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This article provides definitions for hate crimes, a summary of national data on hate crime incidents, and descriptions of federal and state hate crime laws. The author presents various arguments in support of and against hate crime laws, and the inclusion of sexual orientation in such laws. The author contends that it is illogical and a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to exclude sexual orientation from hate crime laws. The perpetrators of hate crime incidents, regardless of the target group, have similar motives and perpetrate similar types of assaults; the victims experience similar physical and psychological harm. Excluding a class of persons who are targets of hate crimes denies them equal protection under the law because the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment establishes a fundamental right to equal benefit of laws protecting personal security.

Laramie, Wyoming, October 7, 1998: A gay college student was brutally beaten by two men who smashed his skull with a pistol butt and lashed him to a split-rail fence. Five days later, he died while on life support and in a coma after doctors determined they could not perform surgery because his skull was so badly smashed.

New York, New York, June, 20, 1998: Three men are charged with gang assault, and assault and harassment for kicking and beating a gay man while yelling anti-gay epithets.

Ukiah, California, June 5, 1998: Two men were charged with first-degree murder in the beating death of a gay man.

Mount Pleasant, Michigan, April 22, 1998: A car was set on fire and two other cars were spray-painted with anti-gay slurs at Central Michigan University.
Dixmont, Maine, April 3, 1998: A teacher was threatened and accosted by a parent who used anti-gay epithets.

Durham, North Carolina, June 1997: A man was attacked by a group of men who used anti-gay slurs and vandalized his car.

Cambridge, MA, March, 1997: A flier containing anti-Semitic, anti-black, anti-Asian, anti-Latino, and anti-gay slurs was sent to a newspaper editor at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government.

Glendale, California, February 26, 1997: A black youth was beaten by a group of youths who believed he was gay.

Atlanta, Georgia, February 21, 1997: A bomb exploded at a gay nightclub and another bomb was found outside the club during the investigation. A group calling itself the Army of God claimed responsibility.

Medford, Oregon, 1995: A lesbian couple who had been active in a defeat of a statewide anti-gay ballot initiative were bound, gagged, kidnapped, and then murdered. The suspect, who confessed, stated, "It was easier to kill them because they were lesbians."

(Sources: "Beating Fatal," 1998; Southern Poverty Law Center, 1997, 1998; and U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary)

These incidents are examples of violence toward those who are or who are perceived to be lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered (LGBT). The difference between these crimes and other hate-motivated crimes based on such characteristics as race, religion, or ethnicity, is that in 21 states in the U.S., hate crime laws do not include LGBT persons (Human Rights Campaign, 1998a; National Gay and Lesbian Task Force, 1997). Furthermore, the current federal hate crime law authorizes investigation and prosecution of hate crimes on the basis of race, color, religion, and national origin, but excludes sexual orientation, disability, and gender (Human Rights Campaign, 1998b). Sexual orientation, disability, and gender are also excluded from many of the state hate crime statutes.

This article provides an overview of the status of federal and state hate crime laws. Definitions of hate crimes and national
Hate Crime Laws and Sexual Orientation data on hate crime incidents are provided. This article presents various arguments in support of and against hate crime laws, as well as for the inclusion of sexual orientation in such laws. I support federal and state hate crime laws that include race, religion, national origin, color, sexual orientation, disability, and gender. This article, however, focuses primarily on the inclusion of sexual orientation. I contend that it is illogical and a violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to exclude sexual orientation from hate crime laws.

DEFINITIONS OF A HATE CRIME

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) is mandated to collect hate crime data as part of its Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) Program. The FBI defines a hate crime as "crime motivated by preformed, negative bias against persons, property, or organizations based solely on race, religion, ethnicity/national origin, sexual orientation, or disability" (U.S. Department of Justice, 1996, foreword). In hate crimes, also referred to as bias crimes, a person or property is intentionally chosen by the perpetrator because of actual or perceived characteristics of that person or group (Levin, 1998). The National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs (NCAVP) collects data on anti-gay hate crimes from local and state anti-violence programs. The definition they use for documenting hate crimes based on sexual orientation is "one in which there are sufficient objective facts to lead a reasonable person to conclude that the offender's actions were motivated in whole or in part by the offender's bias against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or HIV-positive people" (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 1997, p. 2).

A hate crime incident can involve more than one offense, victim, or offender. The FBI uses 11 traditional offense categories in its collection of hate crime data: Crimes against persons—murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, and intimidation; and crimes against property—burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, arson, simple assault, and destruction/damage/vandalism of property. The FBI also reports those offenses not listed in the traditional offenses and identifies these as "other" or "crimes against society." One offense is counted for each victim of a crime against person. One offense
is counted for each crime against property (i.e., an arson and
destruction of property may occur during an incident, that would
count as two offenses). The FBI determines the total number of
victims in a given incident by summing the number of victims
associated with each offense that took place within the incident
(U.S. Department of Justice, 1996).

The NCAVP uses definitions consistent to those of the FBI
for terms in their documentation forms, except for one notable
exception—verbal harassment alone is not a crime in most states
(such as anti-gay slurs). NCAVP believes that these offenses
should be documented as they contribute to victims’ psycholog-
ical pain and fear and may lead to violent behavior in the future.

HATE CRIME REPORTING AND DATA

FBI Data

There were 8,759 hate crime incidents reported to the FBI in
1996; 1,016 or 11.6% of the total reported incidents, were based
on the sexual orientation of the victim making LGBT persons the
third-highest target group for hate crimes. Out of the 1,016 hate
crime incidents against LGBT persons, there were 1,256 offenses,
1,281 victims, and 1,180 offenders.

The breakdown of the incidents by sexual orientation and
gender was as follows: anti-male homosexual, 757 incidents; anti-
female homosexual, 150 incidents; anti-homosexual, 84 incidents;
anti-heterosexual, 15 incidents; and anti-bisexual, 10 incidents.
The locations where most often these hate crimes took place
were highways/roads/alleys/streets, and residences/homes. Of
the total number of offenses based on sexual orientation (N =
1,256) the breakdown of offenses of crimes against persons is as
follows: 2 murders, 222 aggravated assaults, 287 simple assaults,
and 472 acts of intimidation. The breakdown of crimes against
property: 31 robberies, 6 burglaries, 12 larceny-thefts, 8 arsons,
215 destruction/damage/vandalism, and 1 crime against society
(U.S. Department of Justice, 1996).

The FBI data on hate crimes toward LGBT persons have been
criticized for a number of reasons, including the reluctance of
victims to report to law enforcement agencies, and the fact that
local agencies are not required to collect and forward these data
to the FBI. Plans to include questions on hate crimes in the Justice Department’s National Crime Victimization Survey may provide additional data, as the crime survey interviews Americans and is thought to be the best available tool for assessing crimes that are typically underreported (Mercer, 1997; “White House Hate Crimes,” 1997).

**National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs Data**

Hate crimes based on sexual orientation may be more likely to be reported to community-based anti-violence programs. LGBT victims who do not report to the police most often cite these reasons: fear of hostility or mistreatment by law enforcement officials, and fear of public disclosure of their sexual orientation (Herek & Berrill, 1992).

NCAVP reported 2,445 incidents of anti-gay hate crimes in 14 localities across the country in 1997, up 2% from the number of hate crimes reported in 1996 (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 1997). The highest levels of anti-gay violence occurred in the month of June, when many communities in the U.S. celebrate Pride Month. A high degree of visibility and media attention is correlated with increased reports of anti-gay incidents. A reported increase in the number of anti-gay incidents in March and April of 1997 compared to these months in 1996 has been attributed to the public “coming out” of actress Ellen DeGeneres and her television character Ellen Morgan which seemed to have created a homophobic backlash accounting for an increase in violence toward LGBT persons (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs). The NCAVP data show a much higher percentage of reported offenses in the category of offenses against persons versus offenses against property than the FBI data or the Anti-Defamation League data (an anti-Jewish hate crime tracking group).

The 1997 NCAVP report notes a 36% increase in serial incidents from 1996, defined as “continuous violence and harassment by one offender against a single victim over a period of time” (p. 4). Typically, the perpetrators know the victims and the incidents occur in or around the victim’s home. There was also a 76% increase in reported offenders who were law enforcement officers, contributing to the reluctance of victims of anti-gay violence to
seek help from the police or file police reports. Of those incidents reported to NCAVP, only 24% were also reported to the local police. The number of victims who did not report the incidents to the police increased by 21% from 1996. In 12% of the cases of those who tried to report the incident to the police, the police refused to take the complaint. Forty-five percent of those who did file a report with the police reported indifferent to hostile treatment by the police.

The NCAVP data show that anti-gay violence in schools and colleges is rising. The number of victims under age 18 increased by 10% from 1996 to 1997, and those between ages 18 to 22 increased by 35%. A large percentage of offenders were reported to be under the age of 22.

NCAVP reported a 36% increase in the number of victims of anti-gay violence who identified as heterosexual, suggesting that the perception of the perpetrator, not necessarily the actual sexual orientation of the victim, puts a person at risk for anti-gay hate crime. The percentage of female victims in the NCAVP cases is 30%. One hundred and two of the victims who reported hate crimes identified as transgendered persons with the majority of those male to female.

In the 2,445 incidents reported by NCAVP in 1997, there were 5,338 offenses documented, of which 1,081 were assaultive offenses. The type of assaultive offenses in order of frequency were: assault without a weapon (N = 576, 11%), assault with a weapon (N = 274, 5%), attempted assault with a weapon (N = 118, 2%), sexual assault/rape (N = 95, 2%), and murder (N = 18, .5%). In 22% of the assaultive incidents, the victim sustained serious injuries “that involve significant pain or bodily injury and usually require medical attention, such as actual or apparent broken bones; actual or probable internal injuries; nerve damage; injuries requiring reconstructive surgery; injuries that keep the survivor from working for any period of time; brain injuries; serious lacerations; and any gunshot wounds. . . . Serious injury is presumed in all rape cases (oral, anal, vaginal)” (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 1997, Appendix E).

In the incidents involving use of weapons, the most frequently used weapons were bottles, bricks and rocks, followed closely by bats, clubs and blunt objects. Knives and other sharp objects,
ropes and restraints, and firearms were also used. The site of the incident was most often street/public area, private residence, workplace, public accommodation, gay bar, school/college, gay organization/institution, and public transportation.

Although there are problems with accurate and comprehensive reporting of hate crime incidents, the institutionalization of data collection of these incidents has created a method of documenting the existence and prevalence of hate crimes. Additionally, data are used to justify public policy decisions regarding hate crime legislation.

FEDERAL AND STATE HATE CRIME LAWS

Federal Hate Crime Laws

There are four federal laws that specifically address hate crimes: The Hate Crime Statistics Act, The Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act—Section 280003 of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Part C—Civil Rights for Women of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and The Church Arsons Prevention Act. The Hate Crime Statistics Act, enacted in 1990 and reauthorized in 1996 (until 2002), requires the Federal Bureau of Investigation to collect statistics on hate crimes on the basis of race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and disability (the latter as of January 1, 1997) and to publish an annual summary of these statistics. The FBI collects these data from local and state law enforcement agencies; however, local and state agencies are not required to provide these statistics to the FBI, resulting in incomplete counts. In 1996, 84% of jurisdictions did not report any hate crimes in their regions, including those with well-documented incidents of bias-crime (American Psychological Association, 1998). Those states and localities that exclude sexual orientation from their own state laws would not be reporting numbers based on sexual orientation. Furthermore, as noted above, hate crime victims are often reluctant to report bias crimes to law enforcement agencies (Human Rights Campaign, 1998a). Time frames for reporting the data are uneven between jurisdictions.

Congress included in the Hate Crimes Statistics Act a provision that notes: "Nothing in this section creates a cause of
action or a right to bring an action, including an action based on discrimination due to sexual orientation" (sec. b(3)). Section 2(b) of the Hate Crimes Statistics Act reads: “Nothing in this Act shall be construed, nor shall any funds appropriated to carry out the purpose of the Act be used, to promote or encourage homosexuality.” Obviously, Congress intended for this Act to compile data about bias-related crimes; yet, they did not want the public to misconstrue the Act as supporting homosexuality.

The Hate Crimes Sentencing Enhancement Act directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to “promulgate guidelines or amend existing guidelines to provide sentencing enhancements of not less than 3 offense levels for offenses that the finder of fact at trial determines beyond a reasonable doubt are hate crimes.” This law is the federal counterpart to state hate crime sentencing-enhancement statutes. It applies to person and property attacks that occur on federal property.

The Civil Rights for Women Provision of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) provides for the right of all persons in the U.S. to be free from crimes of violence motivated by gender. A person who commits a crime motivated by gender “shall be liable to the party injured, in an action for the recovery of compensatory and punitive damages, injunctive and declaratory relief, and such other relief as a court may deem appropriate” (Part C, (b)). In essence, this gives the victim of a gender-bias crime the possibility of compensatory and punitive damage awards. The Civil Rights Clause of VAWA has been challenged in several district and circuit courts with inconsistent rulings on the interpretation of the law.

Influenced by the destruction and/or vandalism of houses of worship, Congress enacted the Church Arsons Prevention Act in 1996. This law makes destruction or damage of religious property a violation of Federal law, and makes actions of private citizens motivated by race, color, or ethnicity that interfere with persons being able to hold or use religious real property without fear of attack, a violation of Federal criminal law. This law also provides for a Loan Guarantee Recovery Fund to be used in cases of damaged religious property due to acts of arson or terrorism. Furthermore, this law authorizes additional personnel, investi-
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gators, and technical support personnel to investigate, prevent, and respond to violations of this Act.

Pending Federal Legislation

President Clinton sponsored the first-ever Hate Crimes Summit on November 10, 1997, a gathering of nearly 350 victim advocates, hate crime victims, religious leaders, law enforcement officials, and representatives of Congress and the Justice Department (National Coalition of Anti-Violence Programs, 1997, "White House Hate Crimes," 1997). Clinton launched a campaign against hate and called for passage of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1998 (HCPA) (S. 1529/ H.R. 3081) which would provide authority for federal officials to investigate and prosecute hate crimes based on the victim's gender, sexual orientation, or disability. The Act would allow federal authorities to have jurisdiction in cases where local authorities are unable or unwilling to investigate and prosecute (due to the exclusion of these groups from state hate crime statutes). The bill would also make federal prosecution of hate crimes easier by deleting a current requirement that the crime interfere with the victim engaging in a "federally protected" activity (such as going to school or voting) ("Reno: Expand Hate Crime Laws," 1998; "White House Hate Crimes"). The President announced several initiatives to enhance hate crimes enforcement: assignment of 50 additional FBI agents and prosecutors, creation of a national hate crimes network of U.S. attorneys who would share prosecution strategies and educate the public, increase in monetary penalties for housing discrimination through the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and distribution of a hate crimes resources guide to every school system in the country through the Department of Education (Mercer, 1997).

Challenging the Constitutionality of Hate Crime Statutes

The constitutionality of enhanced sentencing for hate crimes has been challenged in a series of court cases culminating in a U.S. Supreme Court case, Wisconsin v. Mitchell (1993). In this case, the respondent argued that a penalty enhancement for an aggravated assault due to the selection of the victim because of the victim's
race, was prohibited by the First and Fourteenth Amendments. The Supreme Court disagreed and held that enhanced penalties for hate crimes are constitutional and do not violate First or Fourteenth Amendment rights.

Other Efforts to Respond to Hate Crimes

In addition to federal legislation, various federal agencies have been monitoring the activities of organized hate groups and prosecuting members of these groups for various crimes (Bensinger, 1992). Furthermore, the primary task of the Community Relations Service, Department of Justice, is to assist communities to respond to hate groups (American Psychological Association, 1998).

State Hate Crime Laws

Forty-five states have enacted hate crime laws (Levin, 1988). Many of these laws have used a model code developed by the Anti-Defamation League. State hate crime laws typically do not create a new crime category; rather, enhanced penalties for the crime committed (e.g., vandalism, assault, arson) would be assessed when the crime committed is proven to be motivated by bias. For example, in the Freedom from Violence and Enjoyment of Legal Rights Act of the State of Illinois, a first violation of the Act carries a penalty of up to one year imprisonment and a $1,000 fine. A subsequent offense is punishable by two to five years in prison and a $10,000 fine (Bensinger, 1992).

In summary, the increasing number of federal and state laws regarding hate crimes demonstrates the support for public policies that address this issue. There is not consistency, however, in which groups are protected by hate crime legislation as evidenced by the number of states that exclude sexual orientation from their hate crime statutes.

THE EXCLUSION OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION FROM HATE CRIME LAWS

There are several possible reasons for why sexual orientation has been excluded from some of the state hate crime statutes. Empirical data on hate crimes toward LGBT persons have been collected and reported relatively recently; whereas organizations
such as the Anti-Defamation League have been collecting data for a longer period of time and have been able to use these data to influence public policy. Additionally, societal homophobia could play a part in why sexual orientation has been excluded from hate crime statutes. For example, every year since 1994, efforts to pass legislation that would add sexual orientation to Virginia’s hate crime statute have failed. During the 1998 legislative session, the Crime Commission voted not to endorse two hate crime bills that were drafted as a result of their own study on the prevalence of hate crimes committed against LGBT residents. An official from the Attorney General’s office testified against the bills by arguing that sexual orientation is connected to pedophilia (Virginians for Justice, 1998). Sexual orientation may be intentionally excluded by the crafters of hate crime legislation as a strategy to increase the likelihood of the bill’s passage.

OFFENDERS AND VICTIMS OF HATE CRIMES

Physical and Psychological Harm to Victims

The physical and psychological effects reported by lesbians and gay men who have been victims of hate crimes mirror those reported by persons who experienced hate crimes because of their race, ethnicity, or religion (Barnes & Ephross, 1994). The chances of being victimized because of one’s sexual orientation is high. A study of 147 lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals (Herek, Gillis, Cogan, & Glunt, 1997) found that 41% of the respondents had experienced a bias-related crime since the age of 16. Types of crimes reported by lesbian and gays include: harassment, threats (including bomb threats), physical assault, vandalism, arson, murder, robbery, and kidnapping. Attacks against gay men and lesbians are often brutal and gruesome, including repeated stabbing, mutilation, strangulation, torture, and beating (Winer, 1994). The psychosocial effects of these crimes include: lowered self-esteem; feelings of guilt, shame, anxiety, and depression; symptoms resembling posttraumatic stress disorder; anger; withdrawal from the community; fear of injury and crime; less willingness to believe in the general benevolence of people; and on top of this, reluctance to report the crime to authorities due to fear of “secondary victimization” (when others respond negatively to
a crime victim because of her or his sexual orientation) (Berrill & Herek, 1990; Herek, Gillis, Cogan, & Glunt, 1997). Hate crime victims have reported needing as much as 5 years to overcome the psychosocial consequences of the victimization compared to victims of non-bias crimes who report a decrease in psychosocial symptoms within 2 years of the crime (Herek, et al., 1997). The victim of a hate crime is less likely to report the crime to the police than victims of random crimes; this is due, in part, to victims' fears of future contact with the perpetrators (Mjoseth, 1998).

Typical Assailant in a Hate Crime

The typical assailant in a hate-crime incident—no matter if it is motivated by race, ethnicity, religion, or sexual orientation—is a white, male, juvenile or young adult, who is not known to the victim, and not part of an organized hate group (although he may be influenced by the ideology of such groups) (Craig & Waldo, 1996; Herek, 1989; Levin & McDevitt, 1995). Organized hate groups, such as the KKK, Neo-Nazi groups, Christian Identity Movement, Posse, and Skinheads, include lesbians and gays in those groups they term undesirable (Bensinger, 1992). In Georgia, a group known as the Crusade Against Corruption distributed a pamphlet titled "Praise God for AIDS," which included such statements as "AIDS is a racial disease of jews and negroids that also exterminates sodomites" (Herek, 1989).

Motivations of Perpetrators

Studies of motivations of perpetrators of hate crimes demonstrate some consistent types or categories of motivations. In an analysis of 450 hate-crime incidents in Boston and 4,000 nationwide, Levin and McDevitt (1995) found that the motivation of perpetrators of hate crimes can be sorted into three categories. About two-thirds of the perpetrators are "thrill-seekers," who are often bored or alienated youth looking for excitement or power in assaulting someone who is perceived as different. They may travel distances outside of their communities to find someone to assault. About one-third of perpetrators can be categorized as "defensive"; their attacks are directed at a particular set of "outsiders" who have moved into a previously homogeneous workplace, neighborhood, or school. Last, and the rarest type
of attack, are those perpetrated by members of organized hate groups who believe themselves to be the victims of some conspiracy and who have a mission to exterminate the despised group. Research by clinical psychologist Edward Dunbar of 1,459 hate crimes committed in the Los Angeles area between 1994 to 1995, also found that the rarest type of attack (fewer than 5% of the offenders) were by members of organized hate groups (American Psychological Association, 1998).

Although economic downswings have been blamed for increases in hate crimes, recent research by Green, Glaser, and Rich (1998), found that a weak economy is generally not associated with a rise in hate crimes. One form of economic change, however, does typically result in increases in hate crimes—when racial and ethnic minorities first move into a previously homogeneous neighborhood. Offenders in these cases perceive the change in neighborhood demographics as a threat to their traditional way of life.

Research on the motivations of perpetrators of hate crimes based on sexual orientation show similarities to the studies of perpetrators of hate crimes toward other target groups. According to research by Karen Franklin (1988), a forensic psychology fellow at Washington University's Washington Institute for Mental Illness Research and Training, motives underlying hate crimes based on sexual orientation fall into four distinct categories: (1) Self defense—perpetrators perceive the victims as making sexual propositions; (2) Ideology—perpetrators believe they are enforcing a social/cultural norm that condemns homosexuality; (3) Thrill-seeking—perpetrators look for victims because they are restless, bored, and/or want to take risks, be excited, and feel strong; and (4) Peer dynamics—perpetrators want to prove their toughness and/or heterosexuality to friends. In her study of approximately 500 young adults in the San Francisco Bay area, half of the males admitted to some form of anti-gay aggression; 18% admitted to physical violence and threats, 32% admitted to name-calling. Thirty percent of the respondents who did not admit to anti-gay aggression reported a likelihood to do so if they thought the LGBT person was flirting with or propositioned them (the self defense motive).
Comstock (1991) believes that violence against lesbians and gay men is perpetrated by “quite ordinary or average young men within all classes and racial groups” (p. 95). Rather than viewing the young male offenders as simply restless and looking for excitement, Comstock argues that a patriarchal society socializes young males to desire and feel entitled to power and status, which then contributes to the use of violence as a method of power and control.

The motives and type of attacks of the offenders are similar across hate crimes against various groups; the psychosocial effects are similar among the victims. Yet, there are arguments against the inclusion of sexual orientation in hate crime laws, and there are those who oppose the concept of hate crime laws altogether.

PROPOONENTS AND OPPONENTS OF HATE CRIME LAWS

A staunch opponent of hate crime laws is the director of New York University’s Center for Research in Crime and Justice, James Jacobs. In his writings (See, for example: Jacobs & Henry, 1996; Jacobs & Potter, 1998a, Jacobs & Potter, 1998b), Jacobs and colleagues argue these points: (a) All or much of violent crime involves prejudices and providing for tougher sentencing for certain offender prejudices “elevates the plight and pain of some victims above others and creates a counterproductive competition among groups to have their victimization recognized in hate crime statutes” (Jacobs & Potter, 1998a, p. 31). (b) Hate crime laws assume that an enhanced penalty for bias-related crimes is of greater benefit to the victim than a non-enhanced penalty; yet, the groups chosen for inclusion in hate crime laws do not necessarily benefit from the offenders’ increased punishment; victims who cannot prosecute under a bias crime “feel cheated by the lesser penalties their offenders receive” (p. 31); and state laws are inconsistent regarding which groups are included in the law. (c) Hate crime laws are presumed to protect “minority groups” with an assumption that white males are the offenders; yet, most crime is intraracial “and the perpetrator of interracial crime is more likely to be a member of a minority group than a member of the racial majority” (p. 31). (d) Hate crime definitions require a causal connection between the offender’s prejudiced motivation
and his or her actions. If in order to prosecute the crime as a hate crime, the crime needs to wholly or predominantly be motivated by prejudice, then there would be few crimes that would fall into the category of hate crime; however, if hate crimes include any crime even partly motivated by prejudice, then nearly all inter-group crime should be classified as a hate crime. Statutes that require evidence of manifest prejudice, an obvious sign such as an epithet, enable those intent on committing hate crimes to avoid being charged with a hate crime by remaining silent during the commission of the crime. (e) Proponents of hate crime laws picture those being prosecuted under the laws as “neo-Nazis committing vicious, ideological driven acts of violence”; yet the laws are “most often enforced against Archie Bunker-type defendants whose prejudice has bubbled to the surface during an argument over a parking space or campsite, or with a neighbor” (p. 31). The persons most often arrested for hate crimes are adolescents who “may well be confused, mentally unstable or sociopathic. But they are not ideologically driven racists” (pp. 31, 39). (f) Those imprisoned for hate graffiti and vandalism may actually learn to become more prejudiced while in prison. Determining which expressions are hate crime graffiti versus ordinary graffiti is difficult, and punishing hate crime graffiti more than ordinary graffiti creates a “sentencing system based upon a subjective hierarchy of the vileness of terms and symbols” (p. 39).

Proponents of hate crime laws argue that hate crimes are a distinct category of criminal offenses and should be punished more harshly than ordinary crimes. Levin (1988) summarizes the reasons why hate crimes are distinct: (a) Hate crimes disproportionately involve attacks against people (7 out of 10 hate crimes) versus attacks against property. Non-hate crimes are directed against persons in only 11 percent of incidents. (b) Hate crimes are more likely to result in injury and hospitalization than assault in general. (c) There is a greater likelihood of multiple assailants, serial attacks, and risk of retaliatory violence in cases of hate crimes than non-hate crimes. (d) Hate crimes punish the conduct as well as the prejudicial motive of the assailant. The government has an obligation to punish and deter discrimination and may do so without violating First Amendment rights as upheld by the Supreme Court. (e) The commission of a hate crime creates fear
and distrust in whole communities in a way that other crimes do not.

Levin answers the critiques of hate crime laws on the basis of the politics involved in enactment of the laws, and that groups fight among each other to get their own group protected. Regarding the former, Levin says "so what? Politics have always played a role in the passage of criminal laws. Society is far better off for politics having played a role not only in the passage of hate crime legislation, but in the enactment of laws on domestic violence, environmental damage and drunk driving" (1998, p. 31). Levin argues that the drive to enact hate crime laws has united groups, rather than cause division between groups. He points out that new coalitions of organizations representing various groups who are targets of hate crimes have formed. Although some groups have been excluded in state hate crime laws, these groups have often advocated for changes in the initial versions of the laws so as to include more groups.

Levin also refutes the idea that it is dangerous for authorities to establish an offender’s motives. He notes: "Motive is critical in many areas of the law. Breaking and entering only becomes burglary once it is shown that the offender intended to commit an additional crime while on someone else’s property" (p. 39). He argues further: "Criminal law differentiates between seemingly similar conduct in other ways. . . . Carrying a concealed gun on a plane and dealing drugs near schools, for instance, are punished more harshly than the same conduct elsewhere" (p. 39). Lastly, Levin agrees with Jacob and colleagues that the majority of hate offenders are youthful thrillseekers; yet, he believes that strong punishment for the crime is appropriate as a way to send a strong and clear message that the behavior is wrong.

**A CASE FOR INCLUSION OF SEXUAL ORIENTATION IN HATE CRIME LAWS**

It is illogical to include bias-crimes based on race, color, national origin, ethnicity, and religion in a hate crime law and to exclude sexual orientation. Hate crimes toward persons who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgendered look virtually the same as hate crimes toward persons based on the color of their skin, ethnic
background, or religion. The perpetrators have similar motives; the victims experience similar physical and psychological harm. The U.S. Supreme Court has already ruled on the constitutionality of hate crime laws. Therefore, there is no reason to exclude groups that have been targets of hate crimes.

Excluding LGBT persons from hate crime laws denies them equal protection under the law. It has been argued that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment establishes a fundamental right to equal benefit of laws protecting personal security. Laws protecting personal security should be applied even-handedly to all groups who are similarly situated. Excluding LGBT persons from hate crime laws denies them equal benefits of laws protecting personal security, a fundamental right required by the Equal Protection Clause (Winer, 1994).

In Richmond, Virginia, on October 11, 1997, an African-American male found his car spray-painted with homophobic and racial slurs—one side of the car there were words such as “fagat” (sic), on the other side “nigger” (Virginians for Justice, 1997). This victim had already within the preceding three months experienced trespassing incidents, verbal threats on his life, verbal harassment in the front of his house, and discharges of an unidentified weapon under his bedroom window. According to Virginia’s hate crime statute, the crimes related to prejudice against his race would be investigated and prosecuted as hate crimes; whereas the crimes related to his perceived sexual orientation would not be investigated and prosecuted as hate crimes. Is the racist graffiti on this victim’s vehicle to be taken more seriously and profoundly than the homophobic graffiti? The victim testified as to being in fear and threatened by both the homophobic and racial incidents.

**CONCLUSION**

Those who desire to advocate for the inclusion of sexual orientation in federal and state hate crime statutes may consider doing the following: collect local and regional statistics on the prevalence and nature of hate crime incidents toward LGBT persons; identify legislators that may be willing to support a bill that would add sexual orientation to a state hate crime statute; find LGBT victims of hate crimes who would be willing to testify at hearings.
on hate crime-related bills; solicit persons who could provide expert testimony about hate crimes toward LGBT persons, such as staff at a local anti-gay violence project or LGBT community center; know the typical arguments that opponents will raise and prepare responses to them; and build coalitions with other groups that are targets of hate crimes.

In conclusion, hate crime laws exist on the federal level and in the majority of states. Such laws that provide for enhanced sentencing for bias-related crimes, which punish the offender's motive and conduct, have been found to be constitutional. LGBT victims of hate crimes experience similar types of person and property attacks as well as psychosocial crime-related effects as victims who are targeted because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. Existing hate crime laws should include sexual orientation as a matter of logic and in the spirit of upholding the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.
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Americanization and Cultural Preservation in Seattle's Settlement House: A Jewish Adaptation of the Anglo-American Model of Settlement Work

ALISSA SCHWARTZ
New York City

This article examines the dual agendas of Americanization and preservation of Ashkenazic Jewish culture through an historical analysis of the work of Seattle's Settlement House, a social service center founded in 1906 by elite, Americanized Jews to serve poorer, immigrant Jews of Ashkenazic and Sephardic origin. Such analysis is set against the ideological backdrop of Anglo-Americanism which pervaded the field of social work in its early efforts at self-definition and professionalization. Particular attention is paid to the role of the arts at Settlement House, with comparisons to Chicago's Hull-House, the prototypical American settlement operating at the turn of the century. This case study analyzes a German Jewish adaptation of an Anglo-American, Christian model of social work.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, settlement work figured as a central component to the newly developing field of social work. Today, a multitude of paths constitute the practice and conceptualization of social work, and their forerunners in the settlement movement extend beyond the work of Hull-House and Henry Street Settlement and their intelligent, articulate founders, Jane Addams and Lillian Wald. As current discussions range across the field regarding what constitutes an effective multicultural practice of social work, it is important to pause and examine past practice in all its forms to understand how this issue was conceptualized in an earlier era.
Prior to 1890, only four settlements operated in the United States—Neighborhood Guild and College Settlement in New York City, Hull-House in Chicago, and Andover House in Boston (Carson, 1990). By 1910, the settlement movement blossomed to include roughly four hundred centers operating across the United States (Trattner, 1994). Although settlement houses were established in cities of all sizes, most historical analyses of early settlement work have focused on an elite vanguard of workers operating in the largest cities of the United States. More rarely are voices from smaller, “second tier” (Crocker, 1992, p. 6) settlements made a priority for analysis. This study makes use of archival material from the University of Washington and secondary sources regarding the settlement movement in general and settlement work by and for Jews in particular to bring forth a different, lesser known voice of early social work, that of Seattle’s Settlement House.

