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Letters to the Editor

Dear Dr. Leighninger,

Thank you for kindly inviting me to comment on Dr. Betsy Clark’s letter which was published in the December issue of the Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. In her letter, Betsy explains her position on the affair of the guest editorial. I have told Betsy that I understand the challenges of her job and did not wish to put additional pressures on her. I also understand the wider political pressures facing NASW and do not deny that caution needs to be exercised when material containing politically risky content is reviewed for publication in NASW journals. However, we have an honest difference of opinion about the procedures that should be followed when deciding on the inclusion of politically risky content. I respectfully disagree with her position, and the existing policy, and have told her so.

I was not intending to respond to Betsy’s letter but it unfortunately contains factually incorrect statements which I cannot let pass. Betsy writes that, “After deliberation, we asked Dr. Midgley to make very slight modifications to his editorial, primarily removing the names of government officials.” She goes on to say, “Dr. Midgley strenuously objected to the request, and indicated that he would publish his editorial elsewhere if we required any changes.”

I am sorry that Betsy’s memory is clouded on this issue. The fact is that I was never asked to make any changes or given any opportunity to discuss the issue or to reach a compromise. The first communication I had from NASW about the problem came out of the blue in an e-mail from a NASW staffer, Ms. Schandale Kornegay on May 3rd, 2006, who informed me that the inclusion of the names of certain neoconservative
intellectuals and government officials in my guest editorial had been reviewed by the association’s leadership and that it had been decided that the editorial will run without the names and this is a final decision. It was clear that there was to be no discussion on the matter and that I would be afforded no opportunity to compromise. I had no choice except to withdraw permission for NASW to publish the editorial. However, I immediately wrote to Betsy and the NASW President, Elvira de Silva hoping more fully to debate the issue but neither responded. However, I did receive a letter of apology from Jorge Delva, the editor of Social Work who wrote to me after a meeting of the journal’s editorial board. In his letter he expressed regret that I was not consulted on the matter. After repeated efforts to communicate with Betsy, I also received a generous apology from her for the lack of consultation. Both letters confirm that I was not consulted or given an opportunity to discuss the NASW leadership’s concerns.

It is unfortunate that I am being characterized as a pig-headed author who refused to agree to a minor copy change. This is simply not correct! I should also point out that I never asked anyone to intercede on my behalf. Instead, I was and still am committed to advocating for an open debate on the issues arising from the disagreement over the guest editorial. As a loyal NASW member and recipient of several NASW awards (and I may add, co-editor of three books published by NASW Press), I believe the issue of how politically risky content in NASW publications should be adjudicated deserves wider discussion among NASW’s membership. In compliance with the Code of Ethics, I also believe we have a responsibility to engage in advocacy and accordingly, I approached colleagues in leadership positions in NASW in an attempt to have the issue debated by the Board. Although they were able to have the issue discussed, no decision was taken and, as I understand it, the procedures used to review material submitted for publication in NASW journals were not modified.

Although I gave up on the hope that the NASW leadership could be persuaded to change its decision on the guest editorial, I have not given up on my efforts to have an open debate on the policies and procedures currently used to review politically risky content. In view of the outcome of the 2006 Congressional
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It now seems somewhat strange that we should even be discussing the issue of censorship. Clearly, the climate of fear that the Bush administration created in earlier years has dissipated and I doubt whether my guest editorial would have been rejected had it been submitted later this year. However, this is not the real issue. The real issue is whether professional associations should censor politically risky material and, if so, how this should be done.

It is, in my view, unacceptable that material accepted for publication after due editorial and peer review should be subjected to administrative and legal review without any consultation with editors, editorial boards or authors. I believe that this issue should be widely discussed, particularly by members who write for NASW. If the issue is not resolved, there is a risk that they may in the future decline to submit material to NASW out of concern that their work may be subjected administrative and legal review without editorial or peer oversight and full consultation with authors. Even worse, there is a risk that future articles published in NASW journals may be viewed as having passed the scrutiny of NASW censors and that their content is politically safe and unthreatening to the interests of those who hold political power. It this happens, few critical social work scholars will want to have their work published in NASW journals.

If the issues arising out of NASW's decision to censor my innocuous guest editorial, and the association's existing review policy as outlined by Betsy Clark are scrutinized, debated and resolved in a satisfactory way, our disagreement will have been worth it.

James Midgley
School of Social Welfare
University of California, Berkeley
Dear Dr. Leighninger,

When I was asked to comment on the exchange between Jim Midgley and Betsy Clark the first thing I did was to look up the definition of politics and check the law. Among the many meanings of politics the most pertinent is that it is, "the art or science concerned with guiding or influencing governmental policy" (Merriam, 2006). In the relevant section in the Internal Revenue Code under 501 (c) it says, "... an IRC 501(c)(4), IRC 501(c)(5), or IRC 501(c)(6) organization may conduct political intervention activities and may establish and control a separate segregated fund to conduct exempt functions under IRC 527, so long as political intervention is not its primary activity" (IRC 501 (c), 2006). IRC 527 refers specifically to political organizations.

The dictionary definition contains two different implications about politics. One is active. In the practice of politics there is only art. The other is passive. The only science of politics is to study it. This leads to interpretations of the law which appear contradictory. Open Secrets organization says that 501 (c) (6) organizations "... are not supposed to engage in any political activities, though some voter registration activities are permitted" (Open, 2006). While the ban is proclaimed as total there is also a very active exception identified.

The point of all this parsing of politics and the law is to make clear that what the Code is talking about is active intervention in the political process. The Code allows some latitude but doesn’t indicate how much. Reading the editorial against this standard I did not find a hint of any political activity. The editorial is a rather abstract academic policy analysis. That is, it is passive science with no indication that Midgley is urging anyone to do anything related to engaging in a political process. There is a global warning that social workers should guard against the dangers of unipolarism but this, too, is not attached to any behavior recommendations. Policy analysis is not political activity under the law.

I wondered how consistent NASW was in forbidding even a hint of political activity in Social Work. It did not take long to find an exception. Steen (2006), in an April 2006 editorial whose title has the phrase "a call to action" says, "The Bush
Administration has sought to weaken the definition of torture and limit the application of torture prohibitions to narrow circumstances" (2006, p. 102). This is political analysis at a level which is objected to in Midgley's editorial. The editorial goes further and urges social workers to join Amnesty International and the American Civil Liberties Union. NASW professes a desire to get along better with Republicans. To sanction an editorial which attacks the president and urges members to join groups that the administration generally disagrees with is, on its face, political action. Just examine the PACE endorsements in the last election to put to rest the idea that NASW has any intention of forming alliances with Republicans.

