experience in the nurturing system, the alternative generalized other can serve to enforce positive self images and serve as a buffer against negative self images which minority persons may develop if they internalize negative societal images. Norton also used the concept to delineate a process whereby social workers consciously and systematically perceive the values and attitudes of the larger social system with those of the client's immediate system. An important issue revolves around the degree of incongruence between the societal and the client's system. Given rejection of basic elements of minority client systems, it is difficult for minority clients to achieve congruence. Recognizing this facilitates increased awareness by social workers of the points of conflict between minority clients and that of the larger society, as well as highlighting sources of social structural inequity.

De Hoyos, De Hoyos and Anderson (1986) suggest that though considered important, analysts have in fact made limited use of the dual perspective. Their review of the literature points rather to a focus on cultural dissonance and institutional racism. Norton has also begun to reconsider the dual perspective (Norton, 1993) and suggests the emphasis on difference may become pejorative. A focus on culture, viewed as a set of integrating mechanisms may serve to provide the basis for understanding differences while retaining a perspective that values human commonalities.

Biculturalism Ho (1987) suggests that all members of minority groups are part of two cultures and participate in two cultural systems. Two sets of behavior are often required involving distinct ways of coping with tasks and expectations.

Categorical and Transactional Concepts of Ethnicity Green (1982) introduced the categorical and the transactional concepts
of ethnicity. The former emphasizes ethnic specific traits and cultural content, and in his view "pigeonholes" people without explaining the basis of the differences. The transactional perspective focuses on means by which people maintain their sense of cultural distinctiveness in cross cultural encounters. Identified with Barth (1969, cited in Green 1982) the focus is on group boundaries using selected cultural traits as criteria or markers of exclusion.

Cultural content — ceremonies, technology, language, religion — serves a symbolic function separating groups from one another. Transactional analysis is concerned with lines of separation, their management and ritualization. The ways in which distinctiveness is defended, asserted, preserved or abandoned is the "stuff of ethnic identity". There are identifiable consequences that follow from considering the importance of interaction across group boundaries as one of the defining characteristics of ethnicity. Since these relationships are often ritualized, one can predict behavior without having to learn fully of one another's culture.

The Ethnic Reality  The conceptual base of the model of ethnic sensitive practice introduced by the present authors (Devore & Schlesinger, 1981, 1986, 1987, 1991) derives from social stratification theory, specifically, Gordon's analysis (1964) of the relative impact of social class and ethnic group membership on social life. Although he attributed primary importance to social class as a determinant of the basic conditions of life, he observed major differences in outlook and orientation between persons occupying the same class position. Gordon attributed these differences to ethnicity and coined the term "ethclass" to refer to the point of intersection between social class and ethnicity. We have suggested that the unique configuration generated by this intersect be termed the ethnic reality or ethclass in action.

This focus on the interplay between social class and ethnicity allows us to locate groups and individuals within the social structure while facilitating analysis of at least two critical structural realities — class and ethnic group membership. Membership in one of the major social class strata provides ready clues
about the socioeconomic circumstances of individuals while the intersect suggests that a unique configuration is formed when the two factors are joined.

Adams and Schlesinger (1988) suggest that the stratification structure is a key component of the sustaining system identified by Norton (1978) and Chestang (1976). The congruence between the two models has been noted by Chau (1991) who suggests that the "two concepts picture the unique condition of minority individuals very well". We, consider the analysis to be applicable to ethnic and minority groups. The concept of the ethnic reality calls attention to group history with respect to structural sources of oppression and discrimination, and to values concerning such matters as the respective importance attached to gender roles, how the elderly are to be cared for and the ways in which religious teachings are translated into dictums for daily living.

Minority Values and Theory

Lum (1986, 1992) considers the congruence and difference between traditional social work and minority values. Traditional social work values emphasize individual dignity and uniqueness, self determination and resource accessibility. Individual rights and freedom are considered most important. Minority values are more likely to stress collective orientations, including emphasis on family obligation and the dependence of family members on one another, ethnic group identity and "metaphysical harmony in nature or religion".

According to Lum, minority persons in the United States share values that include the importance of subordinating the needs of the individual to those of the family, and viewing the family as the primary source of relationships. The family including the extended family is "the central point of reference and place of refuge" (p 408). The degree of adherence to these tenets varies with the degree of acculturation. The importance of religious institutions in sustaining various minority groups through adverse social stress related to their low status is noted.

Minority knowledge refers to information, awareness and understanding of the minority situational experience. Minority theory "refines minority knowledge in a series of formulated general principles that explain these phenomena systematically."
The Sociocultural Approach  De Hoyos, De Hoyos and Anderson (1986) suggest that two sociocultural perspectives have dominated the literature—cultural dissonance and institutional racism. The first emphasizes problems that arise out of cultural difference, the second focuses on minority problems in terms of discrimination practiced in social structures. They contend that society can be viewed as a system and that values determine social organization, that systems seek to maximize success and minimize failure and that people conform to the extent that they feel rewarded as they perform their roles within systems. Social dislocation occurs when any group is prevented from the opportunity to occupy rewarding roles. Extended delay results in the group's being blocked leading to social and cultural dislocation.

Literature Review

Synthesis of Prior Reviews

There have been a number of reviews of the social work literature focused on attention to minority and ethnic issues. McMahon and Allen-Meares' review (1992) covered articles on minority issues and persons published in four major journals during the 1980's. They concluded that the total relative to other subject matter was small. Based on their operationalization of concepts they concluded that most of the articles recommended an"individualistic, interventive practice that...helps the client adapt to an oppressive environment". (p 537) A reluctance to undertake social action with a macro focus, was noted and in their view "...the literature portrays the social work profession as naive and superficial in its antiracist practice". They found greater attention to developing social worker's ethnic and cultural awareness than on the social and economic contexts in which minority persons live. It is their contention that the focus on ethnic sensitivity is essentially racist.

Lum (1992) examined over 20 social work practice texts written between 1970 and 1990. Based on his tally of the amount of ethnic/minority content found he concluded that minimal attention has been paid to related issues by the leading social work practice theorists. His review of three major social work journals published during the same period revealed only slightly more attention than in the texts.
The Present Review  In our review we focused on identifying emerging issues. Several were readily identified. One was attention to the “ethnic reality” of these groups—that is an attempt to capture their lives, needs and coping styles. Another we term the focus on empowerment/advocacy/social action/social policy issues. The nature of attention to interventive issues was also of interest. During the ten year period covered by our review, there was a focus on minority groups or people of color, with minimal attention given to any other ethnic groups. The group receiving the most attention was African Americans, followed next by Latinos and then Asians.

Such attention as was paid to non minority groups was often by way of comparison with the major groups of interest. Included here are occasional references to Jewish, Italian, Greek, and Irish people, and persons from Africa. As best as we could establish there were no articles on people from Japan, the Middle East or the large numbers of countries in Eastern and Western Europe. The large numbers of recent immigrants from Latin and Central America are receiving scant attention.

No single group or topic area was considered in depth. Rather, the articles ranged over a wide subject matter. Consequently it is not possible to present any meaningful syntheses. Rather, we limit ourselves to providing an overview of the groups and issues considered.

Focus on the Ethnic Reality

African Americans  Explicit in almost all of the work was recognition of the oppression experienced by African American people, and how that oppression impacts on the specific issue under consideration. Examination of the life of the African American elderly was of considerable interest and included their patterns of informal supports (Taylor & Chatters, 1986); comparison of the volunteer service patterns of white and Black elders, (Morrow-Hovele, Lott & Ozawa, 1990); the impact of labor force transformation (Crawley, 1992); service use (Richardson, 1992); and grandmotherhood (Timberlake & Chipungu 1992). Also addressed were perspectives on depression among Black Americans (Fellin, 1989), while Biegel, Magaziner and

Other issues addressed were a perspective on African American women and birth control (Gould, 1984) and single Black mothers. (Seaborn-Thompson & Peebles-Wilkins, 1992). There was also attention to the self image and the roles of African American fathers (Christmon, 1990; McAdoo, 1991); and battered Black women (Coley and Beckett, 1988).

Latinos Articles focused on Mexican Americans made reference to value differences between Anglos and members of this groups. One compared the home and work responsibilities of Anglo and Mexican women (Marlow, 1990); another social science concepts used to understand the situation of Mexican Americans. (Padilla, 1990). Rothman, Gant and Hand (1985) analyzed the characteristics of Mexican American family culture. The health needs of Hispanic children and adults were reviewed by Guendelman (1985); and De La Rosa (1989) as were the nature of support systems of Puerto Ricans (De La Rosa, 1988). The relationship between Hispanic culture and home care of people with Alzheimer’s disease was considered. (Cox & Monk, 1993) as were “cultural dissonance and AIDS (Bok & Morales, 1992). Attention was also paid to “Hispanic” families in poverty (Aponte, 1993). The relationship between biculturalism and mental health among Cuban Americans was of interest (Gomez, 1990), as was the general issues of understanding Cuban immigrants from a cultural perspective (Queralt, 1984). The risks for mental health problems of pregnant Hispanic women are pointed out by Zoyas and Busch-Rossnagel II (1992).

Asian Americans Since many of the persons classified as Asian came to the United States as refugees, a number of the works focused on adaptation to the United States. Interest was focused on acculturation among Vietnamese refugees, (Matsuoka, 1990), on Vietnamese youth in foster care (Mortland and Egan, 1987) on adaptation issues facing elderly Chinese persons (Cheung, 1986) and on cultural factors in casework with Chinese Americans (Ryan, 1985). Also of interest was the situation of
Cambodian refugees (Bromley, 1985) psychological traumas and depression in a sample of Vietnamese people (Train, 1993), sudden unexplained death among some Southeast Asian refugees (Petzold, 1991) and on how Buddhism functions as a support system for Southeast Asian refugees. (Canda and Phaobtong, 1992).

Segal (1991) considers key attributes of Asian Indians and the intergenerational problems they generate. An issue of concern to some Asian Americans, the view held by many, that they constitute a model minority with few needs is considered by Crystal (1989).

**Native Americans** Articles on Native Americans focused on a number of issues including distinct cultural values, how these differ from “Anglo” culture, and how these in turn affect problem generation and solution. Some examples are the relationships between anglo concepts, Indian reality and juvenile delinquency (Robbins, 1984); the implications of Indian values for casework intervention (DuBray, 1985), implications of cultural precepts for child welfare practice (Cross, 1986) and the utility of Durkheimian analysis in understanding suicide among Native Americans. (Davenport and Davenport, 1987).

**West Indian People** A literature is beginning to emerge about persons who come to the United States from the Caribbean area. Several of the articles focused on this population group incorporated a focus on the ethnic reality with treatment implications. Thrasher and Anderson (1988) focused on culture specific problems in dealing with such issues as child abuse and the differential cultural interpretation while Sewell-Coker, Hamilton-Collins and Fein (1985) point to conflicting value assumptions, especially in regard to parent child relationships that must be understood in programs intended to help these families.

**Policy, Empowerment, Advocacy/Social Action**

The work on policy, empowerment, advocacy and social action ranged over a number of issues. Examples are empowering women of color (Gutierrez, 1990) and, patterns of welfare spending that impact negatively or positively on minority persons (Ozawa, 1986; Sandefeur & Pahari, 1989). Black single
mothers in poverty were the focus of attention (Jackson, 1983) as were minority children and the educational system (Meares, 1990; Williams 1990) and in the welfare system (Hogan and Siu, 1988). Social welfare spending and AFDC were the focus of work by Caputo (1993). Access to the profession was an issue with the focus on minority recruitment (Berger, 1989). Interven-
tive approaches to service development were an issue that is touched on in the section on intervention.

Intervention

Discussion of ethnic sensitive approaches to intervention took essentially two forms. In almost all of the articles where the major focus was on description and analysis of the ethnic reality there was also some-albeit often limited-attention paid to the implications for intervention. In a small number, the primary focus was on applying knowledge about the ethnic reality to developing ethnic sensitive interventive approaches and strategies with different groups and problem areas.

The limitations of a review article do not allow for a detailed review or synthesis of a number of the approaches proposed. Most fall within what has elsewhere been termed “adaptation of strategies to the ethnic reality”; (see Devore & Schlesinger, 1991) that is drawing on basic social work theories and interventive approaches, on understanding of the coping styles of different people, and integrating these two types of understanding in modifying or expanding strategies and skills. A few examples are illustrative.

Politi-Ziter (1987) brings understanding of problem centered systems therapy, a perspective on the meaning of the Black ex-
perience, and recognition of the importance of empowerment to bear on suggesting culturally sensitive approaches to the treat-
ment of Black families drawing on systems-oriented assessment. Zuniga (1992) draws on “dichos”—folk sayings that exhibit cultural beliefs as a way of providing an ambience that con-
tributes to culturally sensitive treatment of Latino clients. Issues
of empowerment are central to the work of Hirayama & Cetin-
gok (1988) in the approach they propose for work with Asian
immigrants, while Hardy-Fanta focused on knowledge of cul-
tural and process issues as essential to a comprehensive group
service in the Hispanic community. Weiss and Parish consider
culturally appropriate methods of crisis counseling in working
with Indochinese refugees. Timberlake and Cook (1984) suggest
strategies for social work with Vietnamese refugees. Respect for
the rights of self determination and community needs underpin
the model of practice for work with Black urban youth gangs
focus on culturally syntonic strategies used in assessing service
needs of the Hispanic community. Icard and Traunstaine (1987)
show how negative attitudes to homosexuals and racism can
have impact on efforts to work with Black, gay, alcoholic men.
They propose a series of highly targeted intervention strategies.
Kelly, McKay and Nelson (1985) bring an ecological perspective
to bear on Indian agency development.

The results of this review can be summarized in a num-
ber of way. The overwhelming focus on people of color has
already been noted, as has the fact that coverage spanned a
broad spectrum of areas with limited in depth exploration of
any one area. The notable exception was a focus on adop-
tion and concerns raised about transracial adoption. (eg An-
dujo, 1988) Feigelman and Silverman, 1984; McRoy, Zurcher
and Lauderdale, 1984; Rodriguez and Meyer, 1990; and Rosen-
thal, Groze and Curiel, 1990). Review of the ethnic reality of
various groups far exceeded the urgent need for social work-
ers to develop practice knowledge and interventive approaches
broadly based on understanding the ethnic reality of various groups.
We share the observation made by McMahon and Meares (1992)
that there were a relatively small number of articles focused on
issues of social policy, advocacy, social action, empowerment
and systems change. A number of general principles emerge
from this review.

These are summarized in a later section of this paper in the
section titled “Practice Skills and Strategies”
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Practice Approaches

A number of models of ethnic sensitive approaches to practice have been developed.

Minority Social Work Practice

Lum (1896, 1992) introduced this form of practice. He suggests that discrimination experienced by people of color calls for approaches that are especially sensitive to ethnic and cultural environments. The primary focus is to improve the quality of psychosocial functioning as the minority person interacts with the social situation". (p 6) The target groups are people of color—African American, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans and Native Americans.

The Framework for Minority Practice  There are four categories within the framework for ethnic minority social work: 1) practice process stages; 2) worker-system practice issues; 3) client-system practice issues and 4) worker-client tasks. Process stages focus on the step by step sequence of client and worker movement in the helping process. Client and worker system issues include both those relevant to all clients and workers and those especially pertinent to minority clients. Many minority persons may be distrustful, or have shame about seeking assistance. Ethnic and minority background may provide clues to understanding the client, and determining degree of acculturation is most important.

Practice Model Based on Cultural Awareness

Green suggests that social workers assume an important role as boundary mediators because of the role they play in communication of information and the regulation of resources. He identifies four modes of social work intervention: 1) advocacy because of the inherent conflict between minority and dominant groups; 2) counseling—although culturally sensitive counseling needs to be further developed; 3) a regulator role—one that is often viewed negatively by ethnic community leaders; an example is the removal of Native American children from their homes following allegations of abuse; and 4) the broker role in which in which social workers attempt to redress past failures
of established social service organizations in meeting the needs of minority clients.

Green's model of help seeking behavior focuses on culturally based differences in perceiving and experiencing stress; language and how it crystallizes experience and the social as well as personal experience of a problem. There is emphasis on acknowledging the problem as it is experienced by the client, the way language is used to label a problem, the availability of indigenous helping resources and client oriented criteria for deciding whether a satisfactory resolution has been reached. Also emphasized is the notion of "ethnic competence" which refers to a high level of cultural awareness of others involving more than the usual attributes associated with social worker client relationships. It is a way of functioning that is consonant with the behavior of members of distinct ethnic groups.

A Paradigm for Community Work with People of Color

While the literature related to ethnic sensitive practice with individuals, families and groups has been developing, little has been contributed in relation to work with communities. Rivera and Erlich's paradigm (1992) for organizing with people of color contributed to this area of practice.

These authors suggest that "benign or belligerent neglect" has been part of the history of communities of color in relation to the need to mobilize available skills and extend limited resources. The classic models of community practice—locality development, social planning, and social action are essentially "color blind" and can serve only as a foundation for intervention strategies to be used in communities of color. Work in each of these communities is not the same. The models need to be buttressed with consideration of 1) the uniqueness of people of color; 2) the implication of the role played in the various communities of kinship, their social systems, power and leadership networks, religion and language and 3) the process of empowerment.

The authors present a profile of a community organizer who is seen as a person of racial and cultural identity similar to that of the community. The person is expected to be familiar with
the community customs, traditions, language-including slang, social networks and community values.

Community intervention is seen as having three levels: primary, secondary and tertiary, each with increasing intensity and influence. The primary level is the most intimate requiring a worker with full ethnic solidarity with the community. The secondary level is one step removed from the primary and consists of contact and influence. While sharing the same language is helpful this is not mandatory. The organizer functions as a liaison with the outside community and institutions and may serve as resource with expertise based on the unique cultural characteristics of the community. Tertiary tasks may be accomplished by an “outsider” working for the common interests of the community. Cultural or racial identity is not a requirement. The work is with outside infrastructures in roles of advocate and broker for the community of color.

The Model of Ethnic Sensitive Practice

Here, focus is on the approach to practice introduced by the present authors in several of our works (Devore & Schlesinger, 1981, 1987, 1991)

We take the position that all people are members of ethnic groups and have experienced ethnic socialization processes—whether in single or dual or multi ethnic households. Major elements of being are affected by ethnic group membership. For this reason social workers need to understand and attend to ethnic related dispositions of all peoples just as they need to understand other elements of human functioning. The distinction between oppression and diversity, made earlier in the section on “definitional issues” calls attention to these differences and points to social workers’ obligation to be mindful of both, as well as the special obligation to work to eliminate and reduce the bases of oppression. The distinction between minority groups and ethnic groups as earlier defined is of special importance in this approach to practice.

Basic Assumptions are 1) individual and collective history have bearing on problem generation and solution; 2) the present is
most important; 3) non conscious phenomena affect functioning while the present reality is most important in attending to problems; and 4) ethnicity is a source of cohesion, identity and strength, as well as strain, discordance and strife.

The Layers of Understanding  Ethnic sensitive practice as defined here presents no distinctive model or approaches to practice; rather the position is taken that the understandings and approaches developed can and must be incorporated into the diverse approaches to practice. The “Layers of Understanding” is a concept that suggests that knowledge, value and skill, including the specialized knowledge and skills of ethnic sensitive approaches are the essential ingredients of professional practice. The layers are: 1) social work values; 2) knowledge of human behavior; 3) knowledge and skill in understanding and effecting changes in social welfare policies and services, especially those racist and other structural impediments to effective service delivery; 4) self awareness with emphasis on” who am I in the ethnic sense?”; 5) the impact of the ethnic reality on all people with special attention to those ethnic groups that are particular victims of racism and poverty; 6) the route to the social worker—a conceptualization of the paths to social work services that recognizes that members of oppressed minority groups are most likely to encounter social workers via coercive routes to service such as the courts and the schools.

Practice Principles and Interventive Approaches

Any theoretical or ideological approach ultimately derives its importance from its utility for our daily work. Social work has evolved an extensive repertoire of strategies; it was important to assess whether various analysts found these to be compatible with the various positions that have been advanced. It was also important to determine whether there is need for entirely new approaches or whether ethnic sensitive principles can be incorporated into existing perspectives.

Practice Principles  Based on the present review it is clear that social work practice must be based on clear knowledge of how ethnicity and social class and oppression contribute to individual and group identity, to disposition to life’s tasks, to coping
styles and to the constellation of problems people experience. These factors, joined with individual development, and genetic and physiological disposition contribute to the development of personality structure and group life. Equally important is recognition of the fact that inequity is often built into the very service delivery structure intended to provide services. Although a number of analysts (e.g., McMahon-Allan-Meares; Longres) find that social work's attention to oppression remains wanting, this theme was nevertheless echoed in much of the work.

Social work has long relied on both social structural and psychological explanations of behavior; that these trends are reflected in the analysis of issues related to ethnic sensitive practice is to be expected. More and more we have come to understand the indivisibility of structural and psychological forces. (e.g., Germain & Gitterman, 1980) Out of this view it naturally follows that practice principles that stress simultaneous attention to individual and systemic concerns are congruent with attention to class and ethnicity and culture. We have identified a number of social work models to be most consonant with the various ways in which ethnic-sensitive practice is defined. They include the problem solving models, the structural model, select segments of task centered practice, ecological models and institutional change models.

Practice Skills and Strategies

A review of the skills, strategies and interventive repertoires that long dominated the literature suggests that the basic tenets were developed as if service was to be provided primarily to highly educated persons immersed in middle class culture and values. Any basic social work practice text highlights the importance of privacy, of confidentiality, and the primacy of individual over collective interests. The suggestion is also conveyed that trust and comfort can be readily generated—with the provision of a relaxed atmosphere, respect, use of eye contact and high levels of empathy.

Even the most cursory review of the history of many of this country's ethnic, minority and social class groups point to the fact that many people are not immersed in what may be called the "middle class vision". Involvement in the kind of
relationships offered by social workers—the very process of needing help—is painful and anathema to many people. The kind of intimacy and ready comfort generated by the worker who “maintains an open posture” goes counter to the interactional style expected when super and subordinates meet. And there is little question that many people envision the relationship between the social worker and client as mandatory and perhaps coercive.7

This review of the practice literature suggests a range of approaches to modifying prototypical behavioral repertoires that are in keeping with the needs and disposition of the persons to whom service is provided. It is not possible or appropriate to delineate these precisely, for it is the very process of adaptation as we work with clients one to one, or as we aim to alter negative institutional and agency contexts that is at the core of ethnic sensitive practice. Nevertheless, a series of “ethnic sensitive adaptations have been suggested:

1. Recognizing the primacy of institutional and systemic forces in generating client problems, especially when working with oppressed people, and engaging in professional intervention to minimize that oppression.

2. Emphasizing systems change/institutional change approaches.

3. Recognizing the interplay between systemic/institutional and individual forces as they impact on client difficulties.

4. Exercising great caution and sensitivity before suggesting intervention focused on emotionally charged issues to people for who such intervention is likely more painful than the problem triggering the intervention.

5. Modifying the customary hierarchical distinctions between worker and client when working with people who can not consider emotional matters with a stranger; in contrast some people are comfortable only when a level of formality and hierarchy is maintained which well exceeds that customarily involved in social work.

6. Respecting culturally based perspectives on the types of persons who may or may not participate in important family
decisions (e.g., the men in the family; only members of the family network).

7. Recognizing the importance of incorporating ethnic/class/minority issues at all levels of practice, as well as in interstaff/interprofessional relationships.

8. Being sure to arrange for the availability of workers who speak the clients' language when the client does not have command of English or needs help with cultural nuances available to him or her only in his language.

9. Paying attention to the relative merits of having workers who are of the same group as the client where this is appropriate.8

10. Assuring that our schools and social agencies facilitate the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes consonant with the broad definitions of what we have termed ethnic sensitive practice.

Lum (1992) calls attention to the distinction between emic and etic goals. Emic goals focus on the specific group under study while etic goals derive from the assumption that all human beings are alike in some important respects. In his view, social workers need to be aware of both. Green (1982) has stressed the importance of working with culturally based criteria of problem definition, recognizing group-specific linguistic categories and incorporating lay strategies into problem resolution. Our earlier review of suggested modification of interventional strategies suggested that most analysts consider existing models of practice to be viable, that is, ethnic sensitive micro and macro approaches can be built into the existing approaches to practice.

Conclusions

This review of the state of the art of ethnic sensitive social work practice leads us to a series of impressions, conclusions and recommendations.

Those analysts, who like ourselves have been involved in thinking about related issues for some time, have reason to be pleased. There is no doubt that the profession of social work
has sat up and taken notice of minority issues. Nevertheless, any number of people are dissatisfied with the extent or foci of attention. That dissatisfaction is not to be taken lightly. For some groups, the limited amount of overall attention translated into less than a handful of articles devoted to their people in a ten year period. The *Journal of Multicultural Social Work* is beginning to fill some of the gap. But inevitably, such a journal’s audience is likely to be more limited than that of the standard, wide circulation journals. We call upon these journals to take our findings as well as the work of Lum, (1992) McMahon and Allen-Meares (1992) and others very seriously, and to find ways of responding more forcefully to this compelling issue. The same call is addressed to the authors and editors of social work practice texts. Too many have treated the subject not at all, or sparingly. Not only are special chapters required, but integration of related content into all elements of the text is essential.

The fact that the profession’s response to its earlier neglect of minority issues has led to virtually total neglect of the cultural and ethnic issues and behaviors of other groups is, in our view, a grievous error. It is almost as if to atone for past sins, we have wiped significant segments of our population off our professional map—despite the fact that “whites” continue to constitute anywhere between 75 and 50% of the population in different regions of the country. We have robbed many people of their identity as any number of “hyphenated Americans” and make it difficult for social work students to learn about the needs and dispositions of people whom they encounter daily. Appreciation for diversity, and for the impact of ethnic group membership on the disposition to daily living calls for understanding of the ethnic reality of all people. In our view the present state of affairs furthers inequality and hierarchy—majority students *must* learn about minority persons, while the reverse is not true—and this does little to discourage a “we them” stance. Further, it limits our students’ and practitioners’ opportunity to learn about the range of people in the exciting, multicultural communities they serve; New York City’s former Mayor David Dinkins used the term “the gorgeous mosaic” to refer to the diversity characteristic of this country. It is time to rethink whether the virtually exclusive focus on minority
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persons with minimal reference to others—that has characterized this segment of our literature for the past ten years furthers or retards goals of equality. In our view, both an ethnocultural and a minority perspective are essential.
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Notes

1. A more elaborate definition of culture is included in the article by Doman Lum found in this issue of the Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare.
2. See a discussion of Longres' critique later in this paper.
3. See further discussion of this issue in the section focused on review of the literature.
4. In identifying topics and references no claim of complete coverage is made; we regret if pertinent materials have been omitted.
5. For a detailed discussion of these matters see the article by Ken Huang in this special issue of the Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare.
6. See especially the article by Doman Lum in this issue.
7. See Devore and Schlesinger's discussion (1981, 1987, 1991) of "the route to the social worker" which suggests that many ethnic minority persons have contact with social workers in mandated and coercive contexts.
Introduction

According to Rokeach (1973), a value is a belief that a mode of conduct or end state is preferable to an opposite or converse one. Values are preferred or selected choices. Societal values refer to vested beliefs about people, preferred goals for people, means of achieving those goals, and conditions of life. They represent selected ideals as to how the world should be and people should normally act (Hepworth and Larsen, 1990). This understanding of values is translated into social work professional values toward clients such as respect for the dignity and uniqueness of the individual, client self-determination, and legal authority and self-determination. The value ideology of social work is humanistic and is concerned about democratic individualism and the welfare and protection of the client. It is further rooted in Judeo-Christian principles that emphasize justice, equality, and concern for others. As a result, societal and professional values have a high regard for persons and individual rights and freedom.