The dual agendas of Americanization and preservation of Ashkenazic culture operating at Settlement House are examined and set against the ideological backdrop of Christian-influenced Anglo-Americanism which dominated the burgeoning field of social work in its early efforts at self-definition and professionalization. Settlement House’s practices are compared to those of Hull-House, both because Hull-House figured as a practice model for the founders of Settlement House (Andrews, 1984; Devine 1976) and because as an example of a settlement founded by Anglo-Americans to serve newly arriving immigrants, it offers a prototypical model of settlement work to compare with that of Settlement House.

Like most settlements, Seattle’s Settlement House was a place for immigrants to socialize, receive medical care and education, and to adjust to life in their adopted homeland. Founded in 1906 by elite, German Jews who had lived in the city since the 1860s, Settlement House served the needs of the poorer and more recently transplanted East European and Sephardic Jews. By choosing to focus on the needs of Jews over those of other community members, Settlement House founders departed from the (supposedly) non-sectarian model of Anglo-American settlement work. Settlement House workers’ interest in Americanizing immigrants paralleled, however, the mission of Anglo-American workers.
At the turn of the century, Seattle was a small, frontier town, far from the American Jewish epicenters of Chicago and New York City. Although the city's Jewish population was quite small and assimilation threatened to further decrease its numbers, Jews divided themselves along the same ethnic and cultural lines as those living in larger numbers elsewhere. Ashkenazim and Sephardim maintained their distinctions, as did Germans and East Europeans. Sephardim also separated themselves along geographic lines of origin. Settlement House workers' preference in preserving Ashkenazic over Sephardic culture helped to maintain such distinctions. In addition, Settlement House workers promoted a non-traditional Judaism that was alien to both East European Jews and Sephardim. Workers favored the use of English over Yiddish and Ladino, and they promoted secularity over orthodoxy. These emphases ultimately contributed to the development of a new identity for Jews living in the United States, that of the American Jew.

Also examined in this article is the role that artistic activity, particularly theater, played at Settlement House in facilitating the dual missions of Americanization and preservation of Ashkenazic culture. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the arts were considered an essential element of social work (Patterson, 1997). Both Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr, co-founders of Hull-House, were passionate advocates of the arts and crafts movement promoted by English pre-Raphaelites William Morris and John Ruskin (Patterson, 1997). Morris and Ruskin argued that industrialism negatively affected individuality and caused an artificial schism to develop between work and expression, resulting in alienation and a loss of traditional skills. Jane Addams advocated the use of theater in settlement work, praising art for counteracting the "uncouth stranger, Modern Industry" (Addams, 1932, p. 382). A report from Seattle's Settlement House parallels Addams' sentiments: "Nothing is more valuable for character building than the giving of plays" (1923/24 Report, CJW Archives).

Although some of Settlement House's theatrical activity drew upon East European traditions, Sephardic cultural productions never appeared on its stage. To understand the ethnic tensions that precluded such activity from occurring at Settlement House,
one must understand the cultural and religious differences among German, East European, and Sephardic Jews. What follows is an introduction to the various Jewish ethnic groups whose members immigrated to the United States during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

DIFFERENCES AMONG GERMAN, EAST EUROPEAN AND SEPHARDIC JEWS.

The two major Jewish cultural groups living in the United States are Ashkenazim, Jews of central and east European descent, and Sephardim, Jews of Spanish descent. Prior to the Spanish Inquisition of 1492, Sephardim represented the majority of world Jewry; however, since their dispersion, their representation has decreased until they have since accounted for only 5–10% of world Jewry (Adatto, 1939; Roth, 1971). The United States' first wave of Ashkenazic immigration comprised 200,000 German Jews fleeing nationalistic, anti-Semitic laws between the years 1820 and 1880. From 1880 to 1924, East European Jews immigrated in a second wave of 2.5 million (Lowenstein, 1967; Toll, 1982). Although Sephardim have a history of migration to the United States that stretches back to a small, first wave emigrating from England and the Netherlands in the seventeenth century, their numbers in the United States are significantly lower than those of Ashkenazim (Adatto, 1939; Benardete, 1982). Between the years 1899 and 1913, several thousand Sephardim from the Mediterranean region arrived in a second wave to the United States, bringing their total number to roughly 15,000 (Adatto, 1939).

Having not encountered one another until they arrived in the United States, varying degrees of discord developed among Jews from different geographic origins. Tensions ran particularly high between German and East European Jews. Americanized, German Jews feared that their social status would fall through their association, in the minds of non-Jews, with their newly arriving, East European counterparts. Although they looked alike, their practices and values differed significantly. German Jews had a history of assimilation that stretched back to the late seventeenth century (Cohen, 1984), and unlike the orthodox, culturally separatist
Jews of Eastern Europe, they did not practice a particularly ob-
servant form of Judaism, or speak a language, Yiddish, which
separated them from the general population. East European Jews,
for their part, did not understand why the "decorum loving"
(Lowenstein, 1967, p. 79) German Jews carried themselves as
gentiles. Having lived primarily in shtetls—small, pre-industrial
towns—East European Jews fled anti-Semitic pogroms and dire
poverty for the United States, only to discover that their social,
cultural, and religious practices conflicted with American ones as
well as those of German Jews.

As with East Europeans, Sephardim maintained a cultural
separation from their host countries and lead rural and isolated
lives centered on religion (Cohen, 1984). Nationalism and in-
dustrialism, rather than anti-Semitism, were the driving forces
behind Sephardim leaving their homes. Many Jews left the Med-
terranean when faced with forced conscription in the Turkish
army after the 1909 overthrow of the Ottoman Sultan, Abdul
Hamid (Benardete, 1982). Upon arrival in the United States, Sep-
hardim maintained distinctions among themselves in reference
to geographic origin. In an early account of Sephardim living in
the Mediterranean, Hacker (1926) writes:

The men of Castoria, in their synagogues, employed a slightly
different cantilation that was unpleasing to the men of the island
of Chios... Because of a localism that was the development of
centuries, men from towns only thirty miles apart were prone to
regard one another with distrust. (As quoted in Benardete, 1982,
p. 172)

All Sephardim, however, shared a similar culture and language,
Ladino, which dated back to their common history in Spain.

In the United States, Sephardic culture and practices were for-
eign to Ashkenazim and not well tolerated by them. Speaking dif-
fferent languages and practicing Judaism differently, Ashkenazim
and Sephardim maintained separate social, educational, and re-
ligious institutions. Racism was also a factor, with Ashkenazim
disparaging Sephardim for their darker skins. One Sephardi re-
ports at the beginning of the twentieth century: "the Levantine
Jews feel more discrimination from the other wings of the Jews
than they do from non-Jews" (Adatto, 1939, p. 28).
The first Jews arrived in Seattle in 1860 from Germany. Selling clothing, food, and tools, they “mine[d] the miners” (Droker, 1983, p. 6) of the Californian and Alaskan gold rushes. First settled by white people in 1852, Seattle in the 1860s was a frontier outpost of roughly one thousand people and home to three Jewish families, the Schwabachers, Frauenthals, and Kaufmans (Cohn, 1982). German Jews participated in the city’s civic and social life, and they attained financial success rather quickly. In 1884, Babette Schwabacher Gatzert helped found Seattle Children’s Home, Seattle’s first charitable organization. Bailey Gatzert, her husband, served as mayor of the city in 1876, and he also sat on the Chamber of Commerce as their first president (Avner & Buttnick 1995; Droker, 1983).

At the same time that German Jews were enjoying a certain amount of material and social success in Seattle, they ran up against anti-Semitic attitudes which excluded them from elite, Anglo-American organizations. In response, they established separate civic and social organizations for themselves. In 1883, German Jews founded a local chapter of the B’nai B’rith, a national fraternal organization aiding in members’ health and death expenses. In 1892, German Jewish women—excluded from suffrage clubs, the Women’s Century Club, and the Daughters of the American Revolution (Blair, 1988)—founded the Ladies Hebrew Benevolent Society, an organization serving the newly arriving East European Jews (The Jewish Experience in Washington State, 1990).

For East European Jews arriving in Seattle in the 1880s, participation in the city’s social and civic life was less important than the maintenance of their culture, and the first organizations they established for themselves were religious congregations. The same holds true for Sephardim who arrived from Turkey and Rhodes two decades later. Having never encountered one another until their arrival in the United States, the two Sephardic groups established separate religious and social organizations, although they occasionally united for larger cultural events.

As a coastal city, Seattle beckoned as an attractive site for Sephardic immigration, which began in 1903 (Droker, 1983). By
1910, Sephardim comprised 600 of the 4,500 Jews living in Seattle, the largest Sephardic population outside of New York City (Adatto, 1939; Droker, 1983). By the First World War, the number of Sephardim had climbed to 1,500. With 10,000 Jews living in Seattle, the number of Sephardim and their proportion to Ashkenazim were significantly higher than the national average (Adatto, 1939).

Ashkenazim did not initially acknowledge as Jews the first Sephardim arriving in Seattle. One Ashkenazi wrote what was apparently considered at the time to be a sympathetic portrayal of Sephardim: "We Jews were originally all half-niggers" (Jewish Transcript, March, 1928 as quoted in Adatto, 1939, p. 132). Sephardim maintained a correspondingly low opinion of Ashkenazim. They disparaged German Jews as "Protestantes" and "hatless Jews" (Adatto, 1939, pp. 118, 119) because of their reform practices, and they called East European Jews "schmaltz" (Droker, 1983, p. 9), Yiddish for the chicken fat used in their cooking.

At the turn of the century, most of Seattle's Jews, regardless of origin, lived in an ethnically mixed, primarily Jewish neighborhood called the Central District (Droker, 1983). Many families lived without hot water, electricity or baths and were in need of services to aid them in their adjustment to life in the United States (Devine, 1976). Settlement activities in Portland, Oregon's Jewish community prefigured those in Seattle by a year and were instrumental in the founding of Seattle's Settlement House (Toll, 1982). In 1905, Portland's Council of Jewish Women (CJW), a national social and charitable organization founded by German Jewish women in Chicago, coordinated their piecemeal services for immigrant Jews and established Neighborhood House. A year later, a member of Portland's CJW visited the Seattle CJW and "chastise[d] them . . . for a lack of an initiative" (Toll, 1990, p. 76). At that time, Seattle's CJW activities were limited to hospital visitations, care-taking of graves, and sewing classes. After the embarrassing visit, Seattle's CJW founded Settlement House, basing it on eastern models of social work, particularly that of Chicago's Hull-House (Andrews, 1984; Devine 1976).

Originally housed in the bottom floor of a privately owned home, Settlement House moved three times in its first decade
of operation. Initial offerings of sewing and religion classes expanded to include free baths, medical care, Americanization classes, and Ashkenazic cultural activities. In 1916, Settlement House established a permanent locale in its own three-story brick building, changing its name in 1917 to the Educational Center, to better reflect its mission of Americanizing immigrants (Devine, 1976). Throughout this article, Settlement House will be referred to as "Settlement House" when discussing events prior to 1917 and as the "Educational Center" in reference to events during and after 1917.

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL MOVEMENT AND AMERICANIZATION AT HULL-HOUSE

While some historians (Davis, 1967; Rose, 1994; Trolander, 1987) may argue that Seattle's Settlement House, with its sectarian focus, did not cultivate a true practice of settlement work, this "heroic version" (Crocker, 1992, p. 6) of the movement as non-religious disregards its Christian roots. The development in England of Christian Socialism, a religious movement focused on tackling social problems through the practical application of Christian values, was central to the development of settlement work. Christian Socialism transplanted in the United States became known as the Social Gospel movement, and it informed the practice of many American workers, including Jane Addams. Addams wrote that the movement had a "bent to express in social service and in terms of action the spirit of Christ," and that Christian humanitarianism should be applied to settlement work (Addams, 1910, p. 124 as quoted in Garland, 1994, p. 81).

With the huge flux of immigration to the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the question of how to incorporate new immigrants into American culture was a topic of debate among Americans and immigrants alike, and the Social Gospel movement influenced settlement workers' thoughts and practices. Three conceptualizations of Americanization predominated: pluralism, cosmopolitanism, and Anglo-Americanism (Lissak, 1989). Proponents of pluralism advocated that ethnic groups maintain separate identities while enjoying equal access to political and economic opportunities.
Cosmopolitans, adopting the melting pot as their symbol, advocated a melding together of various cultures to form a new hybrid. Advocates of Anglo-Americanism called for "compulsory acculturation" (Lissak, p. 179) in which immigrants would be forced to abandon allegiance to their countries of origin and give up their mother tongue before acquiring United States citizenship.

The Social Gospel movement, with its pluralistic stance towards the various Christian denominations "laid the groundwork for the advocacy of cultural pluralism that became a hallmark of the American settlement movement" (Carson, 1990, pp. 57-58). While settlement work thus associated itself with the ideology of pluralism, Hull-House workers actually worked more from the values of cosmopolitanism and Anglo-Americanism. Blood (1993) writes:

Addams envisioned a mixture [of American society] in which the bourgeois, "White Anglo-Saxon Protestant" values of early America would remain dominant, and education and political autonomy would be maintained by an educated, moneyed elite, who in turn had a kind of patrician responsibility to serve the good of all Americans. (p. 73)

While not forcing acculturation, Hull-House workers advocated a gradual assimilation into Anglo-American culture. Addams developed a three-part plan for acculturating immigrants which consisted of first respecting and promoting a particular group's traditions and contributions to American society, then encouraging such a group to take on more Anglo-American values, and finally mixing different immigrant groups together for the purpose of Americanization (Blood, 1993; Lissak, 1989). Lissak comments:

The contribution idea served therefore as a psychological device designed to make newcomers feel that their cultures were respected and found worthy of inclusion in the American common fund, when they were actually engaged in a process of transition from their particularistic cultures to the American so-called universal, cosmopolitan civilization. (p. 161)

Cultural tolerance, then, was put into service for the creation of an American society based on the "genteel tradition" (Lissak, 1989, p. 158), an amalgamation of cultures ranging from the ancient
Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, and Roman civilizations; to those of the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and Enlightenment; and culminating in the culture of Progressive nineteenth-century Europe and America. Ironically, the culture of modern-day Hebrews, that of Jews, was presumed to be outside of this tradition.

AMERICANIZATION AT SETTLEMENT HOUSE

Anglo-American cultural discrimination against Jews, then, was also aimed at Settlement House's German Jewish founders. The settlement movement functioned as an early liberation movement for upper and middle-class, educated women (Patterson, 1997). In the late nineteenth century, these women were socialized to administer to family and friends within the confines of their homes. Due to the immense social and economic problems caused by industrialism, such women began to engage in public work. The founders of Seattle's Settlement House, elite German Jewish women, were subject to the same social forces as their Anglo-American counterparts (Toll, 1982). Ironically, as Jewish women were liberated from the confines of their homes, they were oppressed by their exclusion from joining Anglo-American women's social and charitable organizations (Blair, 1988). Even while Jewish women's marginal status as Americans precluded them from joining such circles, Settlement House's founders committed themselves to the Americanization of East European and Sephardic Jews, whom they considered lacking in gentility. An excerpt from a yearbook makes manifest their mission:

A SETTLEMENT is not a sentiment—it is a social necessity. The dependence of all classes, one upon the other, must be satisfactorily adjusted; and this can only be done by the SOCIAL ELBOWING of life. If we are going to share with our less fortunate brethren, let us also share our PRESENCE. If we are truly our "Brother's keeper," it is for us who are fortunate in the possession of education—of leisure—of wealth—and of talent—to make ourselves permanently useful to our less fortunate brethren. [Bold and capitalizations are in the original document.] (1921/22 Yearbook, CJW Archives)

Overt Americanization activities included celebrating Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays, leading children in "patriotic exercises" of saluting the American flag and singing songs, and involving immigrants in "patriotic work" during the First World
War (CJW Archives). Beginning in 1915, Settlement House offered citizenship and English classes. As immigration declined after the First World War and public schools began to offer these classes, such services waned. Throughout these years, however, many clubs—notably the Mothers Club—offered informal opportunities for immigrants to learn and practice English. A report from the 1921/22 CJW Yearbook emphasizes the importance of such clubs in the Americanization process:

Miss Cone [resident worker] has so given of herself to these mothers, —that they feel inspired to read, write, and TALK the English language. . . . Two representatives of the Public Schools complained bitterly of the fact that the children are not encouraged to use the English language in the homes of many of the foreigners,—and, in many cases, forget their pronunciation from Friday to Monday. The mothers, in turn, have complained that their children were forgetting their language,—and so, the situation could only be met by getting the mothers interested in learning the language themselves. (CJW Archives)

Settlement House’s Americanization process consisted of twin goals, that of introducing the genteel tradition to immigrant Jews and of helping to transform orthodox, East European Jews into secular, American Jews. According to the founders of Settlement House, the ideal American spoke English, was involved in patriotic activities, and embraced Anglo-American values. The ideal American Jew was both an ideal American and an ideal Jew, practicing an Ashkenazic Judaism stripped of its ethnic and orthodox overtones.

Settlement House workers utilized Jewish holidays to socialize East European immigrants in an American Jewish culture, one which involved a smoothing out of differences among the Jewish ethnicities and a secularization of religious activities. Chanukah festivals at Settlement House included vaudeville performances in a “Hebrew [Yiddish] dialect” (Elliot, 1944, p. 52), classical dance and music recitals, and plays in English performed by social clubs. Sara Efron, an East European Jew who made use of the House as a child, recalls:

Now, thinking back on it, it amazes me that my parents being so orthodox would have permitted me to go there, but it was innocuous. The stories were [from the] Bible, and I believe they
felt that they should in every way try to become Americanized and take on American ways. . . . This was one of the ways that we [were] given a glimpse of how things were being done in America in comparison to the way we lived in our own homes. (Interview, CJW Archives)

While Hull-House workers tolerated the cultural contributions of immigrants to the extent to which the process served the ultimate objective of creating a cosmopolitan Anglo-American society, Settlement House workers tolerated only certain forms of Jewish practice in the service of creating the American Jew. Sephardic culture, unwelcome and alien to Settlement House’s German founders, was almost entirely disregarded in such work. Sephardim, therefore, most often made use of Settlement House to participate in overt American, rather than Jewish, activities. Gordon De Leon, a Sephardic Jew who attended the Educational Center as a youth, describes Sephardim’s encounter with the Center: “She [Mrs. Alexander, the residential worker in the 1920s] pushed us to have social affairs, Mother’s Day celebrations. . . . We had Sunday afternoon dances. We never knew about going to public dances and stuff like that” (Interview, CJW Archives).

ARTS AND AMERICANIZATION AT HULL-HOUSE

In Jane Addams’ memoirs of Hull-House, she writes: “One of the most conspicuous features in our neighborhood, as of all industrial quarters, is the persistency with which the entire population attends the theater” (Addams, 1932, p. 383). Addams is referring to melodrama, a wildly popular form of entertainment at the turn of the century. With its sensational plots and exaggerated heroes and villains, melodramatic theater gave its audience a temporary escape from their problems. Cheap and easy to produce, melodrama was democratic in nature (Gerould, 1983). Addams did not approve of the genre, however, crediting it as an immoral influence on its audiences, including immigrant children:

The young men told us their ambitions in the phrases of stage heroes, and the girls, so far as their romantic dreams could be shyly put into words, possessed no other but those soiled by long use in the melodrama. (Addams, 1932, p. 384)
While disapproving of the genre, Addams recognized the power of the stage to influence people's thoughts and behaviors. She developed an alternate vision of the theater as a "reconstructing and reorganizing agent of accepted moral truths" (Addams, 1932, p. 391). From its earliest years, theater was thus put to use at Hull-House to socialize and Americanize immigrants. Hull-House offered classes in Shakespeare and Greek tragedy, ethnically mixed children's clubs performed plays in English, and an amateur adult company staged several plays (Hecht, 1983).

At the same time Addams was developing her vision of the social use for theater, a new theatrical form was emerging that challenged the big, commercial stock theaters operating across the country. The "little theater" movement, devoted to artistic experimentation and social realism, developed at the turn of the century and offered an elite, socially conscious alternative to melodrama (Macgowan, 1929; Mackay, 1917). In 1905, Hull-House formed a little theater troupe, the Hull-House Players, whose roots stretched back to the formation in 1893 of the Dramatic Section of Hull-House's Student Association (Hecht, 1982).

The Hull-House Players staged social realist works, some of them local or national premieres, by Shaw, Ibsen, Yeats, Galsworthy, and Hauptmann. Such works did not appeal to immigrants living in the surrounding neighborhood, and in an effort to simultaneously gain an audience and to demonstrate "the great human potential the working class, immigrant population possessed" (Hecht, 1982, p. 175), the Players toured their productions to the wealthy suburbs of Chicago. Ironically, the Hull-House Players never received professional recognition as a pioneer in little theater, for their productions were too closely associated with Addams' ideology of placing a higher value on the social, rather than artistic usefulness of theater (Cheney, 1917; Hecht, 1982). Instead, professional credit for the development of American little theater is generally given to Maurice Browne's Little Theatre, established in Chicago in 1912. Browne, however, credited the Hull-House Players as a prime influence in his work (Hecht, 1982).

Occasionally a group of immigrants would stage a production at Hull-House in their native language, but this was a fairly rare event (Hecht, 1983). A few times, East European groups unaffiliated with Hull-House mounted a work in Yiddish, but
the only Jewish productions ever sponsored by Hull-House were two plays given in 1906-07 by members of a Jewish boys club (Adams, 1932; Lissak, 1989). The plays, *Joseph and his Brethren* and *Queen Esther*, were performed in English and tolerated as stories from the *Bible*, thus fitting into the workers' conceptualization of the genteel tradition (Patterson, 1997).

**ARTS, AMERICANIZATION, AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION AT SETTLEMENT HOUSE**

Consistent with the ideology of Anglo-American settlement workers, Settlement House workers believed that recreational and cultural activities were not intrinsically important. Rather, such offerings served the purpose of inculcating children with genteel values and keeping them off the street and under the "maternal surveillance" (Toll, 1990, p. 76) of settlement workers. A CJW report from 1918/19 reads:

> Two new activities have been added to our curriculum, Folk Dancing and Story Telling. . . . While healthy exercise, and training in manners, culture and imagination are to be gained from these, the real underlying idea in establishing them is to get the children to come to the House as often as possible—every day and all day—thus bringing them under proper guidance and keeping them well occupied. By so doing it is our hope to have them grow up with us, to have them feel at home in our home and thus feel that the Educational Center is theirs. We do not wish to lose our hold over them but by surrounding them with the proper influence and guidance have them with us as they develop and arrive at the critical period of their lives, just when entering young manhood and young womanhood. (CJW Archives)

Folk-dancing was first offered at Settlement House in 1913. Proving to be enormously popular, participation was restricted to children taking part in at least one other activity at the House. In 1918, Nellie Cornish, founder of the contemporary Cornish College of the Arts, established a branch of her children's art school at Settlement House. She supplied the school with two dance teachers and two accompanists. Although no further detail is available in any CJW reports regarding the curriculum, the fact that teachers were supplied from outside of the Jewish community implies that the classes had little to do with the preservation
of any form of Jewish culture and more with introducing children to popular, American dances.

As with other settlements, the Educational Center sponsored the formation of a little theater company, the Neighborhood Players. Maurice Browne’s influence in the little theater movement stretched from Chicago to the Pacific and touched the Players. In 1918, he and his wife, Ellen Van Volkenburg, were invited by Nellie Cornish to found a drama department at the Cornish School. In 1921, the couple founded the first little theater in Seattle, immodestly naming it the Maurice Browne and Ellen Van Volkenburg Repertory Company (Cornish, 1964). It soon became known as the Cornish Little Theater. The Educational Center’s Neighborhood Players were active in the mid-1920s and were directed by a Mr. Marceau, who also directed productions for the Cornish Little Theater. The Players’ productions included Madame Butterfly, Lord Dunsany’s The Gods of the Mountain (1925), and Brooks’ Whappin’ Wharf (1926) (CJW Archives). These works, English and American social realist dramas, were not relevant to Jewish immigrant life, and by attending and participating in such productions, Jewish immigrants were exposed to the cultural values of the American elite.

Due to federal restrictions instituted in 1924, Jewish immigration reduced to a trickle in the 1920s (Schwartz, 1966; Simon, 1992). The potential loss of Jewish cultures loomed threateningly before first-generation Jews, and the Educational Center’s mission shifted to include a more authentic preservation of Jewish culture, albeit only in its East European form. Until then, East European Jewish culture had been Americanized, as in the case of a production of the Fidelia Club, a girls’ club which gave plays once a year. Paralleling the Hull-House productions in English of Jewish stories from the Bible, the Fidelia Club performed in 1916 a Chanukah story titled What’s Tonight? (CJW Archives; Devine 1976). Although workers did not provide instruction in immigrant arts, in the 1920s they allowed their space to be used by a number of groups committed to the preservation of Yiddish and Russian cultures. These groups also entered the cultural mainstream of Seattle, performing for non-Jews. Sephardic cultural production remained anathema, however, to the Center’s workers and to Seattle’s overall population.
Hazomir, a group dedicated to performing Yiddish folk songs, gave several concerts at the Educational Center. A review notes that once their work had crossed over and had gained acceptance by non-Jews, German Jews allowed themselves to profess their interest in Yiddish culture as well:

A lot of Jews who secretly enjoy these Yiddish melodies have until recently been ashamed to admit it publicly—what would the good Nordics think of them? But of late years the goyim themselves have begun to appreciate them immensely—look what a fuss they've been making over “Eli, Eli!”—so we suppose it's quite all-right now for Jews—or shall we rather say Jewesses?—who want to make the grade socially to admit that they like that sort of stuff. (Jewish Transcript, May 4, 1928, p. 4)

Other East European groups met similar acceptance by German Jews and the larger public. The Yiddish Dramatic Society staged at least two productions at the Educational Center, The Landsleit (1925) and Hear O Israel (1926). In 1928, the Yiddish Art Society performed The Dybbuk and Dem Taifel's Shabbos at Temple De Hirsch, a reform synagogue originally founded by Yiddish-snubbing German Jews. In the same year, the Russian Dramatic Literary Society, a Jewish organization committed to the promotion of Russian culture, performed at the Women's University Club, one of Seattle's elite, Anglo-American women's organizations.

In the 1920s, first-generation East European Jews, born and bred in the United States, were more acculturated than their parents to Anglo-American values and practices. They were therefore more highly regarded, both by Educational Center workers and by the larger American populace. Referring to members of the Russian Dramatic Literary Society, an Educational Center's president wrote: “Some of the people attending this club's activities, though poor, are very highly cultured, in fact consider themselves much better educated than the average American college bred men and women” (CJW Archives). This settlement leader's high regard for East European Jews demonstrates markedly more respect than a worker’s patronizing attitude from two decades earlier, as recalled by Sara Efron: “She [the first residential worker, Hannah Schwartz] gave us girls lessons in deportment, in how
to properly sit and how to properly speak” (Interview, CJW Archives).

While the culture of East European Jews was embraced by a wide audience in Seattle, both Ashkenazim and the general populace disregarded Sephardic culture. Although they were ignored by others, the two groups of Seattle's Sephardim, those from Turkey and those from Rhodes, successfully worked together for the first time in the 1920s. In 1921, they joined together to form the Seattle Progressive Fraternity, a club that made use of the Educational Center to celebrate American holidays, including Mothers' Day and Halloween (Jewish Transcript). The Fraternity “interested their new members in becoming citizens of the United States” (Adatto, 1939, p. 99), opening and closing each meeting with patriotic songs. Sephardic cultural events, however, only took place in Sephardic facilities, often synagogues. Plays in Ladino, for instance, were performed in various Sephardic congregations, and although they were not attended by Ashkenazim, they were enjoyed by both groups of Sephardim (Angel, 1973).

During the lean years of the Depression, the Neighborhood Players disbanded, and East European groups ceased staging productions at the Educational Center. Teachers funded by the Federal Emergency Relief Act and the Works Progress Administration gave instruction in visual arts, children's activities, and theater. They directed two plays in 1936, The Valiant and Station YYY, neither of which are relevant to the little theater movement or to Judaism. These are the Educational Center’s last theater productions recorded in the CJW Archives, and reports for the Center’s remaining years of operation mention little artistic activity.

While East European Jews were denied national citizenship in their countries of origin, in the United States they developed a “dual identity” as Americans and as Jews (Linzer, Schnall, & Chanes, 1998, p. 5). Following the Second World War, as they increasingly spoke English and tasted economic success, East European Jews moved from poor, Jewish neighborhoods and dispersed to wealthier areas (Linzer, et al.). As immigrant Jews acculturated to the United States, the challenge of fully incorporating them into American culture was eclipsed by the African-American civil rights movement. White people defined who was American largely by race, rather than by ethnicity. East European
Jews, perceived by white people to be white, were considered by them to be American (Biale, Galchinsky, & Heschel, 1998).

Sephardim, with their smaller numbers and disunity among themselves, intermarried during this period at a rate four times higher than that of Ashkenazim (Donnell, 1987). For every Sephardic-Ashkenazic marriage, there were four Sephardic-non-Jewish marriages (Adatto, 1939). Subsequent generations of Sephardim, having mixed with Ashkenazim and other groups, were perceived by white people to be white and therefore American. As Sephardim transformed into American Jews, they lost much of what was distinctive to their culture. Marcus (1995) writes: “In the United States, Jews, once a hodgepodge of warring ethnics, emerged from the crucible of that postwar decade as American Jews” (p. 330).

At the same time that Jews in Seattle Americanized and moved out of the Central District, increasing numbers of African-Americans moved into the neighborhood. By 1947, Jewish families were in the minority (Devine, 1976), and in 1948 the Educational Center changed the composition of its leadership to reflect the changing demographics of the community and renamed itself Neighborhood House. In 1953, Neighborhood House established itself as an independent organization, and three years later the CJW sold the building to a bakery. This sale gave rise to misunderstanding and resentment by Neighborhood House staff and community members. Having thought that they would inherit the building, they now found themselves forced to seek new facilities. Such an abdication of responsibility by the CJW reflected the broader trend of established, white social service agencies fleeing neighborhoods as they became increasingly African-American (Trolander, 1987). Neighborhood House found facilities in the nearby Yesler Terrace Housing Development and later developed branches in four other public housing communities (LaFond, 1968; Langbecker, 1955).

IMMIGRANT COMMUNITY CENTER
OR JEWISH HULL HOUSE?