In this dispute, the who said what's and when's are irrelevant. There is a larger issue. This is an example of a problem that has become endemic in our society—the lack of trust. That such a loyal member of the politically correct establishment as Jim Midgley became a victim may surprise him and others, but not me. His sin was to write a direct and straightforward analysis of how he viewed our present situation. He did not use the language of politics. Orwell defined it thusly, "Political language—and with variations this is true of all political parties...— is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind" (1961, p. 367). Perhaps if he had used more "political" language he would have fared better.

The lack of trust permeates all levels in our society. This starts at the top. People have little confidence in the presidency or congress. Politics has come to revolve more around personality than issues. Meacham (2006), in a review of James McGregor Burns book on presidential politics, says that one of his central arguments is that, "...the proliferation of presidential campaigns centered on the candidate, not on a larger party has turned politicians into free agents more interested in their own survival on election day than they are in governing once they are in office" (2006, p. 3).

NASW reflects a special case of this emphasis on personality. The organization is not run by people embedded in their craft. It is substantially manned by technical specialists interested mainly in organizational maintenance. Strangely, the leadership is political to the core. During the 1930s in the
midst of a depression and with labor union strength at a low ebb, John L. Lewis, a Republican, helped create a Congress of Industrial Organizations that won strikes and forged strong unions. One of the rules of the CIO was that no one could take on a leadership role if they did not start out as a worker. As time went on, unions changed these rules and hired specialists without factory work experience. They also became more political. I wonder if their current weakness comes from abandoning first principles.

The people who run NASW cannot distinguish between political analysis, a legitimate function, and political activity, a forbidden function. Mechanic (2006) has noted that when legislators pass laws to solve problems and bureaucrats write regulations to interpret them, there is a high likelihood of unintended consequences. He says that new malpractice regulations have forced doctors into expensive defensive medicine, mental health laws make mental institutions release patients inappropriately, and protection of human subjects laws have made it difficult for people to participate in research. Editorial interference can be added to this list. In the recent past, the editors of such distinguished journals as The Journal of the American Medical Association and The New England Journal of Medicine have resigned over conflicts dealing with their editorial independence. Midgley’s experience is not unique. Even though this conflict arose without the editor’s knowledge, there is no evidence concerning what he intends to do.

Midgley’s answer to all of this is to say that NASW is insular. He proposes to open things up for debate. This is a gentlemanly and academic response. It will take more than discussion to correct this problem. Once battle lines are drawn around issues such as this one, it is seldom that one side or the other changes in the short run. NASW is, alas, not insular but very much a part of the institutions that have brought this society to lose faith in public and private institutions. To change this something more is needed—a new politics.

Midgley was judged by people who have little idea of how policy analysts think and write. They have a lawyer’s mentality that avoids even possible exceptions. In this instance, they saw something that wasn’t there. There is a dearth of NASW leadership that knows how to inspire people and bring about
change. We face devastating problems in our areas of professional expertise. For example, extensive damage has been done to children and their families because of major depersonalization and withdrawal of resources for child welfare. Little effective action is visible on these fronts. Anyone who ever heard it will not forget John L. Lewis, during one of his monumental battles with management and the government, summoning up Shakespeare and saying, "A plague on both your houses."

Sincerely,
Harris Chaiklin, Ph.D.
Professor, emeritus
University of Maryland
School of Social Work
Baltimore, Maryland
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Dear Dr. Leighninger,

Given the political agenda and lobbying program of NASW, I certainly respect NASW's need to protect organizational interests. However, censorship seems to go against the grain of journalism. It may well be that NASW needs to consider an organizational disclaimer for publications which do not represent the views of NASW and are the sole views of the authors who are entitled to express opposing views.

Sincerely,
Wilma Peebles-Wilkins
Dean Emerita, Boston University
Former Editor, NASW Children and Schools

Dear Dr. Leighninger,

The censoring that went on in the case of Jim Midgley is very consistent with the interference I received from the Publisher when I was Editor of Social Work. In response, I encouraged the Executive Director to (1) hire professionals to run the Press, (2) have consultants come in to advise re: direction, or (3) outsource the Press altogether. I continue to think this would be a good idea.

Sincerely,
Jeanne Marsh
Former Editor
Social Work
Dear Dr. Leighninger,

At the moment I happen to be in China, where scholars do not always report data or say what they think about particular policies, key people, or statements by the government. Chinese scholars adapt to these unfreedoms; they self-censor and do as well as they can. But no scholar thinks this is ideal. I do not point this out to criticize China, which has a very different history from America and is gradually opening up. The question I have for the editors of Social Work is whether this kind of restricted discourse is something they are aspiring to? The editorial by Jim Midgley is naming actual publications, ideas, initiatives, public intellectuals, and major policy makers. What is the problem here? If we cannot talk openly about public matters, publications, and key people, it will be more difficult to come to clear understandings, build knowledge, and make good decisions as a nation. Democracy depends on transparency and open discourse for its very survival.

I cannot help but recall earlier periods in the United States when social reformers like Ida B. Wells and Jane Addams took on major corporate and political interests in promoting rights, community development, peace, and internationalism. No weak-kneed self-censorship from these ladies. Is it time for NASW to take stock of its foundations and reset its bearing?

Sincerely,
Michael Sherraden
Editor
Social Development Issues
Dear Dr. Leighninger,

From 1937 to 1942, a long-forgotten magazine called *Social Work Today* (no relation to the current *Social Work Today*) was publishing articles on unionization, foreign policy, race and class. At its height it had about 6,000 subscribers and was well-respected by social work notables such as Bertha Reynolds, Mary van Kleeck, Grace Marcus, Grace Coyle, Mary Simkhovitch and others. Contributors to the magazine included luminaries like Frances Perkins, Roger Baldwin, John L. Lewis and A. Philip Randolph. A left-wing magazine, *Social Work Today* was closely allied with the nascent social work union movement of the 1930s. When the magazine ceased publication in 1942, Bertha Reynolds noted that "with the death of *Social Work Today* a light has gone out of social work."