In contrast, cultural values are prescribed ways of behavior or norms which are passed from generation to generation.
within a group of people. Cultural values are life patterns manifested in institutions language, religious ideals, habits of thinking, artistic expressions, and patterns of social and interpersonal relationships. Cultural pluralism is a reality confronting current society. It is the existence of multicultural communities which maintain and perpetuate their own styles, customs, language, and values (Pantoja and Perry, 1976). It is a composite of groups who have preserved their own cultural identities. Cultural diversity is maintained as long as there is a level of tolerance and no conflict with broader values patterns and legal norms. When there are different sets of cultural and societal values, an ethnic minority person of color is confronted with the task of reconciling his/her cultural values with the predominant societal values. Bicultural competency is a process of evaluation where a person integrates positive qualities of his/her culture of origin and the dominant society’s culture. The outcome is a functional way of relating and surviving in both cultures.

The purpose of this article is to delineate various dimensions of culture, factors influencing acculturation, majority and minority values, and etic and emic dimensions of cultural values. An impetus to this article comes from a growing debate regarding whether there are distinctive minority people of color values or whether adherence to these values are a function of migration and social class. To attribute a common set of values to diverse people risks a negation of uniqueness, special needs, and stereotyping, according to ethnic sensitive advocates (Devore and Schlesinger, 1990). To claim that varied minority of color groups share spiritual values, vertical hierarchy of authority, or the importance of corporate collective structures is doubtful when specific group values are explored. Moreover, related values such as family and group solidarity are attributes held by many white ethnic groups such as Jewish and Italian people (Devore and Schlesinger, 1991). Hopefully this article will clarify these issues and will explore the relationship between cultural values and minority people of color.

Dimensions of Culture

An appropriate starting point in our discussion of cultural values and people of color is an understanding of cultural
dimensions. Essential to this relationship are various notions of cultural interaction. There are at least five perspectives of culture which are related to the reality of cultural pluralism in American society: the transcultural perspective, the cross-cultural perspective, the paracultural perspective, the metacultural perspective, and the pancultural, perspective (Lum, 1992).

The transcultural perspective involves the transition from one culture to another. The prefix TRANS means "across; over; on the other side of" and denotes a movement in one direction. In the case of values, the task is to move from understanding the values of the dominant culture to understanding the values of a minority culture. It involves learning at least one other culture—its values, beliefs, customs, language, and related practices. The objective of the transcultural perspective is to enable a person from the dominant culture to relate to a minority individual who is part of another particular culture. The presupposition is that there are differences between two cultures.

The cross-cultural perspective concerns the mutual interaction and synthesis of two distinct cultures. The word CROSS means "to go from one side to the other; to pass across", and therefore cross-cultural means moving between two cultures. To achieve cross-cultural integration, a person moves back and forth between the dominant culture and the minority culture. In the process, a person sees relationships between distinctive similarities and differences of the two cultures. In the case of values, a cross-fertilization of conceptual and behavioral values patterns occurs in the process of mutuality. The cross-cultural perspective views each culture as a separate and equal entity, and a person endeavors to link essential traits between the two cultures.

The paracultural perspective examines the relationship between recent immigrants and multi-generational American-born minority descendants. The prefix PARA means "alongside; by the side of" and offers a side-by-side comparison of at least four generations of ethnic minority family structure. To apply this perspective, a person must be familiar with multigenerational family patterns that involve immigrant or refugee parents and first, second, and third generation American-born children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren. Each generation is involved in acculturation, Americanization, or rediscovery of the culture of origin.
There may be a minority family that consists of a father and mother who are recent immigrants or refugees and who are familiar with their culture of origin and foreign to the dominant culture. For them, the two cultures exist side by side without penetration. However, their first generation American-born children are in the midst of acculturation which involves a merger of both cultures. Misunderstanding and conflict may arise between parents and children over culture-related issues. Cultural value conflict is apparent in this instance.

In other cases there may be a different circumstance between second generation American-born parents and third generation American-born children. A father and mother of the second generation may be Americanized to the point where the culture of origin has minimal influence and residual effects with the values and beliefs of the dominant culture predominant. At the same time, their third generation American-born children may be in the midst of rediscovering their great grandparents' culture of origin. This rediscovery could result from university ethnic studies courses and student ethnic group associations. Multigenerational cultural dynamics raise the issues of whether there are cultural value residuals, maintenance of culture, and cultural value rediscovery in culturally pluralistic America.

The metacultural perspective addresses the commonalities of people of color in terms of cultural values, beliefs and behavior. The term META has been traditionally understood as "beyond" in the sense of "transcendence". However, meta also means "between; among" and is used in this case to mean "between and among cultures". From a metacultural perspective, a person is concerned with common cultural linkages that bind the major ethnic minority groups. The focus is on acknowledgement of distinct differences between minorities and affirmation of common themes of people of color. Are there meta-cultural values, for example, which are common to people of color? Are there common experiences and concerns that are voiced by people of color? Criticism has been voiced regarding generalizing about minorities at the expense of making specific distinctions between particular minority groups or acknowledging that non-minority groups may have similar values, experiences, or concerns. However, a critical need exists to attempt to draw
together metacultural themes between and among minority cultures. Nevertheless, this area requires more concise refinement.

The pancultural perspective articulates universal cultural characteristics that are a part of people throughout the world. The prefix PAN means "universal, common to all" and reaffirms the notion of the common culture of humanity. It is important to offer a pancultural perspective in working with multicultural people which focuses on cultural and ethnic similarities yet recognizes distinct differences. What are common areas of culture which link panculturalism to multicultural groups who are part of the United States. The pancultural perspective is based on the conviction that culture and ethnicity of all people are important factors in the helping process. Panculturalism addresses the need to identify pancultural values which are universal and common to all cultures.

To identify a unique set of values for all ethnic minorities or to claim that all cultures have common values misidentifies the multidimensional levels of culture. Cultural values should be set in context of the particular cultural interaction. Thus, transcultural values are important when one seeks to learn about another distinctive culture than one's own. An understanding of cross-cultural values is appropriate when one is in process of integrating values from two separate cultures. Paracultural values are recognized when there are generational differences and relationships. Metacultural values are important to articulate when one searches for common concerns and linkages between various minority groups of color. Pancultural values underscore the need to identify universal common characteristics.

In brief, cultural values have various levels of purpose and interaction which must be acknowledged and differentiated in a number of settings. Thus, for example, the effort to identify metacultural values among minority people of color groups is a legitimate endeavor which recognizes that there may be unique values which are different from the majority culture. One must strive to differentiate the particular cultural context when addressing the broad theme of cultural values.
Factors Influencing Acculturation

Acculturation is an ethnic minority person's adoption of the dominant culture in which he or she is immersed. There are several degrees of acculturation; a person can maintain his or her own traditional cultural beliefs, values, and customs from the country of origin to a greater or a lesser extent. The term, Americanization, has been associated with the popular notion that people living in the United States gave up former cultural practices and adopted the American way of life.

Bogardus (1949) has identified three types of overlapping acculturation. *Accidental acculturation* occurs when individuals of various cultures in close proximity to each other exchange goods and services and incidentally adopt cultural patterns from each other in a hit-or-miss fashion. In the process, these people influence each other to the degree that they acquire certain cultural practices that serve a functional purpose (food dishes or cultural beliefs, for example) from the other group.

*Forced acculturation* imposes cultural patterns, behavior, or beliefs upon ethnic minorities and immigrants. The dominant cultural group tends to believe that their own beliefs, behavior patterns, and customs are superior to other cultural systems which are less desirable. An example of forced acculturation is the strong move toward Americanization which stresses the exclusive use of English, the relinquishment of foreign ideas and customs, and the adoption of certain forms of Christianity.

*Democratic acculturation* respects the history and strengths of differing cultures and demonstrates the equivalency of social and psychological patterns of all cultures. People from a particular culture are not forced to accept cultural patterns different from their own. Rather, a person can choose either to adopt cultural patterns of other groups over time or to retain the patterns of his or her culture of origin. The prevailing approach to democratic acculturation is cultural pluralism, which recognizes the reality of a multicultural society and the individual's ability to construct a combination of cultural patterns.

Longres (1991) has recently criticized the limitation of the cultural model of practice which emphasizes the importance of culture and cultural differences. He argues that an ethnic sensitive approach cannot rely solely on the concepts of cultural
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norms and values. He believes that the cultural model best fits helping newly arrived refugees and immigrants and less fits helping minority individuals and families whose groups have been in the United States for many generation.

Longres (1991) is not an assimilationist and endorses the ideal of biculturation. However, he believes that the longer people and their families are in a society, the more their thinking, affect, and behavior are influenced by the dominant cultural norms. Ethnicity then becomes an identity, an allegiance to a group and its history rather than holding on to a unique set of beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral inclinations. Furthermore, Longres asserts that these people accept the fact of their Americanization and their place as minority status.

Longres (1991) holds that the cultural model is less useful, particularly for American blacks, Native, Mexican, Puerto Rican, and to some extent, Japanese and Chinese Americans who have been in the United States for generations. Longres reasons that these groups were born and raised within the context of American institutions and that their "private troubles" do not stem from a lack of knowledge of the dominant norms and expectations or from a commitment to values and beliefs at odds with the dominant norms and expectations. Longres seems to imply that these groups are relatively free of cultural conflict and strongly affected and influenced by the norms and expectations of the larger American society.

Instead of the cultural model, Longres advocates the status model which emphasizes positions in a social hierarchy or stratification system. Social hierarchy stems from systems of inequality, while stratification systems emerge from social conflict. Ethnic and racial stratification systems are a type of status hierarchy in the United States and have been a part of the oppressive history of the dominant culture against minority people of color. He believes that the "private troubles" of minority people of color are related to the public issues of racial and ethnic inequality, and as a result, there is ethnic and racial conflict in social, relationships between whites and minorities, particularly blacks and Native Americans.

The term, ethclass, was introduced by Gordon (1964) and highlighted by Devore and Schlesinger Ethclass picks up the thrust of Longres' arguments for the social status model. Devore
and Schlesinger (1991, p. 20) explain: “Gordon used this concept to explain the role that social class membership plays in determining the basic conditions of life, while at the same time accounting for differences between groups at the same social class level. These differences are, in large measure, explained by ethnic group membership.” On the whole, there is less emphasis and attention given to culture and more given to ethnicity and social class (Devore and Schlesinger, 1991).

This author recognizes the importance of social class and its implications for social stratification and social/economic/political oppression based on race. However, this author believes that Longres and, to some extent, Devore and Schlesinger have underplayed the important influence that culture, particularly cultural values, play in the cognitive, affective, and behavioral lives of minority people of color who have been in the United States for many generations.

For example, Longres ignores the reality of maintenance of culture in the lives and practices of people of color. Maintenance of culture is a minority practice that employs the use of cultural beliefs, customs, celebrations, and rituals as means of overcoming social problems. Culture is a source of strength and renewal. Ethnic minority people rediscover their past heritage and use it to cope with present and future life problems. Cultural practices based on ethnic heritage can be documented in minority people of color’s community churches, social organizations, political advocacy groups, ethnic oriented language and cultural schools, and related group institutions.

Lewis (1977) documents the case of Ben Dancewell, a 34 year old full-blooded Cheyenne-Arapahoe, who was medically diagnosed as an alcoholic. He is married, has four children, and is an excellent Indian ceremonial dancer. The cultural ceremonial dances helped Mr. Dancewell to ventilate his feelings, give him a unique sense of identity and pride in his culture, impart a great sense of belonging through being with other Native Americans (experiencing a unique support system), enhance his altruistic feelings, and make him uniquely ready for therapy. Based on this cultural strength, he began to ventilate about his pride at being an Indian and his feelings of inferiority in the majority culture. He used his extended family as a support system. Based
on these helping components, his drinking diminished and he was able to get a job. Similar cultural case studies could be reiterated from the lives of various people of color who have been in the United States for many generations.

Regarding cultural maintenance research, Hayes-Bautista (Midaus, 1991) reports on a three year study of Hispanic cultural attitudes sponsored by the Chicano Studies Research Center at the University of California, Los Angeles. Based on a sample size of over 1,000 participants, the study focused on language, culture, and self-identification. Among his research findings are the following conclusions:

Hispanic people are evolving into a bilingual, bicultural group;
Latinos do not assimilate in the classic sense; rather, they still have a sense of being Latinos;
Mexican-Americans have stronger cultural ties to their ancestral country than many other immigrant groups over the years based on the history of seasonal or temporary migration from Mexico;
Hispanic history should be taught in schools and children should maintain their family's Hispanic culture;
Strong cultural attitudes along with a working knowledge of Spanish were maintained to a significant degree through the third generation and beyond;
Spanish language television stations form an important language and cultural link for the Hispanic population across the United States;
Hispanic people frequently travel to Mexico from their homes in the American Southwest for family gatherings and social/recreational activities;
Mexican communities (e.g. East Los Angeles) are self-contained to the point that Spanish is regularly spoken and that the total population remains minority.

The Haynes-Bautista study and findings tend to refute the position taken by Longres in his arguments against the influence
of culture upon ethnic minorities of color who are multigenerational. This is not to minimize the importance of social stratification and its effect on racism and oppression. However, it does reaffirm the primary role of culture maintenance, cultural values, and resistance to acculturation. Cultural values, beliefs, and practices are still influential components in the lives and behavior of multicultural and multigenerational minority people of color in the United States.

Majority and Minority Values

There is a strong case for distinctive minority values, allowing for exceptions among acculturated ethnic minorities and for similar parallels among many ethnic cultures which historically are traced to European and Middle Eastern countries. Pedersen (1979) reminds us that Euro-American cultural values have dominated the social sciences and have been accepted as universal. In turn, these values have been imposed on non-Western cultures. Recently, an interest has arisen in examining non-Western value assumptions that offer alternatives to the dominant cultural value system. For example, Higginbotham (1979) points out that psychotherapy is determined by culture-specific values. As a result, the emphasis of psychoanalysis on individual growth is in contradistinction to kinship and group-centered cultures. It is important to make a case for minority cultural differences rather than to acquiesce to dominant cultural values.

Minority extended family and kinship networks function on the principles of interdependence, group orientation, and reliance on others. For example, the Puerto Rican family has the institution of compadres: people are designated as "companion parents" and become godparents of the child. They feel free to advise or correct and are expected to be responsive to the needs of the other person. Among African Americans, there is an extensive reliance on kinship networks which include blood relatives and close friends called "kinsmen". These networks arise from mutual need of such things as financial aid, child care, advice, and emotional support. Furthermore, elderly grandparents take young African American children into their households in informal adoption (Staples, 1981).
Minority families generally operate within parental authority structures. Jenkins (1981) states that ethnic minority parents, particularly fathers, value obedience to parental authority. Minority children, however, may be at odds with this hierarchy due to the influence of the dominant society. Rothman, Gant, and Hnat (1985) share their findings regarding the Mexican American family. They state: “Mexican American culture highly values the family as the primary source of identity and of support in times of crisis. Mexican Americans are highly family-centered, with the predominant family structure consisting of the traditional nuclear patriarchy” (Rothman, Gant, and Hnat, 1985, p. 201) Elsewhere they report: “Familism is perhaps the single most striking and consistent feature of Chicano culture noted in the literature. Studies have indicated that Mexican Americans are more firmly rooted in the family as a source of identification than either blacks or Anglos, regardless of socioeconomic status or geographic locale (i.e. urban-rural, or state of residence). However, it should be noted that within the context of the traditional nuclear patriarchy, Mexican American families are not structurally distinguishable from any other ethnic group with a similar family orientation. Chicano familism seems to be distinguishable by its degree of family cohesiveness and by its extended definition of family membership.” (Rothman, Gant, and Hnat, 1985, pp. 201., 202) Not only is a case made for the family as a cultural value, but there is an argument given for the uniqueness of the Chicano family system. Therefore it is not enough to argue that familism is a universal rather than a minority value. Rothman, Gant, and Hnat point out that within the familistic system, the Chicano family minority group is distinguished by family cohesiveness and extended family membership. In this sense, this type of family is unique to this minority group.

Familism is one example of people of color values which are a major part of a case for minority cultural values. Related to this is research on differences between American Indian and Anglo-American values. DuBray (1985) cites empirical background studies to show value differences between American Indians and non-Indians. Trimble (1976) found that Oklahoma Indian high school students had a different value system (non-competitive, present-time orientation) from non-Indians, in spite
of their exposure to the dominant culture. Culbertson (1977) found that Indian subjects showed greater inclination toward role conformity, while non-Indian subjects showed a greater inclination toward individualism. Lewis and Ginerich (1980) conducted a comparative study on attitudes toward leadership with 37 American Indian and 40 non-Indian social work graduate students. They found that 76% of Indians believed that personal qualities of a leader were more important than skills and knowledge. However, 66% of the non-Indians reported the opposite. Moreover, American Indian students tend to suppress authoritarian and aggressive leadership behavior in contrast to Anglo-American students.

Schusky (1970) also found that Anglo-Americans were more aggressive and individualistic than Lower Brule Sioux. Honigmann (1961) found a set of common value characteristics comprising the behavior of the American Indian: nondemonstrative emotionality, the autonomy of the individual, an ability to endure deprivation, bravery, a proclivity for practical joking, and a dependence on supernatural powers.

DuBray (1985) studied the value orientation differences of 36 American Indian and 36 Anglo-American female professional mental health workers, ages 30–45, The Kluckholn Value Schedule was used in this study. There were significant differences between American Indian and Anglo-American workers on relational, time, and man/nature orientations. The American Indian group revealed a more collateral value orientation than the Anglo-American group which preferred a relatively individualistic orientation. The American Indian workers were oriented toward present values, while the Anglo-American group moved midway between present and future orientations. The relative preference of American Indian workers was toward harmony with nature, while Anglo-American subjects tended toward mastery over nature.

In her discussion of these findings, DuBray (1985) reiterated the following conclusions:

Activity Orientation: American Indian workers tend to choose being over doing which implies that intrinsic worth is more important than education, status, power, or wealth.
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Relational Orientation: American Indian workers showed a collateral orientation which placed the welfare of the group (i.e. extended family, family loyalty) over the individual.

Time Orientation: American Indian workers showed a preference for a present time orientation which focuses on living from day to day as best as one can and enjoying life as it comes (the here and now) rather than a concern for materialistic goals or accumulation of wealth which usually motivates persons with a future time orientation.

Man/Nature Orientation: American Indian workers showed a preference for harmony or balance with nature. Indians understand that they are linked intimately with the earth in a network of rights and responsibilities.

DuBray's study (1985) demonstrates that there are quantitative and qualitative differences between Anglo-American majority values and American Indian minority values, even among professional mental health workers who have been educated and have lived in the United States for many generations. Related literature and studies (Ryan, 1976; Nobles, 1979; Bachtold and Eckwall, 1978) support the thrust of DuBray's research. Thus, there is empirical research evidence that there are cultural value distinctions between majority and minority groups.

Etic and Emic Dimensions of Cultural Values

Above all, a discussion of cultural values would not be complete without consideration of etic and emic dimensions. The term etic comes from the linguistic study of sounds and refers to the categorization of all the sounds in a particular language. The term emic refers to all the meaningful sounds in a particular language. From a cross-cultural perspective, these two concepts have been used to describe behavior in cultures and have implications for our discussion of cultural values.

The etic goal documents principles valid in all cultures and establishes theoretical bases for comparing human behavior and values. The emic goal documents behavioral and value principles within a culture and focuses on what the people themselves value as important and familiar to them (Brislin, 1981). It is
important to maintain both emphasis in practice with people—that is, to focus on culture-common characteristics of minorities and non-minorities and on culture-specific traits of particular ethnic groups.

Draguns (1981) poses emic and etic questions about the way to begin cross-cultural research or planning. The emic approach inquires, "Shall we start from within the unique and different culture which we have set out to study?" The etic approach asks: "Shall we proceed on the basis that all human beings are, in some important respects, alike?" (Draguns, 1981, pp. 3–4) Whether to focus on the different and distinctive values of a particular people or on the generally human universal values of people in general is the choice of the investigator studying cultural value in our particular case. The continual shift between discovering what is humanly universal and what is particular to the client's culture makes cross-cultural studies of values such a challenging field.

The cultural value investigator should have an orientation toward both etic and emic perspectives. The investigator should discover the etic and emic characteristics of cultural background. In a real sense, all human beings in cultural contexts have basic values (etic perspective) and are also a part of particular cultural and ethnic groups which express unique values (emic perspectives). Moving between these two points of reference is a creative experience for the cultural value investigator.

Summary

This article on cultural values and people of color has sought to define the concept of value, distinguishing the distinctions between societal, professional and cultural values. It has raised the debate over distinctive minority people of color values vs. universal values in various minority and non-minority cultures. It has sought to differentiate the various levels of culture in order to make the point that one must address specific cultural interaction settings. The trans, cross, para, meta, and pan cultural perspectives each presuppose a unique context for understanding culture. It has categorized acculturation, presented the cultural and status models of Longres, and proposed that the
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ethclass concept include the cultural dimension. Cultural ethclass may be a more inclusive term rather than strictly ethclass.

It has introduced the theme of maintenance of culture (or culture maintenance) in response to Longres' arguments against the cultural model of practice. It has cited a case study and research examples from current Hispanic and Native American samples who have lived in the United States for generations. The two research studies point to cultural differences in cognitive, affective, and behavioral areas of people of color.

Cultural value differences and similarities must be recognized and appreciated among people of color and people of all cultures. The etic universal and emic particular perspectives remind us of the value homeostasis which is required in this discussion. A balance of cultural, ethnicity, and social class is in order for ethnic minority studies and practice approaches. The debate over these issues is a health sign that ethnic sensitive and minority people of color theory and practice are progressing toward maturity of purpose and development.
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Is the "Underclass" Really a Class?

E. WALTON ZELLEY, JR.
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The concept of an "underclass" departs from previous determinations of social class based on criteria of education, occupation, and income in favor of the more subjective and less quantifiable criteria of the degree of social dislocation and the departure of a population from middle class norms and values. A study reviews current definitions of "the underclass"; contrasts this class description with "the poor" in the 60's and before; and suggests that "the underclass" is a pejorative label which has the effect of "blaming the victim", and has negative implications for the formulation of public policy directed toward the population thus labeled.

Introduction

Social class has traditionally been determined by the application of three basic criteria: education, occupation, and income; in which one is the cause and the second is the effect of the third. (Duberman, 1976) Examples of this tripartite analysis can be seen in W. Warner's six-part classification scheme; August Hollingshead's five strata classification; and in Gilbert Kahl's recently developed five part index based on the three factors of capital/property, labor, and government transfers. (Warner, 1949; Hollingshead, 1958; Gilbert and Kahl, 1990)

Recently, however, a new social class description, most commonly designated "the underclass", has emerged in the literature. The criteria by which this "class" has been delineated, however, depart from the usual relatively objective, quantifiable factors of education, occupation, and income utilized by Warner and Hollingshead; or the more recently employed factors of capital/property, labor, and government transfers suggested by Gilbert and Kahl. The criteria employed in consigning people to "the underclass" are based on the more subjective, less quantifiable factors of the degree of social dislocation, and the
divergence of this population from Middle Class norms and values.

Purpose of this article

The purpose of this article is to suggest that the term “underclass” is not really a class description at all. Rather it is a pejorative label, applied to a particular sub-group among our nation’s poor who have reacted to their poverty in ways that threaten those who enjoy a privileged status in contemporary American society. Second, it is to suggest, as others have warned, that “references to the underclass will add nothing to our understanding of poverty, but will erode public confidence in our ability to do something about it.” (Edelman, 1987) Finally, it is to suggest that a decision to maintain or abandon the concept of the “underclass” has profound implications for public policy.

Definition of the “Underclass”

The underclass has been defined as “a large subpopulation of low-income families and individuals whose behavior contrasts sharply with the behavior of the general population” (Wilson, 1987) It has been suggested that the “underclass” is a “concept which captures the mixture of alarm and hostility which tinged the emotional response of more affluent Americans to the poverty of blacks increasingly clustered and isolated in postindustrial cities”, and to the behaviors which these affluent Americans associated with the urban ghetto such as “heightened sexuality expressed in teenage pregnancy; females leading households; welfare dependence; drug abuse, and violent crime.” (Katz, 1989)

In articles about the “underclass” appearing in general circulation news magazines between 1977 and 1987, the following descriptive words and phrases were employed: “intractable,” “socially alien,” “the unreachables,” “rampaging members of the underclass,” “totally disaffected from the system,” “aliens in their own country,” “defined primarily by their deviant values,” “a second nation,” “urban knots,” and “enclaves of permanent poverty and vice.” (“Time”, 1977; “U.S. News and World Report”, 1986; “Fortune”. 1987) A United States Senator, promi-
nently associated with the Liberal wing of the Democratic party warned in a speech about “the great unmentioned problem of America today; the growth, rapid and insidious, of a group in our midst, perhaps more dangerous, more bereft of hope, more difficult to confront than any for which our history has prepared us. It is a group which threatens to become what America has never known—a permanent underclass in our society.” (Edward Kennedy, 1978)

In an article which predated, but also presaged, the formal delineation of that category of class stratification known as the “underclass”, David Matza spoke of what he designated “the disreputable poor” in an article by that same name. He defined the “disreputable poor” as “that people who remain unemployed or casually or irregularly employed, even during periods approaching full employment and prosperity; for that reason, and others, they live in disrepute... a persistent section of the poor who differ in a variety of ways from those who are deemed resistant and recalcitrant. . . . The disreputable poor are an immobilized segment of society located at a point in the social structure where poverty intersects with illicit pursuits. They are, in the evocative words of Charles Brace, ‘the dangerous classes’ who live in ‘regions of squalid want and wicked woe.’” (Matza, 1966)

In Matza’s definition of the “disreputable poor” we find three components in the definition of what later theorists would term the “underclass.” None of these factors was present in the traditional indexing of classic social stratification theory. First, there is the idea of putative status. The members of the “underclass” are held in “disrepute” by those in the social strata above them. Second, there is the idea of geographical clustering in predominately urban enclaves. Members of the “underclass” are portrayed as huddling in “regions of squalid want and wicked woe” which serve as the “gang headquarters” of the alienated and potentially violent masses. Finally, there is a moralistic component. The members of the “underclass” are “located at a point in the social structure where poverty intersects with illicit pursuits.”
"Underclass" Revisited

Once the three factors of "putative status," "geographical clustering," and "moralism" have been introduced we have strayed significantly from classic social stratification theory. For now social dislocations are not seen as being symptomatic of a person's being relegated to a social class on the basis of inequality of opportunity, and the resultant deprivations in education, occupation, and income. Rather, these social dislocations are seen as being the qualifiers for a person's being relegated to a particular social class known as the "underclass" in the first place. It's a classic case of "blame the victim."

Richard Gahey refers to the concept of the "underclass" as "poverty's voguish stigma." He places the formulation of the concept in historical perspective, arguing that "the word 'underclass' is a destructive and misleading label that lumps together different people who have different problems... It is the latest of popular labels (such as "lumpen proletariat", undeserving poor", and "culture of poverty" that focuses on individual characteristics, and thereby stigmatizes the poor for their poverty." (Mc Gahey, 1982)

But even the framer of the concept of a "culture of poverty", Oscar Lewis, argues for an emphasis on structural change rather than the development of social competence in those people living in poverty who would later be termed the "underclass." He insists that "the crucial question from both the scientific and the political point of view is: How much weight is to be given to the internal, self-perpetuating factors in the subculture of poverty as compared to the external, societal factors? My own position is that in the long run the self-perpetuating factors are relatively minor and unimportant compared to the basic structure of the larger society." (Lewis, 1961)

Now, certain it is that there are those who believe they have unearthed "internal, self-perpetuating factors in the subculture of poverty." Edward Banfield comes up with a whole "laundry list" of characteristics descriptive, in his opinion, of those who would later be described as the "underclass." He lists such attributes as: "lack of future orientation; fatalism; passivity; impulsivity; lack of self-discipline; inability to postpone
The key question, however, is whether these characteristics which might, admittedly, be found more extensively among those described as the "underclass" are personality characteristics, the possession of which insures you a reserved seat in the ghetto congregation of the chronically unemployed (and, therefore, chronically poor), or are they admittedly maladaptive responses to a person's having been denied the opportunities which would allow him or her to embrace the "Protestant Ethic" and middle class values and norms?