The settlement movement is unique in its focus on the “social reorganization” (Lissak, 1989) of immigrants. What distinguishes
settlements from immigrant-founded community centers is such an emphasis over that of ethnic preservation. Lissak writes of the difference between Hull-House and immigrant community centers:

The ultimate objective of the Hull-House club policy was the dissolution of the ethnic group through the integration of individuals into the cosmopolitan or ethnically mixed general community; while the ultimate objective of the club policy of immigrant community centers and immigrant settlements was the preservation of ethnicity through the social ethnic segregation of newcomers. (p. 131)

Was Settlement House, then, a “Jewish Hull-House” (Rose, 1994) or a community center run by and for immigrants? Although Seattle’s Settlement House was ostensibly open to all community members, workers kept track of the number of Jews involved in its activities and attempted to keep the organization primarily serving Jews (Toll, 1990). Whereas the agenda at Hull-House was one of social reorganization, Settlement House workers allowed their space to be used by various groups, including Zionists, Sephardim, and Yiddish-speaking (but not socialist) groups. Jewish organizations rarely rented Hull-House’s spaces (Lissak, 1989), but many made use of Settlement House’s facilities. At Hull-House, Jewish religious and national holidays were never celebrated, even when the Italian Mardi Gras and Irish St. Patrick’s Day were (Lissak, 1989). Settlement House, however, sponsored annual Purim and Chanukah celebrations, albeit in non-traditional forms.

While Hull-House’s mission in regards to its immigrant users was primarily to Anglo-Americanize them, Settlement House was founded with the dual purposes of Americanizing immigrants and transforming East Europeans into American Jews. Given that Settlement House never took leadership, however, in the preservation of traditional Jewish cultures, Settlement House is a suspect member of the immigrant community center movement. It was a place where German Jewish women could promote Americanization even while experiencing exclusion from elite women’s organizations. It was a place where East European culture was validated, albeit in a hegemonic form that blended with Anglo-American culture. It was a place where up to 90% of the
immediate neighborhood was Sephardic for much of its operating years, and yet only Yiddish literature could be found in its library (LaFond, 1968). Settlement House, then, with its underlying agenda of smoothing out the differences among Ashkenazic Jews and of Americanizing all Jews had practices more in common with the settlement movement than that of immigrant community centers.

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR CONTEMPORARY PRACTICE WITH IMMIGRANT GROUPS

As discussed, in the early days of social work, an ideology of Anglo-Americanism predominated, and correspondingly, settlement workers did not value the preservation of immigrant culture. Seattle’s Settlement House workers, partly due to their marginalization as Jews, stressed the importance of both Anglo-Americanization and preservation of immigrant culture. While they favored Ashkenazic tradition over Sephardic, their dual agenda for immigrants is relatively modern for its time and anticipates contemporary social work practice with immigrants.

Settlement House’s use of Jewish workers to advance both culturally-specific programming and a basic level of Americanization (e.g. an understanding of English) predates contemporary practice. It does so both in its use of workers that reflect the population they serve and in its focus on these twin concerns. Settlement House’s emphasis on Anglo-Americanism and favoritism towards one cultural group over another, however, would be considered poor practice by today’s standards.

It was not until the second half of the twentieth century that widespread and profound social changes made Anglo-Americanism untenable. Today, multiculturalism, or the equal value and appreciation for all cultures, is now one of the key components of mainstream social work practice. All social workers, regardless of background, can learn from past practice and understand the importance of maintaining an awareness of power dynamics among different immigrant groups in multi-group settings. Not only did Settlement House’s German Jews prefer to work with East European Jews, the East Europeans influenced Settlement House’s agenda by allying with the German Jews against Sephardim.
Social workers must also be aware of their own favoritism towards certain groups and work towards equalizing their services. While workers who share a cultural background with their clients certainly aid in articulating their needs, such workers can learn from past practice and counter any bias they may have against sub-groups within the larger group that they belong. In addition, contemporary social work education, with its stress on multiculturalism, has helped to produce a body of social workers sensitized to both the cultural and Americanization needs of all immigrants. In our increasingly multiracial, multiethnic society, it is becoming less possible to cleanly divide people, including workers and clients, according to race, ethnicity, language, and class. Cultural preservation has become Americanization.
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This research compares employment training program staff estimates (N = 118) and enrollee reports (N = 122) of woman battering, that is, the physical violence and other abuse men deploy against their wives and girlfriends. The vast majority of staff estimate that woman battering obstructs the transition from welfare to work for at least some of their clients. Overall, staff respondents' relative sense of the frequency of battering quite accurately reflects enrollee reports. However, staff are especially reluctant to give estimates of physical violence and injury. Moreover, many give very low estimates for those items that are obvious markers of battering, which enrollees report at nontrivial levels. Such discrepancies are particularly disturbing because successful welfare reform implementation depends in part on staff understandings of woman battering as an obstacle to welfare-to-work transition.

This research compares employment training program staff estimates and enrollee reports of one potential obstruction to welfare-to-work transition with considerable bearing on welfare reform: woman battering, that is, the physical violence and other abuse men use to control, isolate, and dominate their current or ex-wives or girlfriends.

Woman battering, welfare-to-work transition, and staff estimates

Battering potentially obstructs welfare-to-work transition in at least three ways. First, battering creates short term safety and health crises. Injuries or court appearances to seek a Protection From Abuse order (PFA) may prevent battered women
from complying with work requirements. Second, in the intermediate term, abusive control sabotages women’s success in job training and waged work. Failing certification exams or probationary attendance requirements because of the damage or distractions of abuse can derail welfare-to-work transition (Raphael, 1997). Third, the long-term consequences can include disabling injuries, disrupted education, and a cluster of cognitive and emotional symptoms that can impede training and work performance (Murphy, 1993).

Battered women, in short, are likely to be among those clients whose transition from welfare to work will be most fraught. Unless welfare-to-work programs can recognize and address these obstacles, battered women may be especially vulnerable to incurring sanctions. Moreover, their failure to comply with program requirements can count against the performance criteria welfare reformers set for the states’ drawing down their Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) block grants.

To protect battered women from such penalties, and to motivate states to serve rather than sanction battered women, advocates lobbied for an amendment to TANF that would allow states to screen for battering, make referrals, provide services, and temporarily waive the work requirements and time limits TANF imposes (Pollack & Davis, 1997). Most important from a welfare reform administration standpoint, what became known as the Family Violence Option [FVO; PL 104-193, Title 1, TANF § 402(a)(B)(7)] allows states to meet the needs of battered women without jeopardizing their TANF block grant and without counting battered women against the twenty percent of the welfare caseload eligible for “hardship exemption” under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA).

Most existing estimates of the prevalence of battering stem from advocates lobbying for adoption and implementation of FVO. Advocates marshaled anecdotal evidence from the “front lines” of welfare-to-work program administration by informally surveying directors of employment training programs—the organizations where the rubber hits the road for welfare reform. For example, in New York City, “key informants” from employment training sites estimated that battering was a problem for between
30 and 75 percent of their clients. The study concluded that "Job training providers agreed that domestic violence is a serious problem and an employment barrier for the population they serve" (Kenney & Brown, 1996: 7). The methods employed in the NYC study yielded a wide range of estimates that advocates nevertheless interpreted as consensus on the scope and character of the obstacle battering poses to women's welfare-to-work transition.

Staff estimates matter because successful TANF and FVO implementation rests in large part on assessment, referrals, and service provision by staff in local welfare offices and employment training programs. The present study addresses the wide variance of estimates and anecdotal nature of evidence of battering by systematically surveying program staff and by administering comparable instruments to both staff and enrollees. I present the most notable of my findings and seek to explain both the variation in staff estimates and the gaps between staff estimates and enrollee reports.

METHODS

During April and May 1998, I administered surveys to 120 staff (directors, caseworkers, instructors, job developers, and clerical workers with client contact) at 15 of the 16 eligible job training contract sites in an FVO county. By agreement with the State Bureau of Program Evaluation (BPE) and the University Institutional Review Board (IRB), eligible sites were those serving adult, nonprisoner welfare recipients without severe mental disabilities. The director at one eligible site denied access because the site was short-staffed when the project was in the field. The overall response rate of the staff attending the regularly-scheduled meetings at which I administered the survey was 97 percent (N = 118). The site access agreement required complete anonymity, which precluded identifying staff by program site; staff response are therefore pooled across the 15 sites.

Along with a trained volunteer, I also interviewed program enrollees in the shortest-term (four week) job readiness program, a subset of six of the 15 staff survey sites. We interviewed 122 respondents, the entire incoming cohort; this portion of the project was a population study of the May-June 1998 enrollees. By agreement with the BPE and the IRB, all enrollees were guaranteed
anonymity, compensated with $10 vouchers from a regional supermarket, and offered information about how to obtain a PFA and support on a palm card provided by a local battered women’s shelter.

The staff survey instrument measured estimates of how many of their clients face a wide range of potentially abusive behaviors, emotional distress, and other challenges to program participation and welfare-to-work transition (Brush, 1998). I report here on notable findings from two general items (asking whether staff thought “violent or controlling behaviors are a problem for any of the women participating in your program” and if so what percentage) and four sets of specific potential obstacles drawn from a review of research and instruments related to battering and consultation with advocates for battered women. Four items covered violence and injury. Seven items covered nonviolent controlling behaviors. Six items covered specifically work-related behaviors. Finally, four items covered help-seeking and self-protective behaviors, which are not measures of battering itself, of course, but potential battering-related obstacles to welfare-to-work transition.

On all items, providers recorded their estimates of the extent to which their clients experienced those behaviors, using a five-point scale labeled “none,” “a few,” “about half,” “many,” and “all or almost all.” I report the percent of staff whose estimates were “none” or “a few,” a measure of the extent to which staff consider clients experiencing specific behaviors are rare in the caseload. Respondents were instructed to give their “best estimate,” based on their observations, experience, and any formal records or complaints they might have received. Internal consistency among the items on the staff survey was very high; Cronbach’s α ranged from .83 (among the four help-seeking items) to .89 (among the six work-related gender conformity items).

The instrument in the enrollee survey paralleled that for staff. Items measured the frequency with which respondents reported having experienced the same potential obstacles. Program enrollees reported the lifetime frequencies (never, once or twice, or often) for all but the violence and injury measures, which were for their current or most recent relationship. I report the proportion of enrollees reporting each specific obstacle at least “once or twice.” The interview itself was brief, typically lasting
15 minutes. Internal consistency among items on the enrollee survey was lower than on the staff survey, but high enough to justify grouping items into the four sets. Cronbach’s $\alpha$ was .67 for both the four help-seeking behaviors and for the seven nonviolent sabotage items, .75 on the six work-specific gender conformity items, and .78 on the four violence and injury items.

**FINDINGS**

Providers overwhelmingly agreed that battering is a problem for at least some of their clients. When asked in a general question whether they thought violence or control from intimate partners or family members presented problems for any of the women in their program, 96 percent of 103 staff who answered the question—84 percent of the 118 staff who returned surveys—said “yes”.

When asked to estimate the percentage of their clients for whom violence or control were problems, there was considerably more variation. For the 92 staff who gave an overall estimate, the mean was 30 percent (std dev = 20), as was the median. The large standard deviation highlights the wide range and variability in estimates. At the same time, most of that variation is among low estimates. The bottom quartile of estimates were under ten percent. The top quintile was at fifty percent. One respondent in six gave very low estimates, that is, below five percent of clients. Twenty-six respondents (22 percent) gave no percentage estimate at all.

Table 1 displays the 21 items, grouped into four sets. The first column includes the number of staff respondents. The second arrays the cumulative percent of staff with very low estimates; the items are ranked within sets by this value. The third displays the percent of the enrollee population reporting at least one occurrence. There are two key patterns to note. The first is the variation in both the number of respondents and estimate levels in the staff survey, and the strong relationship between them. The second is the correspondence between the staff estimates and the enrollee reports.

Fewer staff answered the violence and injury items (grouped in the top panel of Table 1) than any of the other items. Across
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential obstacles to program participation</th>
<th>Percent staff estimating “none” or “a few”</th>
<th>Percent enrollees reporting “once or twice” or “often” (N = 122)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence and Injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threats with knife or gun (N = 103)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical injury from abuse (N = 104)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced sex (N = 104)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit, kicked, or threw something (N = 105)</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent Sabotage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took, wrecked books, homework (N = 111)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took or wrecked clothes (N = 110)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withheld car keys or ride (N = 109)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picked Fights (N = 113)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracting pleas (N = 110)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal put downs (N = 112)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabotaged child care (N = 113)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work-Specific Gender Conformity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must keep up with housework (N = 108)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassed at work or training site (N = 106)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working moms bad moms (N = 107)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial threats related to work (N = 110)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical threats related to work (N = 106)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealous about work (N = 110)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Protection and Help-Seeking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoided harassment sites (N = 108)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought help (N = 107)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought shelter, moved (N = 113)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought protective order (N = 111)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On the violence and injury set, enrollees N = 121; one respondent refused to answer the item about forced or coerced sex.
the 21 items, the number of staff responding is inversely proportional to the cumulative frequency of very low estimates ($r = -0.62$, $p = 0.002$). That is, there were higher response rates for the items staff in the aggregate perceived as affecting more of their clients. The variation among staff in both response rates and the frequency of very low estimates is moreover patterned. First, staff are especially reluctant to give estimates of physical violence and injury. Second, the vast majority of staff give very low estimates for those items (violence and injury) that are among the most obvious markers of battering for the purposes of FVO implementation. At the same time, staff somewhat less frequently give extremely low estimates on items that measure more subtle (nonviolent) dimensions of battering.

Third, fewer staff give extremely low estimates of three types of items. The first is those they are most likely to be able to observe directly, such as absence from the program due to a court appearance to seek a PFA. The second is those they hear about directly in the form of a client’s excuse, for example sabotaged child care. The last is those they attribute stereotypically to welfare recipients’ problematic relationships or lifestyles, for instance verbal put downs or distracting pleas for help when intimates are drunk, high, or in trouble.

How closely do these patterns in staff estimates match the reports of program enrollees? The good news is that overall, a larger proportion of staff give very low estimates on those items on which enrollees report relatively fewer incidents ($r = -0.69$, $p \leq 0.001$), and significantly more staff responded on those items that had higher levels of enrollee reports ($r = 0.43$, $p = 0.050$). In the aggregate, staff respondents’ relative sense of the frequency of violent acts, for example, quite accurately reflects the difference between the frequency of enrollee reports of being hit, kicked, or having something thrown at her (38 percent) compared to being threatened or hurt with a knife or gun (11 percent).

More disconcerting are the exceptions, that is, the items on which a relatively high proportion of responding staff give very low estimates and there is a nontrivial level of enrollee reporting (20 percent or more). For instance, Table 1 shows that the vast majority (roughly three-quarters) of staff perceived the frequency of forced sex and injury from abuse as very rare. Yet while one
in five enrollees report having been coerced or forced into sex and one in four report having been cut, bruised, or choked in her current or most recent relationship. The vast majority of staff who give very low estimates on the violence and sexual coercion items are also out of line with the findings of violent battering from other studies of the general, working, and welfare populations (Russell, 1984; Lloyd, 1997; Murphy, 1993; Raphael, 1997). Similarly, two-thirds of staff basically dismiss threats and harassment at work and training sites as a problem for more than “a few” clients, but 20 percent of enrollees reported experiencing this type of battering, and 24 percent of enrollees reported they had tried to avoid places abusers might find them.

Exceptions in the other direction—that is, items on which more than half of staff perceived the problem as relatively widespread when it in fact was reported by relatively few enrollees—are few. However, the comparison of estimates and reports of sought protective order, distracting pleas, and verbal put downs reinforces the interpretation above that staff are both more willing to make an estimate (measured by relatively high response rates) and less likely to give an extremely low estimate when the behavior is one they can observe directly or readily attribute to stereotypes about welfare recipients’ dysfunctional relationships.

Variation in provider estimates

Congruent with the results of previous studies (e.g., Kenney & Brown, 1996), I found wide variation in provider estimates of the prevalence of battering as an obstacle in their clients’ welfare-to-work transitions. Unlike previous studies, I sought to establish empirical grounds for at least a preliminary explanation of this variation. The variation in staff estimates was not significantly associated with the most obvious explanatory variable, position in the organization. Directors, job developers, instructors, clerical workers, interviewers, and case workers did not differ significantly in their estimates (data not shown; see Brush, 1998). The anonymity conditions of the BPE-IRB approval precluded identification of staff by site, so I cannot construct or assess explanations based on site-specific organizational culture, structure, or practice.
Qualitative observations offer some empirical if impressionistic ground for explaining variation in staff estimates. Discussions after survey administration revealed differences in provider attitudes toward clients and issues related to battering. Some providers worried that the emphases on professionalism and a work-like setting in employment training contexts could deter disclosure and prevent battered clients from requesting and receiving help. In sharp contrast, others were deeply troubled by the possibility of fraudulent abuse claims and malingering by welfare recipients. More than one staff member, for example, indicated that if they could obtain a classification as disabled or claim exemption from work requirements “just by getting beat up,” they would have someone give them a few well-placed bruises expressly for that purpose. They assumed their clients would not hesitate to do the same. These pre-existing views of welfare recipients and their motives probably explain staff members’ different assessments of abuse as an obstacle in their clients’ lives.

Further evidence comes from the fact that forty staff (one-third of the respondents) wrote in additional categories of battering-related problems their clients encounter. They listed a total of 20 different issues, ranging from pragmatic transportation-related issues such as “boyfriend took the battery out of the car” to the five who invoked the “head games” or “guilt trips” intimates and family members use to control, confuse, or otherwise undermine clients. These results suggest that enrollees occasionally disclose the battering in their lives to staff. Moreover, such disclosures sometimes make an impression on listeners. That impression may be strong enough to increase staff estimates irrespective of position in the organization, although they may not be strong enough to counter pre-existing views of welfare recipients. Staff who did not give a write-in answer were significantly more likely than those who did to leave blank or give a very low (0 to 9%) estimate on the general percentage question $[\chi^2(1, N = 118) = 10.40, p = .001]$. 

Discrepancy between staff estimates and enrollees reports

“Many women,” notes one advocate, “keep their battering a deep secret and, for very good reasons, a government agency is the last entity with which this fact would be shared” (Raphael,
In fact, clients are probably very selective about disclosure, and most employment training program staff have little systematic access to information about battering in their clients' lives. Therefore, they have no empirical basis on which to move beyond impressionistic estimates or personal prejudices. Confidentiality concerns mean all the evidence they might accumulate is anecdotal. Moreover, employment training program staff (like other experts, including mental health personnel; see Gondolf, 1998) are seldom trained to elicit and respond appropriately to accounts of battering. Given the combination of the system's confidentiality concerns, the staff members' lack of the training required to notice symptoms or elicit disclosure, and the enrollees' reluctance to share stigmatizing personal information, the surprising good news is that the disconcerting discrepancies between staff estimates and enrollees reports are so few.

IMPLICATIONS AND QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Responding to the realities of woman battering will be one key to the success of welfare reform, especially as time limits expire and recipients with multiple obstacles (including battering) make up an increasing proportion of those on the rolls. This research documented the baseline of staff estimates that form the foundation of responses to woman battering in the context of welfare-to-work transition. The method facilitated comparisons between staff estimates and enrollee reports. The findings revealed variation in provider estimates (although within a smaller range than previous "key informant" studies). While there are some important behaviors which the vast majority of staff basically dismiss which are reported by a nontrivial percentage of enrollees, such cases are the exception. However, staff appear to minimize precisely those aspects of woman battering—sexual and physical abuse—treated most skeptically by mainstream culture.

The Family Violence Option (FVO) provides state and local welfare administrators with a tool for serving clients who may face multiple obstacles to welfare-to-work transition. The tool FVO provides is only as effective as its implementation, however. Implementation in turn rests in part on the extent to which program staff understand both the accommodations FVO allows
and the actual experiences and needs of welfare recipients. To the extent that FVO-related definitions of battering are weighted more heavily toward violent than nonviolent dimensions of battering, the apparent reluctance of employment training staff to make estimates about the prevalence of violence in their caseloads could result in underestimates of need. Moreover, the fact that staff estimates are sometimes apparently based in stereotypes about welfare recipients' problems with the law and relationships means the rhetorical packaging of FVO as an exemption from work requirements may be perceived by program staff and welfare reformers as special pleading on behalf of welfare recipients already stigmatized as cunning, shiftless troublemakers. These perceptions can stymie effective implementation and turn FVO into yet another punitive intrusion of government bureaucrats into the lives of poor women.

Successful FVO implementation, these findings suggest, can usefully direct training about woman battering to staff in all positions. Training for FVO implementation can fruitfully build on the concerns staff voice both for preventing fraud and for their clients' wellbeing. However, successful FVO implementation may have to go beyond training and exemptions as an tool for administering welfare through block grants. Welfare-to-work program contractors may need incentives as well as staff training in order to assess and respond to woman battering. Many questions remain. For example, how, in the spirit of "reinventing government," can welfare administrators foster innovations in addressing woman battering? Research on the local work cultures in specific employment training sites and the personal histories and ideological orientations of staff can provide the answer. Empirically-informed answers can in turn guide advocates and administrators in efforts to take creative advantage of FVO and the opportunity it provides for states to respond to woman battering not by punishing welfare recipients but by helping them move toward self-sufficiency.
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It is often presumed that the legal rights of those who are mentally ill or alleged to be mentally ill are adequately protected by the changes in civil commitment statutes that most states instituted during the 1970s. The author who participated in the writing of these reform statutes recently observed 63 civil commitment hearings. The gap between the stated requirements of the statute and the actual conduct of the commitment hearings was substantial. This paper attempts to explain why the reality has failed to meet the promise.

In the late 1960s and throughout the decade of the 1970s, substantial changes in the civil commitment laws in the United States were enacted. Prior to these changes a person could be committed to a mental hospital simply upon the certification of a physician that a person was mentally ill, and without benefit of any meaningful judicial review or oversight. The new statutes established a new and tougher standard of commitability—a person had to be both mentally ill and as a result of that mental illness physically dangerous to themselves or others—and that determination had to be made by a judge or jury only after a judicial hearing that contained adequate due process procedures and safeguards. Physical dangerousness is conceived of as either direct physical injury to the person or others or as physical injury resulting from an inability to attend to basic physical needs such as food, clothing, and shelter.

Recently there has been some retrogression in a small number of states where a lesser standard of “mentally ill and in need of
"treatment" has been added to the standard of mentally ill and dangerous, but the stringent model developed during the 1960s and 1970s stands as the legal format in the vast majority of states.

Thus civil commitment in most parts of the United States requires that it be shown by clear and convincing evidence that a person is both mentally ill and dangerous as a result, and that determination is to be made at a judicial hearing in which the person has the right to be present, to be represented by counsel, to have at least one mental health professional who is recommending commitment personally testify, to secure an independent psychiatric examination, and the right to present and rebut evidence. Further, before a temporary or emergency commitment can be accomplished (to be followed by a court hearing in a stated number of days), a person must be certified as meeting the commitment standard by either a physician or a mental health professional as well as by a psychiatrist.

Considering these statutory requirements, one might be led to believe that commitment hearings constitute fairly vigorous judicial proceedings. The reality is quite different. The average commitment hearing lasts only about 15 to 20 minutes and results in about 95 percent of the respondents being committed for treatment either as an inpatient, outpatient, or some combination of the two.

The author, who in the 1970s, participated in the writing of the commitment laws in two large states—Michigan and Illinois—recently researched the pertinent literature and subsequently observed some 63 commitment hearings held in a variety of jurisdictions within Michigan. Thus, while the following observations apply most directly to Michigan, all the available evidence indicates that the process is more or less the same throughout the United States. In fact, Michigan probably ranks above the majority of states in attempting to safeguard the legal rights of those who are mentally ill or alleged to be mentally ill.

Unfortunately, the only precise way to determine what percentage of people who go through commitment hearings in Michigan actually are committed for in-patient or out-patient treatment in any year would be to pull all of the appropriate court files in each of Michigan's 83 counties. The task of going through several thousand court records was beyond the scope of my investigation, and to my knowledge has not been done in any other state. I
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consider the estimate of a 95 percent commitment rate to be a reasonable perhaps even a conservative one. Of the 63 commitment hearings I attended in three different jurisdictions representing some ten counties, there were only two outright releases—a 97 percent commitment rate. In addition, an examination of the court records for another and smaller county indicated that of the 18 commitment hearings held there in 1997, there were no releases. Further, numerous conversations with presiding judges, participating prosecutors and defense attorneys, and court administrative personnel supported this estimate—in fact some thought that the figure was probably even higher. Finally, while the literature from other states on commitment rates is eminently sparse, I have found nothing that would indicate that the Michigan experience is unusual.

Why is it that with most state commitment statutes fairly rigorously drawn, the commitment process itself is so truncated and the commitment rate so exceedingly high? Many different forces and factors seem to be at work and are here set forth:

STATUTORY EROSION

First, as previously noted there has, in fact, been some erosion in state statutes. For example, in 1995, the Michigan legislature amended the Michigan Mental Health Code so that the person who files the petition for commitment is not required to testify at the hearing and consequently can avoid being questioned by the respondent’s (the patient’s) attorney (1995 Mich. Acts 290). In general, one can observe that there is a whole constellation of interest groups (professional and self-described advocacy) who seek to ease or dilute the requirements for commitment and who represent influential or substantial constituencies. Against this stand an ever-diminishing band of civil rights lawyers who have either been financially declawed or whose attentions have been refocused on newer and “hotter” areas of social concern plus some few academics who have viewed the mental health system and who consider constitutional rights of some importance.

PRESUMPTION OF MENTAL ILLNESS

Since before a commitment hearing can be held the patient must have been certified as meeting the standard of commitment
by a physician or mental health professional (variously defined) and a psychiatrist (variously defined), there is almost a palpable presumption in the courtroom that the respondent must in fact be mentally ill and dangerous and which presumption appears to infect the entire proceeding. Whatever merit there may be to that presumption, the essential thrust of the reform movement in civil commitments—contrary to previous law—was that such a determination was to be made by a judge (or jury) and not by physicians or mental health professionals who could offer testimony (expert or otherwise), but no more.

ROLE OF COUNSEL

It is axiomatic that no statute is self-executing. In commitment hearings the role of the respondent’s counsel is crucial. Unless counsel mounts a vigorous defense in accordance with the expressed wishes of his or her client, the client will be overwhelmed. The reasons why counsel seldom does so are intricate and are related to the manner in which counsel is selected, the fees received, what I regard as an often misplaced benevolence, and, perhaps most importantly, an astonishing naivete' about the nature of mental illness and psychiatric expertise.

In Michigan, counsel is selected from a rotating court roster, on which any attorney can have his or her name placed, and for which he or she is paid about $50 per commitment hearing. When I speak of their astonishing naivete' concerning mental illness, I am making reference (among other things) to the fact that almost all of the lawyers I spoke to who were participating in commitment hearings believed that a psychiatrist could establish a diagnosis of schizophrenia, bipolar disorder (manic depression), or clinical depression by means of some biological test such as urine, blood, or spinal fluid analysis, or through genetic testing or brain imaging. The scientific fact, of course, is that such diagnoses are only subjective evaluations based on the patient's reported history and the examiner's personal interpretation of what he sees and hears.

DANGEROUSNESS

It is perhaps ironic that because the older laws only required a finding of mental illness and the newer laws require a finding of
both mental illness and dangerousness, that the issue of whether someone is actually mentally ill will now usually receive less attention than whether they are dangerous. In the 63 hearings that I recently attended, not once did I hear a respondent’s attorney challenge the diagnosis of the state’s testifying clinician. In fact, not once was the clinician forced to justify his diagnosis by reference to some benchmarked criteria. Since the respondent’s counsel was either unable or unwilling to deal with psychiatric matters, his or her inquiry tended to focus on facts, allegations, and issues related to whether the respondent should or should not be considered dangerous to himself or others—and subsequently to treatment dispositions—inpatient, outpatient, or a combination.

INDEPENDENT PSYCHIATRIC EXAMINATION

If one has witnessed a criminal trial in which the defendant’s sanity is a matter of issue, you are apt to observe that the psychiatric and psychological testimony offered by the state and the defense can be at considerable variance both as to diagnosis and prognosis. Consonant with that reality, contemporary commitment statutes will often provide that a respondent has a right to secure an independent psychiatric examination—and at state expense if indigent.

The Michigan statute has such a provision, and yet in all the hearings I observed, an independent examiner testified but once. Subsequent inquiries to court administrative personnel indicated that independent psychiatric examinations are utilized in only about two percent of the hearings—which is more or less consistent with the experience in other states (Van Duizend & Zimmerman, 1984).

As to why the percentage is so low, a specific answer is elusive. Probable factors include: counsel’s or the patient’s lack of knowledge that such a provision exists, the low fee paid by the state to an independent examiner, the probability that the examiner will be chosen from the same facility that employs the state’s testifying clinician (and thus the possibility of a less than independent opinion), subtle discouragement from the court to avoid incurring the cost and lengthening the proceeding, the patient’s disinclination
to delay or postpone the hearing which might thereby result (particular if he or she is already hospitalized), and finally counsel’s belief that an independent examination would simply confirm the state’s diagnosis.

With the exception of the last explanation, the absence of an independent examination leads to an almost untenable situation. The state produces a clinician who testifies that the respondent is mentally ill. The respondent produces no opposing clinical testimony, and the respondent’s counsel—as previously noted—almost never challenges the diagnosis of the state’s clinician. Ergo.

CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE

In order for someone to be civilly committed in the United States, it must be proved by at least “clear and convincing evidence” that the person meets the criteria for commitment. This standard of proof was enunciated by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1979 (Addington v. Texas), and had been the standard utilized in the 1974 Michigan Mental Health Code. In the older commitment statutes, it was not unusual for people to be committed based on “a preponderance of the evidence,” which is the common standard utilized in civil proceedings. The criminal standard, of course, is “beyond a reasonable doubt.”

Of the three standards of proof, clear and convincing appears to be the most subjective in application. It has been suggested that a preponderance of the evidence should mean a 51 percent level of proof, clear and convincing a 75 percent level of proof, and beyond a reasonable doubt a 95 percent level of proof. It appears, however, that it is intellectually and emotionally easier to intuit a 51 percent level or a 95 percent level than it is a 75 percent level. In fact, since clear and convincing is a relatively recent legal construction, there is relatively little in case law or otherwise to illuminate at what point the balance is tipped, and none that I know of in Michigan.

Thus in observing commitment hearings it seemed clear that the participants were applying different levels of proof-certainty under the rubric of clear and convincing evidence and further that levels seemed to vary from court to court.

My own impression, and it is definitionally a personal one, is that judges were deciding cases much closer to a standard
of preponderance of evidence than to a standard of clear and convincing evidence. In fact, my own conclusion was that in less than one-third of the cases was it made clear and convincing to me that the respondent met the standard of commitment. This observation is made not to point a finger but to suggest that the standard of clear and convincing permits too wide an area of discretion and in application tends to pivot to a lesser standard of proof rather than to a more rigorous one—or at least so it seems in commitment hearings. What is obviously needed, as difficult as it may be to construct, is some legislative or judicial articulation that provides more specific guidance as to the weight and fulcrum of evidence that applies.