Two principals in *Social Work Today* were Jacob Fisher and George Wolfe, who ended up being harassed and blacklisted by the McCarthyites in the early 1950s. At the time, NASW (established in 1955) and its predecessor the American Association of Social Workers said and did nothing. Social work professional organizations were conspicuous by their silence. Presumably, Fisher and Wolfe were not the only social workers who were victims of the McCarthy era. In the face of repression, these professional organizations retreated into arcane discussions about casework and group work, and preoccupied themselves with esoteric but heated debates around the functional versus the diagnostic schools of therapy. In fact, social work organizations did not raise their heads until the relative safety of the 1960s. When safe, they became vociferous advocates for the poor, the downtrodden, and the disenfranchised. In short, being fearful of including the names of government officials in Midgley's editorial is hardly an historical precedent; it reflects a long-standing commitment to sitting out the heat.

If dissidents were rounded up in concentration camps, social work organizations would lobby to make sure they had enough blankets. Perhaps this is behind Elizabeth Clark's statement that "The notion that NASW is reluctant 'to take on the administration' or 'to stand up to the right' is simply uninformed. We do it every day through our advocacy, through our lobbying, and through our PAC work and grassroots
organizing—but we do it in appropriate ways and within legal and regulatory requirements.” I suppose NASW would also lobby for blankets in “appropriate ways and within legal requirements.”

Character—or the lack thereof—shines through in adversity. It’s easy to be tough in a liberal democratic milieu that respects civil liberties; it takes much more courage to stand up to a paranoid right-wing administration composed of zealots like G. W. Bush, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney, Karl Rove and John Bolton, who get nourishment from ideologues like William Kristol and Gary Schmitt.

Maybe now that the Democrats control both Houses, NASW will feel safe and come out from under their blankets to give a little squeal. If a Democratic president is elected in 2008 they might even muster up the courage to roar, at least until the next hostile administration takes power. In the end, one can only hope that NASW finds the gumption to forego the censor’s ink. Long live courage!

Sincerely,
Howard Karger
Professor
Graduate College of Social Work
University of Houston

Dear Dr. Leighninger,

In Lewis Carroll’s classic—Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland, our heroine begins her journey by falling down a rabbit hole. Upon landing, Alice explores a most peculiar world where up is down, large is small, crazy tea parties are arranged, a smiling cat fades away, and a Queen commands “Off with her head!” There have been many interpretations of Lewis Carroll’s work, and one that I have come to appreciate is that this is really a cautionary tale about the importance of ideas (even nonsensical ones), the need to recognize differing views, and the
necessity of debate and discourse. Attempts to squelch any of the processes, as the Queen tries to do to Alice, is antithetical to human growth and understanding. We are enriched by the lively exchange of perspectives, thoughts and opinions.

So I was saddened, and exasperated, to hear of what had transpired between Jim Midgely and the staff at NASW Press. As I understand the situation, Jim submitted an Editorial—which is, by definition, an opinion piece. Personally, I thought the editorial was, given the topic, quite measured and balanced (indeed, if I had any criticism, I thought Jim was too fair—but that’s for another letter). Yet Jim apparently made the “mistake” of naming some policy makers; all well-known for their design and endorsement of particular stances. They are public figures and if one follows their positions, it is quite apparent that they are proud of their work. Jim wasn’t stating anything new; he wasn’t “outing” some closet intellectuals. Rather, he was doing what any responsible educator ought to do—he was making a connection between the responsibilities that social workers have, given our endorsement of social justice, and some well-known foreign policy positions. In turn, readers are free to disagree with Jim. And I believe that Jim would welcome such a debate, knowing that he and anyone else who participated with an open mind would probably learn something new and benefit from the exchange.

Censorship is the publishing industry’s version of “off with her head.” And with logic reminiscent of the conversation found at the Mad Hatter’s Tea Party, Betsy Clark has attempted to explain it away by suggesting that Jim (and others) don’t really comprehend all the complexities of the situation, and besides, it wasn’t THAT bad because it was just some minor changes and by the way, NASW already does some advocacy. Well, here’s what I do understand: what NASW Press staff did was wrong. Jim’s Editorial should not have been altered. “Minor” changes do matter, if for no other reason than it makes it easier to trim away greater pieces of information in the future. Lobbying for issues doesn’t provide you with the capital to then engage in censorship.

Some may be saying that I, and others, are making a big deal out of nothing. To them, I would say that integrity is eroded through seemingly small incidents such as this, until
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eventually no one is allowed to express an opinion. If, as social
workers, we truly embrace justice and dignity, then we also
need to preserve forums in which varying views can be pre-
sented. That's all Jim was doing. He was trying to get us to
think.

Sincerely,
Cheryl A. Hyde
Temple University
Past Editor, Journal of Progressive Human Services
Editorial board member of 5 social work and
social science journals

Dear Dr. Leighninger:

Absurd as NASW's abstemiousness with respect to Jim
Midgley's critique of neoconservatism in international devel-
opment, the incident represents little more than a hypocritical
hiccup compared to the corruption, ineptitude, and mediocrity
that suffuses Social Work's editorial practices. These are serious
accusations, to be sure; but, the Midgley incident reveals mis-
chief of a decidedly more malignant nature: chronic editorial
failure.

Corruption: Half of the October 2000 issue of Social Work
featured articles that were solicited by the then-Editor-in-Chief
and could not have been vetted according to professional edito-
rial standards. Of the four invited articles, each of which rhap-
sodized about postmodernism, three were received on May 4,
2000 and accepted on May 9, 2000; the fourth was received May
8, 2000 and accepted May 9, 2000. The remaining articles in the
issue were peer-reviewed, typically received sometime in 1998
and accepted for publication in 1999. The Editor-in-Chief, in
other words, used Social Work as his own ideological billboard,
rushing essays he favored into print while bumping other
articles in line for publication, manuscripts which had been
vetted through the normal peer-review process. This misuse of
editorial policy exacerbated *Social Work's* backlog which pro-
voked the ire of one reader who complained that the eleven articles in a subsequent issue of the journal averaged 35.3 months in gestation, "virtually three years!" In response, the new Editor-in-Chief, promised "expanded issues" to reduce the backlog.¹