In other words, are the dysfunctional behaviors and attitudes which have been used to define the "underclass" innate traits of character possessed by the urban poor which leave them alienated from middle class values and norms? Or, are they, rather, reactions of the poor to having aspired to the living out of these middle class norms and values; having measured themselves by the litmus test of that value system; and then having been confronted with social restraints which assure that they will fail the litmus test they've employed in self evaluation, and leave them with little or no hope that they will ever pass? Might it not be that far from being alienated from middle class norms and values, the members of the so-called "underclass" have embraced them so passionately that they feel their sense of failure in meeting them more acutely?

Leonard Goodwin examined attitudes toward work among a quite diverse population, ranging from members of the "upperclass" to members of the so-called "underclass." He summarized his findings by stating that "everyone, from the welfare mother to the suburban white woman, had the same deep commitment to the work ethic. Where they differed was not in wanting to work, but in their estimation of the chances of success in doing so. The welfare mothers, the sons from fatherless families, genuflected before the Protestant Ethic, but had little confidence that they could act upon it." (Goodwin, 1972)

Another study, this time of unemployed black males "hanging out" on an urban street corner, came to a similar conclusion.
"There are both constant failure and the constant fear of failure among these men," the study concluded, "It is not, as some social scientists suggest, that they are 'present oriented', lacking the 'future orientation' of the stable worker who internalizes the "Protestant Ethic." The difference has to do not with their different future orientations, but with their different futures. It can be argued that it is precisely because these black men accept the values of the larger society, but are not given a serious opportunity to achieve them that they live as they do. For someone who has a real chance to work at decent wages, simply hanging out would be neurotic, irrational conduct. For one who does not—who lacks a future to which he or she can orient—it can be a way, if not of coping, then of disguising one's fate as a freely-chosen, purposely irresponsible life style." (Liebow, 1967)

The Era of the "Sixties"

Of course, it might be argued that if issues of economic inequality were the only factors in the emergence of a sub-group of poverty-stricken people showing a high degree of social dislocation and dysfunction, how is it that there was a period of relative stability in ghetto areas prior to 1960, and how was it that a black middle class managed to emerge from the economic restraints characteristic of those ghetto areas then just as now?

First, there was more economic opportunity available to the unskilled workers who comprised the bulk of inner city ghetto dwellers prior to 1960 than there is today. As we have moved to greater reliance on automation in industrial processes; have moved, in general, to a service economy; and have moved our industrial plants out of the inner city areas where they were once located into suburban industrial parks inaccessible to public transportation; the door of economic opportunity has closed even more securely in the face of inner city unskilled workers.

Second, the civil rights revolution has done much more to increase opportunities for minorities who have already achieved middle class status than it has for those who haven't. More housing is available to middle class blacks who can afford to move out of the ghetto than there was prior to 1960. Through affirmative action programs white collar, executive, and pro-
fessional slots are more readily available to people of color. Avenues are open to participation in the political structures which help mold their future which weren’t prior to 1960. At the same time, few significant advances have been made in advancing the cause of the ghetto-dwelling poor.

Third, the flight of the middle class minorities from the ghettos, made possible by the gains of the civil rights movement, left in the ghetto areas only those who were unable to meet middle class aspirations, and thus acted out their sense of failure in a variety of socially dysfunctional ways. This, in turn fed the denial system of the middle class power structure, and permitted the more affluent to impute an even more devalued status to those still left in the ghetto, and to absolve themselves from taking the steps necessary to secure a more just distribution of wealth, and the expansion of economic opportunity.

Fourth, the greater accessibility of the mass media to residents of the ghetto, and especially television, confronted the poor through such vehicles as popular situation comedies with a picture of the kind of affluent middle and upperclass lifestyle which they saw, not without reason, as being closed to them. This reinforced their sense of despair about the seemingly unbridgeable gap between rich and poor in this country, and their sense of hopelessness that this situation was ever likely to change.

Fifth, the wholesale introduction of drugs, especially of cocaine and “crack cocaine”, with the huge economic rewards made possible from the most minimal of investment; the violence and crime associated with its use, and the protection of its sales territories; the dislocation of family life resulting from its use; the high rates of incarceration of inner city males on drug charges, and the subsequent barriers to employment erected by the acquisition of a criminal record has brought a whole new demonic dimension to the plight of the urban poor.

In a perverse way, the drug culture, which may be one of the most influential factors in indicating the line of demarcation between the life of the “deserving poor” in the pre-1960’s ghetto, from the so-called “underclass” of today’s ghetto, might well represent the triumph of the ghetto dweller’s “responding to middle class incentives in terms of the opportunities available,”
in which drug dealers become the true entrepreneurs, realizing great profits from minimal investments.

And yet this aberrant behavior which may well be the most important component in the social dislocation which characterizes the life of the poor in our urban ghettos today, and earns them the title of "the underclass" has a way of taking on a life of its own, and turning back on itself, so that the victims who temporarily become the victimizers end up being even more tragically the victims in the end. High crime rates; transmission of potentially fatal diseases; depletion of already meager community resources; loss of incentive; and the destruction of any visible sense of a commonweal can all be the direct results of this central reality in urban ghetto life as we enter the decade of the nineties.

Policy Implications for the "Nineties"

What, then, are the policy implications for all that we have discussed?

First, there can be no shrinking from the truth that it is economic inequities that are at issue in the phenomenon of what has been described as the "underclass" in American society, and that this is the target at which intervention should be directed. Back in the sixties Gladwin warned that "since poverty is viewed nowadays more as a disabling way of life than as unbalanced income distribution, it should come as no surprise that the current emphasis is on people and the development of their social competence rather than on structural change." (Gladwin, 1967) The concept of the "underclass" as currently defined, perpetuates this misguided emphasis in public policy. For to describe a maladaptive response to an ongoing reality of diminishing economic opportunities as a generationally, if not hereditarily, transmitted "culture of poverty" is to blame the victim for his or her victimization. And to define a particular subculture of the poor as a "class" not in terms of education, employment, or income; but, rather, in terms of the social dislocations which are the symptoms of having regularly received a grade of "F" in the litmus test of middle class aspirations, is to hand the middle class power structure a tranquilizer which can
return members of that class into their own ideological dream worlds, and blind them to the role they play in maintaining a society in which extremes of poverty and wealth continue to co-exist. Given the resources of this nation there is no earthly reason why there should be the extremes of wealth and poverty which presently exist. Is there any reason beyond the naked self-interest of those who are bent on maintaining their positions of privilege and power in the more affluent sectors of American society?

I am reminded of a story told at the orientation at the School of Social Work of which I am a graduate. It concerned two social workers, one of whom busied him/herself with saving people in danger of drowning as they were being swept along by the swift currents of a nearby river, and pulling them safely to the shore; while the other went upstream to find out who was throwing them in. There is a need for all of us in the social services to spend more time “up stream”, analyzing and doing battle with those unjust economic structures in our society which aid in creating and maintaining the plight of those who have been pejoratively dismissed as the “underclass” in our nation’s cities.

But we also need to take seriously the role of alienation and marginalization in the maintenance of the so-called “underclass.” An important role for us in the social service system will continue to be supporting and facilitating the participation of the poor in their own self-determination. Community organization directed toward the goal of participant democracy should be a major weapon in the social services’ arsenal of interventions. We must focus on those interventions which will be most likely, in Rainwater’s very incisive words, “to signal a change in the social equilibrium of failure.” (Rainwater, 1970)

Conclusion

The term, “underclass”, is a pejorative term. It is not a description of class in any traditional sense of that word, but is rather a moralistic judgment pronounced on the powerless by the powerful. As such, it has no legitimate place in the vocabulary of social stratification. References to the “underclass,” as Dr. Edelman has so presciently warned, “will add nothing to
our understanding of poverty, but will erode public confidence in our ability to do something about it . . . and may reinforce the misguided belief that poverty is the product solely or primarily of individual pathology, ignoring the institutional forces in our society which help perpetuate deprivation." (Edelman, 1987)

It is not the alienation of the urban poor from middle class values and aspirations which has earned them the pejorative label of the "underclass." In fact, it is precisely the internalizing by the urban poor of those values, and the sense of failure they have encountered in realizing them, that has given birth to the social dislocations which have caused them to be labeled as such. It is time we stopped urging the poor of our country to dream of a future, and started redirecting our efforts to the creation of a future worth their dreaming about. It is time we stopped "blaming the victim," and started to work on removing the barriers which remain to there being "liberty and justice for all" in our nation. Labeling the poor of our inner cities as the "underclass" on the basis of the social dislocations they've exhibited in response to their economic deprivation is really no answer at all.
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Native American Agencies for Native American Children: Fulfilling the Promise of the Indian Child Welfare Act
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The Indian Child Welfare Act seeks to protect Indian children from family and cultural disruption. The Act mandates minimum standards for the removal of Indian children and for their placement in foster care. However, a recent national survey suggests that requirements for Indian foster homes are not being met in public agency substitute care programs. At the same time, Native American child welfare agencies have developed a range of services for Native American children. The authors show that the intent of the Act will be better served if the case management of Native American children in public agency care is transferred to Native American child welfare agencies.

Promises and Problems

The Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (PT. 95-608) was prompted by concern in the mid-1970s that Indian child welfare services had become "a patchwork of programs with contentious overlaps, many gaps, and a history of disrupted families and culturally displaced children" (Plantz, Hubbell, Barrett & Dobrec, 1988, p. 1-5). At that time, 25% to 35% of all Indian children in states with large Indian populations were separated from their families. The Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) seeks to protect Indian children from further family and cultural disruption by promoting minimum standards for the removal of Indian children from their families. When children are removed,
the Act provides for the placement of the children in homes that will reflect the unique values of Indian culture.

ICWA, unfortunately, has not lived up to these ideals. In particular, implementation of ICWA has not stemmed the flow of Native American children into substitute care. Between 1980 and 1986, the numbers of Indian children in care increased 25%. Once in care, they are more likely to stay there longer than the general population of children in care. Half the Native American children in care are in public agency care, and only a third of these public agency children are in Indian foster homes (Plantz et al., 1988). Fulfillment of the promise of ICWA, therefore, requires a fundamental rethinking of the care of Native American children in public agencies.

Placement

Native American children are supposed to be placed in foster homes that will promote the stability and security of Indian tribes and families. In essence, this means placement in an Indian foster home. Plantz et al. (1988) found that the rate at which Indian placement occurred varied according to the auspices of the child welfare agency. Tribal agencies place 84.7% of their children in Indian homes, Bureau of Indian Affairs' agencies place 83.2%, and off-reservation (urban Indian) agencies place 74.6%. Public child welfare agencies, which are responsible for 52% of the Indian children in care, place only 35% in Indian homes (Plantz et al., 1988). ICWA requirements for Indian foster homes are not being met in public agency substitute care programs.

The non-placement of Native American children in Native American foster homes has wide-ranging detrimental effects. Literature on Native American children emphasizes that their removal from their cultural context is detrimental to them as individual Indians and to their families, tribes and communities (Cross, 1986; Hogan & Siu, 1988). Indian children taken from their families and tribes lose self-esteem and self-identity and do not regain their self-esteem when they return to their communities (U.S. Senate, 1988, p.13).

Solutions proposed by public child welfare agencies appear to be inadequate or inappropriate to address the situation. One
conventional solution is for public agencies to attempt to recruit more Native American foster parents. In general, public agency recruitment of minority foster parents has met with little success in the past (Stehno, 1990). For Native American recruitment, this lack of success may be due to non-Indian agencies' failure to involve Indian groups in the recruitment of Indian foster parents (Deitrich, 1982). At the same time, it is the experience of Indian agencies that they can recruit Indian families who are available, appropriate, and willing to foster or adopt Indian children (U.S. Senate, 1988, p. 105).

Another, current solution is the provision of services to preserve the family. At first glance, family preservation policies, seem an ideal solution for preventing Indian children from removal from their families. There is also widespread political and professional support for family preservation services and both the ICWA and the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (P.L. 96–272) emphasize the responsibility of social workers to prevent or eliminate the need for out-of-home placement (Hunner, 1986). However, mainstream family preservation services, despite their positive features, are based on a single model of service delivery (Family preservation services, 1991). This model emphasizes intense, short-term, multi-agency, crisis intervention to stabilize the family. Such services may be counterproductive with Native American families: they reproduce the aggressive interference in Indian family life that the ICWA was designed to prevent.

In addition, even current services are underused by Native Americans. For their part, Indian clients fail to use mainstream social service agencies because they are not available at times and places convenient to the clients; because services are irrelevant to Indian problems such as poverty; because Indians have no say in the programs; and because social work practice has middle class and assimilative biases that devalue Indian childrearing and family values (Farris, 1976). At the same time, non-Indian workers resist providing home-based services that Indians prefer (Guilmet & Whited, 1989).

Thus, we contend, public agency foster parent recruitment programs and public agency child welfare family preservation services are not likely to be successful in providing the culturally appropriate foster care services to Native American children.
that is required. Since public agencies are unable to provide appropriate services to Indian children, solutions must be sought within Native American communities. For these reasons, this article proposes the transfer of Native American children in public care to Native American child welfare agencies. We would like to make a special point of emphasizing the appropriateness of this transfer in urban settings.

Transfer of Management

Transfer of case management to Native American agencies would ensure that Native American children have a greatly improved chance of living with Native American families: Indian agencies have more than twice the rate of children in Indian foster homes than public child welfare agencies have (Plantz et al., 1988). In addition, Native American agencies can provide staff and supports that reinforce Native American values and customs.

This proposal is consistent with the intent of the Indian Child Welfare Act, and is in keeping with the Federal Government policy goal of Indian self-determination (Fischler, 1985). Also, transfer of the children to Native American agencies would challenge the present pattern of foster care discrimination against Indian children, and support Congress' action in passing the Act to protect Indian families (Abourezk, 1977). Transfer to Indian child welfare agencies supports the preference of urban Indian families for receiving services from Native American workers (Red Horse, Lewis, Feit & Decker, 1978).

Off-reservation agencies already exist in many major cities (Plantz et al., 1988; Stehno, 1990). They provide culturally relevant services to Indian children and families (Guilmet & Whited, 1989; Ribbich, 1988; Youngbear, 1988) and allow Native American helping networks to function (McShane, 1987). This not only allows Indian workers to provide culturally appropriate therapies (Ashby, Gilchrist & Miramontez, 1987; Jemison, Atkinson & Nephew, 1988) but it mitigates the distrust Native Americans have for state agencies and courts (Guilmet & Whited, 1989).

Of course, the transfer of Native American children to Native American agencies must provide an alternate service. If
Native American Agencies

Indian agencies merely duplicate public agencies' attitudes and services, there will be no benefit to Indian children (Deitrich, 1982). The provision of culturally appropriate services to Native American foster children requires a change in professional practice from service delivery systems that originate in non-Indian traditions.

Alternate Practice

One outcome of Native American management of the foster care of Indian children would be a reversal of the assimilatory practices of mainstream foster care. Yet, as Schorr notes, for a change in outcome there must be a change in staff ethos and service delivery. An essential part of that process is to identify already successful programs (Schorr, 1990).

In many cities, urban Native American child welfare programs that protect the Indian child, safeguard her/his cultural identity, and provide coordinated services to Indian families have already been established with some success (Davis, Evans, & Bridges, 1991; Jemison, Atkinson & Nephew, 1988; Ribbich, 1988; Youngbear, 1988). Urban Native American agencies tend to provide a network of services to Indian families (Ribbich, 1988; Youngbear, 1988) who, because of their many problems associated with poverty, education and health, require ongoing welfare and advocacy services (Farris, 1976). These agencies provide multi-purpose programs that meet the varied needs of Indian families. This allows them to provide preventive and back-up services that reduce the foster care placement of Indian children and the adoption of Indian children by non-Indian families (Plantz et al., 1988). The establishment of new Indian child welfare services and the endorsement of existing ones support Native American preference for relying on other Indians for help (Fiske, 1979).

Already successful programs provide a model of culturally appropriate foster care delivery for Native American children. They are based on Native American strengths such as the interdependence of the extended family (Cross, 1986), mutual respect among and help from family members (Light & Martin, 1986), and the esteemed role of tribal elders in leadership, discipline,
Native American child welfare agencies make use of these strengths by providing a range of culturally relevant, coordinated services for Indian clients (Ribbich, 1988), including home-based services (Guilmet & Whited, 1989) and outreach (Youngbear, 1988), the recruitment of Indian foster parents (Jemison, Atkinson & Nephew, 1988; Plantz et al., 1988), services provided by Native American child welfare workers (Jemison, Atkinson & Nephew, 1988), and small caseloads (Goodluck & Short, 1980).

Indian managed programs also allow the provision of culturally relevant professional services such as the integration of traditional Indian therapies with western treatments (Ashby, Gilchrist, & Miramontez, 1987; Red Horse, 1982; Youngbear, 1988). Red Horse (1982), for example, proposes a model agency where service is provided "through more natural informal relationships... than through sterile clinical procedures" (pp. 17-18). In addition to professional services, family members can be involved in case-planning and in foster care (Cross, 1986). Even parents can be actively engaged in the placement of their children (Goodluck and Short, 1980). In essence, Native American children in Native American child welfare agencies are placed within Native American homes with the support and cooperation of their families, with access to their family and relatives, and able to receive an appropriate integration of traditional and western therapies.

Implications for Mainstream Practice

This article proposes the transfer of Native American children to Native American child welfare agencies to ensure compliance with the requirements of ICWA. Underlying both ICWA and this proposal is the belief that members of Native American families, agencies, communities, and tribes are the best resource for the placement of Native American children. Furthermore, political and legal mandates already exist for the transfer of control in the recognition of Indian tribes as self-governing, sovereign peoples—recognition based on ratified treaties and consistently upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court. ICWA and the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1973 are part of the Federal Government's commitments to transfer the administration of
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local government services to Indian tribes (National Indian Policy Center, 1992).

These being so, there are significant implications for public agency child welfare practice. First, public agencies need to see that their support of Native American agencies is the opportunity to create a partnership that will more aptly address the needs of Native American children. High quality services can only come from collaborative efforts to address previously intractable problems (Stehno, 1990). Inevitably, as part of this collaboration, Native American agencies must be supported financially. The thrust of this paper has been to show that this support is both effective and worthwhile.

Second, professional practice requires versatile responses to the complex situations of today's families (Schorr, 1990). Many Native American agencies are providing that response. However, the burden of versatility should not fall on the individual, mainstream child welfare worker when it is apparent that monolithic public agencies do not well serve Native American children. Versatility needs to be part of the child welfare system so that the unique placement needs of Indian children are met by a range of services appropriate to Native American culture. The transfer of Native American children to Native American agencies would begin to demonstrate that versatility.

Third, first steps in that transfer should be the identification of Native American children within the public child welfare systems and their consolidation around specialized workers and/or teams. Having one worker, or a team of workers, responsible for all Native American cases will ensure that appropriate workers will develop extensive knowledge and experience of Indian cultures and the ICWA (Deitrich, 1982). The purpose of this consolidation will better ensure that the provisions of ICWA in regard to placement and Indian foster care have been met. Consolidation will not only highlight Native American children as a class or group that is legally due certain rights but will also make visible a group of children around whom public and Native American agencies can negotiate for transfer.
Implications for Social Work Training

Any proposal to transfer Native American children to Native American agencies will have major implications for the education of Indian and non-Indian social workers and their teachers. The central task will be a rethinking of the content and principles of social work practice which are based on theories and models from the dominant, non-Indian society (Morrissette, McKenzie & Morrissette, 1993). These have already been categorized as antithetical to Indian peoples (Blanchard & Barsh, 1980) and naive, superficial, and racist in regard to practice with minorities in general (McMahon & Allen-Meares, 1992).

Any suggestions for social work education must flow from the already proven practice of Native American agencies. Their experience has been that they can provide a culturally sensitive and appropriate service to Native American children. Social work education must take into account the following themes if it is going to respond to Indian demands for their children and the challenges posed by the development of Indian agencies.

The first implication for social work education is the realization of the distinctiveness of Indian worldviews and traditions (Morrissette, McKenzie & Morrissette, 1993). Blanchard and Barsh (1980), for example, urge social workers to explore the strengths of Native American families, not their weaknesses. Some points to emphasize could include the importance of elders (Red Horse, 1980), the different meaning of leadership among Native Americans (Lewis & Gingerich, 1980), the importance of group activities (Edwards & Edwards, 1980), Indian ways of knowing that privilege feelings, history, prayer and personal relations (Colorado & Collins, 1987), and Indians' less individualistic, present-centered, and harmony-with-nature orientations (DuBray, 1985). A realization of the distinctiveness of Indian worldviews and traditions fits very neatly with a strengths perspective in social work (Saleeby, 1992) and with empowerment theory (Solomon, 1976).

Second, social work education must allow students to come to an understanding of Native Americans' history of colonization and that history's current effects (Hudson & McKenzie, 1981; Morrissette, McKenzie & Morrissette, 1993). This realiza-
tion must encompass the deliberate creation, by social policies (Cross, 1986), of Native Americans' dependence on the state and Native Americans' resistance to that dependence. In this vein, Hughes (1987) recommends a change in social work training from a reliance on psychological frameworks to larger social, cultural, and economic contexts.

Third, Indian and non-Indian students need to experience Native American programs similar to those mentioned in this paper. This will not only provide an experience of cultural awareness but also demonstrate culturally appropriate services that incorporate community-based, traditional teachers, healers, and therapeutic practices (Morrissette, McKenzie & Morrissette, 1993). Experience of, and education in, culturally appropriate practices will support understanding and cooperation between Indian and non-Indian agencies and practitioners.

Fourth, for some time now, commentators have pointed out that non-Indian social workers are often ignorant of Indian cultures and the ICWA (Kessel & Robbins, 1984). Social work education needs to help dispel that ignorance. This can be done by incorporating culturally-relevant material throughout the curriculum including the traditional Indian community model of relationships (Edwards, 1991). Above all, “cultural understanding comes about with interaction” (Davis, Evans, & Bridges, 1991, p. 98).

Finally, social work educators often want to promote and increase the number of Native Americans in social work. One reason for their absence may be that they are being asked to study in places where, as Blanchard and Barsh (1980) said of the American Indian family’s experience of social work, “they are denied expression and visibility” (p. 353). Social work education that acknowledges and values Native American experience, skills, therapies and professional practice will create a powerful environment for nurturing Native American social workers.

**Conclusion**

The authors argue, in this paper, that fulfillment of the promise of ICWA requires a fundamental rethinking of the care of Native American children in public agencies. We note that
Native American child welfare agencies have developed a range of services for Native American children. We believe that the intent of the ICWA will be better served if the case management of Native American children in public agency care is transferred to Native American child welfare agencies.

Above all, it has been an unspoken thread underlying this proposal, that there is still an urgent need to address the high rate at which Native American children enter care. The factors that bring children into care are poverty, discrimination, and racism, as well as individual malice by caregivers. Once again, social workers are asked to consider working on more systemic remedies for abuse and neglect, in addition to their provision of individual care (Stehno, 1990).
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This article assumes of the necessity of a theory of “tripartite personality” and utility of ethclass assessment in cross-cultural therapeutic interventions. It includes, (1) determinants of human behavior; (2) ethnocentrism and effects on groups and individuals, both majority and minority; (3) strategies of conventional intervention and its cultural encapsulation; (4) the proposed tripartite cultural personality, and psychocultural intervention; (5) the ethclass assessment and how it can be incorporated into the DSM-III-R (now, DSM-IV) Multiaxial Diagnostic System.

For most of us brought up in an ecological “like us” milieu, intercultural sensitivity is atypical. According to Milton J. Bennett (1986:27), history abounds with “bloodshed, oppression, or genocide,” when cross-cultural contacts occur. The world today is increasingly interdependent, and issues tend to be global and international. The failure to exercise intercultural sensitivity is not simply bad business or bad morality—it is self-negation, or even self-destruction.

Why should mental health professionals who include social workers be concerned with crosscultural issues? James W. Green and Collin R. Tong (1978:2–4) gave the following answers: (1) avoidance in dealing with ethnic and minority clients is impractical and impossible; (2) a survey conducted among social workers like the one in Alaska (Jones, 1976) revealed grievous instances of “cultural insensitivity” and “blatant expressions of racism”; (3) “the profession has never adequately conceptualized what its relations to these groups ought to be.” Added to the list should include: (4) the gross neglect if not outright violation to our code of ethics in the treatment of linguistic and/or cultural variant minorities; and (5) the issue of “fitness” between...
our service paradigms and unmet needs as evidenced by high dropout and underutilization rates of ethnic minority clients.

The gist of this article is derived from years of the author’s clinical practice with Native Americans, Blacks, Whites, and Asians in North America, teaching and research both in the U.S.A. and Asia. More specifically, the theoretical presuppositions were formulated in conjunction with a three-month doctoral field study at a psychiatric inpatient service unit targeted at Asian clientele and further tested with the same ethnic group at a child/family guidance service.

The article is intended to rectify some of the pitfalls of monocultural therapy involving ethnoculturally dissimilar populations, especially those at the lower rung of socioeconomic status. It is grounded on the assumption of the necessity of a theory of “tripartite personality” and utility of ethclass assessment in cross-ethnic, cross-cultural therapeutic interventions.

The content of the article is structured under several headings: (1) determinants of behavior; (2) ethnocentrism and effects on groups and individuals; (3) conventional intervention and its cultural encapsulation; (4) tripartite cultural personality, and rationale for psychocultural intervention; and (5) ethclass assessment and its incorporation into the DSM-IV Multiaxial Diagnostic System (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). We turn to a review of how human behavior is determined.

Determinants of Behavior

Human behaviors are never static. A dynamic conceptualization of behavior determinants should be viewed from the interaction of two dimensions: the vertical individual stage of development and the current impacts of bio-psychocultural factors. From figure A, the vertical axis reflects movements and stages of life and family cycle which are cumulative and evolving. It encompasses the temporal dimensions of past, present and future, such as one’s life goal, resources, determination or lack of determination. In the Western culture, it is generally viewed along the continuum of Erickson’s seminal eight ages of man (1950; 1959). Erickson, Freud, Piaget, Kolberg all postulate that each stage of life presents both crises and opportunities, and hence, tasks—sexual, cognitive, moral, and psychosocial—to
be mastered. Developmental stagnation or fixation is plausible if sequential developmental crises are unresolved. Since the late 1970s, the Ericksonian theory of individual life cycle has been expanded into a proposition of family life cycle (Rhodes, 1977; Duvall; 1977, 1988). Devore and Schlesinger (1991) condensed Duvall's 8-stage formulation into a more generalized 5-stage family life cycle: (1) joining together, (2) families with young children, (3) families with adolescents, (4) families as launching centers, and (5) together again in later adulthood. The model could be easily modified or expanded to apply to single-parent, or reconstructed families.

Figure A

*Dynamic Interactions of Determinants & Behavioral Outcome*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determinants of Behavior</th>
<th>Outcome of Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life Stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I Infancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eco-cultural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When encountering those of non-Western cultures or ethnocultural groups, the applicability of the Ericksonian developmental theory and the family life cycle and its derivatives may be subject to question.
The horizontal axis represents the convergence of three levels of impact:

1. Personal or Micro Level, which includes genetic-biological, attitudinal-behavioral factors that can be conscious and/or unconscious.

2. Interpersonal or Mezzo Level, that is both intrafamilial and extrafamilial.

3. Ecological or Macro Level, which encompasses both physical environment and societal-cultural milieu.

Due to the dynamic interaction of various concurrent forces interfacing with one's life and family stage development, outcome of behavior could be categorized as normal, deviant, borderline, or a vacillation between two. Behavioral traits that make up each human being are both complex and unique, and culturally determined as to the demarcation between acceptability and aberration. For a disenfranchised oppressed people, not to have some degree of paranoia toward others, is as abnormal as mice unafraid of cats. For this reason, close scrutiny is needed if cultural meaning of behavior or personality is to be deciphered.

Next let us discuss the possible consequences when people of diverse cultures are in contact with each other.