**DEFINITION OF MENTAL ILLNESS**

As noted, the commitment standard requires a finding of both mental illness and dangerousness as a result of that illness. How is the fact of mental illness legally established? Again, as noted, the state's testifying clinician, most often stipulated as an expert witness, will offer his or her diagnosis usually in a conclusive fashion (the patient is suffering from a bipolar disorder); the respondent's attorney will neither challenge the diagnosis nor require the clinician to specify the signs that led to that diagnosis. The prosecutor will then ask the clinician whether in his or her opinion the respondent's illness falls within the definition of mental illness as set forth in the statute. The answer is invariably "yes."

Obviously defining mental illness in a generic sense is no simple task. The American Psychiatric Association's official definition (mental disorder) consists of 148 words that first appeared in its 1990 Diagnostic and Statistical Manual III and has been repeated in DSM III R and DSM IV. This definition presumably applies to the 300 or so syndromes listed in DSM IV.

The author examined the statutory definition of mental illness or mental disorder as contained in each of the 50 state civil commitment statutes. Aside from California which has no statutory definition (nor did Michigan until one was added to the 1974 Mental Health Code by a subsequent amendment), the definitions consist of one or two sentences.
About one-quarter of the states define the term either tautologically (a mentally ill person is someone who suffers from a psychiatric disorder) or by combining the two prongs of the commitment standard (a mentally ill person is someone who is mentally ill and dangerous to themselves or others). Another quarter define mental illness in functional terms (Mental illness is a mental disorder that results in adverse effects on a person’s ability to function).

Approximately 50 percent of the states employ a definition that replicates or appears to be derived from a definition promulgated by the Massachusetts Department of Mental Health in 1970, when that state’s civil commitment statute was rewritten. The wording then and now is: “Mental illness means a substantial disorder of thought, mood, perception, orientation, or memory which grossly impairs judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality or ability to meet the ordinary demands of life.”

The derivative Michigan definition contained in its commitment statute is “'Mental illness' means a substantial disorder of thought or mood that significantly impairs judgment, behavior, capacity to recognize reality, or ability to cope with the ordinary demands of life.”

Two points deserve comment concerning the Michigan definition—and by extension the other 25 states employing a similar definition.

First, not once in any of the hearings that I attended was the issue raised by either the respondent’s counsel or the court as to whether the alleged mental illness was indeed “substantial” or one that resulted in a “significant” impairment. Nor was the issue specifically addressed by the state other than by asking, pro forma, the state’s clinician as to whether the respondent’s illness met the statutory definition of mental illness.

Second, if the modifiers substantial and significant are implicitly or explicitly removed from the definition, what remains is a statement so inclusive as to imperil us all. Thus literally read, the definition would define me as mentally ill if I had a disorder of mood that impaired my judgment or behavior. I must say this happens to me at least once a month.

It was stated previously that the original draft of the Michigan Mental Health Code (and the Illinois Code) chose not to define the
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term mental illness. It was felt by its authors that in the absence of a definition, the parties in a commitment hearing would be forced to examine more concretely and critically the substance of such an allegation. To my knowledge, California is the only state that does not have such a definition, but I have been unable to uncover any material that has examined that singular approach and its consequences. But surely the definitions of mental illness by which people are committed in the United States should give us all some pause.

JUDICIAL CAUTION

Most judges who preside over commitment hearings have to stand for reelection from time to time. Thus, it should not be surprising if judges would seek to avoid situations where someone they had decided should not be committed then proceeded to inflict serious physical harm on themselves or even more dramatically on others. This would seem to lead to a bias (although some would deny it) for commitment, for however short a period of time, and a transfer of the release decision to a mental health professional who is not as publicly visible and who does not have to run for elective office. This bias or tendency seems to be actively reinforced by a general public perception, strongly advanced by some mental health professional and advocacy groups, that mental illness is biologically based (whatever that means) or a biologically caused illness, although the evidence to support a biological etiology (except in clear organic situations) is far from persuasive (Valenstein, 1998). But judges are first human beings with careers and other obligations to consider, and it should not be surprising if they tended to play it safe rather than to adhere to the strict letter of the law, particularly in an area so loaded with uncertainties.

CONCLUSION

It was more than two hundred years ago that Sir William Blackstone, a prime molder of Anglo-American jurisprudence, offered the criminal law maxim that "It is better that ten guilty persons escape than that one innocent suffer" (Commentaries, 1769). When it comes to civil commitment, which the U.S. Supreme
Court in 1972 defined as a "massive curtailment of liberty" (Humphrey v. Cady), and which the Court has consistently reiterated, most recently in Kansas v. Hendricks (1997), we seem to prefer a much less rigorous standard.
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"He’s Not Mr. Right, He’s More Like Mr. Now"*
Patrifocal and Matrifocal Discourses
Among Homeless Mothers in Kentucky
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What strategies do homeless mothers use to cope with their situations? In-depth interviews in Kentucky of 68 homeless mothers with children revealed similarities and differences among the women, as well as a continuum of approaches to gender relations. Although differing in race/ethnicity and place of origin (rural vs. urban) among other factors, the overwhelming majority of the women experienced unstable and abusive households and social relationships while growing up. Most did not complete high school and had their first births while still teenagers. Moreover, two primary approaches to gender relations were observed. These approaches delimit a continuum along which women with a matrifocal worldview tended to perceive themselves as the primary agents in their own and their children’s lives. Women with a patrifocal worldview tended to see a man as their provider and as the solution to their crises. These two different discourses tended to be independent of region (rural or urban) and race/ethnicity. The study of these two discourses provides new theoretical insights into the social relations and behavior of homeless mothers and should contribute in developing programs for their assistance.

INTRODUCTION

Poor homeless mothers in Kentucky use discourses that fall along a continuum to address gender relations. I have labeled the extremes of the continuum matrifocal and patrifocal, based on their conceptualization of the centrality of men in their lives.

*Title used with permission, New Yorker magazine, Cline (1996).
Through their own life histories and in their own words, this paper contributes to understanding the similarities and differences among homeless women in Kentucky. For a majority of these women, the household dynamics of their youth and teenage years were permeated by turmoil and violence, yet the consequences of similar childhood experiences resulted in different patterns of strategizing survival techniques in their adult roles.

The aggregation of my findings with regard to the realities and perceptions of these homeless women inductively appears to fall along the dimension of their relationships with men. Therefore, by focusing upon the patrifocal and matrifocal strategies employed by these homeless women, a richer picture of their lives and social interactions, and the dynamics of their processes of dealing with homelessness emerges. Variations in some characteristics are evident between rural and urban women, as well as between white and African-American homeless mothers. However, the focus upon patrifocal and matrifocal strategies, which cross regional and ethnic groups, appears to provide a new insight into the lives of these women and their attitudes and plans for the future. These are areas of study that have been seriously underexplored in the literature.

Little agreement exists on the actual numbers of homeless families; however, one estimate (U.S. Conference of Mayors, 1993) is that one-third of the approximately three million homeless in the United States are families—adults with children present, usually women with their children. There is also little agreement as to what the characteristics of these families are, the roots of homelessness, levels of social support networks, prevalence of abuse, psychosocial problems, and what should be done to assist these families (see, for example, Axelson and Dail, 1988; Goodman, 1991a; Goodman, 1991b; McChesney, 1990). My work redresses portrayals of poor women with children as pitiful, problematic, "on the dole," or immoral, by validating their strength in dealing with their current situations and by identifying their survival strategies. The importance of gender in analyzing poverty is central here. I argue that the reason for differences among the women in this study rests with the degree to which they think about their lives as either patrifocal or matrifocal. The women
act in accordance with their internalized beliefs in the context of societal conceptualizations for families in poverty.

Through their telling of their own life histories, my study reveals that poor, homeless mothers in Kentucky, although bounded by many commonalities, are not a monolithic group. Among the differences that emerged in this study were that homeless women employ different discourses, which cross racial and regional boundaries, to conceptualize their relationships to men, their means of resolving their homelessness, and their reliance on the social welfare system. I considered a number of different possible labels for the range of discourses, but am convinced that the term “patrifocal” accurately conveys the concept of some women’s perception of the “fathering” role—that is, the “good provider” (Bernard, 1981) for both the woman and her children. “Matrifocal” also conveys the appropriate implications of a woman herself taking on not only the mothering role, but also the primary responsibility for providing for the physical and psychological needs of herself and her children.

As Bunis (1996) points out, sympathy toward the homeless is culturally patterned. I argue that listening to the women themselves discussing their definitions of their plights and their proposed solutions provides a needed counterpoint to many of the commentaries offered by the media, policy-makers, politicians, advocates, researchers, and others that sometimes depict homeless women as unidimensional, merely pitiful, passive, inept, immoral, lazy, and crazy. The diverse stories of homeless women themselves must be heard in order to effectively implement resources, policies, and supports that assist rather than punish and work for rather than merely on homeless women with children.

SELECTED PREVIOUS RESEARCH

The literature on homelessness spans a number of disciplines including medicine and health services, social work, psychology, sociology, economics, and policy evaluation and analysis—to name just a few. Moreover, the history of homelessness in the United States is a long one, especially since the Great Depression when it was conservatively estimated that more than a
million persons were displaced (Crouse, 1986; Hoch, 1987). Most scholars agree, however, that the composition of the homeless population changed dramatically in the 1980s, due especially to the deinstitutionalization of mentally ill individuals and the worsening economic situations of poor women and children (see, for example, Hartman, 1986; Rossi, 1989; Wright and Lam, 1987). Moreover, the issues involved in examining dire poverty that includes homelessness are quite varied, multi-faceted, and interrelated.

Although recent research has focused on the characteristics of single homeless individuals, in the 1980s, theories of family homelessness tended to center on systemic causes, for example, lack of housing (Leonard, Dolbeare and Lazere, 1989), or on what has come to be known as "personal deficit" theories. These "personal deficit" perspectives blamed homeless families for their problems because of some character flaw or behavioral trait, for example, substance abuse (United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1984). Today, most researchers agree that the causes of family homelessness cannot be attributed to specific circumstances such as housing shortages or alcoholism. Rather, the causes tend to be related to multiple factors that cross individual and societal borders. For example, Snow and Anderson (1993) conceptualize homelessness as an interconnection of three dimensions involving housing options, kin support, and self-identity/self-esteem.

Baker (1994) builds on the constructs developed by Snow and Anderson (1993: 482) in her examination of gender differences among homeless families, and finds that "the homeless woman with children resembles closely her counterpart on the margins of extreme poverty who has yet to slip onto the streets. She shares those characteristics that make economic self-sufficiency elusive and the difference from her domiciled counterpart is more likely a matter of degree." Similarly, Burt (1992) theorizes that the factors that influence homelessness are interactive, and offers a macro-level economic schematic model that incorporates these interactions.

In another study, Vissing (1996) focused on the situation of rural homeless children who were enrolled in schools in five areas in New Hampshire. She conducted interviews with 40 homeless
children and their parents. She maintains that the term "homeless" is inappropriate, especially for the rural experience, and she argues that it is better to describe some families as "displaced," or in "housing distress." Vissing found multiple and complex causes for child-family homelessness, ranging from infrastructure causes (economic, governmental, housing, education, and human services) to demographic, personal, and ideological causes (see especially Vissing’s excellent summary of the causes of homelessness among children, 1996: 229–233). While I used similar ethnographic methodology in this study of homeless families in central Kentucky, my analysis focuses on the different discourses homeless mothers use to cope and to strategize.

McChesney (1992) points out that the individual and immediate causes of homelessness are varied but usually result from the breakdown of relationships or long-term poverty, and in many cases both situations. Similarly, the women in my study interpreted their current homelessness in different ways, mediated by how they saw households and families. I would argue that it is important to examine how the women involved viewed their social relationships—particularly with regard to the centrality of men in their lives—that is, where they fall on the matrifocal-patrifocal continuum.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Snow, Anderson, and Koegel (1994) offer important suggestions regarding how to study homelessness so as to present “a more balanced understanding of the condition of homelessness,” and to redress what they call “distorting tendencies” to medicalize and decontextualize the homeless. They recommend three procedures that will improve research: tracking the homeless across time and space, examining the contexts in which individuals find themselves, and articulating the voices of the homeless. They argue that “a more balanced, contextualized, and adaptive picture of the homeless emerges, a picture that puts their blemishes in perspective and recaptures their humanity.”

This study incorporates all three of these recommendations: Tracking homeless families—Only a few of the families I studied could be re-interviewed because most homeless families are
transient. However, the original interviews contained substantial retrospective oral histories, including childhood experiences. Contextualizing homeless families—The interviews covered the current and past situations of these families, for example, work histories, kin networks, interactions with social agencies and the courts, and a record of how and where they resided over the past several years.

Articulating the voices of homeless families—This study presents the voices of the homeless women, and uses their own words to assist us in understanding how they view their situations. The women said that being interviewed was enjoyable, difficult, and even painful at times. Some said that no one had asked them about their lives before, and they felt important to be asked. Several acknowledged the opportunity to talk for the other women and children who proceeded and would follow them in the shelters and tried to suggest ways to make life better for residents. At times, women would be very reflective before answering questions, and said that they were glad to have the chance to think about a particular issue. For a fuller discussion of methodological issues regarding the study of homeless families, see Badagliacco (1993).

For this study, the working definition of a “homeless family” is one or two parents with at least one child residing in an emergency shelter during the period of the study, fall 1992 through spring 1994. This work is based upon 68 in-depth interviews (two to three or more hours) with homeless mothers who were temporarily residing in one of four emergency shelters in Lexington or Louisville, Kentucky.

Prior to interviewing, preparatory fieldwork (participant observation) was conducted, primarily to obtain a sense of the operation of the shelters and to gain the trust of the residents. I spent many hours at different times of the day and night at the shelters, immersing myself in the daily routine, observing activities and talking to residents, their children, visitors, and the staff. Schwartz and Merten (1971) suggest that in order to understand the distinctive culture of interest, it is necessary to grasp “the symbolic nexus between thought and action in (a) particular milieu.” One of my strategies for accomplishing this understanding was to talk informally with mothers. Sometimes we stood or sat outside the
buildings, where people smoked and children played; at other
times, we lounged in the TV area. I introduced myself, spoke
very briefly about my research, and the conversation then quickly
turned to "small talk" about parenting, the weather, food, shelter
conditions, events in the shelter, children's health, etc. In addition,
many times I assisted in the dining area.

Women were eager to ask me questions about myself, and
I answered all their questions honestly. Questions were usually
about my marital status, my children, University of Kentucky bas-
ketball, and my job at the University. Being married and having a
young child seemed to give me credibility to share in commentary,
complaints, and jokes about men and children.

After gaining rapport with an individual woman, if she
wished to be part of the research study, a time convenient for
the woman was scheduled and a semi-structured interview was
conducted. All adult residents in a family shelter on the days
and times I was on-site were eligible to be part of the sample—
usually single women with their young children. The strategy
of being on-site at different times of the day and evening en-
sured that most families were contacted. Individual interviews
were held in private settings with the mothers, perhaps chil-
dren, and two student volunteers (depending upon whether
there was need for child care). Interviews were tape recorded
if the woman consented, and each participant was paid a small
amount.

Limited resources constrained my ability to use more so-
phisticated sampling techniques, which might have included,
for example, rural families at risk of moving to the city to seek
shelter. (A continuation of this study that includes rural families
is now in progress.) The decision to use sites in Lexington and
Louisville introduced some bias with regard to the Kentucky
counties represented. However, this bias is small because it was
common for many of the families to have lived in various parts
of the state and in other states before coming to these shelters.

The interviews covered many topics, perhaps all of which
could be considered sensitive to some participants, as discussed
by Zelan (1969), Bradburn and Sudman (1979), and Lee and
Renzetti (1990). For example, women might speak about failed
relationships, having had to relinquish a child, illicit behavior,
or the number of places they had lived in the last year. Great care was taken to conduct the interviews in ways that fostered an atmosphere in which mothers could feel that their voices were heard and their stories told, perhaps for the first time.

Women were encouraged to talk about their lives and relationships as they desired. Other topics that were explored included—either by direct questions or because women chose to bring up the subject—chronologies of their homelessness; familial relationships; parenting; social support; gender roles; health issues; family interaction and socializing; sexual behavior, family planning, reproduction, AIDS, and abortion; experiences growing up; childhood abuse and neglect; adult conflict resolution and domestic violence; drug and alcohol use; religion; shelter life; coping skills; and hope for the future (see Badagliacco, 1995a; 1995b; 1995c). This essay explores in depth the relationships of these homeless mothers with men, which are related to all of these aspects of their lives.

Field notes and interviews were transcribed, and then analyzed using qualitative techniques, as well as statistical software tools. Coding was straightforward in that language and meanings were clear, similar across interviews, and rarely tangential to the topic. My approach in interviewing and coding transcripts was in the hermeneutic tradition (Nielsen, 1990), in that I attempted to interpret the social meanings of the interactions of women with their children, their male partners, and their extended families, as they recollected their lives. Partially because the study of contemporary homeless families is multi-disciplinary and very recent, I approached this study as exploratory research, with several “pre-hypotheses,” but with a plan to generate hypotheses for future testing.

**FINDINGS**

Before addressing the patrifocal and matrifocal discourses of the women in this study, it is necessary to briefly review some of my basic findings regarding the characteristics of homeless mothers in Kentucky. I confine myself here to those data that are relevant to the discussion of the degree of patri/matrifocality.

The women in this study had a number of characteristics in common, as noted in Table 1. The average age of mothers was
27, and the overwhelming majority had endured unstable and abusive social relationships growing up. They generally had two children with them at the shelter and, as expected, their children are also young—92% were elementary-school aged or younger. Sixty percent had their first pregnancy while still a teen, and several cited pregnancy as the reason for not completing high school. Mothers had, on average, completed less than 11 years of education. About half of the women also had children who were not currently living with them, having been formally or informally relinquished because their mothers could not care for them at present.

All but two of the women reported themselves as presently sexually active, and everyone spoke of previous or current relationships. Less than a third of the women reported being currently married. But, it is not possible to say precisely how many women were formally married even in the past, because the women often did not make the distinction between formal and informal unions. Moreover, because we do not have adequate language to describe former partners, “ex-husband” was a convenient way to describe a former relationship and household, where the man may or may not be the biological father of her children.

Less than a quarter of the women had ever worked for wages, and those who had, worked before the birth of their first child, and were only able to secure part-time retail or food service work, with no benefits. Given the fact that most mothers had not completed high school, few had any transferable work skills, and most received no child support, it is not surprising that 75% of the women reported that their annual income was well below the poverty level of $11,817 in 1994 for a family of three (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1995). Fifty-four percent of the mothers reported an income of less than $5,000 in the previous year, or less than half the income acknowledged as “poverty” for a three-person family.

The women interviewed differed in three ways: time spent living in a city, race/ethnicity, and receipt of public assistance.

1. City vs. rural residence: Sixty percent of the women had spent most of their lives residing in Louisville or Lexington, which are moderate-sized cities and the major urban centers in Kentucky. Many of these women grew up not far from the emergency
Table 1

Characteristics of Homeless Mothers in Kentucky, 1992–94 Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>All Women</th>
<th>Matrifocal</th>
<th>Patrifocal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=68)</td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
<td>(n=34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–19 years</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–25 years</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26–30 years</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–35 years</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 years and older</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{x}=27.0)</td>
<td>(\bar{x}=26.7)</td>
<td>(\bar{x}=28.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>41.2**</td>
<td>73.5**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>58.8**</td>
<td>26.5**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not finish H.S.</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School, G.E.D.</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{x}=10.8) yrs.</td>
<td>(\bar{x}=10.8) yrs.</td>
<td>(\bar{x}=10.8) yrs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner/father living with family</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence prior to shelter</strong></td>
<td>Rural Community</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>26.5*</td>
<td>52.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>73.5*</td>
<td>47.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Income</strong></td>
<td>Less than $5,000</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5,001–$9,999</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000–$14,999</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$15,000–$19,999</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000 or more</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(\bar{x}=$7,550)</td>
<td>(\bar{x}=$4,800)</td>
<td>(\bar{x}=$10,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aid to Families with Dependent Children</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>70.6***</td>
<td>29.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>29.4***</td>
<td>70.6***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>All Women (n=68)</th>
<th>Matrifocal (n=34)</th>
<th>Patrifocal (n=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currently with</td>
<td>Two</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mother</td>
<td>Three</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}=2.3$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=2.5$</td>
<td>$\bar{x}=2.1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05; ** p < .005; *** p < .0005

shelter in which they were currently housed, had friends, current sexual partners, fathers of their children, and other relatives who visited them there, and they themselves visited friends and relatives in other parts of the city.

The other forty percent of the women had spent most of their lives residing in very rural communities. These women had recently come to the city in which the interview took place. They did so because they were unable to find public resources in their rural communities or were unwilling to use those available, and because they had depleted the resources of their personal social support networks of kin or were no longer welcome by kin. Several of the women had never stayed in the “city” for any long periods of time, while others had episodically used shelters in cities outside of Kentucky as they moved with partners and children in search of work or to seek refuge from domestic violence. Women from rural communities rarely had visitors or visited anyone.

2. Race/ethnicity: Fifty-seven percent of the mothers were white, and forty-three percent were African-American. Compared to the regional population as a whole, the participants in this study were disproportionately African-American. This is indicative of the racial imbalance among “at-risk” families who continually survive at the brink of eviction, where there is a very thin line between housed and homeless poverty. And, as I
demonstrate below, some of the women in this study strategized to use homelessness as a means to become housed.

While white and African-American mothers came from both rural and urban settings, whites were more likely to have come recently from rural communities, and African-Americans were more likely to have grown up in the city. Only eleven percent of the rural families were African-American while two-thirds of the urban families were African-American. This finding is consistent with general demographic characteristics of the geographic areas involved: the majority of African-Americans live in a few larger cities, and most rural communities have very few minorities (Ilvento, Harris, and Garkovich, 1992). Among the women in my study, these demographic traits (race/ethnicity and urban/rural origin) were statistically correlated ($p < .0001$).

3. Public assistance: Half of the women sampled received Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and differences regarding AFDC assistance emerged between whites and African-Americans, and between single women and those with husbands present. African-Americans were more likely than whites to be currently receiving AFDC ($\chi^2 = 4.87 p < .0273$). Moreover, women with spouses present ($N = 12$) were much less likely to be receiving aid. In all but two cases (one white, one African-American), women who had spouses with them were not receiving AFDC, primarily because their husbands were working and the family was not, or did not think it was, eligible for any assistance, and/or because they did not believe in accepting welfare.

Vissing (1996) argues that "homeless" has only negative connotations in American culture, and that it evokes only images of urban stereotypes. Indeed, this could help explain why some rural families in Kentucky are extremely reluctant to seek public assistance in the urban areas until they are absolutely destitute. On the other hand, my research shows that some urban women do not place much import on being homeless or being sheltered. They accept the label reluctantly, and/or angrily, but only temporarily, as they plan for their precarious futures.

Each of the characteristics mentioned above is related to the way in which an individual homeless mother constructed her understanding of gender relations, both in the past and in the present. Many women in the study had similar characteristics
and comparable experiences (e.g., becoming homeless, childhood assault, domestic violence), but as we see below, they used and continue to use different discourses—along the matrifocal-patrifocal continuum—to interpret their experiences and plan strategies.

**Matrifocal and Patrifocal Gender Relations**

In the course of the coding and analysis it became apparent that the women were distributed toward the opposite ends of a continuum with regard to the centrality of men in their lives. I labeled these poles matrifocal and patrifocal. The factors that defined the classification and the women’s placement are summarized in Figure 1. Individual mothers were assessed with regard to their position on each of the factors. Although not all women displayed all of the characteristics simultaneously, I was able to place them clearly toward one or the other pole. The concept of this classification scheme needs to be refined by future studies. Perhaps a scale can be developed for reliably measuring the placement of a woman on the continuum.

Fifty percent of the women (those toward the patrifocal pole) described their current situations as personal crises centering on the men in their lives—a breakdown of family because of, for example, violence, divorce, or substance abuse. The other half (those toward the matrifocal pole) saw their present need for public shelter as structural—a temporary reshuffling of household because they were evicted or lost jobs.

It should be noted that, although there appears to be an underlying continuum between matrifocal and patrifocal discourses, the women tended to describe themselves as primarily one or the other at this time in their lives. Therefore, for purposes of discussion, I have used just two categories to simplify this analysis. But these are not pure categories; women fit into several intersecting categories including race, family history, geographic origin, etc. Table 1 includes a comparison of the demographic characteristics of both matrifocal and patrifocal women.

**Matrifocal Women:** As shown in Table 1, matrifocal women tended to be African-American and grew up in the city. Repeatedly I was told that the men currently in their lives were not “family,” not partners with whom they shared their households
## Figure 1

*Factors that Define the Continuum from Matrifocal to Patrifocal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrifocal</th>
<th>Gender Roles</th>
<th>Patrifocal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sees herself as central to and head of the household/family</td>
<td>Sees herself as subordinate, a caretaker, not the central leader or head of the household/family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sees females as providing for family through paid labor force participation</td>
<td>Sees male gender role as &quot;good provider&quot; and female as homemaker/caretaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Not currently married or seeking a male partner to share household</td>
<td>Currently married or seeking a spouse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. May never have been married</td>
<td>Married (formally or informally) one or more times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has a fluid conception of family, which may be multi-generational</td>
<td>Has a traditional, two-parent, nuclear, conception of family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. More likely to have been raised by female(s)</td>
<td>More likely to have been raised in a two-parent family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sees the role of the biological and/or social father of her children as peripheral to the family</td>
<td>Sees the role of the biological and/or social father of her children as central to the family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Can envision herself as a single mother</td>
<td>Cannot envision herself as a single mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More likely to have some job skills</td>
<td>More likely to have few or no job skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Has had labor force experience</td>
<td>Has little or no labor force experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued*
or with whom they wished to share their lives longterm, but often primarily sexual partners and, in many cases, the biological fathers of their children. Male partners entered the lives of matrifocal women periodically for various episodes. For example, men were mentioned as fathering but not rearing children and, in a few cases, not even being aware that they had fathered a child, or not maintaining a presence after the pregnancy was known.

Only a few men were described as being committed to longer, perhaps permanent coupling in formal and informal marriages. Often children knew who their fathers were, and fathers were reported to acknowledge children even if they did not (or could not) support them. Yet the majority of the matrifocal women did not rely upon men to fulfill “traditional” fatherhood and spousal family roles. As one woman put it when referring to the father of her son, “He’s got too many kids to be somebody’s father.”

Darlene, an urban African-American woman who was 16 at the time of the interview and the mother of two, had this say about her children’s father:

I have no contact with him now because I told him he can’t see his daughter—he wants to hit on her and stuff, so . . . He’s supposed to
pay child support but he doesn’t, so I don’t feel bad that he doesn’t see her if he’s not going to pay child support. [Question: How about Trey’s (her older child) dad?] He’s not in the picture—he’s just the same as her father. He says he’s going to help take care of them, but he never does.

Patrifocal Women: By contrast, a male father figure was seen by the patrifocal mothers as important for their children, even if the biological fathers were absent. Patrifocal women reported that their male partners had abandoned them, beaten them and/or their children, lost their ability to support the family, or lost their battles against substance abuse. Yet, each of these women was also more likely to report that the way out of their crises was starting a new union or mending the current one.

The patrifocal women’s answer to homelessness was a male partner: either her current partner, perhaps the father(s) of her child(ren), or a new male partner—“Mr. Right”—as he was often described or envisioned. For example, a mother of two sons ages nine and seven, reported that “my husband was a terrible abuser.” Yet, in answer to a question on how she copes, she answered “I keep thinking that one day I’m going to find me a good man and I keep hanging on.”

Voices of Matrifocal Women

Most women in this study contended with a broad array of arduous circumstances. Yet, I found that half of the women (the matrifocal mothers) neither described their current situations as traumatic, nor were they particularly emotional. For example, matrifocal women were more likely to report problems that resulted in changes of household—loss of jobs, unemployment, underemployment, eviction, and lack of public housing.

This is not to say that personal trauma such as childhood sexual and physical abuse, or even current domestic violence did not exist, but that many did not view the causes of their homelessness as stemming from these issues but rather from structural or societal issues—that is, long-standing poverty. Indeed, several matrifocal women barely mentioned their current interpersonal relationships, which were on-going or very recent. For example, Delilah, a 32 year-old African-American mother of
two discussed only her eviction record when asked to talk about her situation:

If you've been evicted, it's hard to find a place because they're looking at your eviction records. With me I haven't gone to court over eviction because I leave before [she is served with court papers], so I have no court records of being evicted, and that's good. But the wait [for low-income housing] is from two to six months, and here at the shelter you can only stay for 30 days.

As indicated above and in Table 1, matrifocality and patrifocality emerged independently of race/ethnicity and of region of origin, but matrifocal African-American women, most of whom had lived in the city longer than their white counterparts, quite often described their homelessness or their shelter stay as a temporary situation that they had either planned, or that had befallen them, but from which they expected to recover in due course. Judy, a teenager with one child, is an example of a matrifocal woman who actually chose homelessness as a strategy.

I was staying with her father's mother [her daughter's grandmother]. I was just tired of being up under somebody's roof, so I figured if I come here and be homeless they would give me a place because I have a child. I really ain't got no cause really of some serious homeless[ness] like some people got around here. I don't have it.

Valerie, an African-American mother who was 27, had suffered extreme abuse in her childhood and had rocky relationships with the four men who fathered her children. At the time of her interview, she had children ages five, three, and one, and she was nine months pregnant. When asked about how she came to be at the shelter, she did not speak at length about mending or terminating interpersonal relationships as many patrifocal women had, but about the difficulty of finding housing.

I was living with my daughter's daddy and we had a lot of problems [her only reference to her partner] and so I had to move away from him. I stayed with one of my sisters, then another sister, and then my mother, and there just wasn't enough room. So I called everyone I could think of for low-income housing—the housing authority, and every low income housing agency to see what I could do to get me
a place. And they told me to come here and waitellipsis I've been trying to find everything. You sign up for low-income housing and they tell you you are on a waiting list for six to nine months. They tell you to stay at the [shelter] so you can go on a preference sheet and then it is two to four months. So, I came here.

Voices of Patrifocal Women

Patrifocal women conceptualized their current homelessness as a turning point in relationships, described their current situations emotionally, and lacked hope for the future. For example, nineteen-year old Emily described how she perceived her situation as a crisis. Prior to coming to the emergency shelter, she was living with her husband, four children, plus eleven other adult relatives of her husband in a 3-bedroom mobile home:

He [her husband] would work with his brother. His brother would pay him when he wanted to, what he wanted to, and it usually wasn't very much, and that created problems. So we had problems all the way around but it never escalated until three years ago and that's when the abuse started. He hit me and I would hit him back and the problems just seemed to get really, really worse. I got an EPO [Emergency Protection Order] and the judge ordered marriage counseling, and if we didn't go, we would both go to jail.

Marriage counseling failed, and with the threat from Social Services of losing her children, Emily moved to a shelter with her newborn twins, leaving toddler boys with her husband in the mobile home:

I said, "Do you want to keep our two oldest boys because they like to run outdoors and things and with me trying to concentrate on them and them trying to run outdoors and stuff, it will be kind of hectic." So he said "Yeah," and brought me and the twins up [to the shelter] and in our room he said, "Well, I want a divorce. I don't love you anymore." I mean, it's like whoosh! A brick hit me in the face!