Ineptitude: And what has been *Social Work's* promise to improve its efficiency in distributing articles to the professional community? In 1986 I conducted a survey of ten professional journals to determine the time from submission to acceptance/rejection as well as the period from acceptance to publication. On both factors, *Social Work* ranked last, requiring 24 months, averaging twice as long as other journals, to process manuscripts. The most timely journal was the *American Bar Association Journal* which conducted the entire process in 4.5 months; closer to health and human services, the *American Journal of Nursing* required 15 months, while the *American Journal of Public Health* only 8 months.² By contrast, the April 2004 issue of *Social Work* required 40.8 months, or 3.4 years, to move an article from submission to publication. Even if the article had been accepted, the April 2004 issue of *Social Work* exceeded the previous 24 month period for publication: the lapse between acceptance and publication was 27.7 months, or 2.3 years. For the July 2006 issue, the period from submission to publication was reduced to 37 months, still longer than that of two decades earlier. During this time frame the advent of electronic technology would be expected to abbreviate, not in-
crease, the period from submission to publication. Compared to other professions which have accelerated the distribution of information to their professional communities through elec-
tronic publishing, *Social Work* continues to resemble a time capsule.

Mediocrity: John Pardeck and Roland Meinert's analysis of *Social Work's* editorial board and consulting editors raised warning flags about the scholarship of the journal's editors. Between 1990 and 1995, half of the editorial board and 19.1 percent of the consulting editors had not published a single article recorded in the Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI).³ A recent analysis reveals a similar pattern. Over the entire span of their careers, half of the members of the editorial committee
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of Social Work have published four or fewer articles, as had one-third of the journal's consulting editors. The weak scholarship of so many of the editors of the profession's flagship journal contradicts Social Work's commitment to building an optimal knowledge base for the profession. If scholarly achievement is not the basis for editorial appointment, then what is? "It is reasonable to assume that an old boy and old girl professional acquaintance influence might be involved in the selection process," suspected Pardeck and Meinert.

Thus, it is not so surprising that Jim Midgley, a scholar of international repute, would have an invited article subject to the vagaries of what passes as editorial practice at Social Work. Years ago I decided to boycott Social Work because of experiences with such editorial mismanagement; Midgley's shabby treatment indicates that little has changed. Instead of ingratiating the Right, would that NASW's editors and board elected to clean-house and upgrade Social Work so that it actually delivers to social workers what they deserve: the best knowledge, evaluated by the best scholars, in the most expedient manner possible.

Sincerely,

David Stoesz, Ph.D.
Professor, Virginia Commonwealth University
Executive Director, policyAmerica

(Endnotes)
5 Pardeck and Meinert, p. 90.
Outsiders-Within: Critical Race Theory, Graduate Education and Barriers to Professionalization

CAROLANN DANIEL
Adelphi University
School of Social Work

This article uses the lens of critical race theory to examine the experiences of minority students in and outside of the social work education classroom. Research has not critically analyzed the structures, policies and practices of graduate education programs and how they influence the socialization experiences of students. Qualitative interviews with 15 African American and Latino students reveal that their experiences are often characterized by marginalization and conflict. They suggest that certain aspects of the professionalization process create and support forces that reproduce stratified social relations. These problematic relations have a negative impact on minority students threatening their persistence and professional development. The perspectives of minority students in their own voices provide critical insights into actions graduate programs can take to change the quality of student life in predominantly White institutions.

Keywords: graduate education; critical race theory; minority students; professional socialization; marginalization

Introduction

Since the early 1970's when the Council on Social Work
Education (CSWE) acknowledged the importance of cultural diversity for social work education and practice, schools of social work have been mandated to increase diversity in the curriculum, faculty and student body. But that alone is not sufficient for a profession that seeks to promote social justice and social change. Schools must also confront the inequalities that continue to undermine the professional development of minority students. Because social work education takes responsibility for training future social workers, educators must critically assess the social and academic experiences of students. Only then can we uncover elements of the professionalization processes that have remained hidden. This requires ongoing evaluation of the range of course offerings and content, reading lists, paradigms and theoretical perspectives, student mentoring practices, and evaluation strategies. It is these aspects of graduate education that socializes students toward identifying with and committing themselves to professional careers as social workers.

A number of scholars have suggested that the socialization process presents barriers for minority students that may in part account for their under-representation in graduate education programs. Minority students often come to institutions of higher education with attitudes and behavior patterns that are different from the culture of graduate schools making their path through school more problematic than it might be for a student with the dominant forms of cultural capital. (Bowie and Hancock, 2000, Patterson-Stewart et al. 1997; Romero and Margolis, 1999, Turner and Thompson, 1993, Weaver, 2000). How minority students experience the professionalization process should be of interest to social work educators because it is central to the theoretical, methodological and concrete work of the profession.

Theoretical Assumptions

While alienation and marginalization have been identified among minority students in graduate programs, much of this work is based on survey data. Most do not include students' daily experiences and interactions with others in the institution and there is little discussion of the links between what
takes place in colleges and universities and the larger societal context.

The philosophical approach of critical race theory (CTR) offers a strong conceptual framework upon which to assign meaning and practical application of the research findings regarding minority students. Key components of CRT that are relevant to this study include the use of narratives to understand people’s experiences; exploration of the ways in which institutional structures, practices and policies perpetuates racial/ethnic educational inequalities; emphasis on the importance of viewing policies within a historical and cultural context and a focus on how race and racism are interwoven into the structures practices and policies of colleges and universities (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Ladison-Billings, 2000; Solorzano and Villalpando, 1998). While people of color can experience race, gender and class oppression simultaneously, this paper will focus primarily on race marginality as it relates to the process of professional socialization in social work education.

Socialization of Minority Students in Graduate Social Work Programs

Although the process of professional socialization has been of interest to researchers in many disciplines since the 1950s, there are very few conceptual discussions or empirical studies on the process of professional socialization in social work education (Barretti, 2003). Moreover, the socialization literature within social work is largely concerned with students’ socialization to professional values rather than the process by which a student becomes a professional (Feldman, 1971; Judah, 1979; Landau, 1999; Lusk & Miller, 1985; McLeod & Meyer, 1967; Merdinger, 1982, Sharwell, 1974; Varley, 1963; Yamatani et al., 1986). Critically, none of these studies consider the impact of race and/or ethnicity.