Ethnocentrism and Effects On Minority Groups

Cultural contacts can be inviting or unwelcome, peaceful or bloody, accommodative, or exploitative and even genocidal. Ethnocentrism, according to Milton J. Bennett, is defined as "assuming that the world-view of one's own culture is central to all reality" (1986:33). It parallels "egocentrism" on the individual level. An ethnocentric person disparages peoples or cultures that are dissimilar (Porter and Samovar, 1983), giving rise to the derivative consequence of racism. Ethnocentrism is pervasive in many parts of the world. The names American Indians gave themselves, usually mean "The People," or "Human Being," implying others are not. The "Eskimos"—contemptuous name, meaning "eaters or raw meat," attributed to them by outsiders—call themselves, "inuit, or Inupik," translated as "The Real
People.” The Chinese, no less, for millennia, have viewed themselves as “People of the Middle Kingdom,” and the rest, barbarians on the peripheries, befitted to pay tribute and kowtow to the Son of Heaven. Citizens of USA refer to themselves as “Americans” while obliterating consideration of all other inhabitants of the two continents with the same entitlement (Farb, 1978: 284). Racism such as “White supremacy” is “a most virulent form of ethnocentrism” (Axelson, 1985:134). Since racism is a fact of life, it is better for our country and people to acknowledge it than to deny it. By conscious exposure, at least, we could have a better chance of dealing with it.

The ramifications of cultural contacts are many. The most ostentatious is the division between in-group, out-group, and between groups (Figure B).

The dividing line between what J. Galtung calls “top dogs” and the “underdogs” or the dominant/majority group and the minority group is not so much one of numbers as it one of power and control. The less than 1% of British in colonial Hong Kong, and the domination of the 15% white Afrikaners in South Africa are such examples. In the United States, the white power structure coincides with its majority in number. To safeguard the prerogative and privileges of the Anglo Americans, the alternatives for the minority group as evidenced by historical development are: assimilation, accommodation, and segregation.

1. Assimilation as viewed from the dominant majority, is the expected treatment accorded to ethnocultural groups, based on the “like us” perception, and, therefore, part of the in-group. Assimilation, like acculturation, relies on a trait-list categorical explanation of racial or ethnic groups and that “diversity of groups is expected to recede over time as each group adopts traits from the other and submerges its own distinctiveness” (Green & Tong, 1978: 29). Unlike the latter, assimilation suggests the possibility of racial merging, while acculturation may or may not. Historically, assimilation in the United States was reserved primarily for immigrants of Northwest European stock. The color-blind distortion was probably related to the exaltation of the “melting pot” cultural myth, which discounted the “unmeltable ethnics” (Novak, 1971). People of color, despite a high degree of acculturation, and even the helping hands of
Figure B

*Cultural Contacts and Effects on Groups and Individuals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Grouping</th>
<th>Treatment of Minority Group</th>
<th>Effects on Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Group</td>
<td>Assimilation: Appreciated</td>
<td>DC: Cultural superiority validated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MC: Rejection of home culture; acceptance of second culture as superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between-Group</td>
<td>Acculturation: Accomodated</td>
<td>DC: Cultural pluralism acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MC: Selective acceptance/rejection of both home and host cultures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-Group</td>
<td>Segregation/ Subjugation: Depreciated</td>
<td>DC: Pervasive racism: oppression &amp; exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MC: Traditionalism—clinging to home culture for security &amp; identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marginalism—identifying neither with home nor the host culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defeatism—resigned to the fate of subjugation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radicalism—revolting by means of force</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent civil rights and affirmative action, have yet to transcend the hurdles of social barriers, and worse, the biological bulwark of interracial marriage. Contemporary America has witnessed some easement of such a racist stance. Mixed marriages, an index of racial acceptance, for Japanese and Chinese Americans, especially among the third generations, have reached or come close to the 50–50 mark at least in certain Western cities.
Cultural Personality

(Kikumura, & Kitano, 1973). The expected assimilation of a minority group, conveys the message that it is appreciated, the "they" can be "we." For members of the dominant culture, this amalgamation process helps to affirm the superiority of their heritage and group. Members of the assimilated group trade their allegiance to the second culture which is deemed superior with the price of rejecting their first.

2. **Acculturation** is the second preferred treatment between majority and minority groups when fusion or assimilation are impractical or impossible. Traditionally, it is both a process and the end state of Americanization, denoting one's ease and ability to assume the expected norms and life style of "mainstream America," meaning White, Anglo-Saxon, and Protestant (WASP). Acculturation defined by *The American Heritage Dictionary* (1985, denotes "the modification of the culture of a group or individual as a result of contact with a different culture." In this sense, it need not and should not be a one-way street of WASP-conformity, it implies mutual accommodation of variant groups, regardless of race, ethnicity, religion, and national origin. The right of diverse groups to coexist and the respect for differences is known as pluralism and is acknowledged by the dominant group. In the incipient heterogeneousness, unity in diversity appears to be a pragmatic destiny for our society to strive toward. So "the salad bowl" analogy, a sort of "distinct but equal," is gaining ground replacing the mythical "melting pot" scenario of the past. When we apply the transactional jargon to intergroup relations, it is the "adult" to "adult" relationship, not parent-child, superior-inferior, conquerer-coquered, or master-slave relationship. Under the canopy of pluralistic ideology, members of the nonmainstream group, may act as "the Americans" do, but this does not necessarily confer fusion, nor imply abandoning of one's roots, identity, and distinctiveness as a subculture. Their prerogative to choose the right mix of accepting or rejecting both ones' home or host, dominant or minority way of life is retained. For them one can postulate that each culture, like each person, is unique, merits and demerits-are inclusive. Difference is normal. It should by no means be conferred as undesirable, inferior, deviant or pathological.
Recent literature on intercultural interaction takes issue with the earlier view, exonerating the notion of "marginality" and conferring on it a positive tint. Adherence to this perspective, the freedom from the binding and blinding of a specific culture is highlighted. This constructive version accounts for the rising variable, designating the culturally expanded individuals as being: "bicentral,—or multicultural person," (Adler, 1977), the "mediating person" (Bochner, 1981), or the "150% person," (McFee, 1968; Saltzman, 1986). Capitalizing on the vantage point of "inbetweenness," such an individual comes close to what Milton J. Bennett refers to as having undergone "a paradigmatic shift"—from "reliance on absolute principles" of ethnocentrism to some sort of "non-absolute relativity" of ethno-relativism (Paigen, 1986: 5). Although bicultural or multicultural persons can also emerge among either the assimilated or the segregated groups, more likely, their ranks are largely drawn from the acculturated group.

3. Segregation of people by race, color, creed, or social class is an unmistakable indicator that minorities are the out-group who are systematically debased and categorically depreciated. Members of the dominant group are prone to be what Robert Merton (1976: 189–216) referred to as bigots, be they "all-weather," or "timid." The more differences are pigeonholed, albeit superficial and selective, the more similarities are disavowed. Denigrating others, the mainstreamers often interact by aggrandizing themselves. Members of the subordinate class are looked down upon as stupid, inferior, or even subhuman and stereotyped as gooks, "Jim-Crows," infidels, or savages. Distorted, half-true stereotypes, especially the negative, are promulgated to justify the exploitation, subjugation, extermination, and the pervasive "chocolate city, vanilla suburbs" (quoted in Schaefer, 1989: 39) form of segregating the culturally variant. Not infrequently, the ethnic minority itself may be splintered into different reactive ideological camps: traditionalism, marginalism, defeatism, and radicalism.

The traditionlists of the ethnic minority under an oppressive circumstance are obliged to double their efforts, clinging to the vestiges of their cultural legacy as a defensive measure and a source of pride and security. The earlier involuntary
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Insulation of Chinatown as an ethnic enclave is illustrative (Yuan, 1963). In the above paragraph, we have already alluded to the constructive force of marginality. The negative connotation is traced to Robert E. Park's (1928) itemization of vulnerabilities and strains faced by those under such circumstances. Under the weight of our racist society, some members of the people of color are eager to pass for white. Despite alterations of outward appearances, and even physical features, they unwittingly turn to racial self-hatred, distancing themselves from their own cultural affiliation without being accepted by the mainstreamists. They are those straddling two cultural boats, part of but apart from neither. More often than not they are despised by their own kind as "cultural traitors." Such individuals for blacks are derogatorily labeled, "oreo cookies," (black outside and white inside), for Asians, as "bananas" (yellow peel wrapping the white stuff), and for Native Americans, "apples" (red skin with a white core). Then there are defeatists, who resign themselves to the assigned fate of powerlessness and helplessness. Many, through their self-degradative, self-destructive behavior, ironically fulfill the depreciative racial/ethnic stereotypes, which, in turn, refuel the spiral of prejudice, discrimination, oppression and exploitation. The last subcategory are the militants, unyielding to the fate they have been ascribed, they rebel, and if necessary, by means of bloodshed.

Cultural Myopia and the Paradox of Intervention

Practitioners in the field of mental health deal with individuals whose psychosocial problems range from normal exigencies of day-to-day living to maladaptive behavior that is within the realm of mental disorder. Our approaches to behavioral intervention could be subsumed under one of a combination of three non-discreet levels: (1) micro level which implies social work or therapy with the individual or family concerned; (2) mezzo level which includes others in the form of group process, or alignment with the community support network; and (3) macro level which encompasses activities such as community education and organization, advocacy, and social action, working with or on behalf of our constituents on various levels of jurisdiction.
Few would quarrel with the conceptualization of these interventive modalities. The trouble is often in the process of implementation when the converging impact of "minority status, ethnicity, and class" as well as the language gap is attenuated or ignored, and when the "negative, dysfunctional aspects of the ethnic reality" is exaggerated (Devore and Schlesinger, 1991: 127). Our so-called practice principles and techniques, interview skills, and theoretical assumptions of human behavior and personality development are both culture-bound (Singer, 1976; Sue, 1981) and class-bound (Hollingshead and Redlich, 19587). For many years, diagnostic assessment schemes, typified by the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-III-R, 1987) were conspicuously devoid of the cultural inclusion, resulting in unresponsiveness of our ethnocultural communities and courting potential disasters.2

A case in point entails Dock Kim Huey, a 71-year-old Chinese man, found in Camarillo State Hospital, California, in 1971, after 36 years of psychiatric confinement. He was discharged when a new state law made annual review mandatory ("Mysterious . . . ;" 1971). Huey told Wellman Jue, a restaurant owner and interpreter, that he was "the first person" who ever conversed with him in his native tongue.

"Questions begging for answers did not cease at the closure of the hearing . . . Could Huey's first psychiatric encounter, perhaps by default, have sentenced him to a mental hospital? Could Huey's mental illness be real, or a myth created by a cultural and language gap which condemned him to a 'de facto' life imprisonment?" (Huang, 1977: 36). Huey's case was a tragic injustice inflicted on an individual whereas the most rudimentary cultural and linguistic service requirements were obviated in cross-cultural psychiatric care.

A more recent illustration involved a Cambodian man in San Jose, accused of child abuse, based on many purple and scarlet marks discovered on the face, neck and body of his child. The man being publicly disgraced and vitiated as a responsible parent, committed suicide in desperation. It was another example of outrageous violation of cultural sensitivity on the part of child protective authorities who were ignorant, confusing what is culturally condoned, pinching or coin rubbing folk healing
practices with a deviant case of child abuse. These healing arts are prevalent in South China and several countries in Southeast Asia. Our uninformed child protection workers/agency involved in this care, contrary to what they purport to do, have rendered themselves, through their naivete, into the first degree "family abusers." Not only have they cost the tragic loss of a human life, but also deprived the putative "abused" child and the family of a father. All because of our cultural myopia, we are unable to discern what is termed "abusive" behavior from legitimate behavior in an ethno-subculture. If ethnocultural folk healing is indeed harmful, what we need is public education and individual counseling not indiscriminate, punitive action.

To safeguard against the system's abuse and tragic episodes quoted above, we need a tripartite cultural personality scheme to rectify our cultural lacunas in our theoretical foundation, which, in turn, undergirds our psychotherapeutic procedures and practice principles. Equally compelling is our need to acknowledge the imperative for a psychocultural assessment and put it on the front burner in our diagnostic routine, when service involves culturally variant clients.

To sum, our therapeutic intervention, such as psychotherapy and casework counseling workable with intracultural white middle class Americans, is woefully inadequate for the bulk of our constituents who are of lower socio-economic class and culturally different (Sue, 1981; Axelson, 1985).

Personality and Psychocultural Intervention

Neither Freudian id-ego-superego psychic structure, nor Bernian transactional child-adult-parent formulation, nor the neurotic patterns of Karen Horney's "moving toward, moving away, and moving against people" are adequate in explaining human behavior in cross-cultural contacts. Compatible to transcultural service requirements, a different conceptualization of the personality structure is needed. The tripartite cultural personality as proposed consists of: (1) etic, the biopsychological universal attributes that all human beings share; (2) emic, the culturally specific parts which are relative to each culture; and (3) unique, the components that distinguish each one of us
(Figure C). Its formulation is derived from the apt hypothesis by Kluckhohn and Murray (1948, 1953) that every man is in certain respects like all other men, like some other men, and like no other man.

Figure C

*The Tripartite Cultural Personality*

---

Etic

The universal: like all other men

Emic

The cultural: like some other men

Unique

The personal: like no other man

---

Mental health professionals in America today have, by and large, not been trained in the theory and practice of cultural personality. Our training, modes of service intervention are basically monocultural (Figure D). Our principles of human behavior are viewed as universal when in fact they are Western. In service delivery, the etic part is implicitly dealt with mainly through our biomedial treatment. The emic part is either confused with the former or conspicuously ignored. As a consequence, the uniqueness of the individual looms large for our psychosocial intervention. In short, the issue of cultural differences and diversity failed to claim the attention of counseling and psychotherapeutic literature, professional training and practices until recent years.

In contrast, psychocultural therapeutic intervention would not permit the emic part of the cultural personality to be swept under the rug. It is explicitly designed to help the culturally different, particularly immigrants and refugees, to deal with the unavoidable survival issues, uprootedness, acculturation process and attendant issues of social change, Post Traumatic
Monocultural Therapeutic Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Personality Involved</th>
<th>Modes and Content of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>Etic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stress Syndrome, culture shock, their new enemy—the English language, role change and identity confusion, intra- and inter-familial adjustments, intergenerational conflicts, racial oppression, and prevailing feelings of bewilderment, hopelessness, and helplessness.

Psychocultural Therapeutic Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Personality Involved</th>
<th>Modes and Content of Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biomedical Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority:</td>
<td>Etic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority (WASP):</td>
<td>Etic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Psychocultural or bicultural therapeutic interaction requires two levels of comprehension, behavioral norms of the dominant culture and those of the minority experience and subculture to which our client belongs. For the Third World client, even if the therapist also belongs to the same ethnocultural group, he/she is dealing with more than one cultural personality. The reason is that while the minority therapist's subcultural orientation is non-white, the knowledge and techniques he or she has acquired are not. So is the ecology under which both the therapist and the client share and operate. For instance, I am a Chinese American working with a client of the same
Ethnic descent. Lurking behind our common ethnic identity—Chineseness—there is a shadowy but powerful "American cultural personality" that we have to contend with, if the treatment goal is to help the client adapt more effectively in the American society. Ultimately, the aim is neither to make the client "totally American," which is neither feasible nor even desirable. Nor should one encourage ethnocultural clients to rigidly cling to their original culture without modification. The monocultural frame is usurped by being uprooted and has now become anachronistic and maladaptive. The intermediate position—biculturalism—seems pragmatic and reasonable. Our aims of psychocultural intervention should be helping our client to synthesize the two cultural norms, which befit the individual concerned and his/her sociocultural habitat. The issue remaining is how, and at what pace, and with what price.

Ethclass Assessment and Its Utility for DSM-IV

Ethclass, a hybrid term coined by Gordon (1964; 1978) denotes the intersect between ethnicity and social class which generate "identifiable dispositons and behaviors and beliefs." Devore and Schlesinger characterized these as the "ethnic reality" (1991:20). Ethnic reality arises out of the group's (1) cultural values and legacies, (2) shared experience of racial oppression, and (3) nurturing system of kin network and sustentative system of ethnic community (Chestang, 1976). Research has shown that the correlation between the two indices—ethnicity and class—seems high, (Hollingshead & Redlich, 1958). Partly because of this, the plausibility of predicting behavioral norms and situational circumstances should be more reliable than using either indicators of social class or ethnicity alone. The interface between the ratings of socioeconomic standing and the degree of one's acculturation is demonstrated by Figure F:

Besides knowledge of the ethnic reality, to be ethnic competent in therapeutic interaction with minority subcultures, variables significant for individual cultural assessment include: (1) pre-migration socioeconomic and geocultural background; (2) age of immigration and history of migration; (3) educational level and school location; (4) proficiency with the English lan-
The Ethclass Rating Scale proposed by the author (Figure G) is intended to complement the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (see 1987, 1994) Multiaxial Diagnostic System which offers limited if any provision as to how ethclass variables are to be assessed when psychosocial stressors are considered. The scale consists of six variables, and each is rated from a scale of 1–5, with "0" indicating lack of sufficient information. Scale 1, assessment of client (or significant others) in terms of the degree of Americanization, which ranges from being assimilated ("1" or no deficiency) to indigenous ("5" or native culture such as Hmong). Scale 2, degree of English proficiency, ranging from fluency to usage of alien language only (for instance, client speaks only Hmong and Teochiu). Scale 3, the level of education acquired ranging from postgraduate in the U.S. to illiteracy. Scale 4, occupational level ranging from licensed professional to unskilled labor. Scale 5, social network ranging from
Figure G

Ethclass Rating Scale
(as Addendum to Axis IV, DSM-III-R)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Sufficiency</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Mild</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>No Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americanization</td>
<td>Alien (native culture)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilated</td>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Proficiency</td>
<td>Foreign Language Only (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Unskilled/ Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate, USA</td>
<td>Ethnic Subculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Below Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lic. professional</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White middle class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x median income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Ethclass Scale Rating: - - - - -

association with white middle class versus association only with ethnic subculture. Scale 6, income level ranging from twice the median income to below welfare standard. The mean score of the five variables implies an estimation of one’s ethclass grading. Low composite score indicates possession of sufficient resources, high level of communication and coping skills, and one can infer relatively low level of conflicts and stressors associated with the culture/environment. For the reverse, with lack of essential resources and multiple deficiency in adaptive skills in the American society, one would suspect high stressors in one’s psychocultural adaptational process. For the said individual and/or family, the need for assistance in external resources and in skill acquisition is warranted.

The Ethclass Rating Scales are easy to administer. Figure H, illustrates such an assessment for 39-year-old Wee, an ethnic Chinese and a new immigrant from the People’s Republic of
China, who was diagnosed at the time of his hospitalization as “For Axis I. 1, Psychotic Disorder NOS, Chronic; 2, homicidal potential toward the mother cannot be ruled out.” The following can be valuable as addenda to Axis IV, or Psychosocial Stressor.

Figure H

Ethclass Assessment for Wee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis IV</th>
<th>PS stressor: estrangement from family members; No English language and/or marketable skills as a new immigrant from China.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severity Rating: 4 Severe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethclass Rating: 5 Severe deficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ethnicity:</td>
<td>5 Traditional Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Language:</td>
<td>5 Monolingual: Toy San Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Social Class:</td>
<td>5 Lowest SES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Education:</td>
<td>4.5 Semi-illiterate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Occupation:</td>
<td>5 Unskilled, unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Income:</td>
<td>5 None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see Wee’s mean rating score is about 5, the most severe deficiency level. His survival is at stake. Obviously, no one can work effectively with him and his widowed mother (whose ethclass means scale is 4.5) unless one is both bilingual and bicultural.

These scales, the validity of which are yet to be tested, constitute a beginning step in making our ethclass appraisal explicit and thus minimize the haphazard guesswork. Conceivably, it is useful in the matching of clients with therapist in terms of language and cultural stipulations, decisions as to whether or not to call for an interpreter. The ratings of these scales permit visualization of variant acculturation rates among family members, that may augur intrafamilial and intergenerational strife. Needless to say, the tailoring of one’s treatment style and strategy can then be purposefully articulated.
The interaction between ethnicity and social class is never static. War, famine, social change, uprootedness and migration often trigger class mobility. As viewed from the human service arena, experience reveals that most of the adults migrating from the Asia Pacific region who have not been educated in the English-speaking West encounter a downward shift in their career ladder in America. For this reason, working with a client who was formerly an illiterate mountain tribesman is not the same as with an urban, unemployed French-speaking, multilingual middle-aged M.D. whose proficiency in English is less than desired. Without such an ethclass appraisal, I would be amiss to decide if I should treat my client like an American, like a Vietnamese, or like an Asian American who is in the middle range, with a varying degree of acculturation.

Ethclass assessment does not purport to address the issue of mental health or disorder of specific behavior, relative to cross-cultural perspective. Ethclass assessment is only part and parcel of psychocultural appraisal, which should, especially for refugees and immigrants, supersede conventional psychiatric diagnosis, if confusing culturally appropriate behavior is not to be mistaken as mental disorder. How to do it is another matter. Until then, no known short-cut is at hand other than cultural self-awareness and a well-grounded knowledge of the client's subculture, beyond our conventional psychiatric wisdom. The materials added in DSM-IV (1994) are helpful. Limited attention is paid to social class features.

Conclusion

This article begins with a review of determinants of human behavior, discussion of constructs such as ethnocentrism and effects on both majority and minority groups and individuals. Next, the strategies of conventional therapy along with its underpinning conceptualization of personality and human development were examined. Since existing theories of personality ill-prepare us to understand people of variant cultural backgrounds, our emic biased psychotherapeutic principles and techniques seem impotent when applied to people of color, immigrants and refugees in particular. Therefore, a tripartite cul-
Cultural personality is proposed. Stemming from this theoretical presupposition, the author suggests that psychocultural assessment should be attempted and precede psychodiagnosis when service entails intercultural intervention. Working toward this direction, the inclusion of an "Ethclass Rating Scale to the Multiaxial Diagnostic Scheme is proposed. Ethclass Assessment does not address the issue of normality or abnormality, mental health or mental disorder, but is explicit in crucial data like level of education, the type of occupation, proficiency of language, degree of literacy, level of income and extent of Americanization. The scales are quantifiable and a composite score can be easily calculated. This assessment renders haphazard guesswork unnecessary, facilitates consistency and continuity in teamwork or interagency communication and collaboration. It aids decision-making in terms of certain interventive strategies, the most obvious of which is the extent of language and cultural requirements, and whether or not the client should be treated like an indigenous alien, like an American, or like one in the continuum of the two polarities. Its potential and utility depends on further testing, research, and refinement.
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Notes

1. This article was first written on the basis of the organization of DSM-III-R. DSM-IV was published shortly before this article was scheduled to go the press.

2. DSM-IV, Published in 1994, shortly before this article was ready to go to press makes substantial progress in this regard. Appendix I entitled "Outline for Cultural Formulation and Glossary fo Culture-Bound Syndrome" provides and outline intended to "supplement the multaxial diagnostic assessment and to address difficulties that may be encountered in applying DSM-IV criteria in a multicultural environment" (p 843). The outline suggests how to review the individual's cultural background, the role of the cultural context in symptom expression and dysfunction, and the effect of cultural factors on the clinician/patient relationships. In addition, the discussion of specific disorders supplemented by a section titled "specific culture, age and gender features." There is also a glossary fo culture bound syndromes.

3. Please note this paper was originally written in connection with DSM-III-R.

This article is based on a paper presented at the International Congress of Schools of Social Welfare, August, 1990, Lima, Peru.
Ethnic Identity, Intergroup Relations and Welfare Policy in the Canadian Context: A Comparative Discourse Analysis

ADRIENNE S. CHAMBON AND DONALD F. BELLAMY
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This paper illuminates the negotiation of group identities and intergroup relations in the Canadian context. It presents an empirical, comparative analysis of group claims around social assistance policy using discourse analysis. Lexical, semantic and narrative analyses of Aboriginal and multicultural documents show a complex organization of intergroup relations, with distinct and at times conflicting claims. In view of the tensions, responsive policy development requires that historical specificity, complexity, and even incompatibilities be taken into account.

This paper discusses ethnicity by examining the social organization of group identity, group claims and intergroup relations (Barth, 1969) in the Canadian context. This is of particular relevance to the increasing pluralism and complexity of contemporary societies.

As Oommen (1989) has shown in his comparison of India and the U.S., the nature of ethnic relations varies across societies. Ethnic concepts and explanations are context-specific (Bovenkerk, Miles & Verbunt, 1991; Phizacklea, 1984) encompassing dimensions of culture, nationality, race and religion. A given constellation is associated with a specific organization of social identities and group membership, and a particular group distribution of social statuses and resources.
Oommen suggests that ethnic identity be considered dynamically, as the outcome of intergroup tensions and community transformations. Similarly, for Horowitz (1985), intergroup competition and conflict are aimed at recognition and self-esteem, countering status-loss anxiety, and resulting in a changing social organization. As groups appeal for social reorganization, ethnic relations come to be defined and acted upon from the perspective of symbolic resource distribution (Breton, 1984; 1986), with the state acting as the legitimating avenue for change. The crisis of legitimacy characteristic of such transitions can only be resolved through a process of “restructuration of the symbolic order”. In summary, for Horowitz and Breton, following Barth, ethnic identity is fundamental to the social contract and is negotiated through intergroup relations. Intergroup tensions indicate an unsatisfactory distribution of statuses and resources. A symbolic dimension is part of the groups’ contests for legitimacy, claimed in rational and emotional terms.

In pluralistic societies, groups may compete using similar or dissimilar claims which are not necessarily compatible. Horowitz found two sets of claims and sources of legitimacy coexisting in the new independent states of Africa, Asia and the Caribbean. Indigenous groups tend to make claims of exclusion based on uniqueness and priority of land use, and to express status anxiety through their fear of genocide. Immigrant groups tend to make claims of inclusion based on a rhetoric of equality and participation (Horowitz, 1985). This multiplicity of logics and discourses will be examined in part in the case of Canada.

The Canadian “mosaic” (Porter, 1965) is a particular constellation of languages, cultures, visible minority groups, and native issues. Group participation in the social compact, as historically reflected in the constitutional accords (Cairns, 1992), can be differentiated into (a) an “initial ethnic agenda” addressing the relations between the “two founding nations”, Quebec and English Canada, and the two language communities, and (b) a “second ethnic agenda” addressing the remaining groups of non-English/non-French origin including ethnic citizens, recently arrived immigrants, visible minorities, and Aboriginal peoples. A fundamental shift of group statuses and resources
Intergroup Relations Canada

is currently taking place, as reflected in recent constitutional debates, (Cairns, 1989 and 1992)

Although mostly the political arena has been examined (Kallen, 1990), group negotiations occur in multiple forums, among them the public policy arena. Specifically, social welfare or social assistance, as a fundamental mechanism of social integration, is a forum for resource and status reallocation. This paper limits itself to examining the second ethnic agenda at a single level of policy making, of social assistance policy. Social assistance benefits are delivered by the provincial legislation in Canada and vary widely. The province of Ontario was selected for this analysis as it is the most populated province which resettles the highest percentage of immigrants and visible minorities in Canada (Ontario, 1991).

As part of a major policy review conducted in 1987, The Social Assistance Review Committee of Ontario requested that constituencies submit background papers and recommendations for change. Two such working documents, prepared by "ethnic" constituencies, will be analyzed: (1) "First Nations Self-Government: A Background Report 1987" prepared by Heather Ross, vetted by the Chiefs of Ontario, and (2) the "Report on Multiculturalism and Social Assistance" prepared by the Multicultural Advisory Group comprised of immigrant service organizations (August 1987). These are comparable documents responding to the same policy. Moreover, as working documents, rather than final policy texts, they contain opinionated positions of the respective groups.¹

In summary, this paper illuminates the nature of ethnic group relations through an analysis of group claims anchored in the debate for resource redistribution in welfare reform. A second question is whether multiple groups use similar claims to improve their access to resources and achieve status enhancement, or whether divergent sources of legitimation and claims are made, thus (a) indicating a complex organization of ethnic groups, and (b) requiring that social changes, particularly in the sector of social welfare, take this complexity, if not incompatibility, into account.

This work is guided by the conceptual orientation presented initially. Breton's emphasis on the symbolic aspect of social
organization has encouraged us to conduct an empirical examination of institutional discourse (Breton, 1984). The distinctions made by Horowitz between social identity, status claims and status anxiety are used as the core analytical categories. The following analysis examines (1) social identity and group membership through the group denomination, (2) normative group claims, legitimating arguments and objectives of group status enhancement and social reorganization, and (3) the emotional aspect of group recognition. The method used is a discourse analysis of policy documents.