Emily was younger than most of the other homeless mothers, and she lacked any other family to whom she could turn. A few days after I interviewed her, she was negotiating a compromise with her husband, mediated by a sister-in-law. Emily was despondent, and felt trapped no matter which way she
turned. She wanted to keep her marriage and her family together, but did not want to go back to the extended household of her husband’s family. Nevertheless, she probably did return to this household because one evening shortly thereafter she left the shelter quite abruptly with her husband and twin infants and did not come back.

Older patrifocal women such as Carrie who was 42, with an eight-year-old son and an eighteen-month-old daughter, also did not escape instability and crisis. Her life had always been unstable, and she never felt that she had a family growing up:

I had a bad home situation. As far as I’m concerned, I don’t have a mother or father. My mother was mean to me. My dad sexually abused me. I have lots of handicaps—hearing and eyesight. I had no stability, no love.

Carrie found her family in Jim with whom she had two children; she tries desperately to keep her family intact, but her life continues from one crisis to the next:

We’ve moved every year for eight years because of Jim’s drinking. We were evicted [from five places in the past year]. Jim’s drinking got bad and he was in the hospital for drinking and he attempted suicide several times. Jim’s drinking has a lot to do with our situation.

Patrifocal women tended to be more recently from rural backgrounds and were more likely to be white and currently married. Erica typifies such a woman who placed great importance on being married, staying married, and working out problems that have caused homelessness, even after major setbacks. Erica was one of the few sheltered mothers whom I was able to re-interview two years after our initial meeting because her family was again homeless.

Erica, a white woman originally from Indiana, was 20 when I first met her. She was married to Mark, who is African-American and who was 21 years old at the time. Erica had one son who was almost 18 months old; he is biracial, but Mark is not his biological father. She was pregnant with Mark’s child at our first interview. Erica reported growing up in a rural area in a working class family without the problems such as unemployment, alcoholism, or abuse that plagued so many other homeless families. “I came
from a good family. We had some communications problems, but we were a close family.” Mark grew up an only child in an urban middle-class family, where he was given every opportunity—at 16 he had a car and at 17 a college basketball scholarship. Mark’s scholarship was withdrawn after one semester because of academic failure. He and Erica became a couple at about that time, and their troubles began.

Both sets of parents refused to assist the young couple. They had no social support network, save for Erica’s elderly grandmother who passed some money her way when she could. Erica and Mark spoke openly of their parents as being prejudiced toward the other member of the couple. Erica: “My father is prejudice[sic], especially since I became pregnant.” Mark: “Whenever the name ‘Erica’ came up, they exploded. They said that we would have to go out on our own.”

Erica and Mark had no money, no jobs, and very few skills. Mark physically abused Erica to the extent that in their short time together, she and her baby had lived in several spouse abuse shelters, and he had been court-ordered to attend spouse abuse counseling. In Erica’s words, “he needs to finish the training.” Yet, she continued to stay with Mark, seemed to be in deep denial of her situation, and even reported, “I’ve noticed a big difference, things are okay now.”

But things were not “okay,” when I ran into Erica and Mark two years later in the same shelter. They now had three children, ages 6 months, 18 months, and 3 years. Erica told me she wanted no additional children but expected to have more. With her three small children, she could not work. Mark also could not find a job that would keep them housed. Moreover, she reported continued physical abuse. Erica was always smiling, optimistic, and philosophical about her situation. She told me she was a devout Catholic, believed deeply in the sanctity of marriage and family, and was trying to cope.

We are trying to get a place. I’m tired of living in the shelter. Before, we weren’t trying, we were making excuses. But we are trying now, and maturing, we are tired of being like this.

Other patrifocal women mentioned similar marital and housing problems, but usually they had also suffered severely
throughout their childhood years, unlike Erica and Mark. Jackie, for example, was 30 years old when I met her, and currently in her fourth marriage. She had been raped by her father as a teen and became pregnant as a result; the baby died shortly after birth. Jackie first married at 16, had her second child, divorced, and remarried at 18,

which didn't last but six months. He left me for another woman and then I caught up with another guy right in between, and had my third child. We never got married—when he found out I was pregnant, he left. Then I got married again to a very, very violent man, who threw me down two flights of steps and broke my back. That marriage lasted six years, though.

Subsequently, Jackie remarried two years later to her current husband, from whom she has been separated six times in four years. Despite all of this, in response to a question on what her life will be like in five years, Jackie answers, “I’'ll still be married, and I’'ll be well off, and I won’’t have to worry about anything anymore.”

Influential Social Relationships

During the interviews, I asked each woman whom she thought had been influential or affected her life in some important way, either in a good way or a bad way. A few women replied that no one had been influential. However, of those patrifocal women who responded, 75% of the time a man was named and almost uniformly in negative references. Among matrifocal women, however, the responses yielded a more gender-balanced sphere of influence—men were named 54% of the time, again mainly because of a negative experience such as incest, physical abuse, or alcoholism. But, mothers were named almost as often, and were much more likely to be named as a good influence.

Among patrifocal women, husbands, boyfriends, fathers, and uncles were most likely to be named as the persons who most affected their lives, unfortunately because of incest or physical abuse. Nevertheless, as just illustrated, they still looked to men to lead them out of their dire poverty. For example, Tara, a white woman in her mid-twenties who has six daughters ranging in age from 2 to 10, reported a very unstable childhood, and blamed her
uncle for making her promiscuous and in her words “wild.” She described life growing up with anger in her voice:

Abusive. My mother and father were abusive. My father was verbally abusive. My mother was physically abusive. My uncle—my mother’s brother—raped me over four years. My parents denied everything. My parents denied this even though my four cousins said he raped them too. Abuse has been in my family for many generations.

Tara feels that she has settled down now with Tom, who fathered two of her youngest daughters, after she relinquished custody of her three oldest daughters. Tara had a difficult time conceptualizing who could be considered “family” beyond Tom and her three youngest children, even though two of her eldest daughters lived with her mother.

Among matrifocal women, when men were mentioned as being influential, it was also often a negative reference; women were commonly mentioned as positive influences. For example, Judy, quoted above, reported that “my childhood was all right (but I was) getting beat up all the time by my three older brothers.” However, when asked why she came to Lexington from Florida, she said, “I just come back ‘cause I had a child. I just came back so I could be around my mama. With my mama, I’ve got family.”

Some women did relate happy childhood relationships and feeling nurtured and supported during their teenage years. For example, one 18-year-old matrifocal woman named her mother and father, siblings, and her children as her family, and her mother as the person most important to her. She is illustrative of a woman whose concept of family locates herself and her children centrally. She did not include the father of her two children as a member of her family or her household, even though they had one infant not yet a year-old, and she had given birth to their second child a week earlier. Referring to him, she said, “He helps me out with the kids.” Another matrifocal woman, Jackie, who had to quit high school because of pregnancy, also speaks of her mother: “We haven’t always gotten along but she’s always been there for me and loved me.”

I also asked subjects to think about their current situation and for each to name the person who was most important to her at
that moment, excluding her children. Several women had trouble naming anyone, indicative of their current loss of social support. A few women named God or Christ, and one woman insisted on naming her dog. Once again, I found that women's responses were related to the role of men in their lives. Patrifocal women named men more often—60% of the time—usually husbands and boyfriends. Women who were named included mothers and sisters. On the other hand matrifocal women named other women more often—a corresponding 60% of the time—usually mothers, sisters, and friends, perhaps indicative of their more woman-centered kin networks.

Looking For a Future

Women also mentioned different paths out of their homelessness, depending on their views of family and households. Patrifocal women dreamed of stable traditional families—their current husbands (or each one's future "Mr. Right") would be working at good jobs, personal problems such as alcoholism would be resolved, and they would be well housed. Most often these women painted a picture wherein their men would lead them out of the shelter, out of homelessness, usually by being able to earn an income in the classic "good provider" model (Bernard, 1981).

Here are some of the responses patrifocal women gave in answer to the question, "What will happen to you in the next six months?" Note that these patrifocal women often used the plural pronoun "we" to discuss their future, even when they did not have a current partner living with them. They were referring to themselves and a partner and not directly their children nor to their extended kin.

We'll have a place to live. We will be slightly on our feet—not completely on our feet. I hope we are never here again. I hope we are financially situated, and rebuild our lives again, and be like normal people.

I think we'll have a place to live. Probably a job.

Things are going to get better. Either my husband and I will get back together or we'll get divorced and try to work things out afterwards.
I'll get married, get my baby back, and be happy. Make something of my life.

I'll move in with my ex-husband.

Matrifocal women, on the other hand, saw themselves as central to finding the way out of their homelessness. Indeed, many of these women discussed their homelessness as part of a strategy for their individual life plans. They certainly did not wish to be homeless, but saw their situations as part of a larger plan to obtain permanent housing in the future, and to keep their households—themselves and their children—intact. If they remained at the shelter for a week or more they would be eligible for priority standing on the waiting list for public housing. One woman told me that she went so far as to plan her college career around being homeless for a short period of time in order to gain special housing for herself and her son, which provided child care. Many of these women kept fairly close contact with their families—their parents, siblings, and other relatives, such as aunts, uncles, and grandparents.

Notice in the following examples how these matrifocal women rarely included male partners in their plans for getting out of homelessness. Whereas the patrifocal women often said, "we'll do . . .," matrifocal women focused on themselves. For example:

I'll be out of school, have a good job, and my own car.

I'm going to start school in January.

I hope to have my G.E.D. and enter college.

I'll get a place, get a couple of sugar daddies, buy the kids new clothes. [Ronda laughed heartily.] Well, you asked me and I'll tell you the truth. [Earlier Ronda openly admitted to prostitution.] Maybe I'll take my husband back. I'll get AFDC checks to get a place.

Hopefully, I'll get an apartment, get back to school, get my life together, and get a job.

I'll have an apartment, a job, and have the kids in day care.

I hope to get a raise, move, and go back to school.
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I will have an apartment to live in and I will either have a job or be going to school so that I can get a job.

DISCUSSION

The fact that matrifocal and patrifocal mothers experience their concept of family and their homelessness differently is demonstrated by the findings presented above. Patrifocal homeless mothers perceived themselves as being in crisis and their men as often the cause and, as they see it, the solution to their family and household problems. Matrifocal mothers, on the other hand, were much more sanguine about their situations. Few reported themselves as being in crisis; rather, they described their homelessness as a transition, another "down on my luck" episode similar to earlier experiences and, in several instances, a strategy to gain public housing more quickly. They often blamed "the system" for the lack of low income housing, which they felt would have kept them from becoming homeless. For example, Judy said:

The housing authority kept on losing my paperwork and now I finally got it all in. Everywhere else I had to be 21 or my income was too low. But it's low income housing—that's what I don't understand.

[Emphasis original.]

Risman (1998) argues that while gender structure organizes our lives there is also evidence that actors shape the gender structure they inherit. The women in this study make these distinctions apparent: they are trapped in poverty resulting from gender structure, but through their own agency formulate and reformulate their gender relations. For some, no doubt, gender structure (i.e., poverty, abuse) looms overwhelmingly larger than their ability to make choices, such as gaining work skills, or moving.

Some of the reasons for the differences between matrifocal and patrifocal women stem from the social construction of an ideal "traditional" family in the United States, which is grounded in gender relations. Throughout their lives these homeless mothers were entrapped in a patriarchal system that repeatedly failed them. As children they were assaulted by the very men who had been socialized to support and protect them, but who could or would not. As teens and young adults, they accepted the sole
adult role open to them—motherhood—only to find out that lack of opportunity, domestic violence, and substance abuse ensured that they could not change their circumstances. In their present situations, patrifocal women continue to believe that they would be rescued by a current or future husband and/or by a social system that brands them immoral and blames them for their poverty (for fuller discussions of the latter issue, see, for example, Abromowitz, 1988; Gordon, 1988; Katz, 1989; Katz, 1995).

Yet, both patrifocal and matrifocal homeless mothers in Kentucky are in jeopardy of losing their fight for survival, despite their strategizing. Personal agency can be quite limited when the societal conceptualization of "family" for those in dire poverty is itself located within particular social and political discourses in the United States that offer only three alternative models for survival, all male. Pearce (1990) and Gordon (1990) explain that, for example, poor women have few choices: to rely on (usually poor) men as the family breadwinners; to become second-class or underground workers in a male labor market; or to receive public assistance that differentiates between genders with regard to entitlements (e.g., unemployment insurance, social security, public assistance). All of these models leave poor women in dependent circumstances, barely making ends meet, if that is possible at all.

This societal discourse about poor women is largely framed by others ("experts," politicians, academics), and is often predicated on social control and dominance—for example, requiring single mothers receiving welfare to complete their high school equivalency diplomas and to work after two years of receiving benefits. The irony of the current proposed "stay-at-home" tax benefit for couples as opposed to single mothers would not be lost on these women. The women in my study were well aware that their life chances would probably not change because they passed a G.E.D. examination. Rather, what they need is jobs with fair wages, health-care benefits, and decent housing that they can afford. The best they can hope for are low-wage, service sector jobs probably in the fast-food industry, factory work, or the low end of retail businesses, such as gas stations and convenience stores. Zimmerman and Garkovich (1998) demonstrated that even with the availability of such low-wage jobs, in several rural counties in
Kentucky a hypothetical single mother of two may be unable to remain housed without additional support, because the average wage is approximately half of what is needed for subsistence.

Fraser (1990) suggests that the focus of inquiry must shift from discourses about the needs of poor women to "the politics of needs interpretation." She claims that the interpretation of what people need is not simple or unproblematic, and is often politically contested. When we examine the issues from this perspective, we quickly see the complexity of the issues that surface. For example, if housing is recognized as a basic need for families, what is homelessness? Will housing be provided for needy families? What kind of housing? Who will pay for it? If a woman does not or cannot work, will her family still be able to be housed? Will she be eligible for a "stay-at-home" tax credit?

We must expand on the structural explanation of poverty to include personal agency in the conceptualization of family forms as Jarrett (1994) and Risman (1998) remind us. Thus, if we acknowledge the personal agency that matrifocal homeless women have in defining their families (for example, to exclude the father(s) of their children), then we must also recognize that the decisions they make with regard to setting up households, applying for public assistance, or looking for work will probably be different from those of the patrifocal women who define their families with male partners at the core.

Gordon (1990) also proposes that some women are (more) in control of their situations within the welfare state, and the matrifocal women in this study seem to be trying to exert this power. They are strategizing and struggling to survive, even "using the system" to meet their needs. And, we can also argue that patrifocal women are using the patriarchal system (if not the welfare system) to their perceived best advantage and that of their children. The goals are the same for both groups of women—to survive and provide for their children. Their strategies differ.

Patrifocal women supported the notion that while women may need to work for financial reasons, this role is temporary and secondary to a husband's role as primary breadwinner for the family. This is confirmed by the fact that only one of the patrifocal women whose husbands were present had ever worked
in the formal labor market or was looking for work. This was true as well of patrifocal women who were currently separated or divorced. Furthermore, by conceptualizing their situations as male-centered, they defined their families as “naturally” including husbands if present, but also tended to include men with whom they might have a relationship, using words such as, “Well, now, I guess it is myself and the children,” suggesting that the situation would (hopefully) change.

Matrifocal women also expressed personal agency through their plans, strategies, needs or desires to focus on themselves as being at the core of their own and their children’s lives rather than on their partners or the children’s father(s). They made clear distinctions between households—“myself and my kids”—and “family” that included a larger group of individuals, generally women kin. Often these relatives were not necessarily individuals with whom they had lived, but persons with whom they had strong emotional ties, such as grandmothers, aunts, cousins, and full- and half-siblings, as Collins (1990) and Stack and Burton (1993) discuss. For example, Teresa, a single mother of three pre-teen boys, was not receiving welfare, and vowed that she would manage:

I plan to do better than I’m doing. I’ll have a roof over my children’s heads. I’ll be alive and in good health. I’ll provide comfort [for them] and enjoy life with my children.

It is clear that matrifocality and patrifocality constitute the poles of a continuum. Women place themselves along this continuum and at various times, depending upon current circumstances, may modify their position. It seems likely that if the women can achieve a stable balance they will have a far greater chance of becoming or remaining housed. Although none of them felt he was sufficient or necessary for survival, a few of the matrifocal women felt that a man’s role could be that of the primary breadwinner. For example, Ronda spoke openly about her prostitution, and several times said she would “sell ass” to get her kids whatever they needed, reporting to me that she would provide for her kids. She was currently sheltered after having suffered a brutal physical attack from her third husband who left
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her on the streets alone with her three children. Yet, she expressed her tremendous ambivalence about being alone:

For all the shit my husband has put me through, I still love him. I still believe [that] no matter what happens if you truly love someone there ain’t nothing you can’t fix.

One of the questions that emerges from the new welfare reform statutes is the degree to which homeless mothers may be forced to adopt such a patrifocal approach. If it is not possible for a woman to support her children alone, and the state no longer carries the same share of the burden, she may have to find and rely on a partner. Alternatively, a matrifocal approach would entail increased reliance on additional kinship support.

It is important to consider how these women perceive their social relationships. By doing so we can begin to understand not only the causes and conditions of their homelessness, but also the varying approaches of women to dealing with and improving their situations. To the extent that a woman feels that her future depends upon having a male provider for herself and her children, she may choose different strategies to alleviate her situation than a woman who sees herself as the primary provider. Each woman will attempt to choose those strategies that are in concert with her beliefs and her current situation. For example, one might elect to defer job training in favor of her male partner while another might choose to avail herself of the training.

Gordon (1990) adds another important dimension: the acknowledgment of responsibility along with power. I believe that the homeless women whom I interviewed recognized and accepted the responsibility of heading households and being members of families. What they need is a fair chance at survival. As one woman put it, “There are lots of reasons why people are homeless. Most have an abusiveness factor in common, a feeling of not being in control, a feeling of hopelessness.”

CONCLUSION

This research was exploratory, and these findings should be studied further. Both matrifocal and patrifocal women (and their partners and children) require extensive assistance in dealing
with and recovering from childhood physical and sexual abuse and neglect.

Moreover, welfare change is likely, at least temporarily, to increase homelessness among these women, and women in similar situations who are currently housed but are at-risk of being displaced. All the families I studied needed adequate housing, jobs, and affordable child care if the family (matrifocal or patrifocal) could ever become economically self-sufficient. But, they also needed substance abuse counseling, spousal abuse prevention programs, self-esteem counseling, job training, and equally importantly, life skills training—household management, budgeting, strategies for obtaining and keeping a job, parenting skills, and information on identifying and acquiring community resources. The significant dissimilarities in the roles of men in the families have distinct implications for the provision of services to matrifocal and patrifocal families. And, the provision of services continually crosses the borders between gender structure that perpetuates families in poverty, and gender agency that mediates how individuals negotiate their lives in poverty.

The saliency of certain programs or services is different for families that are male-centered and those that are not. Therefore, in order for distressed families to become housed and remain housed, the above services must be provided with a range of options depending upon where the woman places herself on the matrifocal/patrimonial continuum. For example, patrifocal women are much more likely to be and are desirous of finding themselves in a two-parent situation. Matrifocal women are more likely to be in and are willing to accept a one-parent family. Therefore, needed parenting skills will be different and the training offered to these women should take into account these differences. Likewise, the daycare needs of single-parent families are often quite different from the daycare needs of two-parent families. Also, self-esteem training must be tailored to the role that a woman chooses, either as a patrifocal partner or as a matrifocal single mother after taking into consideration the abuse histories the overwhelming majority of the mothers reported. And as a further example, Brooks and Bruckner (1996) developed a predictive model of factors that facilitate employment possibilities for some single-parent low-income women but that deter others. We need to explore if similar
predictive models of employment possibilities can be developed for matri/patricentric homeless mothers and fathers.

One of the tragedies for most homeless families is that men are often unable to contribute to a stable environment for themselves, their wives/partners, and their children. Frequently, they are unemployed or underemployed; they are often substance abusers; and they may be spouse abusers as well. The work that lies ahead is to determine—based on the women's conceptualization of family, and the role they desire for men in their lives—how to provide appropriate services to the families as a whole, and to the women and the men individually, to enable them to fulfill their roles. One of the major challenges is to accept that poor, homeless mothers have agency and are entitled to define, for themselves, where they wish to be on the matrifocal/patricentric continuum.

Camile, a married 24-year-old, rural, patricentric, mother of four warns us, "Grandma always said that family is like a house. If you don't have a good foundation, you don't have nothing." The agency of homeless mothers to choose the building blocks and definition of their family cannot be denied.
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This study addresses the incidence, persistence, decline, and marginalization of historical research in social work by examining one indicator of that research, social work dissertations. This study reveals that despite the dominance of other research methods, historical research was a legitimate method for doctoral research in social work, but its use has declined over time. Before World War II historical dissertations were common. Through the 1950s almost 13% of all social work dissertations were historical. In the 1960s and 1970s interest in history as a research method declined, but social welfare history was still a legitimate option for doctoral research. By the 1990s historical research in social work dissertations was almost non-existent. The current state of historical research seems terribly myopic, especially given developments in other social science disciplines and challenges to contemporary social work research.

Because contemporary social work neglects and marginalizes historical research, there is little study of history as a research method in social work. Nevertheless, historical research has a more significant place in social work than the literature reveals. This article examines the place of historical research in social work by studying one indicator of that research: social work dissertations. This study of doctoral dissertations in social work, including both theses written for the Ph.D. and D.S.W. degrees, illustrates a number of central points about historical research. One in particular stands out. Despite the dominance of other research methods, historical research was an accepted method for doctoral research in social work, but its use has declined over time. Before World War II historical dissertations were common, especially at schools with a policy orientation such as the University
of Chicago. Through the 1950s almost 13% of all social work dissertations were historical. In the 1960s and 1970s interest in history as a research method declined, but social welfare history was still an option for doctoral research. Now this is much less the case. In the 1990s fewer than 2% of all doctoral dissertations in social work are historical. The importance, persistence, and decline of historical research in social work are the focus of this study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Reisch (1995) and others are correct about the integration of historical knowledge in social work education. Social workers do learn some history, especially in courses on social policy and values and ethics. Books written by both social work academics and historians on the history of social policy and the professional development of social work are part of the education of most students. But social work students rarely learn about history as a method of research and evaluation (Fauri, 1988). Historian Michael Stanford (1994) draws a helpful distinction between "history-as-event" and "history-as-account." History-as-event is the events that happen in the world, whereas history-as-account is "the ordered arrangement of words and ideas that give more or less coherent account of those happenings" (Stanford, 2). In social work terms, it would be best described as "history as knowledge" versus "history as research method". Social work is more comfortable with history-as-knowledge. This is what the CSWE curriculum mandate on history emphasizes, that social workers should know about the history of social welfare, social policy, and the profession. Much less common is history as a research method in social work education and practice.

The prevailing literature suggests that history as a research method has little, if any, place in social work research. William Reid’s (1987) excellent overview of the history of research in social work for the 18th edition of the Encyclopedia of Social Work makes no mention of history as a research method. He emphasizes that "the methods of social work research, reflecting its diverse content, run the full gamut of the methodology of the behavioral sciences" (Reid, 1987, p. 478). Reid (1987) divides social work
research into four categories: (1) studies concerned with the behavior, personality, and problems of individuals, families, and small groups; (2) studies that look at the utilization and outcomes of social services; (3) research studies that focus on the social work profession, including training and education; and (4) macro research studies whose foci are organizations, communities, and social policy. Even though historical research covers all these categories, it is not included.

Even a cursory tour of some of the most important and widely-used research texts, among them Tripoldi, Fellin and Meyer (1969), Kerlinger (1986), Bloom, Fischer, and Orme (1995), Orenstein and Phillips (1978), Marlow (1993), and Monette, Sullivan, and Dijong (1986) reveal no reference to historical research as a valid method for social work practitioners. A recent text on qualitative research, *Qualitative Research for Social Workers* (Tutty, Rothery, and Grinnell, 1996) includes no mention of historical research. When history does appear in social work research texts it most often does so as the "threat of history." Grinnell (1993, 128) reduces history to "unaccounted for events that may affect the dependent variable" and thereby pose a "threat to internal validity." This point overstates; social work researchers are not actually viewing history as a threat. They are simply warning researchers about controlling for variables in the contemporary context, not in the past. But to turn to an Index in a social work research text and find "history" listed solely as "the threat of history" illustrates more than an unfortunate choice of words. It reflects that history has little place in social work research, except perhaps as a problem for researchers.

The neglect of historical research persists even in histories of social work research. Zimbalist’s (1977) history of themes and landmarks in social welfare research makes no mention of historical research. Klein and Bloom (1994) wax eloquent about the virtues of history: "It is only when we step back to understand and appreciate the entire tapestry of this process that we gain a truer understanding of the nature of the applied scientific endeavor" (Klein and Bloom, 430). But their content analysis of research methods in social work publications over 120 years, from 1870–1990, reveals little mention of historical research. The irony of histories of social work research ignoring historical research in
social work illustrates the divide between history-as-knowledge and history-as-research method.

There are a few noteworthy exceptions (Chambers, 1973; Leashore and Cates, 1985; Stuart, 1997; Reisch, 1988). Tyson’s (1995) history of social work research, surveying the literature from 1920–1989, identified and tracked seven categories of research design heuristics: reviews and commentaries, histories, case studies-qualitative, large scale analysis-qualitative, case studies-quantitative, large scale analysis-quantitative, and experimental designs. Tyson suggests that historical, as well as qualitative dissertations, were more common in social work prior to World War II—a period characterized by methodological pluralism—after which social work research was almost completely dominated by "logical positivist" research which eliminated most qualitative work, including historical research. This study supports her call for methodological pluralism. Certainly in the earlier years, historical research was more common in social work. There was an earlier era characterized by greater methodological pluralism in research, but even then historical research was limited to certain schools and faculty. But the following study reveals that the truly dramatic decline in historical research comes during the past decade, not simply the past generation.

SAMPLE SELECTION

Three sets of data are used in this study. First, the collection of doctoral dissertation data began with the utilization of ProQuest CD ROM Dissertation-Abstracts. ProQuest advertises a data base for doctoral dissertations starting from 1861 to present, but its listings, almost exclusively dependent on the Dissertation Abstract Index (DAI), begin to approach reliability as a source only in the late 1960s and become very reliable after 1973 when almost all doctoral dissertations were being sent as regular practice to DAI. Pro-Quest data was investigated annually from 1952–1980. After 1980, over 200 dissertations in social work are listed per year. To overcome the problem of data overload due to the rapidly increasing number of dissertations, data was sampled for ease of interpretation, focusing on DAI titles every five years, including the years 1985, 1990, and 1995.
Second, because very limited data was obtained from ProQuest for the earlier years, especially prior to 1967, we consulted another source, Social Service Review (SSR). SSR annually printed a listing of social work doctoral dissertations submitted to the journal from 1952 to 1973. The listing was designed to meet the dearth of knowledge regarding social work doctoral research.

Third, because no organized inclusive listing was found of doctoral dissertations granted prior to 1952, we decided to examine another source, one of the handful of schools which granted Ph.D.s in social work prior to 1952. We selected the University of Chicago School of Social Administration for two reasons. It was a leading institution of social work during that time period, granting a significant percentage of the Ph.D.s in social work prior to 1952. Also, it had a reputation, which we sought to investigate, as a program which once encouraged historical research. We theorized that if this was not true for Chicago, if there were few or no historical dissertations, it would be unlikely other places. The data bases used at the University of Chicago included a list of early dissertations at the school (Abbott, 1943) and a catalog review of social work dissertation titles.

PROCEDURES

The same criteria were utilized for all searches. A dissertation was considered historical if within its title it contained the words "history" or "historical" (e.g. "Social Work Practice: An Historical Comparison"); it was a biography (e.g. "Jane Addams as Social Worker, the Early Years at Hull House"); it longitudinally addressed the subject over a time span of ten years or more (e.g. "Safeguarding Adoption in California: 1870-1969, a Study in Public Policy Formulation"); or it addressed a subject in a time span at least ten years in the past (e.g. "The Charity Organizational Societies, the Settlements, and National Minorities in the Progressive Era"). To the extent that we have erred, we have sought to do so on the less inclusionary side; doctoral dissertations judged historical are, if anything, undercounted. Where there was doubt, the availability of a dissertation abstract was a key factor in determining whether a dissertation was historical.
DATA

I. All Schools 1952–1995 (ProQuest and SSR data sets)

Table 1 reflects doctoral dissertations in social work (appearing in ProQuest and/or SSR) granted among all schools for the years 1952–1980, 1985, 1990, and 1995. The total number of doctoral dissertations found solely in ProQuest are listed within “( )”; after 1973 only one total is given as ProQuest was the only data source for these years. The number of historical dissertations are converted into a percentage for the decades 1952–1960, 1961–1970, and 1971–1980. The above data is presented in Figure 1 as aggregate data per decade.

We can see that there has been a steady increase in the total number of social work doctoral dissertations per decade. Moreover, the data demonstrate an important place for historical research in social work, at least through the 1980s. It also details a steady decline in the percentage of dissertations utilizing

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of total dissertations</th>
<th>% historical dissertations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ProQuest only)</td>
<td>ProQuest + SSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952–1955</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956–1960</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961–1965</td>
<td>(74)</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966–1970</td>
<td>(338)</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971–1975</td>
<td>(394)</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976–1980</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1396</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
historical research. In the 1950s over 1 in 10 dissertations utilized historical research. Through the 1960s and 1970s it decreased to 1 in 20. And in the 1990s, even a liberal estimate puts the number at no more than 1 in 50.

II. University of Chicago School of Social Service Administration data set

Table 2 includes data pertaining solely to the University of Chicago from 1921 to 1995 gathered from local sources as well as the ProQuest and SSR data sets. Concerning the data, there are a number of inherent limitations, but the data set serves as a good, if rudimentary, measure of the place of social welfare history in dissertation research at Chicago.

Change in Total # of Dissertations: From the 1930s onward there is a steady increase of roughly 5–10 dissertations per decade, equaling a 20–25% increase per decade. From the 1970s to the 1980s there is an increase of approximately 20 dissertations, equaling roughly a 50% in the total. Looking at the data for the first five years of the 1990s, the total seems to have peaked in the 1980s, leveling off thereafter to approximately 60–70 dissertations per decade.

Change in Total # of Historical Dissertations: The output of historical dissertations remained steady from the 1930s to the 1960s at roughly 7–9 dissertations per decade. (Except for the 1940s, whose total, as discussed in footnote 4, reflects an extremely conservative bias). In the 1970s there is a considerable decline, with a total of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Dissertations</th>
<th>Historical Dissertations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952-1960</td>
<td>16/24</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-1970</td>
<td>44/691</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-1980</td>
<td>70/1396</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-1990</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.5%) (estimated from sampled data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.4%) (estimated from sampled data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Dissertations by Decade at The University of Chicago, 1921–1995*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th># of total dissertations</th>
<th># of historical dissertations</th>
<th>% historical dissertations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921–1930</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931–1940</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941–1950</td>
<td>(20–25)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951–1960</td>
<td>(25–30)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971–1980</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981–1990</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991–1995</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* approximate percentage

only 2. From the 1970s to 1980s the total jumps back up to 5 and seems to be maintaining this rate for the 1990s.