One exception is Barretti's (2003) study of the socialization of BSW students in social work education. Consistent with more general studies (Beck et al., 1961; Judah, 1979) of professional socialization, this work suggests that students actively construct their professional socialization. She notes that students entered social work school with well-defined expectations of their role models that correspond to their vision of
ideal social workers. The study also finds that professional socialization is not uniform or consistent and does not produce a homogeneous class of practitioners who subscribe to the same values. The study finds that minority students had different and sometimes marginal socialization experiences.

Weidman et al. (2001) suggest that because socialization and training norms revolve around a White male standard, minorities may regard their instruction and expectations as unrealistic. Their values may also conflict with those of the White male academic culture. As a result, socialization has been most successful for those who could fit the status quo (Turner & Thompson, 1993).

Institutional Factors and the Experiences of Minority Students in Social Work Education

The institutional context in which students are educated can also affect their social and academic experiences. Solorzano, Ceja and Yasso (2000) suggest that a positive institutional climate includes the following: a significant numbers of students, faculty, and administrators of color; a curriculum that reflects the historical and contemporary experiences of people of color; programs to support the recruitment, retention, and graduation of students of color; and a college mission that reinforces the institution’s commitment to pluralism.

The literature suggests that the institutional environment in social work programs is not pluralistic but is one of marginalization, discrimination, negative labeling, low expectations, and attitudes described as symbolic racism (Bahram et al., 1997; Bowie & Hancock, 2000; Longres & Seltzer, 1994; Swank et al., 2001; Weaver, 2000). Longres and Seltzer (1994) maintain for example, that because of the small number of minority faculty and peers in most graduate social work programs, minority students often find themselves isolated without appropriate role models and mentoring relationships. Others (Weaver, 2000; Basham et al., 1997; Bowie & Hancock, 2000) found that sensitivity to minority students among faculty and administration is often minimal or nonexistent and minority students are often frustrated by the absence of a culturally relevant curriculum in their graduate program. The lack of diversity in the student population, faculty, staff, and
curriculum also restrict the nature and quality of minority students' interactions inside and outside the classroom, threatening both their academic performance and social experiences (Swail et al., 2003).

Method

The study was designed to examine the experiences and narratives of minority students in order to identify factors that influence and contribute to their professional development. A homogenous sampling strategy (Patton, 1990) was used to focus the study. Recruitment was conducted through three minority student clubs because they provided a forum to meet a large number of minority students. Students who agreed to be interviewed comprised the sample. The sample included 15 graduate students enrolled in an MSW program in a predominantly White public institution. They ranged in age from 22 to 40 years of age.

All interviews were initiated via telephone by the researcher. Participants were provided with a brief description of the nature of the study and the expected length of each interview. A convenient time and place for the interview were also discussed. The semi-structured, in-depth interview was used as the method of data collection because it is sharply focused, highly intensive and productive (McCracken, 1988). Each interview lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. Interviews touched on a wide range of issues related to the graduate experience: the original decision to pursue graduate education, the application process, experience in the classroom and in their program, and financial and mentoring support. They were asked to describe events that stuck in their minds or other experiences that influenced decisions, choices and career plans. A final question asked respondents to recommend strategies to facilitate the success of minority students currently enrolled in their program.

The interviews were transcribed and each interview was read several times in search of patterns, causal flows and propositions (Miles and Huberman, 1994). In coding the data, core themes were identified, initially through descriptive coding and then through more in-depth categorical and theoretical
Analysis of the data revealed eight core themes: cultural and racial isolation, lack of relevance of the curriculum to minority issues, invisibility and distance from program staff, interaction with faculty, interaction with peers, mentoring and support, race and supervision, and curricula and university-wide changes.

Cultural and Racial Isolation

Minority students reported that one of the most difficult aspects of the graduate education process is the cultural and racial isolation they experience. Participants were primarily attracted to their school because of its perceived racial/ethnic diversity. Not surprisingly, they were shocked and disappointed when they realized that the program was not as diverse as they expected. These students described their experience with this:

First day of class I kept looking out for the African American and Latino professors. You can't imagine how I felt when I didn't see any. It's this feeling you get of wanting to feel safe and like you belong. When you don't feel that, it's just not the same. You just don't build the same connections. ML

I felt very isolated when I came here. I expected a lot more people of color. I walked into the classroom and I thought, did I miss something? I didn't expect that the program was going to be a majority people of color, but I expected a lot more. That upset me. What else upset me is the lack of staff of color... DS

Others noted that the lack of minority presence in the program was not only shocking, but it also complicated their adjustment to the program.

I really wasn't quite sure what to expect when I came here, but the expectations I did have are different from the actual experience... I expected a more diverse faculty. I was shocked at the faculty breakdown when I came here. I saw very few people of color. I had
come to expect, based on the reputation of the school, that there would be more diversity among the staff . . . Quite frankly, all of this has made the adjustment for me very difficult. KS

I was really taken aback at the number of White students and faculty in the school. I thought it would be more diverse. I thought there would be more minorities because the school is in an urban area. It took me a while to adjust to this fact. SG

Lack of Relevance of the Curriculum to Minority Issues

The isolation that minority students experience in graduate programs is further reinforced by the absence of minority perspective or experience in the curriculum. Participants overwhelmingly stated that the curriculum had little relevance to their lives or the people with whom they work. The following quotes are characteristic of responses in this regard:

A lot of us got into this because we wanted to help our communities. We came here to learn about how we can do that effectively, so I think the program needs to offer more courses that are particular to other communities. It needs to be more multicultural in its approach. KS

Most of the classes were structured in such a way that there wasn't room for discussion, even if you felt like you wanted to say something. After class we would meet and discuss what went on in class and how we felt about it. It was our way of expressing those things we wanted to but couldn't express in class. We found other avenues to channel the anger that gets pent up in class. This was always very helpful to me. GP

If the curriculum had more literature about people of color by people of color, it might feel less like someone telling you about your experiences. I got really tired of learning about what my experience was through the eyes of people whom I felt didn't have a clue based on how it was presented. I got tired of hearing about the
Black experience from White writers. There was this sense of hopelessness about that experience from these perspectives. ML

**Invisibility and Distance from Program Staff**

In their narratives about their graduate experiences participants provided in-depth descriptions of events, situations, and interactions with others that they perceived to have affected their adjustment and professional development. One thread running through the interviews is the feeling of being "invisible" and the chronic inability of White faculty, students, and administrators to see minority students as individuals. As an African American student explained:

Part of the problem, I believe, is that they are not really seeing Kurtis. They are seeing a Black person and Black people don’t belong in grad school. It would be great if people just had an idea of me even if they dislike me for being Kurtis and not for being a Black man. KS

This point of view is also supported by a Latino student who said:

The first thing they see is a woman of color, and yes you should see that because its part of who I am. But that’s not the only thing about me. I also want them to see me and understand me not necessarily as a woman of color but as an individual. KG

The subtle forms of stereotyping that students experience makes race the determining factor in social interaction that often lead minority students to feel stigmatized and alienated.