**Discourse Analysis**

Discourse analysis is a method of inquiry based on an interpretive and constructivist approach to social science. Discourse is conceptualized not merely as form, or secondary process, but as behavior or constitutive process. Instead of assuming that major issues preexist to their formulation, a discursive approach implies that through discourse social identities are constituted along with specific claims, possible courses of action and particular strategies of social change (Potter & Whetherell, 1987). In this perspective, language use is the central social practice to be addressed.

The importance given to speech and text stems from the postulate that in given historical contexts, societies adopt restricted discourses which give meaning to categories of experience, shape institutional arrangements, and structure the analytical tools of science (Foucault, 1976). Further, the relative positions of social groups define the vantage point from which their definitions of self and other stem, the range of alternatives they consider (Bourdieu, 1990) and their vision of change. Proponents articulate their stakes (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) within the context of a dominant public discourse which defines the legitimate parameters of group claims (Edelman, 1988). Groups use a variety of means to formulate their claims, from the type of narratives they put forward (Kaplan, 1986), the nature of their arguments and rhetoric (Hirschman, 1991), to the use of specific vocabulary and “governing metaphors” (McGraw, 1991).
We adopt the position that the discourse of ethnicity, as any social issue, concerns the social organization and cognitive schemata of the community, or "habitus" as developed by Bourdieu (1990). Van Dijk's (1984) study of prejudice in speech has demonstrated the close link between public discourse and individual behavior. A discourse pattern used by Native Canadian groups in their appeals to redress was recently examined (Ponting, 1990), while a study of Alaskan Natives showed the importance of group identity claims for policy making (Korsmo, 1990). Comparative claims across ethnic groups have not been extensively studied.

Discourse analysis is consistent with the constructivist and interpretive approach currently advocated in social work practice and research (e.g. Scott, 1989; Sherman, 1991). Narrative and discourse analyses have been applied to the examination of life-histories (e.g., Cohler, 1988), coping mechanisms (Borden, 1991) and clinical process-change (e.g. Chambon, 1994; Sherman & Skinner, 1988). The tools have not been extensively used to assess policy developments. As differentiated from traditional content analysis which utilizes externally defined analytical grids for recording, relying on word frequency and objective indicators of themes (such as standard synonym list), discourse analysis proceeds by deconstructing the text into its structural components and reconstructing its internal logic. Discourse analysis encompasses a range of methods (Valverde, 1991); it can be used in various manners, depending upon the disciplinary and theoretical orientation of the authors (Potter & Whitherell, 1987), and needs to be specified for operational purposes.

This paper rests on a fine-grain textual analysis of the documents identifying central structuring terms, their semantic organization (Spradley, 1979), and dominant narrative features. A combination of linguistic and literary means is adapted from earlier work on dialogue (Chambon, 1994) in which the documents were treated as ethnographic data following a partial grounded theory approach (Altheide, 1991; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). A preliminary analysis led to the refinement of the initial analytical tools, to which were added word frequency count and proximate textual context, commonly used in traditional
content analysis (Weber, 1990). The social identity of groups is analyzed through their lexical use of identity labels. Group claims are analyzed through the rhetorical and narrative strategies of claim-making and the network of pivotal terms around which arguments are elaborated. The narrative analysis examines the global organizing features of the texts: the dominant story genre, narrative themes, major events and protagonists, and the secondary processes of narrative subtext and external references used to legitimize the group's claims. Finally, the emotional character of the claims is analyzed through the affective and relational words.

The Terminology of Group Identity and Group Claims

Key terms are defined in their notional-cognitive sense. Words which share the same root meaning but take different morphological shapes are grouped under a single term, such as colonialism/colonization or compassion/compassionate (cf. Culioli, 1978 for a linguistic argument).

**Emphasized Text in the Aboriginal Document**

Title and chapter headings are considered emphasized text as is the "Executive Summary". The emphasized text in the Aboriginal document uses, and gives prominence to: (1) Aboriginal Nations as group identity; (2) colonization, assimilation, isolation as negative claims, and equality, self-government, and local control as normative claims; (3) despair, respect and recognition as emotional claims. The distribution of these terms in the three analytical categories is summarized in Table 1.

**Frequent Terms in the Aboriginal Document**

A frequency count of key terms was used to identify the structuring notions of the text. In this document, the most frequently used terms in rounded numbers are: Aboriginal nations (130), self-government (80), colonialization (20), assimilation (20), isolation (10), surrender (10), and dependency (10). The two lists (frequency and emphasized text) show a great deal of overlap and consistency in the terms of: Aboriginal nations, self-government, colonization, assimilation, and isolation. The most
noticeable difference concerns the emotional/relational terms. Although identified in the emphasized text, they are not among the more frequently used.

**Emphasized Text in the Multicultural Document**

In document 2, headings and introductory sections serve a similar function as headings and Executive Summary of the first document by introducing, summarizing, and structuring the topic while the remaining chapters deal with specific substantive issues. In this instance, as shown in Table 2, (1) emphasized group identity terms are: immigrant, refugees, domestic workers, immigrant women, minority group/visible minority/other minority, disadvantaged, and Ontario residents. (2) Emphasized normative group claims are: diversity, multiculturalism, access, equality, equity, participation, rights, and opportunities; and the negative claims: barriers, racism, discrimination, prejudice, and ghettoization. (3) Emotional terms are: compassion and sensitivity.

**Frequent Terms in the Multicultural Document and Comparison**

The most frequent terms in rounded numbers are: immigrant (170), refugee (40), multicultural (40), sponsorship (60), language (50), access (20), and discrimination (20). Terms shared
by the emphasized text and the frequency list are: immigrant, refugee, multicultural, access, and discrimination. Once again, the emotional terms are not the most frequently used.

A comparison shows a marked difference between the terminologies of group identity. One clear and consistent group identity term is used in the Aboriginal document, and functions as a single rallying cry. By contrast, group identity is plural in the multicultural document subsuming (1) broad immigrant terms (immigrant/refugee/newcomer), (2) immigrant subgroups (refugee claimant/immigrant women/domestic worker), (3) disadvantaged populations (minority, visible/other), and (4) a territorial and administrative entity of "Ontario resident," presenting thus a complex group identity with subgroups and multiple features.

The two claim lists share few terms, signifying profound differences. The notions of colonization, self-government and self-control are unique to the Aboriginal document. A number of terms such as discrimination, participation and access are emphasized in the Multicultural document, and given lesser prominence in the Aboriginal text. The respective grievances of colonization and discrimination, are not equivalent. Some

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Identity</th>
<th>Claims</th>
<th>Emotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant/woman</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee/claimant</td>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Sensitivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic worker</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor group</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible minority / Other</td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged</td>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario resident</td>
<td>Racism/Sexism/Class</td>
<td>Ghettoization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
apparently similar terms become different notions in textual use. *Assimilation* is a grievance in the Aboriginal document, while *participation* and *access* are normative claims in the multicultural document. Even a single term takes a different connotation in context. The concept of *equality* is associated with *self-government* in the Aboriginal document; *access* and *equity* in the multicultural document stress, respectively, separateness and inclusion.

The emotional claims differ as well. The Aboriginal text, alone, emphasizes a negative notion (despair). Moreover, the notion of *respect*, emphasized in document 1 is absent from document 2, in which *compassion* and *sensitivity* are stressed instead. The notion of respect connotes a relation of equality among distinct partners, while compassion and sensitivity can be seen as pleas for closeness within a relation of relative dependence. In summary, the two documents show asymmetries in their emphasized group identity definition, normative claims and affective emphasis.

**Semantic Organization of the Texts**

*Semantic Organization of the Aboriginal Document*

The semantic clusters and networks of related words, proximate and interchangeable word use, and word context (i.e., the semantic organization of the text) further illuminate the textual use of key words and of rhetoric. The word-cluster comprised of the key terms of *colonization/assimilation/isolation* stands out in the Aboriginal document. The two latter words are repeatedly used in the same sentence, while all three tend to appear in the same or adjacent sentences, as illustrated in:

Before Confederation, the legislation and ideology of colonialism were in place. The project of assimilation and isolation had begun. Following Confederation, this project was rationalized, expanded, and continues to the present (p.ii).

The additional less frequent terms of *civilize, acculturate* and *deculturate* which appear in the same textual context, are part of this semantic network.

Semantic clusters differentiate among group claims. The negative claims or grievances, used as contrast and justification,
show two distinct subsets used in different textual contexts: (1) colonization/assimilation/isolation/destroy/decimate/surrender/ward; (2) racism/discrimination/disadvantaged/neglect. The former, the more frequent, connoting violent relations of domination and annihilation, is part of the political realm, while the second connotes relations of imbalance (lesser violence) in the social realm. The terms wards of the state and dependency appear more frequently than neglect, disadvantaged, or discriminated. A third subset, comprised of dependency and injustice, overlaps the two domains and is used in both contexts.

Similarly, the repeated normative and institutional claims show two subsets. Self-government/third-order government/inherent right is one cluster, to which are associated statesmanship and body politic to form a single semantic network. Municipality/self-administration/self-management cluster separately around social administration. Individual terms are used interchangeably within each of these sets, but cannot be used across sets (e.g. self-government cannot replace self-administration). They represent distinct if not antithetical claims. Whereas the first cluster appears throughout the document, the second is present only in the last chapters discussing the management of social services. This is also true of the cultural claims.

Emotional language is a particular form of group rhetoric which can accompany collective symbolic claims. More expected in oratory styles, it is less so in policy documents. The chapter heading profile of despair highlights the notion as an organizing category, which is extended into a semantic network to include distress, hopelessness, horror, and pain. The term respect is positively paired with recognition and negatively paired with ignored, emphasizing respectively equality of- vs. lack of- partnership (or invisible partner). The notion of recognition is associated by proximate use with the claim of self-government. The complementary use of negative and positive emotional terms construes them as cognitive dimensions.

The group identity of Aboriginal nations is used throughout the text with multiple associations, in an almost decontextualized fashion, achieving the status of an absolute identity claim. A second set of identity terms, Indian community/Indian people is more narrowly associated with the provision of social
assistance. It does not, however, replace Aboriginal nation, under which it becomes subsumed, the latter standing for the dominant identity. A legally-ascribed identity cluster of registered/status/non-status Indian has more limited use. Ethnicity is distinctly missing as an identity marker. Its use is restricted to naming groups in foreign countries (Nicaragua). This notion is, therefore, irrelevant to the Aboriginal nations' self-identity.

*Semantic Organization in the Multicultural Document and Comparison*  
A complex vocabulary characterizes the group's identity and claims. Its semantic mapping shows multiple principles, tensions, and ambivalence.

The notion of immigration is central to the document in various forms: immigration/immigration status/immigrant/imigrant woman/sponsored immigrant/immigrant community, and is a dominant component of group identity. Minority is used in close proximity to immigrant:

- We recognize the rights of immigrant, refugee and minority groups... (p.2)... racism and ethnic discrimination, pervasive prejudice and discrimination against immigrants, visible minorities and other minority communities (p.3).

The two notions do not have equal authority. The notion of immigrant stands by itself more often than the notion of minority, most often accompanied by the former. The term minority covers two subsets: visible minority and other minority, which, in Canada, refers to linguistic minority, i.e., non-English/non-French, including groups known in the U.S. as ethnic whites.

The central notion of discrimination is used to encompass a range of grievances, "systemic and outright" (p.23) bridging diverse experiences. In conjunction with the minority identity, it is part of the semantic network of ethnicity-race-poverty-sexism-ghettoization-class division and prejudice. In conjunction with immigrant, it refers to policy inequity in settlement:

- The failure of the system is exacerbated for specific groups which face discrimination on the basis of their immigration status: sponsored immigrants, domestic workers, and refugee claimants (p. 4)... discriminatory social assistance regulations which discourage and limit access (p. 11).
The broad description of injustice and inequity links different subgroups of the multicultural entity. It allows a certain ambiguity as to the relation between group identity and group claim.

In this document, the notion of equality is used in two ways: as a substantive (“achieving equality”) and as an adjective mostly with the term of access (“gaining equal access”). Indeed, the terms of barriers and access are prominent in the text. The first usage, closer to the Aboriginal document, implies a collective claim of power sharing. The second draws the notion into a semantic network which includes notions of equity and opportunity, emphasizing instead individual rights and life chances. This dual usage of the notion is indicative of the document’s dual logic and ambiguity. Unlike the Aboriginal document, the multicultural text presents a tension between the two emphases of group claims.

A differentiated use of affective terms to characterize segments of the multicultural community, such as trauma/victimized with the refugee experience, violence and the experience of women, highlights the heterogenous identity structure of the group. The words compassionate and sensitive are associated with the service system: “Ontario needs a social assistance system which is compassionate and sensitive” (p. 4). A diffusion of the notion occurs and sensitivity is associated with cultural differences (“culturally sensitive services”). The two derived notions of sensitive are used, sensitivity and sensitiveness, the first is closer to compassion, the second to responsiveness. This broadening of usage strengthens the argument and achieves greater consensus — however, through ambiguity.

The contextual use of the term isolation shows a fundamental divergence in meanings between the two texts. In the second document, isolation refers to the personal loneliness of newcomers, particularly women and the elderly, in an individual sense. By contrast, it refers to collective marginalization in the Aboriginal text. These usages reflect radically different emphases between collective and individual affect and claims. The individualized use of affect in the multicultural text is consistent with its claims of equity and access equality, versus the collective, nation-based equality claim of the Aboriginal document.
The Nature of Narratives

Using a distinct set of tools (Chambon, 1994), narrative analysis addresses the overall construction of the text, and provides a mechanism for understanding relationships among terms.

Narrative Genre in the Aboriginal Document

This is a narrative of the historical liberation of a nation presenting three features: (1) a story of the liberation of a collective entity, (2) a historical narrative, and (3) a political subtext.

The key words: conquer/surrender/struggle/self-government are part of a narrative of liberation showing a development from autonomy to dependency, and its reversal towards regained autonomy.

An Ojibway Chief: "Englishman . . . you have not conquered us. We are not your slaves (p.5) . . . "The Aboriginal nations have not been defeated nor have they surrendered" (p.40).

The historical narrative opens with the “discovery” of the New World by the Europeans, demonstrating that the status of the Aboriginal people is that of a nation, whose position has not always been one of dependency:

In 1763, the reality was that the Aboriginal nations were sovereign nations; the British and the French acted accordingly (p.5) . . . For the first two and a half centuries, the relationship between the Aboriginal Nations of the New World and the European Nations was one of equality, respect, allegiances and enmities (p.ii).

History is used not only for the benefit of the non-Aboriginal audience, it also strengthens the collective memory and identity of the claimant group, as stated in the concluding section: “Aboriginal nations have not forgotten who they are nor where they come from” (p.145). Writings on native issues tend to follow this narrative mode, such as Timpson’s (1990) discussion of the Ontario’s Child Welfare Legislation, or Korsmo’s (1990) work on policy formation and the Alaska Natives.

The political subtext of the narrative is made apparent through the extensive use of political terms:
Throughout the Constitutional process, the Aboriginal nations were striving to gain admission to Canada through statesmanship. They were working to have their rights recognized by the Canadian body politic as a matter of principle and policy — a positive recognition (p.58).

It is the main frame of reference under which community and social service issues are subsumed.

**Narrative Themes and the Legitimation of Claims**


These lakes, these woods and mountains, were left to us by our ancestors. They are our inheritance; and we will part with them to no one (p.5).

As illustrated in the quotation, land is at the centre of a number of arguments: land as territory with accompanying rights, as legacy, “custodian of land”, source of livelihood (hunting and fishing rights, and Guaranteed Annual Income), nature and environment to be protected. The use of the term *surrender* in conjunction with nation (“we have not surrendered”) and land (“surrendered and unsurrendered lands”), stresses this powerful identification.

Another main narrative theme is the threat of destruction, resulting from: the physical destruction of Aboriginal persons through epidemic, raid, war, removal of means of subsistence; the destruction of natural resources; and community and cultural destruction due to assimilation. This genocidal theme shapes the discussion on Aboriginal children (their deculturation in boarding schools, their life-threatening conditions, their suicide rate and overrepresentation in the penal system, (pp. 32–34). Annihilation is blamed on intrusive policies:

... the most contentious aspect of the Indian Act was the sweeping power that it gave to administrators and to the federal government. The Indian Act extended the regulatory reach of the government into virtually every nook and cranny of Indian life (p. 62);

and the dislocation of group membership through federal regulations:
From its earliest versions, the Indian Act and its precursors have defined who the state considers to be an Indian... they have reflected the assumption common throughout most of Canada's history that one could not be both Indian and Canadian. The result of these attempts at definition has been the creation of different classes of Indigenous peoples (p67).

The narrative of group splintering into status and non-status Indians, with service eligibility restricted to the former (i.e., persons registered under the Indian Act), and institutional provisions of membership loss (living off reserves, and, until recently, marriage to a non-Indian), is followed by the actions taken by the Aboriginal people to reverse the statutes and affirm their self-ascribed identity.

A third narrative is a narrative of social disadvantage and marginalization:

As with any group that experiences prejudice and discrimination from the dominant society, Aboriginal workers are last hired, first fired (p.34).

This narrative compares housing conditions, employment, health, education, and mortality rates to those of the broader Canadian society. Aboriginal peoples are in a more precarious position in each of those categories:

Racism, low educational levels, the many hours of labour required to survive in underserviced communities, lack of employment skills and lack of employment services all contribute to unemployment levels of anywhere between 50 and 90% (p.46).

Social Service and Narrative

The last two chapters deal specifically with Social Assistance, introducing new terms and arguments: Indian people, cultural uniqueness and need for cultural sensitivity and flexibility in service provision, the opposition to the municipal model of self-management, and reiteration of the claim for self-government.

(1) Indian people are unique and want to preserve their different culture; (2) the reserves are the keystone to Indian culture; (3) community services must be adapted to meet Indian needs;
(4). need for additional resources to maintain communities; and 
(5) responsibility of Federal government (p.135).

Social service needs are described holistically:

Since people do tend to view their lives and their communities as 
a whole, it was not possible in the studies to isolate social services 
from the economy, from education etc. (p.135),

and recommendations are articulated with the political claims. 
The argument for culturally appropriate and sensitive service 
provision is coupled with community-control and political gov-
ernance, as described in the recommendation made by the tri-
partite social services review comprised of federal, provincial 
and Aboriginal organizations:

The corner-stone of the policy would be community-based, Band 
controlled, culturally appropriate and specific services (p. 140). 
Transfer of services or self-management is not Aboriginal 
government (p.114). To avoid the municipalization model, Aborig-
inal self-governments must have the authority to plan and man-
age programs as well as simply administer and account for them 
(p.153).

Marker Events and Protagonists

The central narrative events are the negotiations and treaties, 
policy decisions, struggles and agreement violations, the process 
and outcomes of intergroup relations centered on institution-
izing domination and liberation. The nature of the protag-
onists shifts with the historical periods and changing nature 
of group relations. The protagonists of the pre-confederation 
period are the Aboriginal and European Nations, British and 
French, whose relation of political and economic alliances is 
characterized by equality and respect. Following Canadian con-
federation (1867) an adversarial relation developed between the 
Aboriginal nations and organizations, and (a) a settler state/ 
nations, or settlers (applied also to the present); (b) specific lev-
els of government, i.e., the Department of Indian Affairs and 
Northern Territories; and (c) the dominant European culture.
External Referents, Texts, and Exemplary Actions

External references, decisive public policy texts and international references, bolster the narrative of liberation. Among the key political events and documents mentioned, the White Paper of 1969 and the Penner Commission of 1983 are discussed at length. They represent two opposing visions of intergroup relations (Weaver, 1981). The first undermines the special status of Aboriginal nations in the name of individual human rights, while the second recommends the entrenchment of uniqueness and Aboriginal self-government into the Constitution. Repudiated by native organizations, the first led to their mobilization. The second, widely supported though not implemented, is extensively quoted to support the arguments, underscoring the slow pace of change.2

The unexpected use of international references in a local policy document indicates the international strategy of the Aboriginal peoples (Ponting, 1990), and further underlines the text’s political agenda. It discusses South African apartheid and its origin in Canadian laws, the Black Power movement, international courts to which the Aboriginal nations have appealed for redress (e.g., in recent years, the Bertrand Russell and the Hague Tribunals, and the U.N.), and recent autonomy arrangements won by Aboriginal groups in Greenland and Nicaragua. Explicitly quoted, the latter documents are contrasted with the individual rights orientation of the 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

Narrative Genre in the Multicultural Document and Comparison

This text can hardly be thought of as a storied narrative. It does not have a historical or developmental dimension, but is about the current state of affairs. The document follows the narrative features of bureaucratic texts, and its discussion of social issues is organized around service arrangements and categories of benefits. Some chapters address universal social service concerns of the Canadian system, such as health, child care, education, social assistance, and employment; others focus
on immigrant and refugee needs, including sponsorship, settlement services, and E.S.L. This textual organization, constituted around administrative domains, is in sharp contrast to the previous document in which topics are intertwined holistically from a community standpoint.

This narrative genre is accompanied by its own rhetoric of legitimation. The multicultural narrative appeals to universal rights, not on historical priority grounds, but instead on apparently a-historical principles of equality, and above all, equity. Its legitimation rests on arguments of access and inclusion:

Multiculturalism is a goal, an ideal and an organizing principle. It is a vision of a society governed by equality of access, opportunity and participation in the social, political, cultural and economic life of the province (p.3).

Appeal is made for redressing imbalances and discrimination associated with the life conditions of minority groups. The intergroup claim is one of full participation to social services, and therefore access to "mainstream" services, and to the community as a whole. Barriers and obstacles faced by ethnic groups, such as ghettoization and vulnerability, are to be overcome to achieve full participation. Claims for women are described as the unmet needs of a particularly vulnerable subgroup. Universality and individualism are the subtext in the claims for equity and participation, in contrast to the Aboriginal document which emphasizes distinctiveness and the collective. The principle of universality does not exclude group specificity, but the combination is somewhat ambiguous.

A secondary narrative theme is that of cultural differences, based on two lines of argument: (a) a transitional claim of adjustment for newcomers, and (b) cultural uniqueness and distinctiveness.

Principles (printed in bold)

(1) We recognize the right of all Ontario residents to participate in the social, political and economic life of the province. (2) We recognize that all residents of Ontario have the right to equal access to the social services system. (3) We recognize the rights of immigrant, refugee and minority groups to special services in order to achieve equality (p.2).
The discussion of need reflects this duality of inclusion and specificity in each of the document's target problem areas:

For immigrant parents, therefore, as for all parents, child care is an essential need (p.39). . . . Immigrant families also have specific concerns and needs in relation to child care (p.40).

The dual claims are translated into a proposal for a two-tiered service structure, with access to mainstream services and availability of ethno-specific services. This strategy conciliates the two principles of distinctiveness and inclusion (cf. Jenkins, 1981), and is in sharp contrast with the Aboriginal document which emphasizes equality through distinctiveness. Recommendations are made that mainstream agencies adapt their mode of functioning to their diverse clientele, while urging the establishment of crosscultural and race-relations training. These linking strategies are consistent with the objective of lowering barriers and achieving inclusion. They are not as relevant to a group concerned with specificity and recognition. Such intergroup strategies (particularly training) are not mentioned in the Aboriginal text, nor are mainstream agencies asked to change. Instead, the appeal is that services for Natives be adjusted to Native needs and governed by Native communities.

Further ambiguity is found in the multicultural document's delineation of the target group's identity. We have already discussed the overlapping group identities of immigrant and minority, and their multiple subgroups. A number of statements further indicate difficulty in defining membership and group boundaries. The statement:

The population of Ontario contains a great diversity of ethnic and national origins: 40% of Ontario's population has origins other than British, French or aboriginal Canadian. Over 850,000 Ontarians speak a home language other than English or French, and 148,000 Ontarians speak neither official language (96,000 of these are women) (p.3)

is consistent with the focus of the document on the "secondary ethnic agenda" of non-English, non-French, non-Aboriginal groups. This can be contrasted with the much more inclusive statement:
It is a vision of an Ontario where all social groups — whether they be Native Peoples; Franco-Ontarians; the Black, Anglo-Saxon and German descendants of the United Empire Loyalists; descendants of later waves of immigration; or recent arrivals — will share equitably in the enjoyment of the diversity and wealth of the province (p.3).

The multicultural document does not articulate the range of ethnic agendas, and steers clear of specifying those connections. Moreover, the status of the target group and its contribution to the larger community is ambiguous. At times, the phrase all Ontario residents implies the inclusion of the multicultural group in the collective. At other times, it is used as an aspired community to which the multicultural communities do not fully belong. Such shifting usage of the term indicates an ambivalent relation which serves as the basis of the group's claims.

Events and Protagonists

There is no plot, as the narrative describes a state of affairs. A tentative protagonist structure can still be inferred. One side is represented by the vulnerable target groups with an overlapping set of characters (immigrant, minority, and women). Another side remains unnamed and can be thought of as Ontario residents, or the aspired-to community presenting obstacles to full participation — more specifically, mainstream agencies which need to become more responsive and accessible. Last is the implied institutional audience of the Social Assistance committee to which the text appeals.

External References and Subtext

References are made to external policy texts. The Charter of Rights and Freedoms, included in the current (1982) Canadian Constitution, is a major turning point of the social contract, in that it acknowledges cultural diversity and multiple constituencies as full constitutional players (Cairns, 1989). Reference is also made to subsequent multiculturalism implementation documents at the national and provincial levels, including the 1984 Equality Now report of the Canadian Parliament on race-relations. The Charter is concerned with protecting individual
rights within a civil society: its reference legitimates the multicultural document's subtext of universalism and individualism, with priority given to the social arena. The Charter also contains sections on cultural specificity and the retention of "cultural heritage". Our multicultural text thus closely follows the Charter's orientation, in contrast to its negative connotation in the Aboriginal document.

Discussion

Our initial question on the nature of ethnic relations as manifested in welfare reform, and the similarity or divergence of claims used to achieve access to resources, status enhancement, and social reorganization, can be answered as follows.

Similarities, Overlaps, Differences and Incompatibilities

A comparison of the main lexical and narrative features of the texts (see table 3) indicates that group identity is singular in the Aboriginal document, with secondary nested identities (Aboriginal people). It is plural in the multicultural document, encompassing immigrant and minority identities, to which the principles of multiculturalism and diversity serve as umbrella, without resolving their tensions or differences. Group relations are defined as relations among political entities or nations, in the first text, and as relations among social status groups, in the second. Although cultural identity is central in the latter, it is minimally mentioned in the former. Last, the Aboriginal statement rejects ethnicity as a self-concept.

At times, these two constituencies are opposed through their documents. Specifically, the Aboriginal document posits Aboriginal nations and settlers as conflicting groups, including, by implication, the recent immigrant constituency of the multicultural document:

Until now, 500 years later, the non-native inhabitants of the western hemisphere have difficulty remembering that Indians are not just another immigrant group (p.145). . . . Every campaign demanded that Canadians recognize the Aboriginal Nations as nations not as a uniquely disadvantaged sector of the Canadian society (pp. 89–91).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Lexical features</th>
<th>Narrative features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal Document</td>
<td>Aboriginal Nation</td>
<td>Historical/liberation narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colonization/Assimilation</td>
<td>Land/priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
<td>Political subtext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-government</td>
<td>Distinctiveness + Collective rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>Holistic community needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect vs. Despair</td>
<td>Penner Report vs. Charter Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural</td>
<td>Immigrant/Minority</td>
<td>Administrative a-historical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Participation/Access</td>
<td>Social subtext</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equality/equity</td>
<td>Inclusion + Individual rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discrimination</td>
<td>Categorization of service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural transition</td>
<td>Common &amp; specific services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compassion &amp; Sensitive</td>
<td>Crosscultural/Race relations training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&amp; Interorganizational linkage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Charter of Rights &amp; Freedoms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Group claims differ, as well. Mainly political in the Aboriginal document emphasizing distinctiveness and separation, they are social in the multicultural document which stresses participation within a pluralistic frame. The respective orientations of separateness and inclusion are similar to the distinctions found by Horowitz (1985). There is consistency here with the emotional vocabularies of the two documents, with the emphasis on the terms of recognition and respect in the Aboriginal text, and on compassion and sensitivity in the multicultural document.