*Change in % of Historical Dissertations:* The data can be described as representing three eras at the University of Chicago's School of Social Administration (SSA). For the first era, the 1920s and the 1930s, historical dissertations were considerable at SSA, accounting for approximately 40% of the total number of dissertations. During the second era, the 1940s to the 1960s, historical dissertations held an important niche in research at SSA, accounting for approximately 25% of dissertations (the 1940's figure of 12% is considered extremely conservative, and hence this decade is assumed as similar to the 1950s and 1960s). In the present era, the 1970s to the 1990s, historical research could no longer be described as holding an important niche at SSA. It still, however, maintained a presence, accounting for 5–7% of social work dissertations.

**III. Historical Dissertations by school only from ProQuest and SSR data sets**

The University of Chicago data, combining both local and more universal data sets, encouraged the examination of historical dissertations by school to determine range and concentration. Figure 2 lists the historical dissertations granted at individual schools for the years 1952–1980 as derived from the ProQuest/
SSR data set, the most reliable and generalizable data base for this study. Figure 2 records the number of historical dissertations at schools which granted at least three historical dissertations during the years 1952-1980.

One hundred thirty historical dissertations were granted during the years 1952-1980. The top 6 schools account for 68 of the 130 or just over one-half the total. The top 8 schools account for 83 of the 130 or just under two-thirds of the total. And the top 11 schools account for 99 of the 130 or over three-quarters of the total. These schools represent a small cadre of the schools granting doctorates in social work. This cadre quality is equally evident when examining schools by decade. In some decades a few schools were very dominant. For example, for the 1950s, a total of 11 schools appeared in the data source. However, two schools (University of Chicago and New York University) accounted for 9 of the 16, or over 50% of the historical dissertations in our data base for that decade. For the 1960s, the base broadens somewhat. A total of 17 schools appeared in the data source. Of these, 6 schools (Columbia, Chicago, Catholic, Brandeis, Southern California, and Pennsylvania) accounted for 28 of the 44, or 64% of the historical dissertations.
dissertations in our data base for the decade. For the 1970s, a total of 40 schools appeared in the data source. Of these, 4 schools (Bryn Mawr, Brandeis, Southern California, and Tulane), a more concentrated cadre than the previous decade, accounted for 33 of the 70, or almost 50%, of the historical dissertations that decade. This information is summarized in Table 3 below.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

This study offers a relative estimate of the incidence, time, and place of historical dissertations in social work. The sample was limited for the earlier years, especially prior to 1952, and makes no claim to account for all dissertations, historical or otherwise, either before or after that date. However, since these limitations can be assumed to have affected historical and non-historical dissertations equally, the study provides a relative data set which yields some interesting and informative results about historical research in social work.

Despite the dominance of other research methods in social work, historical research has until recently been an accepted method for doctoral research in social work. While most of the contemporary literature on social work research ignores or excludes it, historical research has always had a place in social work. For the University of Chicago during its first two decades historical doctoral theses numbered one-third to nearly one-half of all dissertations. For all schools in the 1950s approximately one in eight dissertations were historical; in some years the rate was as high as one in three. Even from the 1960s through the early 1980s social welfare history accounted for approximately 5–6%.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th># of Cadre schools/# of Total Schools</th>
<th># of Historical at Cadre schools/Total #</th>
<th>% Share for Cadre Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952–1960</td>
<td>2 of 11</td>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961–1970</td>
<td>6 of 17</td>
<td>24/44</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971–1980</td>
<td>4 of 40</td>
<td>33/70</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of all dissertations. Only since then has the percentage declined to an almost negligible amount.

The reasons for the decline of historical research are complex. Clearly historical research was more popular in earlier periods when history was more dominant in the social sciences, when social work research was more characterized by methodological pluralism, and before social work became so heavily tied to a narrow range of behavioral science methods (Tyson, 1995). Relatively, Austin (1986) suggests that policy-oriented research began to decline by the end of the 1950s, resulting from a new emphasis in the research component in social work education on quantification and statistics. For example, the Social Welfare Research Group (SWRG), founded after World War II, emphasized the centrality of research methods from experimental psychology and sociology. Historical research was part of social work’s problem, said William Gordon (1951), a leader of the SWHG, in a report on research to the Council on Social Work Education. “The large proportion of descriptive and history-tracing studies may be thought of as a natural consequence of the newness of social work and of a stage of development not yet characterized by sufficiently elaborate theoretical structures to stimulate many hypotheses testing studies. For the most part these are the same conclusions drawn from other evidences and only point up again the need for social work research to catch up with the advancing front of social work knowledge and to take its place in advancing that front through better-focused, more penetrating studies” (Gordon, 1951, 7). Over time such criticisms of historical, and qualitative, research won the day. The “social scientific culture” of social work research steered students away from historical research (Fisher and Karger, 1997; Karger and Fisher, 1998). Fewer and fewer faculty and schools even suggested that historical research was a valid option for doctoral social work research.

So how do we account for the persistence of social welfare history at least up until recently? Historical research has always had a local quality, being associated with specific schools and, more specifically, with a dean or faculty person trained in historical research or interested in it. At Chicago it was the personage and influence of Edith Abbott and later Rachel Marks. At USC it was Norris Class and Maurice Hamovitch (Tucker, 1998). At Bryn
Mawr Milton Speizman. At Minnesota Clarke Chambers and Gisela Konopka. Having an historian or someone interested in social welfare history on the social work faculty makes historical research “thinkable” for graduate students (Chandler, 1998). On the other hand, the presence of a “history person” on the faculty did not guarantee historical dissertations. Given pressure within the profession for other types of research, historical research dissertations were less common than expected at some schools. For example, both Ralph and Muriel Pumphrey were on the faculty at Washington University. He held a Ph.D. in history from Yale; both of them had done research and published in social welfare history. Nevertheless, there were fewer historical dissertations than expected at Washington University. Historical research persisted at some schools, such as Brandeis, because of their institutional focus. At most schools, given that historical research was usually tied to a specific individual, when the history-oriented faculty member departed, as when Karl deSchweinitz left UCLA, so did the interest in history. In the more contemporary period such individuals have not been able to reproduce to an equal extent the interest in historical research.

Another reason for the persistence of historical dissertations through the mid-1980s is their contribution to the profession. Historical research may not be encouraged for doctoral research, but social workers understand the value of historical knowledge and perspective. For example, historical dissertations cover a broad range of social welfare and social work issues. While organizational/institutional history, policy history, and biography dominate, the field of historical research includes an impressive diversity of social work fields and subjects. They cover practice methodologies: (Drew, 1972; Lloyd, 1965; White, 1980; Burns, 1958; Hartmann, 1972; Becker, 1960; Lewis, 1954; Bolen, 1972; McNair, 1970; and Connolly, 1976). They include varied fields of practice and special topics such as children and families (Comp-ton, 1971; Lewis, 1973; Ripple, 1953); mental health (Poor, 1962); adoption (Brown, 1970), volunteers (Jones, 1968); policy (Marks, 1950; Patti, 1967; Blau, 1988 ); theory (Pumphrey, 1956; Lloyd, 1965; Joseph, 1986; Widroff, 1987); research (Zimbalist, 1955); radical social work (Whitaker, 1970; Spano, 1978); comparative and international (Chatterjee, 1972; Dasbach, 1972; Carter, 1975);
African-American (Pollard, 1976; Carlton, 1982; Johnson, 1980; Chandler, 1993); immigration (Lane, 1932; Mostwin, 1971; Kuramoto, 1972; Chen, 1980), women (Zimmerman, 1977); social work education (Popple, 1977; Sikkema, 1964; Ozanne, 1985); and biography (Walsh, 1965; Cornelius, 1976; Freedberg, 1984). They include “big picture” studies of the profession (Leighninger, 1981; Karger, 1984; Siebold, 1987) as well as local social welfare history (Horovitz, 1969; Cohen, 1972; Levin, 1963; Leashore, 1979). The former get at the essence of social work and social problems, providing a wider lens of understanding for those within and without the profession; the latter closely contextualize a subject in its time and place and add to the knowledge of social welfare history in places like Chicago, New York, Pittsburgh, and so forth. These examples illustrate both the breadth of these works as well as the contribution and potential of historical research. Moreover, many of these dissertations served as the basis for book-length studies (as well as articles), a phenomenon much more common in the discipline of history than in social work. See, for example, Zimbalist (1977), Blau (1992), Lyons (1982), Leighninger (1987), Karger (1987), and Stuart (1979). While most historical research done in social work dissertations has been “top down” and supportive of the profession—what historians call “institutional” and “contributionist” history—they have helped define the profession of social work and the field of social welfare.

Social workers also wrote historical dissertations due to what we would call a professional imperative. Social workers should research and write the history of their profession. Historical research is interesting in its own right, but it is also critical to the self-understanding of a profession. Currently there is a great deal of valuable work being done in the field of social welfare history, most of it by historians and social scientists outside of social work (Chandler, 1996). The “new social history” studies of social welfare and social work written by those outside of social work, brilliant as they sometimes are, often lack the insight and knowledge of those more familiar with the profession. To leave the history of social work and social welfare to historians outside of the social work profession limits the historical record. To leave the history of social work almost completely to others might challenge the very reproduction of the profession.
Of course, the value of any research depends in large measure on how well it is done. But given contemporary criticisms of social work research (Tyson, 1995; Heinemann, 1981; Karger, 1983; Reid, 1987; Fraser, 1994; Fraser, Jenson, and Lewis, 1993), given the contemporary debate in social work about expanding definitions and modes of research (Tyson, 1995), given that increasing methodological diversity will expand the profession's knowledge base (Fraser, 1994), and given the turn to history in other social science disciplines (Gould, 1989; Neuman, 1997), historical research deserves more of a place in social work education and practice. Abbott (1995) thinks we may well be in a period of critical reexamination in social work. As in the 1950s, another period of critical reexamination, the reflection, perspective, and contextualization inherent in good historical research could be invaluable in getting the profession to its next stage (Fisher, 1999). At the least we need to recognize that historical research had a place and value in the social work profession. Perhaps in doing so we may begin to acknowledge that it might still.
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NOTES

1. The second edition did have a chapter on "Assessing Historical Research," a well-informed appreciation of historical research, but one not geared to "doing" history.

2. Limitations of data by decades: 1) '21–30 and '31–40 benefitted from data being in a printed list in Abbott's book, thus dissertations could be examined more methodically; however, titles only were available—no abstracts available to consult for those possibly historical; (2) '41–50, '51–60, '61–70 decade totals were derived from the overall total of 101 dissertations for the years '41–72 as counted by the researcher from the card catalog search; thus, totals are reasonable estimations rather than exact totals; (3) '41–50 resulted solely from cursory card catalog search. In addition, titles only were available—no abstracts available to consult. Hence, the resulting total is a very conservative representation—maybe as much as half of the true total; (4) '51–60 had SSR as a data source in addition to card catalog search eg. to the initial total of 3 historical dissertations culled from the card catalog search, SSR adds 4
additional, making the total 7 for the decade; (5) '61–70 had ProQuest added to SSR and card catalog as a data source, offering opportunity to examine another printed listing. SSR and ProQuest contribute 5 dissertations to the overall total of 8. Abstracts only available for SSR data; (6) '71–80 and '81–90 had ProQuest as single data source (except for years '71 & '72); (6) '91–95: ProQuest was the sole data source.
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Social epidemiologists have found a relationship between poverty and infant mortality. Welfare policy experts have found that welfare benefits affect work effort, family structure, migration, and the rate of intergenerational transmission of welfare receipt. Social epidemiologists have paid little attention to the effects of poverty policies on infant mortality. Welfare policy experts have paid little attention to the effect of welfare on infant mortality. This paper merges the concerns of social epidemiologists and welfare policy experts by examining the relationship between welfare and infant mortality. The key finding is that welfare directly and indirectly affects infant mortality rates. States with higher welfare benefit levels also have lower infant mortality rates. The policy implications of this finding are discussed.

One of the perennial concerns of social epidemiologists is the question of the etiology of infant mortality in the United States. The main cause of this problem has been found to be low birth weight. A report by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1991) estimated that low birth weight was the primary cause of approximately 60 percent of all infant deaths. A great deal of recent research has attempted to determine what variables are linked to low birth weight.

Although variables such as age of mother (Orme, 1993), use of cigarettes and other drugs (Frank, et al., 1992 and Weiss and Lonquint, 1997), inadequate prenatal care (Frank, et al., 1992 and Sharma 1998), and race and ethnicity of mother (Hummer, 1993; LaVeist, 1992; Druschel, et al., 1996; and Schoendorf, et al., 1992) have been found to be related to low birth weight, one of
the most important variables related to this condition appears to be poverty. Singh, et al. (1995); Weiss and Lonnquist (1997); and Frank, et al., (1992) all report that poverty, via its generation of low birth weight, causes infant mortality.

Just as a great deal of attention has been paid to the causes of infant mortality, another set of researchers has assessed the effects of welfare benefits. For example, Moffit (1992) found that welfare creates work disincentives, is related to the formation of so called female-headed families, appears to cause some impoverished residents of low benefit states to migrate to higher benefit ones, and results in intergenerational transmission of welfare receipt. The intergenerational point simply means that children of welfare recipients are more likely to end up on welfare than children of non-recipients are. Lichter, et al. (1997) and Hoffman and Duncan (1995) also found that welfare is related to the formation of female-headed families. Fairlie and London (1997) assessed whether receiving higher benefits as a result of having children while on welfare causes women to have babies to obtain more benefits. They found no statistically significant relationship between these two variables.

What I do in this paper is attempt to "merge" the concerns of these two disparate literatures. Although social epidemiologists have been interested in the effect of poverty on infant mortality they have not addressed whether higher welfare benefits might curtail poverty rates and, thereby, curtail infant mortality rates. Although welfare researchers have been interested in the effects of welfare benefits they have also allocated little attention to this question. Presumably higher welfare benefits generate lower poverty rates, and, assuming social epidemiologists' findings hold at the aggregate level, lower poverty rates should generate lower infant mortality rates. The effect of welfare on infant mortality rates, via its effect on poverty rates, is called an indirect effect. This paper is, in part, an attempt to assess the extent of such an effect.

In addition to assessing the indirect effect of welfare on infant mortality rates, I exploit one of the advantages of the methodology I use (discussed below) and assess the total effect of welfare on such rates. This total effect is the sum of the direct and indirect effect of welfare on infant mortality rates. An assessment of the
indirect and total effects of welfare on infant mortality can provide guidance regarding the extent to which welfare can be used to curtail the proportion of infant deaths. Thus, after discussing the various types of effects of welfare on infant mortality I conclude with a discussion of the policy implications of my findings.

MODEL

Given that I am interested in the indirect and total effects of welfare on infant mortality rates, an extension of regression analysis called *path analysis* is the appropriate methodology to use to assess such effects. The units of analysis for my examination were the fifty states in the U.S. Washington, D.C. was not included in the analysis because its proportion of female-headed families with children under eighteen (about 39%) was more than seven standard deviations (each standard deviation was 1.24 units) above the mean proportion (about 9%), and its infant mortality rate (20.7%) was more than eight standard deviations (each standard deviation was 1.42 units) above the mean infant mortality rate (about 9%). According to Gujarati (1988), if a value on a particular observation is at least four standard deviations above or below the mean value of all the other observations, this particular observation is an outlier. Thus, Washington, D.C. was an outlier and outliers can appropriately be excluded from analyses because inclusion of them tends to overstate or understate the extent to which key variables are related to one another (Agresti and Finlay, 1997).

*Exogenous and Endogenous Variables*

The exogenous variables in the model I estimated were the following:

- **EDUC** = the proportion of those twenty-five years old or older in states with B.A. degrees or higher
- **UNEMPLOY** = states' unemployment rates
- **DISABLED** = the proportion of those in states too disabled to work
- **SINGLE** = the proportion of single mothers in states with children under eighteen years old
WELFARE = states' average monthly AFDC payments per family

I included EDUC in the model because economic analysis informs us that, at the individual level of analysis, there is a negative relationship between educational level and poverty (Schiller, 199). I hypothesized that this relationship might hold for my aggregate level data as well. I modeled a direct inverse relationship between EDUC and INFANT because recent epidemiological researchers have found evidence for such a relationship at the individual level of analysis (Singh, et. al., 1995 and Sharma, 1998). I conjectured that this association might hold at my higher level of analysis as well.

UNEMPLOY, DISABLED, and SINGLE were included in the model because all are positively related to poverty at the individual level of analysis (DiNitto, 1995; McLanahan and Garfinkel, 1995; and Mishel and Bernstein, 1994). I thought the same might hold at the aggregate level of analysis. I modeled a direct positive effect of UNEMPLOY on INFANT because there is research that suggest that unemployed persons are more likely to mistreat their children than employed persons are. One reason for this may be the increased contact that takes place between parents and children when parents are unemployed (Belsky, 1980).

I included a direct positive relationship between DISABLED and INFANT in the model because of a conjecture on the relationship between disability status and low self-esteem. I take it for granted that members of our society discriminate more often against disabled persons than against non-disabled ones. Such discrimination may lead to relatively higher rates of low self-esteem among the disabled, and low self-esteem has been found to be associated with child maltreatment (Bhatti, et. al., 1989; Oates and Forrest, 1985; and Shorkey, 1979).

The direct positive relationship between SINGLE and INFANT was included in the model because of a conjecture that single mothers of young children suffer higher rates of stress than the rest of us. There is evidence that suggest a positive relationship between stress and child maltreatment (Oates and Forrest, 1985 and Steele and Pollock, 1974).
The inclusion of all the above variables in my model allowed me to compare their total effects on infant mortality with that of welfare. Such a comparison is important for policy purposes.

The endogenous variables in the model were the following:

- **POVERTY** = states' poverty rates
- **INFANT** = states' infant mortality rates

The first equation in the model is:

\[ \text{POVERTY} = a - p(EDUC) + p(UNEMPLOY) + p(DISABLED) + p(SINGLE) - p(WELFARE) + e \]

The second equation in the model is:

\[ \text{INFANT} = a - p(EDUC) + p(UNEMPLOY) + p(DISABLED) + p(SINGLE) - p(WELFARE) + p(POVERTY) + e \]

Where each "p" stands for respective path coefficients.

**DATA**

The source for my data was the 1990 census. Census data are based on answers to questionnaires that were sent to all housing units in the country. Each unit received one or two versions of the census questionnaire.

The short form version asked about basic population and housing issues. For example, questions about family structure, income, employment status, etc. were asked of all respondents. All housing units received this version of the questionnaire.

The long form version contained the same questions as the short form one plus some additional questions. A probability sampling procedure was used to determine which housing units were to receive the long form questionnaire.

Census officials also made attempts to obtain data from those who did not reside in housing units. This was done in the following way. Census takers visited public and private shelters to obtain counts of shelter residents. Shelters for runaway youths and abused women and children were also visited. Census takers also made counts in open locations in the streets and other places not intended for habitation.
RESULTS

Table 1 contains the path coefficients for the direct causal effects of the five exogenous variables in the model on states’ poverty rates.

These path coefficients measure the relative magnitudes of the direct impacts of each exogenous variable on states’ poverty rates, controlling for the other exogenous variables in the model. For example, controlling for the other exogenous variables in the model, for each standard deviation increase in states’ proportions of those twenty-five years old or older with B.A. degrees or higher (EDUC), states’ poverty rates decrease by 1/10 of a standard deviation on average. The adjusted R squared value for this model is .67, indicating that almost 70% of the variation in poverty is explained by the five exogenous variables in the model. This is a pretty high amount of explained variation by social science standards.

Table 2 contains path coefficients for the direct causal effects of the five exogenous variables in the model and states’ poverty rates on states’ infant mortality rates.

We see that states’ proportions of families headed by women with children under eighteen years old has a stronger direct effect on states’ infant mortality rates than any of the other independent variables in the model. For each standard deviation increase in

Table 1

Path Coefficients for the Direct Causal Effects of Exogenous Variables on States’ Poverty Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exogenous Variables</th>
<th>POVERTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>-.10 (.143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOY</td>
<td>.25 (.373)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISABLED</td>
<td>.29 (.468)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>.22 (.342)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE</td>
<td>-.28 (.004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .70
Adjusted R Squared = .67
Standard Errors in Parentheses
Table 2

Path Coefficients for the Direct Causal Effects of the Five Exogenous Variables in the Model and States' Poverty Rates (POVERTY) on States' Infant Mortality Rates (INFANT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>INFANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>-.21   (.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEMPLOY</td>
<td>-.17   (.160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISABLED</td>
<td>.02    (.199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINGLE</td>
<td>.61    (.146)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE</td>
<td>-.29   (.062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POVERTY</td>
<td>.003   (.002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R Squared = .58
Adjusted R Squared = .53
Standard Errors in Parentheses

states' proportions of families headed by women with children under eighteen years old, states' infant mortality rates increase by about 3/5 of a standard deviation on average.

The direct effect of state's average monthly AFDC payments per family on states' infant mortality rates is second in magnitude. For each standard deviation increase in states' monthly AFDC payments per family, states' infant mortality rates decrease by a little more than 1/4 of a standard deviation on average.

The adjusted R squared value for this model is .53, indicating that this is a weaker model than that in Table 1. A model that explains more than half the variation in a response variable is still a pretty good one by social science standards.

In Table 3 we have path coefficients for the indirect causal effects in the model, that is the effects of each of the exogenous variables on states' infant mortality rates by way of their effects on states' poverty rates. These were obtained by multiplying the appropriate path coefficient for the direct effect of each exogenous variable on poverty by the direct effect of poverty on infant mortality rate.

The table indicates that the indirect impact of states' proportions of residents too disabled to work is higher than that
of any of the other exogenous variables in the model. The indirect influences of states unemployment rates and states' average monthly AFDC payments on states' infant mortality rates are equal.

In Table 4 we find the measures of the total causal effects of the exogenous variables in the model on states' infant mortality rates. These were obtained by adding the direct impacts of each exogenous variable on states' infant mortality rates to the indirect impacts of each of these variables on infant mortality rates. For example, the total impact of states' proportions of those too disabled to work on states' infant mortality rates is equal to .02 (see Table 2) plus .0009 (see Table 3).

We see from the table that the total causal effect of states' proportions of families headed by women with children under
Infant Mortality

eighteen years old on states’ infant mortality rates is greater than that of any of the other endogenous variables in the model. The total causal effect of states’ average monthly AFDC benefits per family is second in magnitude.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This paper has been concerned with the impact of welfare on infant mortality. One of the reasons for this concern is that analysts of the causes of infant mortality have not investigated the extent to which a policy, such as welfare, that presumably curtails poverty might also curtail infant mortality. The other is that analysts of the effects of welfare benefits have neglected to consider the impact of such benefits on infant mortality, that is children’s literal life chances.

In the first section of this paper, I stated that researchers have found that welfare creates a work disincentive, generates intergenerational transmission of welfare receipt, causes poor persons in low benefit states to migrate to higher benefit ones, and causes the formation of female-headed families. On the basis of such findings some have argued that welfare benefits ought to be abolished.

For example, pointing out what he views as the “social ills” associated with welfare generated reductions in work effort and increases in female headed families (e.g., crime, poverty, etc.), Tanner (1996) has argued that government should get out of the business of providing welfare and leave such provision to private charities. Although he does not appear that interested in infant mortality, Tanner could cite findings from this paper to bolster his case. Recall that the total effect of female-headed parenthood on infant mortality was the highest among the exogenous variables included in the model. Thus, Tanner could argue, that if welfare causes female-headed parenthood and female headed parenthood causes infant mortality, we could curtail infant mortality by curtailing welfare benefits. There are two problems, however, with this line of reasoning.

First, recent research has shown that the effect of welfare on family structure is small; thus decreasing welfare benefits might not do much to curtail the formation of single-parent families
Lichter, 1997). Secondly this paper has shown that welfare benefits are negatively related to infant mortality. That is, a decrease in welfare would cause an increase in infant mortality. This is because welfare is both indirectly, through its effect on poverty, and directly related to infant mortality. Thus, if lowering infant mortality is one’s policy target, whether or not it would be advisable to decrease welfare spending depends on whether or not a decrease in spending, through its effect on the formation of female-headed families, would decrease infant mortality enough to offset the increase in infant mortality that would follow from the welfare spending decrease. If the increase in welfare spending ended up not having much of an effect on the formation of female-headed families but a large negative effect on infant mortality, the welfare spending reduction would have “backfired.” Since no one has developed a path analysis in which female-headed parenthood, poverty, and infant mortality serve as endogenous variables while welfare serves as an exogenous one, we are not, at this point, in a position to make a good prediction about the effect of a welfare spending reduction on infant mortality. The major contribution of this paper is its suggestion that we may be able to make a substantial dent in the infant mortality problem by providing destitute families with more income assistance.

In addition to having some impact on the formation of female-headed families, recent research findings discussed above suggest such an increase would create more intergenerational transmission of welfare receipt, less work effort and more migration from low benefit to high benefit states. Again, how increases in these occurrences would compare to the decrease in infant mortality could only be predicted with a more complicated model. Currently, public officials and the electorate seem very interested in curtailing work disincentives, intergenerational transmission of welfare receipt, and migration from low to high benefit states. Thus, they might not be likely to support an increase in welfare benefits. The findings presented in this paper suggest that by refusing to increase welfare benefits we might be forgoing the opportunity to curtail the untimely deaths of a substantial number of children. As a society we have to decide if this is a cost we want to bear.
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The socialist market economy in China has brought about impressive economic growth. It has also resulted in serious social problems such as unemployment, deteriorating family relations, prostitution, and poverty among the disadvantaged groups. This paper discusses a welfare model proposed by the Chinese Government to contain the destabilizing effects of the social problems and to serve the newly adopted market socialism. The authors argue that although this welfare model is still very much residual by western standards, it is a big step forward in building a modern Chinese welfare system.

INTRODUCTION

Structural economic reform has fundamentally changed the planned economy which has been instituted in China for more than three decades, and which is now substituted by an economic system with a strong market orientation. As a result of the market mechanism, people have greater freedom in choosing their jobs and the location of residence, and in purchasing goods and services such as education, medical services and transportation. People have greater power and can now act according to market forces instead of governmental orders or instructions. Politically, the government continues to adhere to socialist ideologies as
proclaimed in the latest version of the Constitution, and in the documents of the 15th Communist Party Congress in 1997. Obviously, the economic reform was not followed by political reform. However, an increasing number of citizens could not adapt or survive in the new economic system. The traditional forms of welfare supply can no longer cope with the new and increasing welfare needs which, if ignored, may threaten social and political stability.

This paper aims to examine the demand and supply of social welfare services under the economic reform, and to discuss the government's attempt in socializing social welfare services to meet new social needs. To set the stage for the discussion, the social welfare system before the economic reform took place is briefly reviewed.

THREE DECADES OF RESIDUAL STATE SOCIAL WELFARE: 1949–1979

When 'new' China was established in 1949, it inherited tremendous social problems from the 'old' society. Poverty was rampant, unemployment widespread, and social ills everywhere. Among the various political and social measures, social welfare was considered an important one in maintaining social order and stability, and to keep social unrest under control.

An examination of the social welfare system in the first thirty years of communist rule shows a rather residual orientation, emphasizing self-reliance, self-help, and a community approach. The social welfare system as officially defined was basically composed of four parts, namely, labor insurance, social assistance, social welfare, and services for the army's personnel, families, widows and orphans (Ministry of Civil Affairs, 1995). In addition to these services, community support and informal care at the neighborhood level play an important role in the provision and implementation of social welfare services (Mok, 1987a; 1987b; 1988; 1990; 1993).

The labor insurance provides comprehensive occupational benefits for sicknesses, injuries, disabilities, maternity leave and retirement. These benefits, however, are basically provided for at a minimum level and are available only to employees of the
state enterprises and staff of the state and party bureaucracy. The majority of the population are not eligible for labor insurance. Social assistance and social welfare, on the other hand, are designed to help the most vulnerable groups in the society, such as elders without sons or daughters, orphans, the physically and mentally disabled, families in extreme poverty, and victims of natural disasters. Services are primarily selective, temporary and to some extent stigmatizing. Services for the army personnel are considered special protection for a special group, which, like labor insurance, are not available for the general public. At times of contingencies or crises, people normally will first apply for labor insurance benefits or services for army personnel if they are eligible, then seek help from relatives and people in the neighborhood, and going to obtain social assistance and social welfare is the final resort.

The choice of this residual approach to social welfare was made out of necessity because the need for assistance was great and resources were scarce. The state was the only supplier of social welfare services and its responsibility to feed the vast population was enormous. Given the needed resources, China would have accelerated the pace in developing its own socialist welfare state. After all, China’s socialist ideal commits it to improving the living standards of its people, and social welfare has much to contribute to socialist construction and to serving socialism (Mok, 1983). But after three decades of socialist construction, China considers that it is still in the early stage of socialism which is characterized by low productivity and poor living standard. The country just could not afford to provide universal, comprehensive and free social welfare services which constitute the basic model of distribution under socialism.

THE CHINESE SOCIETY IN TRANSITION: FROM ECONOMIC REFORM TO MARKET SOCIALISM

The pressure for change was unprecedentedly high after the death of Mao Zedong in the mid-1970’s. Economically, agricultural production was stagnant, many state-owned enterprises were losing money. Politically, a great deal of pain and suffering were endured by ordinary citizens in the Cultural Revolution
which, to a great extent weakened the government bureaucracy. Ideologically, doubts were raised, though not publicly, among the masses about the efficacy of communism in light of the backward economic development and the never-ending power struggle and in-fighting within the Communist Party. These economic, political and ideological factors, coupled with the emerging globalization of the world economy at the time, had led the government to believe that economic reforms were urgently required to rejuvenate the country's economy and to restore the masses' confidence in the Communist Party as well as the government.

In 1978, the third plenum of the 11th Community Party Congress formally endorsed the economic reforms and open door policy (Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, 1978) under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping. The economic reform literally was to enliven the economy by all means, guided by Deng's pragmatic principle of "it doesn't matter whether the cat is white or black, it is a good cat if it can catch mice." The open door policy was to open up China to the world in the economic sphere, the primary purpose of which was to attract foreign capitals, investment and technology.

The economic reform and open door policy emphasized efficiency and profitability, and in effect transformed China into a market oriented economy. In 1992, the 14th Communist Party Congress reaffirmed the importance of the free-market in Socialist China (Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, 1993). As a result, the concept of socialist market economy was adopted and added to the Chinese Constitution. Essentially, the Chinese socialist market economy is one that is pluralistic: some enterprises are owned by the state, others privately, still others cooperatively or jointly by different parties. Competition is encouraged and reward is performance-based. On the other hand, the Chinese Government vowed to stick to socialist ideologies but in a pragmatic and realistic way. It is argued that as China is still in the primary stage of socialism, a widening gap in pay is acceptable in order to promote work enthusiasm and to stimulate production. It is further contended that some people must be allowed to get rich first, so that others can follow suit. The goal of socialism is for everybody to get rich altogether, not to get poorer. To the outsiders, China is on the way to capitalism; but
to the Chinese leadership, the market is necessary and useful in achieving the ideals of socialism in the long run.

CHANGING WELFARE NEEDS UNDER THE ECONOMIC REFORM AND SOCIALIST MARKET ECONOMY

The economic reform has quickly transformed China from a planned economy to an economic system that allows the market to operate without undue control. Material incentives, differential rewards and market distribution are encouraged, while competition is seen as a necessary condition in achieving economic efficiency. Striving for economic prosperity, promoting national pride and improving the quality of life have become the new social and economic order. So far the results have been impressive. From 1978 to 1996, the Gross Domestic Product was up by 444.7%, and the income per capita was increased by 309.2% in the rural areas and by 196.7% in the cities (State Statistics Bureau, 1997).