One student discussed how his experience with program administration has undermined his earlier passion for his chosen profession, suggesting that noncognitive personal variables such as feelings, attitudes, and perceptions of program staff erode the motivation needed for successful completion of the program. The student also notes that his is not an isolated experience but rather generalizable to many of his classmates.
I think they get this message in the first year and by the second year they are burnt out. I still care very much about social work but that message has really brought my passions down. It really had a negative effect on me. SG

Critically, minority students perceive program administration/staff as unable to appreciate the sacrifices they make to be part of the graduate program. The essence of these sentiments is captured in the following quote:

For some of us, we are also adjusting to no income, or having to continue to produce an income at the same time that you are struggling to do this. There are a lot of emotional consequences that tie into all that and I don’t think they really look at this at all. KS

When viewed through a critical lens the conflicting views of support between administration and minority students become evident. The university appears to see monetary contribution to students as adequate support while students are looking for additional support in the form of caring and concern.

Interactions with Faculty

Several threads emerged from informant responses about their relationship to program faculty. The themes that surfaced include difficulty forming relationships with White faculty, low expectation and difficulty receiving feedback.

Two-thirds of respondents interviewed for this study reported difficulty relating to White faculty. Moreover, White faculty are often viewed with suspicion and mistrust. Many of the participants expressed reservations about admitting difficulties to White faculty because they feared it would be regarded as further evidence of their inadequate preparation for college and of not belonging. As one student explained:

You just have to be better and you have to show it. Going to faculty when you are having problems is like admitting that you really can’t cut it. It’s a lot easier
to talk to your peers when you are having trouble or feeling confused or unsure of yourself. GP

Others feared that asking for help might negatively affect their course grades. One student noted that she is unable to open up to White faculty because when she has tried to have conversations in the past, she did not feel welcomed.

For me I have only been able to [talk openly] with minority professors... It's hard for me to go to White professors and say I am having a hard time. Maybe because I have tried before and I haven't felt welcomed. I felt like I was being put down or like I wasn't smart enough. SS

One of the most significant features of Black relational responses to racial stratification is the degree of distrust of White Americans (Ogbu, 1994). Years of negative contact with educational institutions may have also left minority students with the fear that they will suffer negative consequences if they expose ignorance or inadequate preparation when they meet with professors.

Lower expectations of performance and assumptions about the student's lack of ability also surfaced as factors that tended to block communication with White faculty. Study participants felt that White faculty do not believe that they can handle difficult coursework and other requirements the way White students can.

A lot of times professors would praise my work really enthusiastically and I could see that a lot of it was a surprise. They have this assumption that you can’t do the work. DS

Both White faculty and students of color enter college with assumptions and stereotypes formed through earlier experiences both in and outside of the educational system. While these students do not necessarily accept these assumptions and stereotypes they are not entirely free from their influence. Participants admitted having feelings of incompetence prior to their graduate experience. However, they also believed these
feelings were exacerbated by further subtle messages of incompetence from White faculty and staff.

Several students reported that stereotypical assumptions about their ability to perform in graduate school also made it difficult to get useful feedback from faculty. They indicated that faculty comments were either overly positive or overly critical. A Latina student described her responses to a feedback session with her adviser.

Last year my supervisor, who was a person of color, told me that she thought my ability to look at situations analytically in terms of the power structure, race, class, and gender was one of my strengths. This year I have another supervisor who is White, and she described the same characteristics as a weakness. When I spoke with her about it, she said that in this one particular log entry I focused more on race issues than the positive outcome of the situation. So my weakness was having a social justice lens. I shared this with my faculty adviser, who is also a White woman, because I wanted her to know how I felt about it. She really didn't get it. She thought that I was being defensive. MP

Most people have difficulty assessing feedback about their performance. However, as Feagan, Hernan and Imani (1996) point out, minority students are particularly sensitive to the character and quality of the feedback they receive given the possibility of bias in mostly White college settings. The above-quoted student noted how her ability to analyze her work through a social justice lens was seen as positive by a supervisor of color but as a deficit by a White supervisor. While both supervisors might be correct in their assessment, in dynamic relationship to both prior experience and present setting, only one of the sources of feedback can be processed. Given the level of racial tension in some graduate programs White faculty may also fear giving students of color critical feedback on their work because they do not want to appear insensitive or racist. The result is an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust that is felt by everyone (Romero and Margolis, 1999).
Mentoring and Support

Having minority professors was seen by all as critical. In particular, respondents overwhelmingly expressed a need for mentoring relationships with minority faculty. They elucidated the meaning of having a minority faculty member as their adviser, describing minority faculty as supportive, genuine and understanding. Participants also stated that they found it easier to share their vulnerabilities with minority faculty because of their shared experiences with marginality. These comments are typical:

I was always able to build good relationships with minority professors. They make me feel good about pursuing this [graduate school]. Even when I am having problems, they make me feel I can do it. I was never able to connect to White professors in the same way. MP

I think it's hard for White faculty to understand what it's like to be a student of color. It doesn't mean that they can't be helpful, but it's just not the same. AS

Given the problems of marginality and alienation experienced by minority students in social work education, the need for mentorship is crucial. As Collins (1994) reported mentorship often led to greater success among protégés, and those who had a mentor were more satisfied with their careers than those who did not. However, the absence of faculty of color in graduate programs coupled with the difficulty that minority students have in forming relationships with White faculty further exacerbates this problem.

Interaction with Peers

Because most graduate programs have low minority enrollment and few minority faculty members, students of color often find themselves lacking both informal and formal supports. The participants identified the importance of having minority peers available in their respective programs. These respondents described how they depended on their peers for
support and validation.