Moreover, claims are formulated as collective rights in the Aboriginal document derived from a historical priority claim and equality among nations. They are stated as individual rights in the multicultural document drawing from a different source of legitimacy, that is, a universal individual claim to opportunity and equity.

Ethnic Group Discourse and Policy Implications

If social policies are to be responsive to a complex structure of ethnic relations, similarities and divergences in intergroup claims must be taken into account. Ethnic groups cannot automatically be included under a joint and unitary policy development, nor can variations in policy be thought of as adequate. A political orientation towards self-determination, together with a holistic understanding of community needs are essential for guiding policy solutions for Aboriginal groups. Solutions addressing primarily, though not exclusively, socioeconomic disadvantage and discrimination, and categorical access to services could better respond to the multicultural constituency. The plural group identity of immigrants and minorities discussed above and the consequent tension between the two require different handling in policy development and practice. It would follow that cultural uniqueness and service responsiveness would be shaped for the Aboriginal and the multicultural constituencies by each of these perspectives.

To illustrate further, the demand for respect stated in the Aboriginal document as an alternative to the current lack of respect, in its tangible and intangible forms (low status, exploitation, stereotyping and disregard), can also be perceived as part of the group's internal vocabulary and values. These
characterize the group’s relation to its members, the community, and Nature. This connotation can be taken as a proposition for its enhancement, recognition, or even adoption. Again, separate policies need to be considered.

On the other hand, a number of converging themes could be drawn upon to develop common policy directions: (a) disadvantage and deprivation, (b) marginalization, and (c) cultural uniqueness and the need for cultural responsiveness in service delivery. It is, however, important to recognize that the convergence is limited.

Conclusion

This study was limited to the "second ethnic agenda" of Canada and to a single province. The working documents drafted by two "ethnic" collectives showed distinct logics in group identity and claims, emotional stakes and intergroup relations, and demonstrated partial incompatibility of interests regarding social organization and resource distribution. It served to underscore the importance, in developing responsive policies, of paying attention to the specificity of group discourse, acknowledging historical circumstances, and issues of distinctiveness vs. participation, individual and collective rights, and institutional dispositions.

A further analysis of a larger number of documents would provide more detailed information as to the variations and tensions within and across groups. To further our understanding will require to: (a) increase the number of documents to be analyzed across human service fields and provinces; (b) broaden the ethnic focus to include the "first ethnic agenda"; (c) conduct a historical analysis of changing intergroup relations and policies; and (d) conduct international comparisons of intergroup relations.

The interpretive discourse analysis revealed the systemic discursive coherence of each document (between names, claims, and emotions), and consistency in the vocabulary, semantic organization, and narrative features of the texts. It is suggested that the mode of analysis employed in this study has an important place in policy research and development in the field of
ethnic group relations in diverse societies and in policy research generally.
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1. Although a number of developments have taken place since then, they do not modify the messages communicated in these texts.

2. An agreement was reached on August 20, 1992 by the ten provinces, two territories and Aboriginal leaders for a constitutional revision (the Charlottetown accord) which included the recognition of a third level of government to the Aboriginal peoples, reflecting asymmetric group claims. The overall proposal was rejected in a Canadian referendum on October 26, 1992.

3. This tension is reflected in the various policy documents published since 1982 which tend to either emphasize an ethnocultural agenda, or an ethnoracial agenda.

4. The difference in subtexts between the two documents results in part from the different processes of consultation and authoring of each text. However, the latter reflect the distinct orientations and intergroup strategies adopted by the two constituencies.
Ethnic and minority conflict seems to be an inherent part of social life. The study of specific ethnic and minority groups and their cultural backgrounds and coping mechanisms reflect the fact that people are very different as well as similar, that people live in very powerful competitive modern or traditional societies, and that group conflict and inequality is generally the social norm rather than the exception (Dahrendorf, 1969; Feagin and Feagin, 1979; Kitano, 1980; Weber, 1946; Peterson, et al, 1980; Myrdal, 1944).

Social workers deal primarily with inequities and personal problems of disadvantaged individuals and minority groups, often succeeding in removing or alleviating some of the pressures that clients face. Social work literature frequently describes practice techniques and interventions with populations negatively affected by such variables as race, ethnicity, minority status, sex group, marital status, color, physical disability, religion and nationality (Jacobs and Bowles, 1988; Schlesinger and Devore, 1991; Burgest, 1989; Norton, 1978; Chestang, 1976; Sottomayor, 1971; Glazer, 1975; Desai and Coelho, 1980). Social heterogeneity (in even seemingly homogeneous situations) and its effects on
interacting diverse populations has taken a relatively prominent place in social work theory, practice, policy and research. Special attention has been given to specific population groups such as Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, Blacks, Indians and specific categories of individuals such as immigrants, refugees, and people of color.

These activities reflect a greater contemporary sensitivity of social work to cultural diversity, and the introduction of sensitivity content into the social work education curriculum is a logical result, although based on earlier foundations (Cohen, 1958; Stein and Cloward, 1958; Pederson, 1976; Green, 1982; McGoldrich, et al, 1982; Lum, 1986).

Nevertheless, it is appropriate to ask about the purpose and outcome of this education, and the role of social work in affecting social change, diminished ethnic conflict, and alleviation of social forces which create social inequality for disadvantaged groups. Is there a relationship between sensitivity and social change? Does sensitivity change values and outcome? Does social work have a significant role for intervening in ethnic conflict and for social change? These are some of the questions discussed in this article.

The setting for this analysis is Israeli society, a Western, democratic, pluralistic enclave in the Middle East, where American, British and indigenous Israeli social work practices and principles combine to form eclectic theoretical and practice norms. Multiple ethnic groups in Israel, mass immigration, religious diversity, a dynamic Western politico-socio-economic environment, and a cohesive, committed and well-developed social work profession make Israel an ideal case-in-point for this analysis.

Ethnicity in Israel

Israel, the size of New Jersey, is a country of immigrants. Much has been written about the different "waves" of immigrants, their historical origins, the establishment of the social insurance and personal social services network, and clashes between various ethnic groups (Cohen, 1972; Inbar and Adler, 1977; Jaffe, 1975, 1977, 1982, 1988, 1992; Liebman and Don-Yehiya, 1984; Vital, 1978; Shumsky, 1955).
Ethnic relations in Israel can only be understood by a knowledge of the origins of the Jewish people, the history of Zionism and Palestine, the Ingathering of the Exiles, the Holocaust, the British Mandate period, and the creation of the State and its religious, social and economic institutions. Also important is the role and ideology of the dominant Israeli Western culture which "absorbed" masses of successive Jewish immigrant groups, including Jewish refugees from Arab lands, from Russia, former Iron Curtain countries, and from Ethiopia. Although it is impossible to deal with all of these subjects in this article, we can discuss specific current ethnic dilemmas and background factors which influence them and provide the environment for social work practice.

The two largest Jewish ethnic groups in Israel are the Ashkenazi (Western) and the Sepharadi (Middle-Eastern) populations. The latter group is referred to as the remnants of Jews dispersed in Exile throughout the Middle-Eastern, Arab lands as a result of the destruction of the First (Solomon's) Temple during the First Jewish Commonwealth Period by the Babylonians in 586 B.C.. The Ashkenazi group stems from those Jews who eventually returned to Israel from Babylonia, where they had been taken as captive slaves, and who rebuilt the Second Temple during the time of Ezra and Nechemia (the Second Jewish Commonwealth Period). Jews again were subsequently exiled to southern Europe by the Romans who destroyed the Second Temple in 70 A.D. These Jews then migrated all over Europe and then to North and South America. Most contemporary American Jews are descendants of European Jews who originated from the Roman conquest during the Second Temple period.

In the 1800's a group of pioneering European Jews came to Palestine to recreate a modern Jewish State and emancipate themselves from the antisemitism and racial and religious hatred of their inhospitable "host" countries. These Jews set up Western social, democratic, economic and educational institutions. After undergoing a metamorphosis from an agrarian communal society to a technological-industrial society during the 1930's and 1940's, they established the State of Israel when the British left Palestine in 1948. The 600,000 Western (Ashkenazi) Jews then "absorbed" 750,000 Jewish refugees (Sepharadim) from the Moslem countries between 1948 and 1956 when all the
neighbouring Arab states began a war to destroy the newborn State.

The Sepharadi population, with large extended families, deeply religious, and steeped in the fatalistic, pre-industrial culture of the Middle East, faced the intensive competition of the veteran population, which was comprised mostly of secular, nuclear family oriented, protectionist Ashkenazi founders of the State. The American melting-pot model (touted by Israeli sociologists at the time) was widely implemented and Sepharadi young people quickly adopted the Western secular model, and do so to this day (Glazer and Moynihan, 1963). Research conducted by this and other researchers shows clear preference among Sepharadim for Ashkenazi traits, often accompanied by feelings of inferiority and damaged self image (Jaffe, 1988, 1990; Avineri, 1973; Patai, 1970; Cohen, 1972). Intermarriage between the two groups is high, amounting to nearly twenty percent of all marriages annually (Smooha, 1978). The preference pattern began around age five, when Sepharadi four-year olds already showed ambivalence about their ethnic identification. Children of Western origin preferred to identify with Western people, and so, too, did a majority of children of Eastern background prefer Western adults (Jaffe, 1988).

Today, most Israelis, including social workers, prefer to play down, deny or reject evidence of ethnic identification and a need for increasing their own ethnic sensitivity. They point to great strides in closing socioeconomic and educational gaps, political involvement of Sepharadim in mainstream political parties, intermarriage, and a pluralistic society. Nevertheless; the Likud party lost the elections in 1992 primarily because of internal ethnic (Ashkenazi-Sepharadi) fighting and posturing, which turned off many potential voters. Western paternalism still exists, with clear objective socio-economic differences among ethnic groups. One manifestation of ethnic conflict was the appearance in 1972 of the Israeli “Black Panthers,” a social protest street corner movement originating in the slums of Jerusalem, created by Sepharadi street corner youth attempting to change their dead-end lives and enhance their life chances (Cohen, 1972; Jaffe, 1975; Iris and Shama, 1972). The movement was eventually neutralized by a combination of cooptation by government social
and educational services, and by politicization and in-fighting among the Panther leadership.

The Ashkenazi-Sepharadi conflict described above has apparently "cooled off" somewhat in recent years due to increased political participation of Sepharadi Jews, a slow but perceptive narrowing of objective socio-educational gaps, and increased second generation integration into the dominant Ashkenazi society.

The Russian Immigration

In late 1989, glasnost led to rapid disintegration and liberalization of the Soviet empire, and to a welcome mass immigration to Israel of Jews from Russia and the Eastern European former Iron-Curtain countries. Within two years, nearly 500,000 Soviet Jews immigrated to Israel. Over 60% of the adults are university graduates, and within a year they spoke Hebrew, entered government vocational retraining programs, organized their own immigrant associations, and vigorously began their own integration into Israeli society. Unlike those who arrived in 1948 as refugees from Iraq, Yemen, Morocco, and other Arab countries, the Russian immigrants were almost immediately attuned to the mixed-market economy and tempo of Israeli society. They began competing with veteran Ashkenazi and Sepharadi Jews alike. The citizen response to the Russians has generally been good, with many nonprofit organizations mobilized or formed especially to help them move into Israeli society. Russian immigrants have a strong ethnic affinity with many veteran Israelis, who themselves originated from Russia, Poland and Eastern Europe before, during and after the war. The Israeli government has provided immeasurably better conditions and benefits to these latest immigrants than was economically possible during the Sepharadi mass immigration of 1948–1956. This has led to some signs of resentment, especially among the veteran unemployed population. What took the Sepharadi Jews 40 years to obtain (e.g. professional positions, status, university education and housing) will happen for the Russians in less than one-third that time, and will probably surpass the Sepharadi mobility. Moreover, the Russian immigration has now created a clear
numerical majority for the Ashkenazi population, as opposed to the situation before the Russians arrived.

The Ethiopian Immigration

For many years, a population of Jews were believed to exist in Ethiopia (Kaplan, 1992). Theories about their origin suggest that they were one of the ten lost Israelite tribes, Jewish converts, descendants of King Solomon and the Queen of Sheba, or refugees from the destruction of the First Temple who fled south to Egypt and then up the Nile River into villages in the mountains of Ethiopia. Whatever the explanation, the Israel Chief Rabbinate recognized the Ethiopians as Jews because of many unmistakable ancient religious customs and rituals identical to Jewish ritual as mentioned in the Bible and existing at the time of the First Temple. Based on this recognition, the Israeli government made every effort to bring this group home to Israel. In 1977, nearly 7,000 Ethiopians arrived in a clandestine American-assisted airlift from neighboring Sudan — for those Jews who survived the long and dangerous trek out of Ethiopia (Ben-Ezer, 1985; Rosen 1991).

Further Israeli efforts continued, despite the Marxist-communist regime and civil war in Ethiopia, to rescue and bring out the rest of the Jewish community. Finally, in 1990, the cessation of Russian military and economic support and repeated losses inflicted by rebel forces, resulted in the Ethiopian government allowing (for a steep head-tax) the Israeli Air Force airlift to bring home 16,000 Ethiopian Jews within 24 hours. Today the Israeli Ethiopian community numbers nearly 40,000.

The integration of this community has been mixed thus far. There is general consensus that the younger Ethiopians are adjusting well in the educational system and in the Army, and want very much to enter the dominant society. The 1977 group has generally been accepted by most Israelis, but also experienced cultural, religious and economic problems that were still not settled when the 1990 immigrants arrived. Among these problems were the lack of rabbinical acceptance of Ethiopian Kessim (religious leaders) qualified to perform marriages and
divorce in Israel because the Ethiopians were totally cut off from Talmudic and Jewish Halachic (legal) developments and other Jewish communities after they fled Israel in 586 B.C. In 1977, the Israeli rabbinate, under pressure of prolonged Ethiopian mass demonstrations, was forced to retreat from their demand that all Ethiopian immigrants undergo “symbolic conversion” to unequivocally clear up their status as Jews (Ashkenazi and Weingrod, 1985; Bard, 1988; Abbink, 1984). Most Ethiopians adamantly refused and many are still in religious limbo as far as the State is concerned.

Other adjustment problems include classic culture clash between children and their immigrant parents and elders, in-fighting among the new leadership, problems of personal adjustment to Western culture such as secularism, technology, relations between the sexes, family roles, political activity, and self-image (Munitz, et al, 1985; Suellen, 1989; Dothan, 1985; Schoenberger, 1975; Kaplan, 1988; Wolf, 1969; Weil, 1988). Some of these problems are normative for all immigrant groups, but the Ethiopian situation is much more complicated because of the long historical, social, and religious separation from the rest of Jews in the world, and the intense desire to be accepted as modern Israeli Jews.

It is very important to note that the black skin color of Ethiopian Jews has not greatly affected their acceptance into Israeli society and some intermarriage has taken place with Ashkenazim and Sephardim. Unlike the situation of Blacks in America, who were brought from Africa as slave labor for white importers, the Black Jews of Ethiopia (as well as all other Jewish immigrants to Israel) are welcomed home along with the other dispersed exiled Jews from other countries. The fact of common historical and religious origins eliminates pretense at racist ideologies of genetic “inferiority,” “inherent ability” and hereditary “behavior traits.” Since most of the Jews went into exile as prisoners or slaves, there is or was among most Israelis an immediate, nostalgic kinship affinity for the Ethiopians, regardless of color differences. The same is generally true regarding Sepharadi-Ashkenazi Jews, despite Sephardim being generally of darker color. The Israeli case, where religious kinship works
to overcome conflict due to color differences is outstanding on the international scene, and a basic positive underlying feature of Israeli ethnic relations.

The Arab Population

While Jews constitute 84\% of the 5 million citizens of Israel, (excluding the Territories of Judea and Samaria), there are also 13\% Moslem and Christian Arabs and 3\% Druze and other religious groups such as Bahai, Karaites and Samaritans (Central Board of Statistics, 1992). By the year 2005 the population forecast for Israel is 6.3 million.

Most Israeli (and West Bank) Arabs claim to be descendants of the ancient Philistines and Canaanites, but some American Jewish scholars believe they originate from Bosnia which in ancient times was a Roman province called Illyricum, where Christianity was introduced in the Middle Ages. When Bosnia was invaded by Turkey in 1386, the entire population was forcefully converted to Islam. When Turkey lost Bosnia to Germany at the Congress of Berlin in 1878, the Ottoman-Turkish Empire that same year granted lands in Palestine to Moslem refugees from Bosnia and Herzegovina for colonization, including a twelve year tax exemption and exemption from military service in the Turkish army. Lands distributed were located in the Galilee, the Sharon Plain and Caesaria. Other Moslem refugees from Russia (Georgia, Crimea, and the Caucasus) were resettled in Abu Ghosh near Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights, while Moslem refugees from Algeria and Egypt were later settled in Jaffa, Gaza, Jericho and the Golan. Other Arab family clans migrated south to Palestine from Syria.

The different explanations of Arab origins clashes with the Jewish historical accounts of an uninterrupted 3,500 year Jewish presence (despite the exile). These conflicting claims affect contemporary Jewish-Arab relationships where both peoples now live together in the same land. After the War of Liberation in 1948, military rule was imposed on Israeli Arabs and was subsequently abolished in 1966 when Israeli fears of Arab dual loyalty were less tense. Nevertheless, only in 1992 was the government “Office for Arab Communities” eliminated. As a democratic,
pluralistic country, and as a result of Arab lobbying, all gov-
ernment Ministries now deal directly with Arab citizens as they
do with everyone else. Also, the present Labor government has
committed itself to further equalizing the level of services to
Arabs and other minorities to that existing for Jewish citizens.

Operational Definitions of Concepts

The concepts of "ethnicity" and "ethnic groups" in social
work literature are used in several contexts. Ethnic groups have
at least one of three possible distinctions:

1. peoples distinguished primarily by visible physical criteria
   (e.g. racial groups such as Blacks or Orientals);
2. peoples distinguished by common cultural heritage, lan-
   guage, religion or national setting (e.g. Arabs, Jews, Italians);
3. peoples distinguished by conquest (e.g. Blacks, Mexican
   Americans, Indians).

In many cases, these physical, cultural, political and social
conditions may be combined in a particular group, but any sin-
gle criteria may define "minority" status within a larger popu-
lation (Bengston, 1979).

It is important to clarify that this article refers to Jews as well
as Arabs and all other Israeli groups as cultures, and not as a
race. These groups have formed as an outcome of social, histor-
ical and religious experience, rather than genetic and biological
mutation transmitted through germ plasm.

In Israel there are innumerable cultural and ethnic sub-
groups within the Ashkenazi, Sepharadi, Ethiopian, Russian
and Arab groups, based on one or more of the common-de-
nominator criteria noted above. For example, broad religious
groupings include Orthodox, Conservative and Reform. Each
of these are subdivided, especially in the Orthodox camp, into
hundreds of sub-groups based on such variables as common
country of origin and district of origin, identification with a rab-
binical dynasty, degree of orthodoxy, historical and ideological
affinity, language prior to migration, etc; (Jaffe, 1992).

All societies are socially stratified, and ethnic differentiation
is an inherent reflection of the inequality in the distribution of
power, privilege and prestige in such societies. C. Wright Mills (1963) summarized typologies to describe features of stratification as follows:

1. The economic order is of primary importance in determining social position, inequality, and the mechanisms of stratification.
2. Group consciousness emerges among persons in a similar stratum, and may be an important dynamic for social change.
3. Conflict and competition are inevitable between strata.
4. Ideologies and beliefs of individuals are a reflection of the individual's position in the stratification system.
5. Life histories and life chances from birth to death are shaped by position in the class structure.

In caste societies, unlike Israel, ethnic groups are locked into ascriptive forms of stratification and inequality, with no mobility allowed. Current theory, also applicable to the Israeli situation, tends to focus on a multiple hierarchy model of stratification in which class, ethnicity, sex, age and other variables are considered separate but interrelated aspects of social inequality (Bengston, 1979). The "double jeopardy hypothesis" suggests that membership in more than one of these groups increases the degree and effects of inequality (Dowd and Bengston, 1978). The Israeli situation corroborates this theory as can be seen in the hierarchical ordering of ethnic groups described below.

The Israeli Ethnic Pyramid

A stratified pyramid of ethnic groups based on status, income and opportunity structure exists in Israel with the Ashkenazi veteran group on top, Sepharadi Jews next, followed by Russians, Arabs and Ethiopians. Ten years hence the Russians, Arabs and Ethiopians will most likely blend into the Ashkenazi group at the top with more Ethiopians moving ahead of the Arab population (Haidar, 1991).

This appraisal is based on objective and subjective criteria, the former indicated by income, political influence, education, ownership of goods and property, size of family, and personal well-being, and the latter by perceived ability or mobility to
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achieve expectations, and a sense of alienation and discrimination (Peres, 1977; Hassin, 1985, 1992; Amir and Shichor, 1975; Peres and Smooha, 1974; Zipperstein and Jaffe, 1981). Ethnic status, in Israel as in most countries, correlates highly with social disadvantage. For some groups ethnicity has helped perpetuate disadvantage and lack of opportunity, for others the opposite is true.

In addition to the stratification typology presented above, other theories have been applied to explain the status of Israeli ethnic groups, and especially the disproportionate distribution of minority ethnic youth as juvenile delinquents. Prominent theories are the "culture conflict theory" based on immigration maladjustment (Sellin, 1938), the "ecological-influence and socialization theory" (Shaw and McKay, 1942; Cohen, 1955) based on the influence of reference groups and neighborhoods on behavior, and the "technology-innovation versus retarded social change theory" (Ogburn, 1950) which ascribes social problems and inequality to the slow pace at which social programs are introduced to alleviate the detrimental societal effects of new technology.

All of these theories have differential relevance for explaining inequality in Israel and for describing ethnic groups and sub-cultures. For the most part, however, Jewish social cohesiveness is relatively prominent in Israel due to a strong basic common historical and cultural heritage, including the Holocaust experience, modern antisemitism, and physical danger from neighbouring countries. Arabs, too, are generally united in a common culture and Pan-Arab identification based on strong religious and nationalist foundations. Kinship and national feelings are very strong in both groups, but most Israelis and Arabs have learned to live together in a democratic, relatively pluralistic Israeli national framework. Terrorism by PLO and intifada violence from the Territories has worked against improved relations between Arabs and Jews in Israel proper, despite much mutual outreach effort by members of both groups.

Both the Arab and Ethiopian groups have a longer road to travel than other groups toward equality, the Ethiopians because of their late start in Western culture and the Israeli Arabs because of the late opening to them of the opportunity structure.
Both will continue to experience strong competition from the dominant and more powerful Ashkenazi and Sepharadi groups. There will even be some resentment. But the basic democratic direction and nature of the society and its institutions will continue to enable more mobility for these groups.

Social Work Attitudes and Stereotypes

The social work profession is committed at individual, group and societal levels to work for change in order to equalize power, close social gaps, preserve individual dignity, eliminate negative discrimination, and enable maximum participation of all individuals in the life of their society. The professional ethos suggests that social workers represent a humanistic force in society and are capable and willing to be agents for change in clinical practice and social policy.

Yet, Israeli research has shown that these goals are not axiomatic or attainable for many social workers. In fact, despite years of experience in Israel with mass immigration, many social workers are still "culturally encapsulated," willing to engage clients only on their terms (Penderhughes, 1989) or tend to adopt stereotypic explanations for behavior and prescriptions for treatment (Solomon, 1976). Keadar (1978) found that Israeli social workers, when presented with identical fabricated case material, responded with different diagnoses and intervention strategies when the material was attributed to an Ashkenazi or Sepharadi client respectively. They diagnosed the Sepharadi client's problems as environmental and deprivation related, while the Ashkenazi client was thought to have serious interpersonal, psychic problems. Consequently, intervention recommendations for the Sepharadi client involved environmental manipulation and material assistance, while the Ashkenazi client needed long term therapy and work on interpersonal relationships, and personality problems. Keadar also found that these stereotypes were the same regardless of the ethnic background of the social worker.

Almost identical findings were obtained twelve years later in a similar study of social work students at the Hebrew University (Wahab-Gilboa, et al, 1990). Ziv and Givoli (1986) found
that Israeli rehabilitation counselors tend to focus on individual clients without proper attention to ethnic and demographic background factors. Programmatic research by Jaffe (1990, 1990a) found that Sepharadi respondents from all ages and sectors of the Israeli population, including welfare clients, prefer Ashkenazi social work helpers significantly more than they prefer Sepharadi social workers. He also found that social workers overwhelmingly preferred Ashkenazi helpers for their own problems rather than Sepharadi helpers. Since his studies were based solely on respondent's preferences for random passport photos said to be social workers, Jaffe concluded that social workers (and all other respondents) rejected Sepharadi photos purely because of their ethnic stereotypes. It is worthwhile also to note that Ashkenazi respondents significantly preferred Ashkenazi women social work helpers. Moreover, both Ashkenazi and Sepharadi respondents described Ashkenazi social workers (based on passport pictures alone) as "intelligent, worldly, informed, and of good personality," while Sepharadi social workers were characterized as "good looking, strong, and neat" (Jaffe, 1990).

In brief, Israeli research shows strong ethnic stereotyping among clients and social workers alike, and they clearly influence differential diagnosis and intervention. This data becomes more urgent in the view of the fact that Israelis, including social work practitioners and students, tend to deny the existence of stereotypes. Even members of ethnic minorities are often reluctant to talk openly and frankly about this subject. While pluralism is the current official approach to absorption, empirical data of behavior show strong emphasis on the earlier assimilation-absorption-modernization model in Israel. Jaffe (1990) suggested that this approach often leads to internalized feelings of negative self-concept and feelings of inferiority.

Very few social work research studies have documented the actual effects of ethnic insensitivity on Israeli social work practice (Greenwald, 1992). However, this has been studied by Israeli education researchers who documented negative effects of stereotype-based discrimination in public schools. Ironically, no serious institutional or personal changes have occurred in the educational system to remedy the situation. Teachers still relate
to children with their own personal attitudes, stereotypes and values. Will this be the fate of social workers, even after "sensitization" from research findings and curriculum change? In the final analysis, when worker meets client, how much influence do personal values and stereotypes have over curriculum content? How can theory and information change values? These are vital questions for social work educators and practitioners in the post-melting pot era.

Changes in Social Worker Attitudes and Values

Real change in practice requires changes in values. Many social workers in Israel still believe that ethnic conflict and inequality will go away over the years as a result of intermarriage, better education, and Westernization of the disadvantaged. But this will not take place unless there is a change in existing values. For example, in 1978, when only ten percent of the students admitted to social work courses at Israeli universities were disadvantaged Sepharadim and Arabs, it was believed that they were simply not capable of studying and practicing social work. Subsequently, a seven year research study on preferential admissions proved this hypothesis false, but there was still reluctance to liberalize admission procedures (Jaffe, 1989). In my view, social work today may have more theory and knowledge about ethnic and minority issues and social conflict than it is willing or able to act on. While applauding the lobbying role of state and national social work organizations such as the National Association of Social Workers in the U.S. and the Israeli Social Work Association, these are limited due to relatively small membership of the organizations and because of the diverse socio-political values of their membership.

Social workers do not come to the profession free of individual, family, and reference-group stereotypes and values. Research done by Bar-Gal (1978, 1981) found that most social work students already came to University schools of social work with humanist values and a desire to help people, rather than absorbing these from the curriculum. Bar-Gal found that social work study had only a slight impact on prior values. He also noted that these values stem from students' personal, economic,
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 ethnic, and social background and from life experiences. The implication from Bar-Gal's research is that there is no homogeneous social ethic or consensus among social workers regarding major social, ethnic and minority issues. This unclarity of attitudes and lack of consensus does not allow for social work to speak with one voice or to operationalize its desire for playing a significant role in social change.