Notwithstanding these positive indicators of the economic reform, there are obvious expected and unexpected social consequences. For example, job security is no longer guaranteed as more and more bankrupt enterprises are being closed down; people are enjoying greater freedom of choice, accompanied by rising material aspirations and family conflicts; mechanisms such as price control, state subsidies and narrow wage differentials which were once treasured are now abandoned, while the government is determined to reduce the state supply of welfare services. New social problems have arisen and new social needs emerged, notably in the areas of unemployment, deteriorating family relations, prostitution, and poverty among the most vulnerable populations such as the disabled, the elderly and families with difficulties.

Unemployment. The primary objective of the structural economic reform is to increase economic efficiency by allowing state enterprises to operate according to market principles, without the usual interference from the Party or the Government. As a result, some state enterprises were sold or rented out, merged with others, developed into joint ventures with private companies, or just went bankrupt. A large number of workers were laid off and many more simply lost their jobs. Worse is for the graduating students, who find it increasing hard to get a job. The unemployment
rate in the cities had been rising since 1985 (with the exception of 1991 and 1992), and the following table (Table 1) provides a summary of the unemployment figures.

In addition to unemployment, under-employment has also become a serious problem. Although there are no official statistics, it is believed that the number of working poor is rising at a alarming rate (Sun, 1995). Workers are employed but their income is decreasing because of insufficient work.

In the rural areas, as more and more farm lands are used for property development, many farmers are forced to find work in small towns or in the cities. The younger generation are eager to move out of their village, to look for better opportunities elsewhere. The internal migration from rural areas to the cities has caused many social problems and added pressure to the already serious problem of unemployment.

_Deteriorating Family Relations._ Alongside the economic reform, social attitudes towards marriage and family have undergone significant changes. For example, the general belief that "good people never divorce, the divorced never be good" is being rejected; the traditional family morality is being questioned; and romantic love is considered more important than family stability (Xue, 1997). At the same time, women are demanding more freedom to release them from home chores and family

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unemployed (Million)</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2.385</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3.832</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3.522</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3.639</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4.201</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4.800</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5.196</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5.528</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

responsibilities. This demand is reinforced by their increasing economic and social independance. Three areas of concern emerged. First, divorce rate has increased, and much more so in special economic zones such as Shenzhen when compared with the national figures (see Table 2 below).

Secondly, the problem of family violence is getting worse. For instance, 20% of families in the eight counties near Beijing had incidents of family violence, 80% of which involved wife battering (Tian, 1997). Thirdly, extra-marital affairs have become more and more common, especially among the men who have made instant money from their businesses (Wang, 1997). In short, social values have changed and family relations worsened.

**Prostitution.** Prostitution was unthinkable in Socialist China, but it is now a social problem. According to the findings of two surveys, one conducted in Shenzhen in 1994 and the other nationwide in 1989, most prostitutes (about 80%) were between 16–25 years old and some have regular jobs (40.4% in the Shenzhen survey and 56.3% in the national survey) (Fang et al., 1997). The reasons for prostitution varied, but more than half admitted that making money was the primary motive, as shown in the following table (Table 3).

The survey results also linked prostitution to the prostitutes' desire for conspicuous consumption and their conception of prostitution as a legitimate means of making a living. Such research findings may to some extent reflect the impact of excessive

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Divorce Rate in Shenzhen (%)</th>
<th>National Divorce Rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Motive for Prostitution (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Making Money</th>
<th>Revenge</th>
<th>Curiosity</th>
<th>Enjoy Life</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1989 National Survey</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 Shenzhen Survey</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fang et al. (1997, p. 287)

material wants on a section of the female population in a socialist market economy.

**Poverty among Vulnerable Populations.** Absolute poverty in China has been substantially reduced since the economic reform. In 1978, 250 million people lived under the poverty line, but the figure was reduced to 65 million in 1996 (Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party & State Council, 1996). While the people's material life has been greatly improved, the disadvantaged populations such as the disabled, the elderly and families with difficulties are living a more vulnerable life in a market-oriented society. The reasons are simple: they are less competitive and the government is adopting a "small government" policy in social service. For example, welfare expenditure on civil affairs has been decreasing from 1.65% of the total government expenditure in 1981 to 1.5% in 1995 (Ministry of Civil Affairs, 1996). These vulnerable groups are living in an increasing difficult environment and are urgently in need of help from the society.

**SOCIALIZING SOCIAL WELFARE: A NEW SOCIAL WELFARE MODEL**

The tidal wave of the economic reform in China has awakened the country. It has lifted one sixth of the population above the poverty line and improved the quality of life of many people. However, the tidal wave has also been damaging, particularly to the vulnerable groups such as the unemployed, under-employed, disabled, elderly, families with difficulties and the poor, who may be drowned if proper assistance are not rendered immediately. The residual state welfare system from 1949–1979 can no longer
cope with the ever increasing complex social problems arising from the economic reform. The centralized and reactive welfare policies and provisions must be reformed to meet the new social needs more effectively, and to face with the new challenges that lie ahead.

The Chinese Government was well aware of the side effects of the economic reform, socially and politically. Thus, a new concept or model coined ‘Socializing social welfare’ emerged in response to the new social needs and social problems. It was intended to dispell people’s discontent, resolve internal contradictions and ensure a socially and politically stable environment for economic development. Social welfare is expected to support the economic reform, and to serve the newly adopted market socialism (Zhang, 1990; Cui, 1991; Ministry of Civil Affairs, 1993). It was proposed and experimented in the mid-1980’s when there was an upsurge in unemployment rate and other social problems, and was fully implemented in the early 1990’s.

The Concept of Socializing Social Welfare. ‘Socializing social welfare’ is not just a slogan, but an important concept with significant policy and practice implications. It refers to all activities aimed at meeting the urgent needs and solving the more serious problems of the masses in their daily life, through mobilization of people’s power and community resources (Zhang, 1990; Bai & Wu, 1996). Social welfare is considered not the sole responsibility of the government, but a duty of every member, every organization, and every sector of the community (Cui, 1991; Wang & Bai, 1996). Socializing social welfare, therefore, implies that the provision of social welfare should be ‘by the community, with the community and for the community’. The role of the government is to give all possible encouragement and support to implementing this new concept or model of social welfare.

Concerns and Contents. The residual state social welfare system in China is characterized by its restrictive coverage, limited service provisions, state funding, and centralized planning and management. It is apparently unable to cope with the new social problems and new social needs. “Socializing social welfare” as a concept or model provides a clear direction in four major areas of concern (Zhang, 1990).
First, expanding social welfare services to cover all members of the society. It is envisaged that eventually all residents in the cities, not just the service recipients of the Ministry of Civil Affairs will be able to get social welfare benefits (Ministry of Civil Affairs, 1995). In the mean time, the rural population are beginning to enjoy old age insurance, medical care and basic welfare services (Duoji, 1995).

Secondly, increasing the varieties of welfare services. In addition to reforming the existing labor insurance in the cities and introducing old age insurance in the countryside, the central government is encouraging the establishment of innovative programs to meet new needs. For instance, local governments and enterprises are requested to provide job placement, job training and re-training programs for the unemployed. Non-governmental and grassroots organizations are asked to develop counselling services for individuals and families in need. Different forms of residential and community-based care for the disabled and the elderly are also advocated.

Thirdly, developing multiple sources of welfare funding. In the past, the state was solely responsible for financing all welfare programs which were naturally limited in service provisions and restrictive in coverage because of insufficient funds. In order that welfare programs can be expanded, all possible avenues to raise money for welfare are supported. For example, selling welfare lotteries, accepting donations from abroad and fee-charging for social services are allowed. Local governments are expected to mobilize community resources for welfare purposes as much as possible, enterprises are required to set up welfare funds for their workers, and social welfare agencies are encouraged to develop profit-making businesses to support their welfare activities.

Fourthly, decentralizing the planning and management of social welfare programs. As the level of economic development and standard of living vary greatly across the nation, community problems and needs can be very different. The central government considers it appropriate for local governments to plan and design their own social welfare programs, because they are in the best position to understand their needs and solve their problems.

Some Guiding Principles. What have been proposed and implemented in socializing social welfare address a few basic questions:
Who is responsible for social welfare? What kinds of welfare services are needed? How are these services organized and delivered? Who benefits? These questions have been discussed and debated within the government and the Communist Party, and in academic and social welfare fields. Unlike before, the discussion was not dogmatic, but open and pragmatic enough to accommodate widely dissenting views. There were no common or absolute answers to these questions. However, a general consensus has been reached on some guiding principles for counties and provinces to develop their local social welfare policies and programs, including:

1. The government should play a less active role in social welfare than the society at large. The ideal model of social welfare is one that stresses ‘small government, big society’.

2. Individuals, families, neighbors and the community as a whole should assume more responsibilities for the welfare of themselves and members of the community. The social values of self-protection, self-reliance, self-help and mutual help should be further enhanced.

3. The individuals’ privileges should correspond with their duties. Thus, the principle of distribution should be based on work and performance. Occupational welfare should be encouraged and should be made available to all employees.

4. The speed of social welfare development should not exceed economic growth; nor should it be left far behind. An optimum point of balance should be sought between the two.

5. Where-ever possible social equality and economic efficiency should be maintained to a high extent. When there is a conflict between the two, economic efficiency should be given priority. An important objective of social welfare is to promote social equality which can best be achieved under conditions of economic efficiency.

6. The supply of welfare should be prioritized according to the demand, urgency and financial strength of a particular community. A cautious approach should be adopted.

CONCLUSION

'Socializing social welfare' was initially a concept raised in response to the new social needs arising from the economic reform.
It later evolved into a working orientation which has identified common welfare concerns, developed significant welfare contents, and derived some guiding principles. It can be considered as a new model of social welfare designed to serve the newly adopted market socialism. In fact, the mission of social welfare as repeatedly reiterated by Chinese leaders, is to help construct and consolidate socialism with Chinese characteristics through making full use of the market. This new welfare model still have a strong residual orientation by western standards. Nonetheless, taking into consideration China’s present state of social and economic development, ‘socializing social welfare’ as a concept or model is a big step forward in building a modern social welfare system in China.

Undoubtedly, China is determined to use whatever welfare strategies that are effective in containing the emerging social ills and in promoting the welfare of its people, particularly the vulnerable populations. The success of the new welfare model however, has yet to be ascertained. Ideological as well as practical challenges are lying ahead and awaiting to be addressed.

Ideologically, there is always a big trade-off between economic efficiency and social equality. But the overriding emphasis given to efficiency in all fields, including social welfare, would certainly reduce equality. In addition, relying on market distribution of income and resources would lead to a widening gap between the rich and the poor. The slogan of “letting some people get rich first” as advocated by Deng Xiaoping may end up with “letting the poor remain poor” for a long time. Financially, allowing welfare funds to be raised by all means without proper guidelines and supervision could result in the misuse or even abuse of welfare funds. Corruption is the worst possible outcome. Policy and management-wise, the government opted for a “small” role, but it is questionable if the people or the community as a whole can shoulder immediate and greater welfare responsibilities, given that the people have not been able to accumulate wealth or experience in welfare in the years prior to the economic reform. Finally in practice, implementing the new welfare model requires an army of welfare personnel who should be equipped with varying degrees of professional knowledge and skills. Currently, trained social welfare personnel in China is extremely lacking.
Some major Chinese universities have begun to offer social work courses but it will take a long time before the manpower need in social welfare can be met.
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Implementation Problems in the Development of Urban Community Services in the People’s Republic of China: The Case of Beijing
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To review the ten year implementation of the community service policy of the People’s Republic of China, community service implementers and academics located in Beijing were interviewed. By employing implementation theories as a framework of analysis, a number of implementation problems are identified. In terms of policy characteristics and the structuring of implementation, this case shows that the objectives are not specific enough. The decentralized implementation strategy allows the implementers too much discretionary power. The shortage of qualified and motivated personnel further complicate the issue. Lastly, the policy environment of Beijing does not lend adequate support to the policy.

INTRODUCTION

1997 was a special year to those interested in the community service policy of the People’s Republic of China (PRC). That year marked the tenth anniversary of the endorsement of the community service policy in the first National Symposium on Community Services in Urban Areas in 1987 (Chan, 1993a; and Leung, 1995). To review the ten-year implementation of community service, another National Symposium was conducted in October 1997, in Wuhan. The community service policy is a crucial ingredient in the PRC’s welfare reform package.1 It is intended to
take over the welfare provision function originally shouldered by state-owned enterprises before market reforms were undertaken. Like other reforms in the PRC, the community service reform is proceeding in an experimental manner, and like other social experiments, the community service policy encountered problems from its inception. In the ten years since its birth, have the policy makers managed to ensure effective implementation of the policy? This paper attempts to answer this question by examining the problems and difficulties in the implementation process.

Three teams of community service implementers and six academics located in Beijing were interviewed by the authors. The reasons for selecting Beijing are three-fold. Firstly, Beijing is among the first batch of cities to implement the community service policy. Secondly, being the capital, local policy makers are more zealous in implementing the policy according to central authority directives. Finally, Beijing has the economic resources to facilitate effective implementation of the policy (Leung & Nann, 1996; and Zhang, 1989). As the success of community service relies heavily on a continual supply of local resources, an analysis of the situation in a resource-rich city would enable some predictions to be made regarding cities with less resources.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

"Policy implementation is the missing link between the concern with policy making and the evaluation of policy outcomes" (Ham & Hill, 1984, p.95). Numerous researches attempt to fill in the "missing link" or "the process of putting policy into action" (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973). In general, the policy implementation literature is subsumed under three headings: the top-down, the bottom-up and the synthesis or iterative approach (Sabatier, 1986).

The top-down approach focuses on how the implementation process is structured to attain policy objectives. Emphasis is placed on the possibility of manipulating legal and political mechanisms (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983, 1989; McFarlane, 1989; and Van Meter & Van Horn, 1977). This approach tries to modify policy design, structure the linkages between organizations and groups involved in implementing the policy, and respond to
Implementation Problems of Community Services in the PRC

the continually changing socio-political environment in order to make the policy a success.

In contrast to the top-down approach, the bottom-up approach tends to adopt the perspectives of the implementing organizations and actors. This approach stresses that the implementation environment or "implementation structure" (Hjern & Porter, 1981, p.211) involves a plurality of stakeholders who have different interests, values and goals. Mobilization of the support of these divergent stakeholders is vital to the success of the implementation. Scholars (Barrett & Fudge 1981; Elmore, 1985; Hjern 1982; and Hull with Hjern, 1987) usually recommend allowing implementers adequate discretion so that they may adapt to the turbulent environment.

The synthesis or iterative approach (Alexander, 1985; Hasenfeld & Brock, 1991; Knoepfel & Weidner, 1982; and Sabatier, 1986) tries to capture the strengths of the first two approaches. As with the bottom-up approach, front-line bureaucrats are seen to possess the capacity to act on their own initiative. The need to pay attention to stakeholders, policy coalitions or affected interest groups within the policy environment is also regarded as important. However, proponents of the synthesis approach also accept the "top down" preoccupation that policy makers should possess the legislative power to structure the implementation process and confine the implementers' behavior within acceptable boundaries. The approach accentuates the impact of continual communication between policy makers and implementers, and ongoing evaluation activities, in helping policy makers to learn ways to improve the monitoring mechanism. The emphasis on interactions between the "top" and the "bottom" has earned this approach another name, the iterative approach.

Guidelines for Identifying Implementation Problems

Despite the diversity of these approaches, they tend to share a common thread. It can be categorized into the following three groups of guiding questions. The first set of questions relates to the policy characteristics and the structuring of implementation. Are the policy objectives spelled out clearly and specifically? Are the implementing agencies granted sufficient resources and legal authority to carry out their jobs? Are the tasks clearly assigned
to different agencies? And finally, is there an integrated structure co-ordinating the implementing agencies at different levels?

The second set of questions is about the implementing organizations and personnel. Are the implementers professional enough to finish their tasks? How are they motivated? Do their value orientations, attitudes and commitments jeopardize the policy objectives?

The last set of questions relates to the policy environment. Are the current socio-economic and political environments supportive for the continuity of the policy? Are there any interest groups or coalitions opposed to the policy? Does the clientel identify with the policy? All these questions will be examined in this study.

**CHINESE COMMUNITY SERVICES**

The evolution of the Chinese community service system was undertaken against a background of economic reform, which triggered a number of social problems. Community service policy, alongside social security reform, emerged as a response to these social problems (Duo Ji, 1994). The post-reform community-based welfare system is well documented by other scholars (Chan, 1992, 1993a; Leung, 1990; and Wong, 1992). Thus, this paper will only briefly describe the current scenario.

**Community Service Policy Objectives**

Before 1993, the stated overall objective of the community service policy was to "help the community residents, especially those facing difficulties, through the provision of welfare and services" (Zhang, 1989, p.237). From 1993 onwards, new policy objectives were added. The objectives were: (a) to deliver welfare services to the elderly, disabled persons and families of martyrs and ex-servicemen; (b) providing convenience services for the community residents in general; and (c) co-operating with the enterprises and government departments located within the community to provide social services. The new goal of the policy was to accelerate the establishment of a community-based social service market (Ministry of Civil Affairs, et al., 1993). Even though the overall aim remained intact, serving the general community
residents was considered as important as providing welfare services to the needy group.2

The Scope of Community Services

The scope of community services has been widened since the promulgation of the 14 Ministry Document. Before 1993, the scope was mainly confined to provision of free welfare services for the needy. After the announcement, it was widened to include subsidized and paid-for services. The fee-charging services, which include those services that are not provided in the market, are purely for profit making. These services are also known as convenience services (bianmen fuwu) such as helping community members to deal with their daily life nuisances, like bicycle parking and repairing, breakfast serving, shopping services, sewing, leisure and recreational activities as well as the installation of public telephones, etc. Besides convenience services, community organizations can even provide other profit making services, like catering, karaoke, marriage matching, disco and tourist services. Subsidized services are provided to the urban poor who are able to pay a certain amount.

The Implementers

Urban community services are usually organized under a three-tiered system: District government, Street Offices and Residents' Committees. The District government is supposed to be the administrative unit responsible for organizing community services. However, because of the emphasis on local variations, in most cases, community services are delivered by a community network, which consists of a Street Office and the Residents' Committees under its jurisdiction. At the end of 1995, a Street Office usually managed a population of 50,000 to 80,000 in large cities, and 15,000 to 20,000 in small and medium-sized cities. Generally, each Street Office manages 15 to 25 Residents' Committees. Its duties include: (a) administering the daily affairs of the street; (b) acting as the intermediate between the residents and the government; (c) giving advice and directing the Residents' Committees; improving the living conditions of the street; (d) coordinating different governmental and non-governmental units within the street; and (e) directing and monitoring businesses
opened by the Street Office or the Residents' Committees (Ministry of Civil Affairs, 1996a).

The Residents' Committees are para-governmental organizations, though they are supposed to be self-managed by the neighborhood members and the members of the committees are elected by local residents. The Chinese government has further emphasized the community status of the Residents' Committees: District governments should direct rather than lead the development of the committees' activities so as to reduce their government-dependent nature (Ministry of Civil Affairs, 1996b).

The MCA is mainly responsible for organizing and monitoring community service programmes. Nevertheless, there are other ministries and para-governmental units involved in the community: the Ministries of Labour, Personnel, Education and Culture, the Women's Federation, the Communist Youth League, trade unions, and the state-owned enterprises located within the community. As a result, Street Offices and Residents' Committees have to be responsive to various ministries and para-governmental units in their daily operations. Nonetheless, the MCA co-ordinates various requests from these units, because Street Offices and Residents' Committees are formally under the MCA's supervision.

**Implementing strategies**

With government direction and subvention, Street Offices and Residents' Committees are in charge of mobilizing various supportive forces within society, according to the characteristics of the local community, to develop small scale welfare facilities and other social service activities (Zhang, 1989). Decentralization has become the major strategy for service provision. This means that, District governments, Street Offices and Residents' Committees can autonomously determine what and how community services are provided, and how much of each service is provided.

The rationale behind decentralization is to allow local variations to develop. Since localities have their particular resource endowment, rigid standardization would restrict choices for developing appropriate community services. The principle of self-reliance and mutual help, part of the socialist ideology of mutual care and mutual responsibility, is also emphasised (Mok, 1987).
Because of limited financial support, many community service programmes, particularly free services, rely on mobilizing local volunteer groups. The slogan, "everybody helps me, I help everybody" (renren weiwo, wowei renren), highlights the mutual help principle behind this approach (Zou and Chen, 1992: 36).

**Underlying Principles in Setting Policy Objectives**

The objectives of the PRC's community service policy reflect the underlying principles of the central policy makers who are more concerned with economic reform than with the provision of welfare. Community service policy is directly affected by economic reform. Firstly, the development of social welfare and social work is aimed at resolving the possible instabilities associated with economic reform (e.g., Chen, 1988, 1990), especially the enterprise reform. In view of this, some Chinese policy makers suggest developing community services as tools to stabilize society (Hu, 1990). Some (e.g., Shanghai Research Group on Social Security, 1989; Yang, 1994) even argue that community service is complementary to economic development. Because the community is the most basic level of people's lives, providing adequate and appropriate community services can lessen or even resolve the unemployment, inflation, elderly, and child-care problems created by the economic reform. Without the development of community services, further economic reform may be compromised. Especially the role of Residents' Committees as the basic local organizing unit, become an essential element of a stabilizing mechanism at the local or neighborhood level, which is indispensable for furthering economic reforms (Yan, 1994).

Secondly, the limited revenue attained by the central government since the initiation of economic reform has made it more and more reluctant to finance welfare services in general and community services in particular. Consequently, the District governments, Street Offices and Residents' Committees are encouraged to be self-financing. Under the self-financing imperative, for-profit community service provision is encouraged so as to obtain enough funding to sustain or expand services for the needy (Ren, 1993). The slogan, "using services to support services", is well known among service implementers. Another rationale behind providing for-profit services is that these services serve
the wider public who are also members of the community. It is through this self-financing mechanism that central government can limit its public spending without having to reduce the service commitment to the public, including needy groups.

Finally, some policy makers (Zhang & Yang, 1989) not only view the development of community services as complementing economic reform, but also as a catalyst to developing service markets. According to this perspective, community service providers have to serve different segments of the community, not only the most needy. The marketization of community services can provide more choices to satisfy the various needs of the population. Once service markets are developed, Street Offices and Residents’ Committees can fulfil the dual goals of self-financing and serving the whole community. With adequate funding, they can offer more quality services to the needy. In sum, the community service system is seen not only as a stabilizing mechanism, but also as a promoter of the service industry and the financial source for social welfare.

COMMUNITY SERVICE PROVISION IN BEIJING

The developmental pace of the community service system in Beijing is closely synchronized with central policy changes. In 1984, the MCA decided that social welfare service organizations should strive for both social and economic efficiency. One year later, the MCA advocated the idea of ‘civil economy’ (minzheng jingji), which means social welfare service organizations need to develop their own profit-making businesses. Welfare production organizations, like welfare factories and community service providers, have to consider whether their ‘production’ is cost efficient.

Beijing took the lead in launching the new policy objective. In 1987, the MCA, after consolidating the experiences of various experimental projects, initiated the community service policy. It reasserted the principle of “using service production to support welfare provision” (yi fuwu yang fuwu). Two years later, the MCA elaborated the details on how to establish a civil economy: introducing a market mechanism in welfare production and provision, using profit generated from service production to subsidize welfare provision; and encouraging welfare service providers to become self-financing (Zhang, 1997).
Beijing adopted a three-year plan since 1986. The first three-year plan (1986–1988) had the following aims: popularizing the idea of civil economy; structuring the community service system with Street Offices as the core and Residents’ Committees as the supplement; erecting the community service infrastructure and setting experimental targets. The second three-year plan (1989–1991) further deepened the efforts of the first three-year plan. In addition, a number of community service centers were erected, and different kinds of mutual-help services were developed (Beijing Civil Affairs Bureau, 1990). Up to 1993, the development of community service was still focused upon welfare services rather than service production. The main targets to be served were still the needy groups.

However, after the issue of the 14 Ministry Document, “Opinions About Accelerating the Development of the Community Service Industry” (Guanyu Jikuai Kaizhan Shequ Fuwuyi de Yijian) in 1993, the whole welfare reform drive turned onto a new path. In time with the climate of economic reform, the MCA set up new standards for developing community services. Marketization and the deepening of the idea of civil economy became dominant. In 1995, the MCA encouraged local governments to set up model “Community Service Urban Districts” as examples for others to imitate (Yan, 1997). Following the new instructions, Beijing’s Street Offices and Residents’ Committees established many for-profit service facilities. Since then community services have been formally differentiated into fee-paying, subsidized and free service types. A number of model community units have also been established.

One of these model units is in Beijing’s Xicheng District. The District government restructured the management of community services in 1987. The major goal was to separate politics from service provision. In the past, the community service centers and their financing were centrally controlled by the Street Offices. Although quite suitable for the free and subsidized services, this system was not apt for the civil economy model.

The Xicheng District government further encouraged the community centers to establish their own profit-making businesses. As a result, with the support of the MCA, the Beijing Xicheng District Community Service Association (Beijing Xichengqu Shequ Fuwu Xiehui) and the Community Service Devel-
The Development Company (Shequ Fuwu Gongsi) were established in 1993. The Association is responsible for coordinating the Company, its subsidiaries and joint ventures. The Association has legal status, but it is neither a government agency nor a company. It acts as an intermediary between the service users and the providers. The functions of the Association are: (a) accelerating the decentralization process by taking over the job of regulating community service production and provision from the government; (b) mediating the relationships between the government, the Company and other social actors; (c) fund-raising; (d) organizing activities, such as training, needs assessments, citizen surveys, and consultation, to improve the quality of services; and finally (e) monitoring the economic and financial situation of the service providers (Deng, 1995).

At the street level, community service centers have been established. Among the ten streets in the Xisheng District, three community centers were first erected at Xichangan Jie, Yuetan, and Dewai in 1988. It was supposed that other Street Offices would follow later. These three centers are located in densely populated commercial areas. The total construction cost is around 450 thousand Yuan of which 51 thousand came from the City and District governments, 160 thousand from the MCA, 150 thousand from the Street Offices and the rest (89 thousand) from various private donors (Shi, 1990). Although the government provided the initial financial resources and provided indirect assistance, such as tax exemption, the centers have to become self-financing at a later stage. Originally, the centers aimed at serving the traditional target groups (i.e., the needy), and the profit generated from the fee-based services was used to support the subsidized and free services. However, under the self-financing imperative, the centers gradually shifted their focus to profit-making service provision.

At the neighbourhood level, Residents' Committees mainly focus on developing mutual help activities due to their grassroots nature. In addition, they provide convenience services that are also categorized into fee-based, subsidized and free services. The Residents' Committees are also encouraged to be self-financing. As a result, they have to find ways to generate profit. Apart from providing for-profit convenience services, the Residents'
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Committees issue licenses to migrant and redundant (xiagang) workers to operate various types of locality-based businesses. These “street businesses” are usually in the form of contracted out convenience services that are important for the common welfare of the neighborhood. The contracting out is justified by the official endorsement of this role of community services, namely, developing the service market.

IMPLEMENTATION PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

Policy Characteristics and the Structuring of Implementation

Lack of clear specification in policy objectives. The importance of providing services to both the needy and the general community, as well as the significance of both economic and social efficiency have been stressed at the policy level. Consequently, free, subsidized and for-profit services are all legitimate outputs. In order to enhance economic efficiency, marketization is necessary. Moreover, the idea of using for-profit services to finance subsidized and free services may be on the right track. However, there is no further specification about the proportion of resources committed to each type of service. The problem is quite serious when the main implementation strategy is a decentralized one. One of our informants pointed out that implementers are allowed so much “discretion” that they can do whatever they want. This is especially true of those located in a prosperous community, where they can provide many convenience services while leaving the welfare service at a minimum. Local conditions can be used as justification for such measures.

Although some high-ranking officials have persistently called for more attention to the needy (Cui, 1991; and Yan, 1994), some Beijing providers have clearly shifted their focus from free and subsidized services to for-profit ones (Zhang, 1997). As Wang (1997) argues, the for-profit and non-profit services belong to two different structures of the community service system. With the objective of maintaining social stability, community services are treated as remedial services for the needy. Nevertheless, with the introduction of marketization, for-profit services are viewed as providing more choices to recipients who can afford them. The nature of community services has fundamentally changed from
remedial to remedial-cum-commodified, and at worst, purely commodified.

The community service policy is basically a welfare policy. When economic efficiency is over-stressed, even at the expense of social efficiency, one may wonder that the implementers may subsume the social objectives under the economic ones. Without clarifying priorities and specifying the proportion of different types of services, the well being of the vulnerable groups may ultimately rest in the hands of the implementers.

Reliance upon decentralized implementation strategy. The decentralization strategy has the virtue of allowing implementers the flexibility to respond to the local situation in different communities. However, when decentralization is accompanied by the self-financing imperative, the implementers may face difficulties in providing sufficient free and subsidized services to the needy in poor communities. In poor neighborhoods, the size of the vulnerable groups is relatively large, but people who can contribute their valuable time in providing mutual help services or are able to purchase the for-profit services are relatively few. As a result, the implementers cannot mobilize enough resources to satisfy the community’s needs. For instance, those community service centers located in the prosperous neighbourhoods of the Xichang District and Dongchang District are well decorated and provide numerous kinds of services. In contrast, there is no service center located in the Toutiao and Ertiao neighborhoods of the Dongchang District because they have a relatively large elderly population. The Residents’ Committees in these poorer districts lack money to provide sufficient free and subsidized services.

Worse still, when the self-financing imperative and the role of promoting the development of the service market are introduced to the implementers, the adequacy of welfare service provision becomes questionable in the well off communities too. Complicating matters further is the direct tie between the salary of the implementers and the success of their for-profit business, since staff pay levels are raised if more profit is earned by the organization. Thus, the implementers have a great incentive to deliver convenience and non-welfare services. As noted by Zhang (1997), as the
policy emphasis shifted to self-financing, the Xichangan Jie and the Xinjiekou Community Centers in the Xichang District had to cut a large portion of their free and subsidized services, and moved to provide more fee-paying services in order to survive. Both the members of the Residents’ Committees and staff of the community centres interviewed demonstrated their pride in organizing a wide variety of for-profit services, and the amount of profit generated for their organizations in the past few years. However, when we asked about their welfare services, they were quite reluctant to tell us. They mentioned some limited services, such as fun fairs for the elderly and helping the childless elderly with housework. The exact quantity of welfare services was not revealed. Some academics worry that a number of implementers are abusing their position to gain personal benefits particularly by running services” such as restaurants and karaoke clubs. To correct these defects, some rules have to be enforced. More resource input to the poor neighborhoods is also required.