I remember the first day of class. I was so scared. . . . I thought that I was the only one that felt that way... When we got together, I realize there were other students who felt that way... And that made me stronger. RST

We would get together and talk about what happened in class. I personally found some of the remarks very offensive, but nobody felt that they could say anything. After a while you start to think that it's just you, so it's good to hear other students say that they also found it offensive. AO

Difficulty forming relationships with White peers further intensified these students' need to create a supportive family that was considered essential to their survival. Interpersonal conflict with White peers was identified as a factor that negatively affected their graduate experience. Minority students felt that their peers did not understand them and were often racist in their characterization of minority individuals. They noted also that minority students often had to initiate interaction with White students or risk being ignored.

Race and Supervision

Apart from the cross-cultural conflicts that exist in the classroom and in relationships with faculty and peers, students overwhelmingly stated that cross-cultural differences also interfered with the field instruction relationship. They indicated that field instructors are generally reluctant to raise cross-cultural issues in practice. Students also felt that cross-cultural differences and perceived supervisory responses have influenced their willingness to raise concerns about their learning needs in the supervisory relationship.

There are a lot of issues in the field placement around race. There is a lot of tension. It really makes it hard to express yourself... I feared them thinking I was lazy or I am just another minority person trying to get over.
Just fearing that race thing again. You don’t want them to think that you can’t do the job. ML

Others described having to distance themselves from issues around race for fear of creating discomfort or appearing oversensitive to the issue.

In the field of community organizing, most of the organizers that I have worked with have been White, and sometimes as a Latina I see things like racial tension with a client or with the community and I would bring that up with my supervisors and they don’t see it. It’s hard to explain to a White supervisor that these things are happening without making things uncomfortable. So after a while you also pretend that you don’t see it. AO

The lack of attention to race and diversity in the supervisory relationship complicates the professionalization process for minority students in a number of ways. First, it encourages students of color to stop identifying with their community concerns and to shift loyalties to faculty and peers in their profession. Second, it encourages them to become blind to personal experience of inequality; and third, it helps students to develop a detached stance from racism and other social issues affecting their communities (Romero and Margolis, 1999). From a critical race perspective situations such as these also serve to enforce the ideology that requires people of color to see their experiences with regard to race and racism as particularistic rather than linked to larger cultural and societal forces.

Although acquiring “professional distance” is considered part of developing a professional identity this requirement may be particularly burdensome for minority students because it requires a constant adjustment between the duality of being a minority, which is tied to a sense of community and being a professional. Consequently some minority professionals are caught in a conflicting web of expectations, which goes beyond being a professional or being a minority (Gilkes, 1982).
Curricula and University-wide Changes

Respondents identified a number of actions that might facilitate an environment that is responsive to the needs of minority students. Their responses suggest that the goal of an inclusive environment cannot be reach through the selection of students alone but by targeting the curriculum and the institutional environment. Specifically, they suggested that increasing the number of minority faculty and students, establishing a more culturally relevant curriculum and the inclusion of race and other cross cultural content in the curriculum would create a more hospitable environment for minority students.

Conclusion

As the demographic changes in the country continue to take hold graduate programs need to prepare students to work and learn in a multicultural society. This exploration of the experiences of minority students highlights the challenges they must confront during the professionalization process. It suggests that for minority students, graduate social work education is one of uncertainty, sacrifice, and strain. This is due in part to concerns that students bring with them, but more significantly, to the marginal experiences which seem to characterize their socialization into the social work profession. However, much of the literature on professional socialization ignores the realities of inequality and persistent discrimination endured by students of color in graduate education programs. If these programs are to become places where students of color can thrive, the barriers and obstacles they face must be recognized, understood and targeted for change.

CTR maintains that those at the margins can use their outsider-within stance to provide insight and vision. The perspectives of minority students in their own voices provide critical insights into actions that graduate education programs can take to increase the quality of life on predominantly White campuses. Improving the educational experiences of minority students is not just a matter of fairness but is central to the profession’s ability to provide appropriate and effective services to all of its clients.
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This essay covers three broad topics: the relationship between social theory and social problems, the truth-value of theories, and the importance of theorizing about the role of the state, i.e., national government, in the achievement of social
justice. First, much contemporary social theory has interest in ameliorating of social problems, a goal of classical social theorists. Second, many social theorists tend to fall into two camps, those who are more concerned that their theories be correct (have truth value) and those who want their theories to be useful. Each camp, however, fails to see that truthfulness and utility are important to theoretical developments meant to have any viability in regard to amelioration of social problems and realization of social justice. Third, without the legitimate, tangible incentives and moral exhortations inherent in policies issued by national governments, these goals cannot be achieved. The contemporary global economy requires national level leadership.

This essay draws on Mouzelis (1995) and Unger (1987/2004a&c. Also see 1975), whose “old fashion theory books” apply a set of critical arguments on conceptual themes (Cohen, 1996). It also relies on Popper (1961, 1965, & 1968) whose efforts to demarcate scientific theories/knowledge from other bases or claims of theoretical knowledge (e.g., ideology, religion, law, logic) provide a useful criterion by which to judge the capacity of social theories to adjudicate truth claims (Also see Baert, 2005; Magee, 1985). Evans, Rueschemeyer, and Skocpol (1985) and others (e.g. Barry, 2004; Peters, 2004) provide theoretical insights into the importance of the state in safeguarding against the erosion of the public sphere, promoting protections against the vicissitudes of the market, and providing the institutional structure within which contested aspects of social justice can be settled. Finally, this essay illustrates how normative or emancipative social justice theories, types of which Popper would reject on principle because they are not scientific, can nonetheless provide a basis for empirical investigation for purposes of knowledge building in a way that Popper would in all likelihood approve. To do this, the author relies on examples of his own conceptual and empirical works (Caputo, 2005a & b; 2004; 2003a & b; 2002a & b) that can be used in support of arguments justifying a positive role for national government in the amelioration of social problems and the achievement of social justice.

It should be clear from the outset that this essay will be silent in regard to theory development for its own sake, a
position advocated by Kiser and Hechter (1991; Also see Hage, 1994; Jasso, 2001). Somers (1998) criticized Kiser and Hechter's "theoretical realism" (the thesis that belief in an explanation depends on belief in the a priori theory from which it is imputed) and posited "relational realism" which places greater emphasis on the pragmatic aspects of explanation (Also see Skocpol, 1994; Quadagno & Knapp, 1992). Somers's position is adopted in this paper. The author contends that amelioration of social problems and the realization of social justice are better served when theories are developed with problem resolution and social betterment in mind rather than as a byproduct or epiphenomenon of formal theory development.