Perhaps this conclusion is too presumptuous. From my experience of three decades as social work educator, social activist and organizer, I believe that social change occurs most decisively and rapidly when marginalized minorities who are hurting activate themselves and create coalitions that force majority interests to solve minority problems. Social workers, who chose to help people as a profession, can never attain the power of organized minority groups. They can be coalition partners, but they cannot walk around in clients' shoes. This is how change has occurred for the Sepharadi, Ethiopian and Russian immigrants, Arabs, battered women, large families, the handicapped and many other minority groups (Kahn, 1990; Jaffe, 1983). It is also true for the problems of African-Americans, Hispanics and other groups in America.

The suggestion to be more realistic about social work's capacity to affect social change means, however, that social workers should excel at being "social warners," formulators of policy recommendations for the political echelon, engage in advocacy, and assist disadvantaged groups to mobilize their own resources and power (Korazin, 1989; Cox, et al, 1970; Grosser, 1976; Schneiderman, 1965). It also means that non-ethnic-sensitive practice is inconceivable in contemporary social work. Shirley Jenkins made this abundantly clear in her pioneer research on ethnic factors and practices in American and other international social services (Jenkins, 1981).

Schools of social work can play a major role in attempting to inculcate values, empathy and sensitivity to minority values (Schlesinger and Devore, 1991; Williams, 1988). Three specific vehicles are the following: careful selection and utilization of field work settings and experiences, faculty and supervisors as role models, and provision of factual information and knowledge in the social work curriculum. Schools of social work in
Israel have also become keenly aware of the impact of a heterogeneous student body on attitudinal changes, and as catalyst for generating serious dialogue among the students in and out of classes. Another important challenge for social work educators is to develop skills and knowledge that can be integrated into the curriculum specifically enabling some students to become professional change agents. These practitioners should be educated to mobilize marginalized minorities create coalitions that force majority interests to accommodate minority values.

Social Work Practice with Ethnic and Minority Groups

In recent years, the influx of over half a million Russian and Ethiopian immigrants has created a strong need and interest among Israeli social workers to understand the cultures and social background of these new clients. Hundreds of social work jobs were created by government and nonprofit agencies specifically to work with these communities and ease their integration into the country. The State of Israel several decades ago created a special Ministry of Absorption (a Cabinet position) with funding for hundreds of programs and social workers devoted to providing social services to immigrant individuals, families and groups. These include personal counseling, financial and concrete assistance, brokerage, therapeutic services and networking with the Housing, Education, Welfare, and Health Ministries. Social workers are also employed in a wide range of nonprofit organizations such as youth villages of the Youth Aliyah organization, which care for over 8,000 children, the Tikva organization which provides psychiatric social work services, the Israel Interest-Free Loan Association, and hundreds of other organizations and programs.

Major professional national conferences have been convened on social work with minority communities yielding a fruitful exchange of information, research knowledge and practice skills and approaches with different cultural groups. This has greatly influenced practice and sensitivity to methods and components of service delivery on a wide variety of specific topics such as marital therapy with Ethiopian immigrants (Ki-Tov and Ben-David, 1993), adjustment difficulties of adolescent immigrants from the former U.S.S.R. (Shraga and Slonim-Nevo, 1993), social
work intervention with religious families (Schindler, 1987), affective responses to cultural changes (Banai, 1988), work with Holocaust survivors (Graaf, 1975) and others. Inventories of innovative services for children and other groups have been published (Tadmor, 1990) and prestigious prizes are offered annually to professionals and volunteers working with immigrants and other minority groups in distress.

A popular Israeli vehicle for working with families in extreme distress involves teams of social workers consisting of the family's social worker from the local welfare office (acting as case manager), a qualified family therapist, school psychologist, and other professionals. Interventions focus on child, couple and parent systems, boundaries, communication, and relationships with community institutions — all within a framework of focused short-term interventions (Sharlin and Shamai, 1991). Interdisciplinary cooperation and brokerage activity are seen as vital to successful work with families which usually experience a multiplicity of problems. This is even mandatory regarding cases involving child placement in Israel. It has been found that interdisciplinary practice brings extensive input and knowledge regarding cultural practices and norms that may affect intervention planning and outcome.

Social Work in Fragmented Society

In the age of "the disuniting of America" (and Asia and Europe) where the mainstream, dominant society is giving ground to the celebration of ethnicity, the social work profession must find ways to help mediate cultural and interpersonal conflict (Jacobs and Bowles, 1988; Burgest, 1983). In Israel, this means primarily cessation of denial of ethnic culture differences and gaps between ethnic groups. Ethnicity must stop being a non-subject, ethnic pride should be revived as it was before immigration to Israel, and closer examination of social workers' practice performance, sensitivity and information about cultural groups must be undertaken. These goals are important for Israeli society, where the secular and religious, veterans and immigrants, Westerners and Easterners, Jews and Arabs need to improve communication and common effort to achieve their goals.
Both American and Israeli ethnic dynamics show that mobility among the disadvantaged is no longer homogeneous but rather heterogeneous, that poverty is multi-ethnic and thus lends itself to universal, government policy changes and that the dominant culture is more amenable to genuine ethnic pluralism and sharing than previously. These are positive indicators for social change which must be nurtured by everyone concerned (Kilson and Bond, 1992). Another positive factor, in my view, is the increasing role that nonprofit, third sector organizations can play in Israel, America and other Western countries, in mediating social conflict and promoting dialogue and indigenous interventions to defuse social problems. Social work professionals may be able to learn from this model and play a larger role with nonprofit organizations (Wuthnow, 1991; Powell, 1986).

The discussion of ethnic and minority relations and treatment has moved far beyond issues of ethnic “sensitivity and information.” As international and local communities undergo rapid and often violent change due to political, demographic, religious and economic changes, the subject is now of crucial global importance for many nations and peoples. The migration of millions of displaced people to Western countries with high unemployment rates, following the breakup of the U.S.S.R., has led to rekindled ethnic, xenophobic nationalism rooted in unresolved historical conflicts. These present complicated problems for many groups and individuals and major challenges to the social work profession and the world community. Knowing how to understand and work with diverse populations and situations of ethnic and minority conflict may become one of the most important tasks of the twenty-first century.
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Responses to Aging in Great Britain: The Black Experience

WYNETTA DEVORE
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Ethnic minority persons who migrated to Britain from the Caribbean and Asia in response to the call for workers are now elderly. British social workers have not responded well to their needs. This article examines recent progress in social work education and practice in West Yorkshire. It examines research related to elderly needs conducted by the Kirklees Metropolitan Council. Also examined are anti-racist, ethnic-sensitive education and practice models developed by faculty and practitioners.

Arriving in Britain

In the era following the second world war, the British economy, short of labor, looked to former colonies for able-bodied persons who were willing to come to England, the Motherland, for employment. Early in 1948 young immigrant males from Jamaica found employment in foundries, on the railways, as farm workers, clerical workers in the Post Office, in coach building and plumbing (Fryer 1984).

In the years that followed, more young West Indians went to Britain. Many from Barbados, Trinidad, and Jamaica were recruited by London Transport. West Indian nurses were invited, as were skilled workers for the hotel and restaurant industries (Fryer 1984).

At the same time, rural workers from India and Pakistan accepted the invitation to come for employment. This group, and others, was influenced by the “push-pull” phenomenon that often accompanies immigration. The push, unemployment in India and in the British West Indies; the pull, the promise of employment in Britain. Young men and women left their homes to escape high unemployment, low wages, and chronic lack of opportunity (Fryer 1984).
Blakemore (1985) explained that the Caribbean and Asian response to the labor shortage in the 1940s, 1950s, and early 60s would increase Britain's population of minority elderly quite rapidly during the 1980s and 1990s. Indeed these young workers did mature and now form a cohort of ethnic minority elderly in Britain. It is anticipated that by the year 2000 there will be approximately 300,000 minority elders in the United Kingdom as a whole (Victor 1987, Mays 1983). These were not the first nonwhite persons to arrive in England.

Historical Perspectives

Despite the generally accepted view that the multicultural history of England began with the building of the British Empire, Fryer (1984) suggests that Africans were in Britain even before the English came. As soldiers in the Roman imperial army, they occupied the south of England for at least three and a half centuries. Various accounts give evidence of a Black presence in the Courts of the Monarchy as entertainers, musicians, dancers and servants. They were also to be found serving in the homes of titled and propertied families.

Although it was entertaining to have Blacks at Court, Queen Elizabeth hardly approved. In July 1596, noting a concern for the increase in this population, she declared that there are "ti manie" infidel Blackmoores in the country, taking food from the mouths of her subjects. It was her pleasure "that those kind of people should be expelled from the land. (p. 11) Thus the tone for the future, indeed the present, was set.

More recent history is of concern here. We are more familiar with the glory and demise of the British Empire. Fact and fiction have presented a dismal picture of relationships between conqueror and the conquered on several continents. Wars in this century changed the population of England as Black members of the Empire came to the Island to live filling non-skilled positions necessary for the support of the general population.

Not surprisingly, the experience of those people who came from the Caribbean, India, and Pakistan and elsewhere were negative. Many came with great hope, encouraged by the British Nationality Act of 1948 which confirmed the rights of citizens
of the United Kingdom to enter Britain freely. The Victory of World War II and the establishment of the welfare state had produced a sense of optimism and confidence in the ability of the British system to solve social problems and to open its doors to members of British Commonwealth countries.

The migration was such that by the mid-1970's a significant number of Blacks had been born in Britain. Earlier generations of their families had not been welcomed as the racism of the sixteenth century was compounded by twentieth century economic fears. Racism was denied. Rather, as was the case in the Elizabethan era, overpopulation was presented as the dominant issue. "...the fewer Black people there were in this country the better it would be for 'race relations'" (Fryer, 1984, p. 381).

The optimism of the post World War II period was slowly replaced as more restrictive immigration legislation was passed. The Immigration Control Act of 1961, was intended to restrict immigration of Blacks but was couched in terms of workforce needs and began to depict commonwealth people as aliens. At the same time anti-discrimination legislation, the Race Relations Act of 1968 was passed. Some viewed this as a curious effort to justify limitation of immigration by suggesting that this legislation would help Blacks already there.

According to this act, discrimination on the basis of color, race or ethnic or national origins is unlawful in areas of employment, housing, granting of credit and insurance. Funds were to be made available to local authorities to assist voluntary organizations in providing service to enhance equality of opportunity. At the same time, legislation analogous to what has been termed affirmative action in the United States began to be passed. Making estimates on the basis of diverse information available suggests that by the mid 1980's approximately 4 percent of the population was considered Black. Of that number, substantial segments are concentrated in urban centers such as London and in specific segments of that and other cities. So much so, that in some sections such as London’s Hackney half of the clients of the Department of Social Services are Black.

It is hardly surprising that those termed Blacks in the British system are disadvantaged in respect to education, income, and equality of access to social services. Interviews carried out by
the author in 1989 with leading social work educators and practitioners suggested that British Blacks were dealing with a post colonial phenomenon, where need for increasing power is among the main issues.

Few professionals interviewed disagreed with the view that racism is all pervasive. Many presented a common theme that challenged the British myth that it is a white, unicultural society.

Invisible Generation

Scant attention has been paid to this minority population as it moved into old age. Indeed, the aged in general have not fared well in British social work and other social science areas. The first suggestion that social workers might take a look at practice with the elderly came from the British Association of Social Workers in 1973. However, it was not until 1977 that a working party published "Guidelines for Social Work with the Elderly" in an issue of Social Work Today (BASW 1977).

The very detailed work defined the elderly and work with them. Essential areas of knowledge were identified, as well as the values, attitudes, and skills that would support practice. Special attention was paid to practice in a variety of settings, including home, residential, and hospital care.

Appendices focused on aspects of physiological aging and statutory provisions for the elderly. At no place does this document call to the attention of the social worker the influence that race and/or ethnicity, the migration experience, or social class may have on the aging process.

Our concern here is with ethnic minority elderly, so it is important to note that this significant practice document failed to take into account the various aging experiences in the United Kingdom. This neglect is evidence of a narrow view of practice based on apparent assumptions that the aging process is universal. The reality overlooked was the experience of aging in Scotland was different than the experience in Wales or England, and the minority experience would be different for each group in each country.

In 1978, a year later, Bosanquet painted a portrait of old age that showed the economic condition of elderly. Although the
data presented spoke to income and spending habits of pensioners, again no attention was paid to the variation in well-being that could be related to membership in majority or minority ethnic groups.

By the 1980s greater attention was being paid to the experiences of the elderly in general, and minority elderly in particular. Thomson (1984) considered social welfare responses in that time period and noted the decline in the value of pensions for the elderly, concluding that benefits were not as valuable as allowance distributed under the nineteenth century Poor Law. As the British society grew richer it was more willing to use its increased wealth to increase the relative position of the elderly. The claim was that in the late twentieth century Britain was over-burdened with elderly dependents and therefore unable to be as generous as it would like. Although not identified, among this population were members of ethnic minority groups.

The household structure of the elderly population was examined by Dale, Evandrou and Arber (1987). Their examination revealed a fall in the proportion of the elderly who were living with others as well as the fall in the age of marriage, suggesting that young people were leaving home to marry at an earlier age. The work also found that the vast majority of single elderly living alone were women. In each instance, the conclusions would have been greatly enriched if consideration had been given to the influence of ethnicity in family lifestyle and structure, particularly as it related to Caribbean and Asian and families.

In 1981 the ethnic minority population was but 87,117, less than one per cent of the elder population. Not only were these persons largely ignored in the literature but by service providers as well (Boneham 1989). Although there had been an increased emphases on community care and services it appeared that racism and ageism slowed progress. In addition these were issues related to integration or segregation, the appropriate role of the family, and the roles to be assumed by voluntary or state agencies.

The paucity of work related to the minority elderly led practitioners and others to examine the work of gerontologists in the United States (Boneham 1989). A comparison of inequalities in old age between Britain and the United States emphasized
the lack of research in Britain. However, Blakemore (1985) con-
cluded that with the evidence at hand Britain’s population of
Asians and West Indian aging suffered from depressed incomes
in retirement because of problems related to pension contri-
butions during their work years. He also noted that assump-
tions and myths about family support placed Asian elderly in a
vulnerable position, leaving them in double jeopardy, old and
lonely.

Mays (1983) conducted a review of the literature related to
members of ethnic minority groups in Britain. The first study
identified, a qualitative study, was conducted among West Indi-
ans in Leicester; the second, conducted in Birmingham, included
Asian, Afro-Caribbean, and white elderly; the third, a survey of
elderly and late-middle-aged West Indians, was conducted in
Nottingham. In his conclusions Mays identified two contrast-
ning assumption about elderly Asians in Britain, the first, that
the culture and lifestyle of Asian families will continue to sup-
port the elderly without the need for social services. The second
assumption is that migration will erode traditional practices and
values supportive of the elderly.

Mays’s review was of research conducted during the 1970s.
More recent work by Sammy Chiu (1989) provides a more cur-
rent portrait of the elderly and their families. He suggests that
the move from an agrarian life in China to a cosmopolitan life
in London changed the role of the elderly, who have the knowl-
dge needed for success in farming. As they age in the city they
often have need for formal and informal health care. They have
little knowledge of available services and many would be re-
luctant to receive services because “they didn’t understand us.”

The most important source of assistance for this group of
elderly Chinese was their family. The question to be considered
is, whether the family is able to care for them. While families
may provide most of the care needed, constraints must be rec-
ognized. Economic needs of families call for sons and daughters
to work long hours. They are not available to provide the care.
Those who were early migrants have had time to establish rel-
ationships with their grandchildren, and language is less likely
to be a problem. More recent immigrants have had little time to
develop relationships with adolescents who speak English and
very little Chinese. Chiu’s (1989) work begin to question old as-
sumptions about ethnic dispositions in the Chinese family. This work advances practice considerations far beyond the BASW statement in 1977, which rendered minority elderly invisible.

The Current State of the Art

Paper 30

The most significant impact on practice in relation to attention to ethnic minority groups in Britain was CCETSW (Central Council for Education and Training in Social Work) Paper 30 (1989). This document set forth the requirements and regulations for the Diploma in Social Work (DipSW).

This Paper identifies the areas of knowledge, values, skills, and measures of competence expected of a qualified social worker. The significant difference is the call for attention to be paid to many areas of diversity in relation to the essential knowledge base, values for practice, and the skills needed for competence. Expected knowledge includes “an understanding of the range of human needs, especially those of vulnerable, disadvantaged, and stigmatized groups” and “transcultural factors which affect clients’ needs and social work practice” (p. 14).

Qualified workers are expected to be able to develop an awareness of structural oppression related to race, class, and gender; understand and counteract the impact of stigma and discrimination on grounds of poverty, age, disability, and sectarianism and recognize the need for and seek to promote policies and practices which are non-discriminatory and anti-oppressive (p. 16). Most certainly, then, the practitioner is expected to be able to practice with sensitivity with ethnic minority individuals, families, and communities. A declaration of the need for ethnic sensitivity gives no assurance that practice will change significantly in the immediate future. Change in attitudes and practice responses comes slowly, although progress is evident in social work education as students learn from experiences in ethnic differences and sensitive practice responses.


Prompted by the lack of current research related to the needs of Black elderly, the Race Equality Unit of Kirklees Metropolitan Council instituted a study of the experiences of the Black
elderly in this West Yorkshire community. Rather than pursuing the practice of making people fit into the services provided the survey provided information related to the needs of the Black elderly. The expectation was that the goal of ethnic sensitive practice might be accomplished.

The Black community of Kirklees consists primarily of Indian and Pakistani Muslims, India Sikhs, and Afro-Caribbeans. The elderly respondents in this survey were born in India, Pakistan, and the Caribbean having arrived in the United Kingdom between 1955 and 1969. They had not expected to spend the rest of their lives there but at this time in their lives they expect to spend the rest of their lives in the United Kingdom. This response is similar to Mays' (1983) findings in relation to the expectations and experiences of South Asians in Britain.

Health is a major issue for aging persons across ethnic groups. This group of Black elderly had physicians that were available to assist with health concerns. In addition they could count on family and/or neighbors to assist when necessary. Primary complaints were poor eyesight, arthritis, and difficulty with walking. At the same time many reported that they were able to help someone else with their daily tasks. In instances of their own needs 45% could count on family members help with using the stairs, shopping, or washing and ironing. However 12% stated that no one helped them out.

Using national representative data from the general household survey for 1980, Dale, Evandrou and Arber (1987) discovered a fall in the proportion of elderly living with others. The more recent Kirklees study found that 70% in the elderly Black population lived with others, with between two and fourteen persons in the household. Support systems in the community were strong, with 82% of the respondents stating that they had close friends who lived in the vicinity.

These findings in relation to awareness, understanding and potential use of services were similar to the finding of others (Mays 1983, Atkin, Cameron, Badger and Evers 1989, Chiu 1989). Seventy six percent of those interviewed were not able to tell the interviewer what services were provided for the elderly by the Council's Social Service Department. These services included social work, equipment and home appliances, home
care, day care, residential care and meals on wheels. Only 8.5% received services, and of these, 5% received services from social workers. However, when services were described, 50% thought that the services might be useful.

Language continues to be a barrier to the delivery of services. The survey was conducted in English, Gujarati, Punjabi, and Urdu. A majority of respondents could read and write in their mother tongue, however they could not read English as a second language. They felt that it would be useful to have information from social service, printed in languages other than English.

Recommendations to the Council based on the findings of this survey should move social service delivery in a direction that is more ethnic sensitive to the ethnic reality of this population. The list of recommendations is quite comprehensive. Some of the more significant listed here ask that:

- the report and future reports be available in ALL community languages;
- information related to personal services (forms, signposts, leaflets) be printed in ALL community languages;
- training for professional staff, especially those having regular contact with the public become available. The training to include; community languages, the use of interpreters, ethnically sensitive practice, eliminating racism, ethnic monitoring and record keeping;
- personal service continue to provide ethnically sensitive service and develop such environments in elderly people's homes, day care, home service and social work provisions;
- the attention of ALL Executive directors and Heads of Services be drawn to this reports and it's recommendations and their pertinence to their own service provisions.

Change in the delivery of service will require that these and other recommendations become agency policy. Indications are that the Black population of elderly will grow in Kirklees as it will in all of the United Kingdom.
The Northern Curriculum Project

The Kirklees Council social service delivery system may look to the "Northern Curriculum Development Project on Anti-Racist Social Work Education" as they attempt to implement the recommendations made following their survey. This project helps educators and practitioners move toward the development of anti-racist practice and education. Organized by CCETSW, the project represents a commitment to provide support for classroom and practice teachers as they work with students toward education and practice that is anti-racist and ethnic sensitive. Competencies developed by students help them to fulfill the requirements for the Diploma in Social Work set forth in Paper 30.

Improving Practice with Elders

One of the six training packs produced by the project was devoted to *Improving Practice with Elders* (Ahmad-Aziz, Froggatt, Richardson, Whittaker and Leung 1992). This group was multi-ethnic and diverse in age, gender and social work experience, as were others in the project. Experience was gained in direct practice, community work and management, and as lecturers in college social work training programs.

The authors aim to educate and train for "anti-racist practice" with the elders by looking at specific areas of learning, with a view toward helping people working in social organizations develop areas of competence presented in CCETSW Paper 30 (p. 11).

Training is centered on 1) the legal framework for social work involvement with Black elders; 2) the organizational context which provides the structures, policies and procedures within which social work is practiced and services are provided, and 3) assessment, decision making, and counseling skills (p. 12).

Trainer and students are provided with aims, learning objectives, and case studies for each section, along with a range of resource papers as background to support the material under discussion. For example, the unit on the legal framework for practice with the elders includes aims, objectives, areas of
Aging/Great Britain/Black Experience

competence to be achieved, along with areas to be covered in the future. A case study provides an opportunity for students to explore the legal and practical implication for a Bengali speaking family that takes responsibilities for bringing an elder relative to the United Kingdom. Discussion questions follow the case presentation (p. 21-24). A final resource paper provided a discussion on legislation.

This well organized training program is important in the history of social work education in the United Kingdom. Indeed it has enriched social work education and practice. Core groups of college lecturers and agency based professionals who participated provide students the benefit of the experience. A CCETSW steering committee managed the project and each group was provided with a staff resource person.

One may say that the art of anti-racist, ethnic sensitive practice with ethnic minority elders is now well along in its development in the United Kingdom. Legislative thrusts and the efforts of CCETSW have facilitated efforts to enhance practice with this group. Yet, there is much to be done. Other council’s like Kirklees must look to their minority clients and potential clients for direction. These may be elderly persons, the group considered in this work, children and their families, children and adults in residential care, or special population groups. Educators must be able to provide education and training that accepts the competencies that lead to the diploma, relying on the knowledge base, values, and skills needed for anti-racist, ethnic sensitive practice.

The Next Generation

Individuals who migrated from Asia and the Caribbean in the 1940s and 1950s may be counted among the aging minority population. Earlier, population expectations for the year 2000 were mentioned. By that time there are likely to be 300,000 minority elderly in the United Kingdom (Victor 1987, Mays 1983). They have lived through and contributed much to the struggle to achieve a place in British society, residing in communities throughout the United Kingdom; Belfast, Cardiff, Liverpool, Leeds, Lemington, Birmingham, Nottingham, and, of
course London (Ahmad-Aziz, Froggatt, Richardson, Whittaker
generation of minority elders have lived in younger cohorts in
the same time period.

They, along with the older cohorts, provide possibilities for
continued explorations into the minority experience of aging in
the United Kingdom. The work has only just begun.
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Competing ideologies such as conflict versus consensus explanations of social structure, psychodynamic versus behavioral interpretations of human learning, qualitative versus quantitative research paradigms, biological determinism versus social influences in "deviant" behavior such as addictions, homosexuality and schizophrenia, and residual versus institutional social policies have created debate, energized, and yet at the same time constrained development in social science theory.

In this volume, Mary Jackman reviews, analyzes and challenges many existing assumptions and competing ideologies associated with explanations of intergroup relations along three key dimensions of gender, race and class. Through an impressive conceptual framework supported by an empirical study, the author builds a strong case for the position that the conflict/consensus continuum in the analysis of unequal social relations is too simplistic. It is proposed that inter-group relations are subject to the terms of the dominant groups in each dimension who use subtle forms of persuasion and coercion to maintain their dominance. An important strand of the argument is that both dominant and subordinate groups put much energy into conflict avoidance.

The book is divided into three parts: Part I reviews trends in the literature on social stratification, the sociology of race, and gender roles from the point of view of demonstrating how conflict and hostility have been central themes in theoretical explanations and yet constitute a very small percentage of manifest behavior in social relations between unequal groups. The more subtle forms of social control, such as the coercive power of love and the persuasive power of reason are considered as an alternative analysis.

Part II and Part III present the findings of the survey conducted in the United States in 1975. The sample was taken from
non-institutionalized adults in the 48 contiguous states. The data are reported within a conceptual framework consistent with that presented in Part I using gender class and race as case studies. Role segregation, spatial segregation and group affiliations are reported through respondents' assessments of their own exposure to an affiliation with other groups. Inter-group relations as measured by affective responses are reported, as well as beliefs about the costs and benefits of inter-group relations. Chapter VI reports data on respondents' views of public policy issues such as economic equality, racial equality, gender equality and the role of government. Results are summarized within a series of matrix frameworks which include one axis representing feelings towards the other group (inclusion and estrangement) and one axis for policy goals (affirmative change and conservative or reactionary positions). The resulting matrix includes positions such as tolerant, integrationist, paternalistic, revisionist, deferent for both dominant and subordinate group positions. Results relating to gender, class and race are superimposed on this general matrix and thus relating the data from the study to the conceptual framework.

In this part of the book, the strong conceptual framework is still present, the analysis is sharp and cogent, excellent illustrations are given to strengthen the points made and the argument is admirably well-constructed. The empirical part of the book, however, is less strong. The survey is somewhat dated (see p. 109), and the sampling distribution across the groups studied shows a certain inconsistency, when 13.9% come from racial minorities and 7.6% from a group described as "poor." The gender distribution is less imbalanced in the sample with a representation of 41.9% men and 58.1% women. (p. 110). Statistically significant differences are reported in some of the tables without indicating which test of significance has been used. The form of reporting the data is largely tabulated percentages. However, the authors claim that: "To the extent that the three cases manifest clearly interpretable patterns I can establish the empirical plausibility of my theoretical framework" (p. 121) is indeed largely born out by the data. One of the clearest findings of the study is that the largest difference between groups in terms of policy goals occurs in the category of race.
Part IV summarizes within the framework of ideology and social control. The ideologies of individualism and competition are presented as subtle forms of social control which prevent challenges from subordinate groups and maintain the status quo for the dominant groups. The author further argues that processes such as this are "neither planned or conscious" (p. 365). The theme of the book is therefore well represented by the title 'The Velvet Glove'. Intergroup relations based on gender, class and race are seen as complex and as using subtle strategies to maintain the position of the dominant groups, whilst 'flagrant hostility is a minor actor' (p. 377). However, one wonders what the effect would be in carrying out the same study in the wake of Reaganite policies, the Los Angeles Riots and the Bobbitt trial as examples of inter-group conflict along the lines of race, class and gender. In summary, the argument is well crafted and provokes questions throughout. This volume is a useful contribution to the literature on inter group relations, and will no doubt provoke further debate and research.

Doreen Elliott
University of Texas at Arlington


The role of motherhood in contemporary western thought can easily be viewed as the focal point of many disputes regarding the roles and rights of women in society. The meaning and purpose of motherhood has changed over time and in culturally specific ways that deem it either glorifying or oppressive to the female gender. Each of the books reviewed here asks critically important questions: Should feminism celebrate the differences that separate women from men to develop a solidarity, or should the differences between the sexes be down played for the purpose of claiming equality on the basis of "sameness"?
Is mothering/caring behavior a function of nature or nurture? Should and does it originate and operationalize on the personal or political level? Are mother-child relationships based on the unilateral perceptiveness of the mother or reciprocal exchanges between the two parties involved.

Glenn, Chang and Forcey have compiled a collection of articles that address these issues. Glenn's introductory article, titled the "Social construction of motherhood: A thematic overview", outlines the basis of the argument that motherhood is a function of socialization. The book's approach is "to emphasize the social base of mothering [and to look at] the variation rather that search for the universality . . ." (p. 5). The book is divided into four sections that emphasize the diversity in mothering in historical theory, popular American ideology, and practical reality.