Slow and rigid responses by staff of the Ministry of Civil Affairs. A majority of the service implementers interviewed indicated that the MCA officials were slow in responding to their requests. One service provider of a Dongshang Residents’ Committee mentioned that the MCA has not responded to a request for renovation of her office for three years. The slow responses reflect to certain extent that decentralization is mainly confined to managerial duties, while financial discretion is still centrally controlled. Another reason is that the MCA tends to resort to the old established ways of problem solving. The changes brought on by decentralization and marketization are too new for the MAC officials to manage. Under financial constraints and increasing demand from below, many local officials simply ignore the demands or wait for instructions from above. As the top-down approach literature points out, relying on existing departments or organizations to implement a relatively new program has the drawback of dragging along all the existing bureaucratic problems, which deprive implementers of certain flexibility in carrying out the new program (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 1983). The Vice Minister of the MCA, Yan Mingfu (1994) testifies to the tendency of the MCA staff to avoid the new program. He has admitted that staff often stick to their established
job assignment and says they are not dynamic enough to handle the new tasks.

*Lack of inter-departmental co-ordination.* Closely related to the above problem is the ambiguous role of the MCA in co-ordinating community service provision. Even though it is the main duty of the MCA to monitor the implementation processes, there are many government departments and para-governmental organizations involved in the community field. They all rely on the community-based network, especially the Residents' Committees, to carry out their work. Since each department or organization has its own agenda, the Residents' Committees are often overloaded. There is a saying that resident committees suffer from the problem of "a thousand threads through a single needle" (qian tiao xian, yi gen zhen). A thousand threads represents the demands of various agencies while the single needle signifies the Residents' Committee. Mobilizing collaboration between these departments and organizations is difficult. The front-line MCA staff do not possess enough authority to mobilize the co-operation of the para-governmental organizations, not to mention the other government departments. This pinpoints the lack of an effective monitoring mechanism to deal with the strong veto-point in the implementation chain between the MCA and other departments and organizations.

Some suggestions have been made within the MCA to resolve this problem (see Ministry of Civil Affairs, 1995). In Beijing, some District governments set up a permanent monitoring committee with senior officials from other departments and chaired by the District office of the MCA. In some districts, senior officials of the Street Office are assigned to co-ordinate with the other departments through a temporary committee (Deng, 1995). Some even recommend that the monitoring function should fall outside the arena of the MCA and rest in a multi-ministerial structure with chairpersons of the structure democratically elected (Zhu, 1997).

*Implementing Organizations and Personnel*

*Lack of high calibre personnel.* An obvious phenomenon noted in Beijing is that the staff of the Residents' Committees and voluntary helpers are usually elderly. Many of them have had little
formal education. This is not unique to Beijing. Chan (1993b), Wong (1992), and Leung and Nann (1996) also found a prevalence of elderly persons among service providers in other cities. How to attract more young people and people of a higher education level to join the community service implementing organizations is one serious problem troubling senior officials, as suggested by the staff of the Street Office and the Resident Committees visited. The major reason why implementing organizations fail to attract young people is that the remuneration is low. There are some middle-aged personnel, but they are mostly recruited from the redundant manual workers. They lack the professional skills and calibre to implement the policy successfully. Although there are a number of social workers graduated from some renowned universities, such as Beijing University, university graduates are not willing to take up such low-paying jobs. Mostly, they are assigned to the higher level administrative posts rather than direct service posts.

Lack of motivation and commitment. Apart from the calibre of service providers, motivation and commitment are important elements for the success of the implementation process. Particularly given the financial straitjacket in which these operate, motivation and commitment determine the level of success. Between the two Residents' Committees we visited, performance on service delivery differed significantly, even though they were located next to each other within a relatively poor community. The staff of the better-performing committee pointed out numerous ways of generating convenience services and recruiting voluntary workers. They showed us a list of convenience services provided in the past few years. But the staff of the other committee were not so energetic and creative. They tended to stick to the usual routine work. The cases highlight the importance of the frontline workers' enthusiasm in providing services under problematic structural conditions, as previously discussed. Since the staff of the Residents' Committees are recruited from the neighborhood, a strong sense of community identification is prerequisite to motivate them to work enthusiastically without caring about their pay.
Problems Relating to the Policy Environment

Difficulty in mobilizing volunteers. Organizing voluntary mutual help services constitutes a major part of the implementation program. As such, the altruistic atmosphere of the policy environment determines its success. In the past, the mutual aid services were maintained in the name of socialist values. Recent changes in society, like inflation and the rising standard of living are detrimental to people's sense of charity. The ongoing economic reform has sown the seeds of individualism and instrumental mentality among citizens. Since urban communities have become more money-oriented, the government's attempts to instil the "Lei Feng" (self-sacrifice) spirit has gone unheeded. The general public of Beijing is more concerned with improving its economic condition, by taking up a second job or working longer hours, than helping neighbors. One taxi driver told us that he could earn around 10,000 Yuan per month by working about twelve hours a day and seven days a week. Even though he knew that the Residents' Committee had organized some mutual help services, he just did not have time to participate.

Limited take up of community based services. Although the central authority assigned Street Offices and Residents' Committees as the grassroots implementing organizations, these organizations were used as the tool of governance rather than to provide important community services. Moreover, these organizations had limited authority to deal with problems like unemployment, care of the elderly, youth work and women's services. The past image and ability of these organizations are deeply held in the mind of the residents. As a result, the residents do not recognize the new responsibilities and authority of the organizations. Hence, once they encounter problems, they would not seek helps from the local implementing organizations. One of our informants, a redundant widow, said that she did not seek help from the Residents' Committee because she thought that the committee could do nothing to assist her. Instead, she asked her elder sister for help.

Monitoring issues. Decentralization undeniably grants local implementers managerial control of their service delivery. The problem, as identified previously, is how to monitor their behavior.
The existence of groups and organizations actively concerned about the service provision may check the performance of the implementers. For instance, in the field of elderly care, the influential role of the National Conference of the Elderly (NCE) is well known (Olson, 1988). The NCE, as a coalition organization of all groups concerned about the welfare of the elderly, closely monitors the elderly care policy in the PRC. In housing policy, a similar organization was set up to monitor the recent attempts at housing reform (Zhong & Hays, 1996). However, in the realm of community services, so far, no such coalition organization has been formed. As a result, local implementers are left free to interpret instructions from above, and free to design their services according to their own interests. This may lead to deviation from the original policy objectives.

**Inadequate support from the provincial government.** An MCA informant told us that the development of community services in Beijing lagged behind that of Shanghai and Tianjin because of lack of support from the provincial government. Political events, especially the reshuffling of some senior officials due to corruption, dampened the government's enthusiasm in implementing the community service policy. Several years ago, with strong support from the Beijing government, some districts and streets were awarded the "exemplary status" among the model districts and streets in the country. However, the performance of these models has not been impressive in recent years. Changing the government's priorities is thus a crucial factor in fostering more effective implementation of the community service policy in Beijing.

**CONCLUSION**

By employing implementation theories as a framework for the study of the recent community service reform, a number of implementation problems are identified in the case of Beijing. In terms of policy characteristics and the structuring of implementation, this case shows that the objectives are not specific enough. To some extent, this is due to the decentralized implementation strategy that allows the implementers too much discretionary power. Moreover, the existing implementation structures are not
flexible enough to co-ordinate various departments and para-
governmental organizations in satisfying community needs ef-
ciently and effectively. The shortage of qualified personnel in 
implementing organizations and a lack of motivation on the part 
of service providers further complicate the issue. Lastly, the policy 
environment of Beijing does not lend support to the policy. Inade-
quate support from the provincial government, lack of organiza-
tion in monitoring the implementation and the passive residents 
hinder the further development of the community services.

NOTES

1. Although the ideals of community care and mutual help have been first intro-
duced since the promulgation of the regulations concerning the Organization 
of Neighbourhood Office in Urban Areas' in 1954 (Chan, 1992: 359). For the 
details of the community-based welfare support before the economic reform, 
see Dixon (1981).

2. The content of the policy document further substantiates such a change. 
One can easily find paragraphs specifying land use regulations, taxation 
arrangements, and technical support from the government in promoting the 
convenience services.

3. The advocacy of the principle of self-reliance and mutual help may be the 
excuse of the Chinese authority to avoid expanding the financial supports to 
communities.
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Book Reviews


Like its predecessor, Paradigm of Clinical Social Work, Volume 2, edited by Rachelle Dorfman, offers an excellent review of several clinical practice theories. Each author also applies theories covered to a case which adds to the practice appeal of the text. The same case, the Shore family, was used in the first volume of the book and in this volume. Interestingly, using the same case from one volume to the next allows for cross comparisons among the different authors and perspectives. It also provides an opportunity to see how some models may have changed in perspective over time.

This revised volume of Paradigms of Clinical Social Work is more than just an editorial make over of the former text. It offers an extensive revision and coverage of new theories and trends in clinical practice. From this view the text is more than a book about clinical social work theories and practice. It is a book about clinical practice theories that has broad interdisciplinary applications. This perhaps also reflects the interdisciplinary thinking that is applied in the development of social work theories.

A meritorious strength of the text is that Dorfman assembles an impressive array of clinicians and academicians who are experts in the theories and perspectives being addressed. In fact, most authors have actual practice experience using the models. Such practice expertise has become rare in a textbook. I was also impressed with the fact that Dorfman captured several of the current themes and issues that are being voiced in psychotherapies and in clinical practice. Themes such as strengths orientation, brief treatment, client centered/egalitarian perspectives, integrationism, postmodernism, constructivism, and managed behavioral health care are all addressed in the pages of the text. The text provides an excellent repository for professionalizing students to the concerns and discourses of practicing clinicians as well as an introductory text on practice theories.
The book has three parts. Part 1 introduces the case example which is used in the text. Part 2 covers seven paradigms or theories guiding clinical social work practice. Although, it may have been appropriate to give more attention to psychoeducational models and group practice given the current work setting of most clinicians. The seven paradigms covered serve as good examples of popular clinical models in current usage. Paradigms discussed include: Ego psychology, Self, psychology, Solution-focused Brief Therapy, Control-Master Theory, The Cognitive Therapy Model, Ericksonian approaches, and Postmodern family therapy. All chapters have good coverage of constructs and applications.

Part 3 covers five metaparadigms and focuses the rest of the book on cutting edge models and issues. Chapters include: Feminist perspectives, meaning-making framework which could have been labeled cognitive-constructivist perspectives, eclectic psychotherapy, managed behavioral health care and long-term trends in clinical social work practice. All chapters in this section are easy to read and practice friendly. Coverage of feminist practice is well suited for a social work book and further adds the political perspective to practice models as did the postmodern perspectives covered in part 2. The chapter on meaning-making perspectives, however, seemed misplaced in that it could have been included in part 2 following postmodern family therapy. The focus on managed behavioral health care is a strength for understanding the practice settings in which each perspective may be applied. The final capstone chapter on trends in clinical social work practice is an excellent ending, and sums up what current trends mean to the profession from both a historical and a current day perspective.

Dorfman notes that this book was compiled during social work's 100th year anniversary. The book does a good job of providing an overview of where clinical social theory is after 100 years. This book is highly recommended for use in classes on clinical theory and practice methods.

Cynthia Franklin
University of Texas at Austin

Adoption has captured the interest of the American public as never before and the number of children being adopted each year is now at an all time high. About six in ten Americans reports having a personal experience with adoption. New federal initiatives have provided tax breaks for adoption (including costs for infant and international adoptions), smashed barriers to cross-racial adoptions, and provided incentives to states for increasing the adoptions of children from foster care. There is substantial evidence that these adoptions are likely to be successful but not uncomplicated. Post-adoption services to assist parents and children to understand, appreciate, and integrate the differences between adoption and other forms of family formation are being looked to as an important resource during this time of expanding involvement in adoption. Yet, little clinical information is available to guide the development of these services. Indeed, even conceptual guidance about the significance of similarities and differences between different types of adoptions is lacking.

Groza and Rosenthal have written a very useful volume nearly filled with well-grounded clinical wisdom and conceptualization (unfortunately, the part that is not filled by their work is not as strong, so I have chosen not to comment on all of these). In their opening chapter and later, the authors bring an empirical basis to evaluating the dominant dialectics in the field— a welcomed addition, since much of the adoption literature has strong ideological underpinnings. Their cautious embrace of the work done in attachment and adoption is particularly welcome— especially their point that attachment difficulties have multiple sources and that attachment-focused therapies are unproven.

The authors elected to include a chapter by Betty Jean Lifton that has a strikingly different tone than their own writing. This can be seen as an open-minded action that takes full advantage of the harmonic potentials of an edited collection. Or, this could be seen as a significant lapse in scientific judgement, because
the chapter is filled with references to discredited psychoanalytic theories, ghosts, mythic journeys, and the unborn soon-to-be adopted child's hidden relationship to the biological mother as the origin of the self. Reading this chapter left me with the experience of being in a time machine, as the average age of her published references is just over 21! I wish the authors had provided a bit of a commentary to explain the purposes of including this chapter.

Rita Laws wrote a fascinating chapter for this volume. It begins with one of the best histories of adoption in American that I have read—including many excellent references to adoption traditions among American Indians and in colonial America. The chapter proceeds on to become quite timely—including a very detailed section about netiquette in online adoption chat rooms—and eventually provides substantial guidance regarding receipt of ongoing financial and social support.

L. Anne Babb's chapter on ethics in adoption is the most thorough that I have seen and comes complete with a fascinating study of adoption organizations and their stances on a series of ethical dilemmas.

In the final chapter the authors, in concert with Joyce Maguire Pavio, discuss a variety of issues related to a family systems perspective on adoption within a developmental context. They propose a system family therapy model and point the readers to many other resources that can be used to help illuminate this model and its application to adoptive families—whenever and from wherever the adopted child and adopting family were joined.

All in all, there is much informative reading in this slim volume. The central premise of the volume is that clinical issues in adoption cut across infant, special needs, and international adoptions. The authors virtuously ensured that each of the contributors addresses this central premise. Adoption practitioners have few resources to choose from to assist them in the important work that they do. This book is certainly a good starting point.

Richard P. Barth
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

When close to 77.5% of the population lives in urban areas, the problems and needs of rural America almost may seem like an afterthought for many social workers. And that fleeting thought may conjure up a picture of a traditional family farm with neat barns and happy children trudging off to a nearby school. Yet, the nonmetropolitan population of 55 million people in the United States "is larger than the populations of all but a few of the world's nations and nearly equals the population of France or England" (p. 6), according to Leon Ginsberg, in his third edition of Social Work in Rural Communities. A quick perusal of chapter topics on homeless children, AIDS, substance abuse, race relations and fundamentalist religion may startle the reader into curiosity as to how these and other contemporary social problems have penetrated rural America. Revelations demolishing other, perhaps idyllic, images of non-urban life in America are found in the wide range of topics treated in the text. Several of the important demographic features of rural populations described include statistics such as the following: "... less than one quarter of all rural counties are agriculture dependent... At most, 10% of the nation's rural population lives on farms" (p. 117); around one-fourth of the nation's elderly live in rural areas (p. 214), but up to 50% of the elderly poor live in small towns and rural areas (p. 220). The faces of rural poverty (16.3% compared to metropolitan poverty rate of 12.7%) (p. 118) are remarkably similar to those at risk in urban areas (female-headed households, ethnic minorities, especially elderly women of color), but the rural poor face unique barriers to escape from poverty, in the form of social isolation, distance and lack of transportation, and social services.

Ginsberg's text has been a staple for this area of specialization since the first edition in 1976. Major texts addressing rural issues for social work can be counted on one hand; and there is only one major journal devoted to practice in rural settings. Thus, Ginsberg's updated version of this collection of readings and research studies remains an important resource for students and
practitioners. Most of the topics and contributing authors are new, making the text, essentially, a new and current resource.

The text is divided into four sections, totaling 21 chapters on a wide variety of topics: (1) Small community social work: concepts and definitions; (2) Social work practice in rural communities; (3) Rural people and special populations; and (4) Social programs and problems in rural communities. Some of the important chapter topics, in addition to those noted above, include sociological descriptions of rural communities and how their characteristics have changed in recent decades, poverty in rural areas, the important cultural aspects and practice implications of religion, the nature and extent of crime, delinquency, and substance abuse in rural areas, and the serious deficiencies in health care services in rural areas. While it is true that family farming comprises an ever smaller proportion of the rural economy, it was disappointing not to find even one chapter addressing the social, economic, and political implications of the near annihilation of a major traditional livelihood and lifestyle in America. The loss of family farms decreases cultural diversity in the United States. The increasing control of agriculture by agribusiness will have major effects on the cost and safety of food for urban and rural populations alike. These are important concerns for social work.

One of the strengths of the collection is that many of the chapters are well-founded in empirical research on rural conditions or based on practice research. Another strength is the inclusion of debate on the question of whether there remains a social work specialization known as rural practice. This text would be most suitable in a course on human behavior in the social environment or an elective seminar on social work in rural areas. While the chapters provide much valuable background knowledge and address important practice concepts and issues (such as crossing cultural boundaries, or utilizing existing rural networks), it is not a practice methods text. With this caveat in mind, I would endorse the text for instructors in both urban and non-urban social work programs to heighten understanding of the needs of 22.5% of the American population who live in non-metropolitan regions.

Marie D. Hoff
Boise State University

Working with children and families is complex because family life is complex. The child exists in the context of the family; the family exists in a larger societal context. Social workers who deal with children and families, consequently, are well advised to think of themselves as professional tri-athletes in cross-training: they must develop skills and knowledge in several interacting, overlapping, and probably conflicting systems. Schools, work, religious organizations, marriage, health delivery systems, extended families: these are only a start to the long list of systems that affect the child in the family. Not only do systems conflict, but values do, too. Societal values and standards about family integrity, children's needs, and societal obligations are muddled and often contradictory.

Given this complex and confusing state of affairs, it is a relief to see a book that tries to put a practical framework around work with children and families. Though Petr's style and content is appropriate for the more advanced student, it attempts to put conceptually intricate and detailed material into a context that can be applied to realistic case situations—and the book largely succeeds in this goal. It integrates practice and policy to help the student "cross train" in this demanding field. The book, because it weaves together so many threads of policy, practice, and attitude, is best suited to a student who has the conceptual skills and professional experience to grapple with integrated material. Given that caveat, it is a well-written, readable book.

The major framework of this book is built around eight pragmatic perspectives, which are the author's way of organizing concepts and goals that improve work with children and families. The first of these perspectives is one that is rarely highlighted in textbooks: it is Petr's admonition that workers must avoid adultcentrism, or the inclination of adults to view children's needs and problems from an adult viewpoint, rather than from the child's perspective. Seeing human development as a ladder of stages, leading to a specific pinnacle of adulthood, implies that children are both undeveloped and incompetent. Petr maintains
that the competencies of children are consistently underestimated by authorities, and he points to the growing body of literature on children’s resilience to buttress his argument. Adults, Petr further maintains, frequently label children with various mental health diagnoses for engaging in behavior, such as opposing adult control, that is only normal and appropriate for children. To overcome adultcentrism, the book encourages workers to develop skills in listening to and engaging the whole child, not simply the verbal child.

In addition to avoiding adultcentrism, Petr offers pragmatic perspectives encouraging the worker to 1) center on the family as the unit of attention, centering on family strengths; 2) discover and highlight family strengths; 3) honor diversity and difference; 4) wisely negotiate the legal mandate to provide the least restrictive alternative for children; 5) see children in their ecological framework and develop collaborative skills with professionals from other domains; 6) understand and improve the chaotic way in which children’s services are funded and organized; 7) measure and be accountable for the outcomes of their work with children. To illustrate these pragmatic perspectives, the author relates case vignettes and examples, and gives specific suggestions for how to translate these perspectives to case situations.

The author (who is associated with a school which focuses on the strengths perspective) does a particularly good job at explaining the idea of how to identify and build on clients’ strengths. This emphasis on strengths is built into much of the content of the book. Petr also weaves in material on very current developments and issues in services to children and families, such as the contention around the least restrictive alternative mandate, which is often a point of controversy between care providers, families, and policy-makers/ service funders; the mushrooming growth of managed care structures in children’s services and its implications for social workers; the infrequently discussed matter of gay and lesbian teens in an often hostile world; and the growing pressure for services providers to produce measurable (and hopefully positive) outcomes. The student who reads this book should, upon completing it, understand many of the current controversies and realities of working with children and families, and some of the
attitudinal barriers professionals may have in working effectively with children.

The student will not understand all of the services areas, however. Petr's book, like all books, is limited. He chooses to highlight two service areas, child welfare and mental health, and only briefly touches on education, health, recreational, or rehabilitation services. The book does not purport to cover the broad spectrum of children's services, and it does not. What it does accomplish, and in a creative way, is to craft a way of thinking, a mindset, a perspective for approaching children's services. The author weaves this mindset into the policy and practice issues he covers in the book, but when one closes the book, it is the altered way of thinking that one takes away. And learning new slants on thinking is the best cross-training any professional can do.

Dorinda N. Noble
Louisiana State University


The ideological struggle to shape America's social policies has been fought for more than a decade, and many would agree that it has been largely won by those on the political right. The enactment of the 1996 _Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act_ embodies ideas promoted by thinkers on the right, and was championed by conservative political leaders. The enactment of this legislation was touted as a major achievement of the _Republican Revolution_ of 1994, and is regarded by Republican leaders as a significant step towards the creation of a vibrant, enterprise society.

It may be surprising, therefore, that income support programs continues to come under attack from those on the political right. Despite the retrenchments and limitations imposed by the 1996 legislation, writers such as James Payne, a former fellow at the Heritage Foundation, continue to believe that attempts to reform welfare have failed in the past, and will fail in the future. This,
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The ideological struggle to shape America's social policies has been fought for more than a decade, and many would agree that it has been largely won by those on the political right. The enactment of the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act embodies ideas promoted by thinkers on the right, and was championed by conservative political leaders. The enactment of this legislation was touted as a major achievement of the Republican Revolution of 1994, and is regarded by Republican leaders as a significant step towards the creation of a vibrant, enterprise society.

It may be surprising, therefore, that income support programs continues to come under attack from those on the political right. Despite the retrenchments and limitations imposed by the 1996 legislation, writers such as James Payne, a former fellow at the Heritage Foundation, continue to believe that attempts to reform welfare have failed in the past, and will fail in the future. This,
he contends, is because of the entrenched interests of bureaucrats and social workers who continue to perpetuate an inappropriate ‘sympathetic giving’ approach to welfare. Sympathetic giving is fundamental to social work’s philosophy of helping but it has failed disastrously. Until it is replaced by a philosophy of ‘expectant giving’, welfare will continue to debilitate the poor and perpetuate the culture of dependency which has sapped the nation’s vitality.

Unlike other writers who have not paid much attention to the role of social work in welfare, Payne devotes a significant amount of space in his book to the profession. He believes that social workers have exerted a pernicious influence on the formulation and implementation of social welfare programs. Aided by the bureaucracy and the courts, they have ensured that the ‘sympathetic giving’ approach is perpetuated. There is not much chance, he believes, that social workers will change their approach. Citing widely from introductory social work textbooks, he claims that social workers are committed to unconditional giving rather than rehabilitation and self-sufficiency.

Payne clearly overestimates the influence that social workers have had in the political debates that have raged over welfare. Indeed, many lament the fact that they have so little influence in the world of public policy. Despite the best efforts of the National Association of Social Workers, the profession continues to play a limited role in policy formulation at the national level. By using selective citations from social work textbooks, Payne also distorts social work’s philosophy of helping. While many social workers are indeed motivated by compassion, they also believe in a strengths perspective that seeks to enhance the capacity of individuals to functioning independently and be self-reliant.

Although Payne’s book may be dismissed as an attempt to discredit the profession, it should be taken seriously. If social workers are to respond to the charges levied against them, they need to understand the arguments made against them. It is only by understanding these arguments that an effective response can be formulated. The fact that attacks of this kind are made on the profession is indicative of its lack of effective public relations
and ability to articulate its message in ways that capture public support. Hopefully, Payne's book will facilitate a more effective engagement in the public policy arena.

James Midgley
University of California at Berkeley
The Americans with Disabilities Act was a major legislative development in the history of social policy in the United States. Enacted in 1990, it gave expression to well established social policy ideas about social rights. It also demonstrated how governments can effectively use regulatory legislation to ensure that people with needs are protected against discrimination and offered opportunities to participate fully in the mainstream of society.

John Pardeck has written an excellent account of the legislation and the way it is being implemented. He describes the main features of the statute and provides interesting case studies to illustrate its main provisions. He focuses particularly on the implications of the legislation for social workers. Social workers have long served people with disabilities and obviously need to understand the legislation in depth if their practice is to be effectiveness. However, as Pardeck points out, social workers are themselves subject to the legislation. Social work agencies are required to make reasonable accommodations for their own employees who are challenged by disabilities and they must take steps to ensure that people with disabilities have full access to their services. As with any other employer and service provider, social work agencies are themselves subject to the provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

In addition to outlining the main provisions of the legislation, Pardeck also includes a useful account of the way social workers can collaborate with people with disabilities to advocate for recognition and services. In keeping with the spirit of the legislation, he places less emphasis on the delivery of services to clients with disabilities and instead stresses the positive, proactive role that social workers can play to change attitudes and bring about improvements in the lives of people with disabilities. The final chapter of the book dealing with the implementation of the
statute is particularly interesting and informative. This is a well
written and useful book that deserves to be widely read.

Steven Shardlow and Malcolm Payne (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues
in Social Work: Western Europe*. Ashgate Publishing Co., Brook-
field, VT: 1998. $63.95 hardcover.

Just a decade ago, few comparative studies of social work
had been published. Despite the fact that the journal *International
Social Work* had been in existence for many years, comparative
research in the field remained underdeveloped. Very few books
on the subject had been published and articles appearing in the
journals tended to focus on developments in particular countries.
Few attempts had been made to contrast social work education
and practice in different world regions.

Today, the situation is very different. Numerous books about
international social work have been published and increasingly,
these books seek to identify the key features of social work around
the world. Some of these books are concerned with particular
world regions while others are more general in scope, focusing
on international trends in general.

The publication of a book about social work in Western Europe
adds to the growing body of knowledge about social work in
different parts of the world. Although this is not the first book
about social work in Europe, it contains country case studies
which report comprehensively on social work in diverse Western
European nations. These nations include Denmark, Germany,
Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and Britain. The
book also contains a brief introduction and concluding section.

The book's various chapters are detailed and provide a wealth
of information about social work in Western Europe. However,
despite the editor's efforts to standardize the material, the in-
dividual chapters cover different topics which make it difficult
for readers to cross reference key points of information. Also,
the chapters are primarily descriptive and it is difficult to extract
the key similarities and differences between social work in these
nations. The concluding chapter would have been more helpful if
it had attempted a summary of this kind. Nevertheless, this is an
important reference work which provides valuable information
about recent developments in social work in Europe. It should be
statute is particularly interesting and informative. This is a well written and useful book that deserves to be widely read.
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a useful resource for anyone interested in the field of international social work.


Within universities, the study of social welfare is often viewed as a vocational preoccupation, committed to the training of social workers and social administrators rather than the scholarly investigation of a disciplinary subject matter. While faculty in schools of social work are regarded as kindly individuals whose commitment to improving social conditions is laudable, their work is not believed to be within the mainstream of serious academic scholarship. The study of social welfare is somehow regarded as of peripheral importance to the primary concerns of the academic community.

*Theorizing Welfare* should dispel the stereotypical image of social welfare inquiry a fundamentally non-academic. The authors have succeeded in writing an extremely sophisticated book which displays a impressive knowledge of current trends in social theory, and their implications for social welfare. Although billed on the cover as an ‘accessible introductory text’, it is not a work for the beginner but requires a sound familiarity with social theory, and a grasp of the way theorists approach the field. Of course, similar books have previously been published, particularly by British writers, but this is one of the first to focus on the most recent developments in social theory. Indeed, its niche is to focus primarily on those post-Enlightenment theories that have implications for current thinking in the field of social welfare. The chapters in the final section of the book which deal with a variety of post-modern currents in social thought are undoubtedly the most interesting. These chapters range over the work of theorists as disparate as Foucault, Jessop, Giddens and Offe and provide helpful summaries of their ideas.

The book’s wide sweep is commendable but it comes at some cost to an in depth analysis of the implications of current social theory for social welfare. Although each chapter discusses these implications, the discussion is brief, and tends to emphasize critical rather than policy aspects. Similarly, the organization of the
a useful resource for anyone interested in the field of international social work.
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The book's wide sweep is commendable but it comes at some cost to an in depth analysis of the implications of current social theory for social welfare. Although each chapter discusses these implications, the discussion is brief, and tends to emphasize critical rather than policy aspects. Similarly, the organization of the
material is questionable. Even though the authors make a case that subjectivism pervades Hayek and Friedman's work, it is hard to accept their assertion that these writers are post-Enlightenment thinkers. Nevertheless, this book is essential reading for those interested in recent trends in social thought and their implications for social welfare.


One of social work's great strengths is its diversity. It is not only that social workers are a very diverse group in terms of their personal characteristics but that they use a variety of practice techniques to meet the needs of their clients. They also discharge their professional obligations through a rich variety of practice settings. As many commentaries on the social work profession have shown, social workers have many different functions in society and make different contributions to the enhancement of human well-being.

While the role of social workers in conventional social service agencies is now well documented, little attention has been made to their activities in what the author of this interesting book calls 'non-traditional settings'. Focusing primarily on urban communities comprised of people of color, he examines the roles that social workers can and do play in utilizing local indigenous institutions to address pressing social needs. These local institutions include bath houses, beauty parlors and barber shops, botanical shops, food establishments, ethnic businesses, places of worship, laundromats, liquor stores, night clubs and single occupancy hotels. These institutions are focal points for community interaction and thus provide an opportunity for social workers to reach local people are help them deal with a variety of challenges. For example, bath houses can be useful in delivering a variety of educational and other services that respond to the HIV/AIDS threat. Similarly, he provides numerous examples of how places of worship are not only concerned with spiritual needs of their members but with their material and social needs. The expansion of economic and social services by these places of worship offers an exciting opportunity for social work involvement.
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While the role of social workers in conventional social service agencies is now well documented, little attention has been made to their activities in what the author of this interesting book calls ‘non-traditional settings’. Focusing primarily on urban communities comprised of people of color, he examines the roles that social workers can and do play in utilizing local indigenous institutions to address pressing social needs. These local institutions include bath houses, beauty parlors and barber shops, botanical shops, food establishments, ethnic businesses, places of worship, laundromats, liquor stores, night clubs and single occupancy hotels. These institutions are focal points for community interaction and thus provide an opportunity for social workers to reach local people and help them deal with a variety of challenges. For example, bath houses can be useful in delivering a variety of educational and other services that respond to the HIV/AIDS threat. Similarly, he provides numerous examples of how places of worship are not only concerned with spiritual needs of their members but with their material and social needs. The expansion of economic and social services by these places of worship offers an exciting opportunity for social work involvement.
The book is squarely based on a strengths perspective that emphasizes the capacities of low income urban communities to grow and develop and deal with adversity in positive ways. Delgado encourages social workers to recognize and utilize this capacity and to transcend their traditional focus on pathology and remediation. He also makes extensive use of network theory to show how social workers can integrate their services with local community responses. This is a challenging book which should be read not only by community practitioners but by all social workers who deal with clients from low income urban communities. Their practice will be greatly enriched by a greater involvement in these non-traditional settings. This involvement will also fulfill the profession's historic commitment to serving low income populations.
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