The first section defines the roles of mothers, as individuals, in the context of a larger framework. First, the role if the mother is depicted as only one small part of a larger context of family roles. Then, the western concept of motherhood, with it's expectations of the 'stay at home mother', is placed in perspective as a product of white, middle-class values that ignore the disparity in reality dependent on race and class. Finally, mothering behavior displayed by non-mothers is discussed in order to expand the concept of mothering.

The second section of the collection addresses cultural images of mothers and children depicted in literature and film. It explores the personification and glorification of the fetus that leads to the view of mothers as objects with the purpose of caring for children and denies their value as individuals. And, defines oppressive components of motherhood as constructs of patriarchal society.

Lastly, Mothering defines the interpretations of motherhood in various cultures. Here the history of work expectations for women of different race and class backgrounds is discussed and motherhood is put in political and social perspective. Differing expectations and perception of the ability to mother, the appropriate method of mothering, and the social outcome of variations can be seen vividly in non-mainstream cultures.

In her book, Motherhood and Modernity, Everington also focuses on the "social" component of mothering. However, she does so in the context of an ethnographic study of mothering
styles and agency in the context of play groups. Her book begins with an extensive review of literature on a variety of perspective on motherhood, including social psychology, object relations theory, cross cultural perspectives, and the feminist focus. The literature review of morality and motherhood explores issues such as nature/nurture debate regarding mothering, communal forms of mothering, and the 'moral attitude' involved in the practicality of motherhood. The review of literature on the 'self' set the scene for the research questions of the study by exploring the concept of mothering as an intersubjective experience, as opposed to the traditional view of mother as object, controlled by the objective 'needs' of the child.

Everington's study included the researcher observing three play groups consisting of culturally, economically, and philosophically diverse care-givers and children. The study's aim was to define how mothers determine the needs of their children, to see how they coordinate these with their own personal needs, and to discern what effects this has on the child's value system and autonomy. The study found that mothers do assert themselves as subjects in opposition to the demands of the child, mother-child relations result from mutual 'understanding', and that the assertion of maternal subjectivity is determined by social context (i.e., value of personal autonomy, role of women in society, maternal ideals).

Like Glenn, Chang, and Forcey, Everington also addresses the difficulty that lies in the separation of the public and private spheres which places mothering in the private, and less valued of the two. She stresses the necessity of eliminating this constructed dichotomy and representing it instead as two equal levels of action context (individual and non-individual). Here, the boundaries between the 'concrete' and the 'generalizable'; feminist writers and grass roots organizers; nature and nurture; motherhood as glory and oppression; differences and similarities; and autonomy and collective action, can be transcended.

These two books are not designed for beginners. However, they provide powerful insights into the institution of motherhood in modern society and deserve to be widely read.

Michelle Livermore
Louisiana State University

Coalescence around common issues and objectives is a delicate collective process. As the coalition encounters itself through its grassroots membership, serious differences usually emerge. What was once safely viewed as clear common ground becomes a murky dangerous place referred to with different names, symbols, and meanings. The differences are not semantic. who we are and our experiences of marginalization are widely divergent, even as members of the same group. Seekers of progressive social change may share a unifying vision of a society where difference is acknowledged and celebrated through non-hegemonic and inclusive social structures. Yet such ideals are seriously damaged when we find ourselves in polarizing debates and painful exchanges from which we eagerly escape or retreat, alienated. Even in our alienation we are differently wounded and different in our resources and abilities for recovering.

Differences do not necessarily cause divisions. Divisions are not inherently problematic. But disavowed and unexamined differences can seriously afflict social change movements such as feminism. It is in this spirit of commitment to struggle that the editors of *Feminism and the Politics of Difference* have pulled together a series of thoughtful essays from a multidisciplinary group of internationally based feminists.

Editors Sneja Gunew and Anna Yeatman offer women important insights, creative concepts, and analytic tools to deal with their differences so they can work together for needed feminist social changes. Working with poststructuralist critical theory (including deconstruction, psychoanalysis, and postmodernism) along with postcolonialism, they seek to deconstruct power structures which organize debate into

... binary oppositions that invariably absorbs alterity into the hegemonic and familiar. Whenever such thinking prevails, we are merely in the business of juggling with traditional categories, privileging women rather than men, or some women at the expense of others, without changing the power structures behind
such constructions. Such logic is homogenizing and universalist, built on the principle of exclusion and the tyranny of the familiar. (p. xiii).

Naming and affirming our differences—recognizing them as “incommensurabilities”—is an alternative.

Gunew and Yeatman identify the politics of difference and their dangers through the essay writers, multiple interpretations of several themes. The anthology is a quilt of topics: anti-racist politics in Canadian feminist publishing, migration in New Zealand, Chicanas who traverse the Texas-US Southwest/Mexico border, the boy-boy Japanese comics which present male homosexual liaisons for adolescent female readers, a film by an Aboriginal Australian woman, and women’s access to colonial history (to name several). This panoply of texts with compelling yet disparate foci is a jarring display of difference across gender, culture, time, and place.

The anthology’s authors aspire to transcend “identity politics” that construct self-other binary oppositions because these limit further the possibility of difference. The essays consistently stress the necessity for analyzing both race and ethnicity constructions and dynamics. Another major recurring theme is the necessity of finding ways to open spaces for excluded groups without falling into tokenism or appropriation. Just as it is dangerous to identify representatives of groups, it is risky to represent or designate differences in order to engage with issues of marginally labeled groups. Sentimentally taking on the accessories of difference is a common, mistaken way of showing solidarity when we can more easily learn to join with others instead of pretending to be the other.

The burden of authenticity is also explored for the ways in which it is projected onto the other. The emphasis upon shoring up or justifying structures limits the possibilities for difference. Structures lose their permeability and flow when differences are segregated into bounded categories of authentic and inauthentic; the liberatory potential of subversion is overlooked. The need to legitimize marginal positions and to analyze structures of legitimation are also examined for subversive potential, who authorizes whom to speak and how does this process function?
Who has access to resources in relation to language? Print media? The arts?

The anthology's theoretical stances are grounded in the muck of women's political realities. The authors' insights are scattered gems, best mined by readers endowed with a certain affection for poststructuralist discourse and its play. Readers who prefer more direct, concrete narrative about the politics of difference in feminist, social change activism work may still find the book satisfying.

*Feminism and the Politics of Difference* makes an important feminist, internationalist contribution to our literature an difference. If this dynamic and far reaching anthology is any indicator, uncharted pathways for social change praxis will continue to emerge from explorations in the politics of voice and difference. Certainly, feminists will continue to be among the storytellers and listeners.

Marti Bombyk
Fordham University


While writing this review, I recalled the story of Brenda, a homeless woman who died overnight while seeking shelter in a bus stop near the HUD office ("Homelessness Hitting Home: A Death on HUD's Doorstep", *New York Times*, November 30, 1993). As her body was removed, HUD officials and White House personnel were furiously debating funding for homeless programs. Her companions' remembrances were of a woman in her thirties with a "sharp mind" and helpful nature who was afraid of shelters. Brenda's death was not anonymous because of where she died. That we know of her death only underscores how little we know of her life, or the lives of others who are homeless, because of societal indifference and government neglect.

Elliot Liebow rends this veil of invisibility in his compassionate and insightful work — *Tell Them Who I Am*. Liebow's goal is to bring the reader into the world of homeless women;
to understand their problems, struggles, victories. Fundamentally, he seeks a response to his own question — "How, in short, do they stay fully human while body and soul are under continuous and grievous assault?" (pg. 25). His answers have implications for policy, social service, and grassroots interventions. His means of discovery provide invaluable lessons for research methodology and practice.

The book opens with a preface, "A Soft Beginning", and introductory chapter, "The Women, the Shelters, and the Round of Life". Liebow tells how he got involved in volunteering at a shelter, which gave way to a desire to tell the stories of these women, and provides background information on some of the key informants and shelter sites. Part 1, "Problems in Living", is a series of chapters about the daily dilemmas of being homeless. Part 2, "Making It: Body and Soul", reveals the women's survival strategies. He concludes with an indictment of the free market system, which treats the homeless and other poor people as surplus and judges them inferior. The Appendices include information on current situations and life histories of shelter residents, the scope of homelessness and services available, and methodology (participant observation and interviews).

Throughout the book, one is struck by how seemingly minor or taken-for-granted aspects of life become insurmountable challenges because of system requirements, not individual personality or skill deficits. For example, it is mandatory that all women be out of the shelter by 7 am, regardless of weather or health. This means that they can never sleep in (a shared fantasy of the women), and often have to fill time before starting jobs or rounds of appointment. The reader must ask her/himself what life would be like to always be on the streets, early in the morning, 7 days a week, without exception. Or consider the problem of storage of personal affects. Shelters are too risky, storage facilities too expensive. As homelessness continues, these women downsize their possessions, giving up precious mementos of a previous life. What would we give up if placed in this position?

Liebow excels in conveying these daily realities, which singularly seem insignificant until we are forced to ask ourselves how we would cope. In doing so, he helps us understand how there are many more similarities than differences between
those with and those without homes. Yet while sympathetic, Liebow neither romanticizes nor reifies these women or their experiences.

One of the most interesting aspects of this book is that Liebow invited comments from shelter residents and staff. This results in some lively debates, especially with his analysis of social workers and shelter staff. Residents, who view most staff as controlling or paternalistic, clearly believe he is too soft. Even allowing for this view, Liebow nonetheless provides a sharp critique of the "homeless industry" and related government services. He underscores the lack of respect accorded the homeless, demonstrated through neglect, scorn, and intrusive questioning. The more professionalized the shelter staff, the greater the psychological degradation for the women. As one resident commented: "Both my parents are dead, you know. They were killed by social workers and psychologists who tortured them to death with questions" (p. 138). In many instances, agreement to "change one's attitude" is the condition for receiving care, suggesting a striking inability or unwillingness to understand the structural causes of homelessness.

Liebow views homelessness as a manifestation of class oppression in this country, a "direct result of a steady, across-the-board lowering of the standard of living of the American working class and lower class" (p. 224). Jobs with livable wages are increasingly scarce, families (a possible resource for the middle class) are often too financially strapped to offer much assistance, and the government money rarely invests in affordable, permanent housing. Homelessness is not a result of laziness or mental illness (though as with the larger population, there is some of both). It is caused by an economy that is "pushing people onto the street full-time — perhaps beyond the point of no return" (p. 232).

Currently, U.S. society is debating the "homeless problem". Even so-called "progressive" cities, such as Berkeley, San Francisco, and Seattle, are increasingly intolerant of the homeless. HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros, reacting to Brenda's death and society's backlash against homeless, stated: "A homeless person should not have to die on the streets." He's right, of course. But
then again, as Liebow so eloquently argues, no one should have to live on the streets either.

Cheryl Hyde
Boston University


Hillary Rodham Clinton has been credited with creating a new paradigm for First Ladies. According to one observer, she “is coming close not just to influencing policy but [also to] making public policy.” Another notes that she succeeds through “just the right combination of . . . a woman’s touch with a real mastery of the policy” (*New York Times*, 22 September, 1993, p. A18). Anne Firor Scott would most likely take exception to this notion of a new paradigm. In her book, *Natural Allies: Women’s Associations in American History*, Scott examines the long history of women’s activism in America, and documents the successful combination of “a woman’s touch” (or an interest in applying the principles of a well-run, moral home life to the larger community) and the possession of organizational and political skills necessary for making changes. A major vehicle for learning and applying these skills has been the woman’s association, which has existed in the United States in a variety of forms since the late 1700s.

Women’s history scholars have for some time been producing dissertations, articles, monographs, and books on women’s associations, generally focusing either on single organizations or on specific categories of groups, such as suffrage associations or Black women’s clubs. Scott brings this work and her own research together into a coherent whole, presenting the reader with a compelling picture of the impact of women’s associations on women’s lives, on the lives of their communities, and on American society.

Scott’s main argument is that women, “constrained by law and custom in the ways they could achieve goals that seemed to
them to be important, . . . used voluntary associations to evade some of these constraints and to redefine 'woman's place' by giving the concept a public dimension" (p. 2). To understand how women used organizations to move beyond the boundaries of family life, Scott begins with an analysis of the benevolent societies of the first several decades of the Republic, and then continues the story through the roughly sequential development of activist groups concerned with issues such as alcoholism and slavery, Civil War soldiers' aid societies, missionary societies, literary and selfeducation associations, women's clubs, organizations involved with "municipal housekeeping" in the Progressive Era, and the many single issue groups which emerged after the 1930s. Many of these associations looked both inward and outward; that is, while they often began by emphasizing self-improvement and the spiritual and intellectual development of their members, they soon moved to a focus on broader concerns, such as offering charitable services, improving the lot of working women, combatting alcoholism, promoting better public sanitation, and reforming municipal government. In order to pursue such goals and build their organizations, women discovered that they had to acquire essential skills in critical thinking, public speaking, conducting meetings, bookkeeping, fund-raising, and political lobbying. Restricted from exposure to these skills in business or professional life, women developed them within the "safe" confines of the women's association. This skill development was one of the major contributions of women's organizations.

There are certain challenges in this kind of history that Scott struggles with and is not always able to meet. As she notes, it is difficult to present an accurate picture of the goals of the rank and file, since the records passed down to us are kept mostly by the leaders of organizations. Scott deals with this problem most successfully when she presents detailed minutes from local groups. Other problems lie in determining how many women belonged to associations and in assessing the organizations' influence on women's lives (the impact on the outside world is easier to ascertain).

While these questions remain, for the large part, unanswered, the book's contributions far outweigh its gaps. Because
it pulls together so much material, the book abounds with wonderful references. Scott's coverage of the history of African-American women's organizations is excellent, yielding such discoveries as the fact that the first anti-slavery societies were begun by free Black women, and reminding the reader that inherent racism in American society generally kept African-American and white women's groups from making common cause. Scott also offers a rebuttal to the argument that the largely middle-class membership of women's associations had as its major goal the assertion of control over the working class and the poor. Concern for the wages of working women, she notes, was a fairly common theme. Beyond such insights, the book's greatest strength lies in its comprehensiveness. The reader is left with a sense of awe at the number and many accomplishments of women's organizations, and an amazement that their place in American history has been ignored for so long.

Leslie Leighninger
Louisiana State University


Ferguson's provocative book, *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory*, is provocative in relation to her subtitle, rather than to the title itself. Her work presents a lively discussion of three models of feminist theory, defined as praxis feminism, cosmic feminism and linguistic feminism. The models are critically compared and contrasted with a delightful mix of scholarly insight and wry humor. While "male-ordered subjectivity" in regard to women is decried, feminist-ordered subjectivity of women is given a thorough roasting. Each concept is first set forth in purist fashion, setting up a "straw woman" situation which no one could readily support (despite the fact that, truth be known, many do).

For example, praxis feminism faults the universalisms pressed on all women who, in fact, may not fit the mold. Cosmic feminism can be faulted for its amorphous quality, ranging from
high flown metaphysical epistemology to downright flakiness. While open to the possibilities of self in relation to a higher spiritual order, together with transcendence and return, it is difficult to articulate and defend the claims of cosmic feminists. And linguistic feminism, devoted to making the familiar strange, uses strategies that are designed to defamiliarize and deconstruct in order to call into question male-ordered accounts of gender. The problem here is that the named commonalities can be overstated, while neglecting that which is experienced differently.

Ferguson rejects the possibility of championing a selected model and defending its virtues against the criticism of others. Suggesting an alternative to such a purist position, she discusses the possibility of synthesis as a solution, setting up an array of combinations of the three umbrella theories. One by one she then debunks her amalgamated constructs, leaving the reader ready for her personal version of feminist theory. Conceptualized as "mobile subjectivities," the model calls for an acceptance of all three constructs side by side, recognizing that each holds truth at a given moment in time, ever in motion, always ambiguous. The author views this stance as irony, making it possible to reside within an unstable theoretical place.

As a person who has struggled professionally with these dichotomies and unities myself, I have tremendous respect for Kathy Ferguson. She has illuminated the important questions lucidly. I don't disagree with her conclusions, but I do disagree with her definition of synthesis which she apparently views as focussing only on commonalities, while denying or ignoring difference, define synthesis as "unity in diversity" which focusses on shared experience, but acknowledges the reality and importance of differences. To my mind, mobile subjectivities is another way of speaking of this definition of unity in diversity. Could it be called "diversity in unity?" Certainly she is supporting both possibilities. (How I'd like to spend time talking with the author!)

The Man Question, the title of this book, is no doubt the decision of the publisher, while it is a provocative title, it really is not what the book is about by my reading. Rather, the title is set in juxtaposition to the "woman question" which the author feels was largely influenced by Hegel who provides the
conceptual framework for her discussion of feminist theory. An influential philosopher who portrayed human consciousness as shaped primarily by domination, subordination and death, Hegel’s masculine account of self as the human experience provided the necessity for a feminist version of subjectivity out of which the theories in question have developed. In short, the “woman question” was raised by man, posing femininity as a problem that requires explanation. The “man question,” according to Ferguson, “is a kind of frame for feminist metatheories.” It does not, however, turn the woman question on its head, posing masculinity as a problem that requires explanation, as advertised. (I do hope someone will do it one day soon.)

The philosophical backdrop of this book is one that feminist scholars in the humanities, especially, will relish. It is they who would be most at home with the discourse of Ferguson’s work. Although I am not a humanities scholar, I found the book to be thought provoking and most worthwhile. It provides a context for serious discourse whether one agrees with the premises or not. Every library should include The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory in its collection. While, in my opinion, it does not illuminate the man question, it certainly brings light to feminist analysis.

Janice Wood Wetzel
Adelphi University

Why is it that women who are regularly subjected to physical and emotional abuse, continue to endure abuse and even to love their abuser. In this interesting book, the author’s claim that a phenomenon known as ‘Stockholm syndrome’ provides useful insights into this issue.

The term ‘Stockholm syndrome’ was coined in 1973 after two bank robbers held two men and a woman hostage for a period of five days in a large Stockholm bank after an attempted robbery was foiled. Although the robbers threatened the lives of the hostages, the hostages identified with their captors and developed an emotional bond with them to the extent that they viewed the police as the enemy, and their captors as their friends. This feeling persisted long after the hostages had been rescued. Mental health professionals have discovered a similar dynamic at work in many other hostage taking situations. In addition, Stockholm syndrome characterizes many other abusive situations particularly, spousal abuse.

Stockholm syndrome occurs when victims bond with their abusers. While the reasons for this bonding are not entirely clear, the author’s note that bonding occurs because victims see no way of escape and behave submissively in an attempt to further their sense of security. This, they point out, is exactly what happens in abusive family relationships.

The question which the authors do not, however, adequately address, is why some victims of both hostage taking situations and spousal abuse, do in fact resist their captors and seek to escape. While the authors insist that Stockholm syndrome is a normal response of normal people, deviations from the norm require more discussion. Also, problematic is the author’s attempt to employ Stockholm syndrome as a generalized explanatory basis for all gender relationships in society. Femininity, they claim, is an expression of women’s subjugation. Femininity is an attempt to please men which has its roots in Stockholm’s
syndrome. Femininity, women's psychology and gender relationships in general are essentially survival strategies in a captive situation marked by male terror. While this is an interesting thesis, it will be contested not only by men but by many women and many feminist as well. Nevertheless, this well written book should stimulate widespread debate.


It is widely believed that children who grow up in single parent families are seriously disadvantaged. Many believe that these children lack the emotional support they need and that they will grow up with many psychological deficits. Children of single parents are also thought to perform poorly in school, and it generally accepted that many of them will subsequently engage in deviant behaviors including crime, drug abuse and teen pregnancy.

This book explores another aspect of the debate — the health situation of children in single mother families. The authors, who are sociologists at the University of Texas at Austin, have undertaken a detailed analysis of the data. They show that children of single parent families do in fact have greater health problems than children in two-parent families. They note also that these children have inadequate access to modern health care services. However, they demonstrate that the concentration of health care problems among children of single parent families is closely associated with poverty, particularly among African-American and Hispanic fatherless families. Their study reveals that single parenthood of itself has few negative consequences for health status. Adults and children in single families with adequate incomes are as healthy as those in other family configurations.

As the authors note, poverty and racial disadvantage are major causative factors of low health status. The problem is exacerbated by poor services for these families. The authors reveal that health care services for single families are hopelessly
inadequate. Despite the extension of Medicaid coverage to pregnant women and infants, health care budgetary increases have been largely consumed by older adults. As discussions on welfare reform attract increased public attention, the findings of this important study should be heeded.


Most of the editors and contributors to this volume are faculty members at the Free University of Amsterdam in the Netherlands involved in the University’s Inter-faculty Women’s Study Group. Noting that the ideas and writings of Dutch feminists seldom reach a wider audience, the editors have compiled this collection in English in an attempt to draw attention to their work, and engage more actively in debates with colleagues in other countries.

The book covers three major topics. Firstly, it presents a history of the women’s movement in the Netherlands. Secondly, it discusses employment and work related issues for women and the way government policies are affecting these issues. Thirdly, the book discusses the role of anthropology in women’s studies drawing particular attention to the role of cultural anthropologists in feminist studies relating to Third World development.

There is much in this volume that will be of interest to feminist scholars and to social scientists generally. The opening chapter by Mossink, which traces the history of the women’s movement in the Netherlands, shows how the consolidation of the movement was influenced by male pacifists and their astonishing view that women’s alleged frivolity and susceptibility to seduction contributed to war. Organized efforts to refute this view facilitated the growth of organized feminism in the country. There are several important chapters dealing with work place issues and the involvement of women in development. Of particular interest is Keuper’s account of the role of women in the country’s development programs. The book also contains several intriguing chapters on theoretical issues. Hopkin’s
discussion of the images of women in traditional Christian theology, and den Uyl's analysis of Malinowski's explanation of the sexuality of Trobriand islanders make engaging reading.


A substantial body of scholarly research into the sociological, political and economic factors responsible for the development of 'welfare states' in the Western industrial countries has now been published. Many distinguished social scientists have contributed to this research, attributing the emergence of the welfare state to factors ranging from the 'logic of industrialization' to the conspiratorial motives of capitalists who seek to use social policies to subdue a potentially turbulent labor force. Despite its significance, this research has neglected gender. The fact that the welfare state was designed primarily for males in industrial wage-employment has only recently been emphasized, and it was with the publication of Theda Skocpol's book *Protecting Soldiers and Mothers* (Harvard University Press, 1992) that the role of women and women's organizations in promoting social policies has been given adequate attention.

Molly Ladd-Taylor's book makes an important contribution to the growing body of literature dealing with the role of women in the creation of the welfare state. Ladd-Taylor takes Skocpol's research further by analyzing in meticulous detail the many women's organizations that campaigned for the extension of public social services. Conventional explanations of the origins of the welfare state as a product of impersonal societal forces impinging on male dominated governments to facilitate the emergence of a variety of social programs, will have to be recast to incorporate the feminist explanation articulated in Ladd-Taylor's work. As Ladd-Taylor reveals, a variety of women's groups inspired by maternalist ideology made a crucial contribution to the development of social policy. Her book deserves to be widely read and widely cited in future theoretical work on the origins of the modern welfare state.

This study of the experiences of the victims of family violence in Sweden makes disturbing reading but, at the same time, offers powerful insights into the way women are subjected to abuse and of the way they deal with its consequences. Hyden worked for some time as a social worker in a clinic in Stockholm where she developed the technique of recording the experiences of her clients in narrative form. Using this technique, and linking effectively it to symbolic interactionism to enhance its interpretive power, she has produced a remarkable collection of real life accounts which show how ordinary people suffer the emotional and physical pain of abusive relationships.

The study analyzed 141 cases in which interviews were conducted not only with the women victims, but with the male perpetrators of violence and often with children as well. A smaller group was selected for in-depth analysis. In addition to providing a fascinating narrative account of the experiences of her subjects, Hyden uses her material in theoretical significant ways to test and reformulate several critical propositions in feminist theory relating to the issue of family violence. Her book makes an important contribution and should be widely consulted.


This extraordinary book is an anthology of essays, narrative accounts, short stories, oral histories, poems and academic writing on the experiences, views and feelings of forty seven Latina lesbians. While it may appear to deal with an esoteric subject of limited relevance to readers interested in mainstream issues of gender and sexuality, it will enchant anyone working the field. It confirms Routledge's growing reputation as a adventurous publisher of serious books which do not qualify for course adoption. While the book has no unifying theoretical perspective, its literary style which reports subjective experiences and
offers opportunities for artistic expression is highly effective. Its oral histories are perhaps of most significance to social scientists. They unveil the essence of what it means to be a Latina lesbian today.


In this book, psychotherapist Dusty Miller discusses the problem of Trauma Reenactment Syndrome, a condition in which people repeatedly inflict physical harm and pain on themselves. Although both men and women are involved, TRS occurs more frequently among women than men.

TRS is a complicated syndrome which is manifested not only in self-inflicted pain but by intense secrecy about sufferers' personal lives, a failure to respond to traditional psychotherapy, and a disassociated personality which often fragments into three-part self consisting of the victim, the abuser and an uninvolved 'bystander'.

Miller is an authority on TRS and its treatment, and her book is intended to offer insights into this condition as well as prescriptions for effective intervention. She provides gripping case histories of some of her clients and shows that many have failed to respond to treatment, and particularly behavioral treatments which do not deal with the complex causative factors underlying this condition. Her own therapeutic prescriptions involve a time-consuming but effective system of care that uncovers the hidden childhood experiences of abusive relationships that most of her clients have encountered. She also advocates the active involvement of family members and friends. The book is a useful guide to this little known condition and will be of interest to practitioners as well as other social scientists interested in family abuse.


As Polakow shows in this readable and important book, more than thirteen million children live in poverty in the United States today. The vast majority are to be found in poor single-
mother families. Most are, in turn, African Americans or Hispanics. However, this book is not about statistics but rather about the real-life experiences of these women and their children. Polakow takes the reader into their daily lives, and starkly exposes their perennial experience of deprivation, struggle and suffering. It is a disturbing narrative which cries out not for sympathy but for remedial action.

And yet, as Polakow notes, it is unlikely that mere appeals for help will result in significant change. Popular attitudes today are so conditioned that single women have little prospect of eliciting public sympathy. The successful portrayal of poor single women as welfare queens who exploit an overgenerous income support system is deeply ingrained. It may take a writer with the appeal and literary power of a Dickens to change these attitudes. Indeed, Polakow effectively cites Dicken’s writings to demonstrate that the conditions under which many single parent families live today were once widespread.

Polakow effectively combines narrative reports on the interviews with her respondents with wider theoretical analyses of the dynamics of childhood poverty. The book does not deal in any depth with possible solutions to the problem but references are made to the need for universal health care, affordable housing, adequate child care, access to improved schooling and finally to universal family allowances which are widely used in Europe to prevent child poverty. The problem of course is whether any of these policy options are politically feasible in a society which has traditionally rebuffed attempts to help those whose lives are on the edge.
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The Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare is planning a special issue of the journal entitled *New Themes in International Social Welfare* to be published in Summer 1996. The special issue will be edited by James Midgley of Louisiana State University.

In keeping with title of the special issue, the primary criterion for selecting papers will be the originality and novelty of topics. International social welfare has tended to repeat many of the same themes and it currently lacks a dynamic approach which identifies new areas for debate. Submissions should, therefore, seek to focus on neglected topics and make a novel contribution.

Some possible topics for inclusion in the special issue are:
1. The neglect of the Third World in international social welfare research.
2. The application of feminist perspectives when interpreting international social welfare issues.
3. The relevance of recent developments in Eastern Europe to theoretical and policy discourse in the field of international social welfare.
4. The role of diffusion in international social policy with particular reference to post-imperialism and post-colonialism.
5. Ethnicity and cultural diversity as neglected issues in international social policy and social welfare. A focus on immigration, refugees and mass movements in this context would be welcome.
6. The relevance of recent developments in social theory on thinking in international social welfare.

However, the topics listed above are only some suggestions. Other topics dealing with neglected themes will be welcome.

Send two page abstracts or complete articles to:
James Midgley
Associate Vice Chancellor for Research
Office of Research and Economic Development
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
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