Types and uses of theory

Any classification of types and uses of theory is inherently arbitrary and suspect, perhaps at best reflecting latent if not overt biases of whoever constructs such a scheme and at worst leading to epistemological paralysis if pressed for logical consistency and coherency. Nonetheless, for analytical purposes classification schemes are necessary to get the present discussion going with some degree of clarity so that contestation when warranted can move forward rather than end in a stalemate. Wagner (1963), albeit "dated" but nonetheless useful as a backdrop to the subsequent discussion of how contemporary social theorists lost their moorings, identifies three main types of social theories that still have relevance: positive, interpretive, and evaluative. Positive social theories are those whose authors consider themselves and treat their theories within the tradition of the natural sciences. For analytical purposes, these include neo-positivists (e.g., Lundberg, 1955), human ecologists (e.g., Duncan, Schnore, & Rossi, 1959), structural functionalists (e.g., Merton, 1968), social behaviorists (e.g., Homans, 1958, 1987), and bio-psychologists (e.g., Linton, 1940).

Interpretive social theories are those whose authors adhere to the general methodological rules of science, but in contradiction to the natural sciences. These social theorists adhere to the Weberian conception of "value-free" science, while the "value-relevant" nature of the human subject matter nonetheless relies on a methodology of social inquiry that is sui generis. Interpretive social theories include cultural understanding
(e.g., Riesman, 1950), action and interaction (e.g., Becker, 1953), social psychology or symbolic interaction (e.g., Goffman, 1956), and social phenomenology (e.g., Schutz, 1970).

Evaluative social theories are those whose authors neither consider nor treat their theories within the realms of positive or interpretative science. Rejecting both positive "objectivity" and interpretive "value-neutrality," evaluative social theorists proceed on the basis of their philosophical premises, ideological convictions, and value systems. Systematic philosophical expositions, coherent ideological orientations, sets of social ideals, or systems of moral principles form the basis of such theories. Evaluative social theories include social philosophical (e.g., Wolff, 1959), ideological social (e.g., Lynd, 1939), and humanitarian reform (e.g., Thompson, 1961). Given these three strands, whatever convergences in social theory that occurred in earlier times are now gone (Giddens & Turner, 1987; Lundberg, 1956).

**Modern social theory – what is wrong with it?**

*Mouzelis.* To the extent Mouzels (1995) is correct, social theorists went wrong when they failed to go beyond Parson's (1951) adaptation (A), goal-attainment (G), integration (I), and latency or pattern-maintenance/tension management (L) scheme (AGIL) for the analysis of social systems and instead got bogged down in theories of rational choice (e.g., Becker, 1991), structuration (e.g., Giddens, 1984), figuration (e.g., Bourdieu, 1989), and the like (Cohen, 1996). He seeks to preserve objectivity, associated with positivist social theory characteristic of the Durkeimian-Parsonian functionalist tradition, and value-neutrality, associated with Weberian interpretive social theory tradition. Mouzels argues against the over determinism of the former and the neglect of hierarchical, institutional structures in the latter. He also argues against philosophical and ideological approaches to social theory that weaken ties between theory and empirical research. Such theories (e.g., Baudrillard, 1981) collapse the boundaries between and within intellectual disciplines, boundaries that are requisite for theoretical development.

Mouzels (1995) argued that Parsonian theory, while
providing a conceptual framework for the study of cultural, social, and personality systems, overemphasized "systemness" or determinacy at the expense of agency on both the macro and micro levels of analysis. Micro-level rational choice theorists got it wrong by exclusively focusing on an inadequate if not incorrect conceptualization of individual decision making and by omitting any consideration of the context within which preferences are formed and decisions made. Interpretative theorists got it wrong by identifying action/interaction, or symbolic interaction, with micro-level analysis and institutional structures with macro-level analysis and by systematically neglecting social hierarchies they failed to link the two. Transcendent social theorists, that is, those who attempted to transcend the micro-macro dichotomy (e.g., Bourdieu, 1989) nonetheless retained the functionalist logic inherent in Parsonian theory. That logic incorrectly applied AGIL systemic attributes appropriate for collectivities as wholes to subsystems that do not necessarily refer to any specific sub-collectivity with its own clearly defined goals and decision-mechanisms. As such, Bourdieu's "habitus" for example, downplayed the voluntary, interaction-situational dimension of human agency and thereby retained functionalism's deterministic character.

Mouzelis (1995) posits that the road ahead for social theory resides with linking micro with macro and action with institutional structure in a way that facilitates empirical research on the constitution, reproduction, and transformation of social systems. The detailed particulars of his nascent scheme for doing so go beyond the scope of this essay. Briefly, Mouzelis retains the Parsonian AGIL logic of systemic wholes, but recommends viewing all institutional spheres (economic, political, legal, educational / familial / religious) in terms of technologies, modes of appropriation / control, and ways in which such controls are legitimated. This view would provide the appropriate tools for showing how institutional incompatibilities lead, or fail to lead, to group conflicts on the economic (A), political (G), legal (I), and cultural (L) level. In addition it would allow "who" questions about the constitution, reproduction, and transformation of social wholes.

Unger. Unger (1987/2004c) exhorts us to resuscitate and retain the explanatory ambitions and emancipating potentials
of classical social theory (Lie, 1996). "A politicized social theory can coexist with natural science" Unger proclaims, "without either imitating its methods or claiming an unjustified exemption from the responsibilities of causal analysis" (p. 170). Social explanations incorporate causality but they do so in an "antinecessitarian" fashion, eschewing "false necessity" by encompassing contingency and thereby allowing for possibility (Unger, 1987/2004a). The particulars of Unger's prescriptions for transformative institutional experimentation have been sufficiently criticized elsewhere (e.g., Shapiro, 1989. See Unger, 1987/2004b) and they need not concern us here. More to the point of this essay is Unger's concern for the place and role of social theory in our efforts to ameliorate social problems and achieve social justice.

Unger (1987/2004c, pp. 80-169) argues that "deep structure" and "deep logic" theories such as those in the Marxist and neoclassical economic traditions have failed on their own terms because there is no teleological sequence or underlying basic logic of the kind they posited (Shapiro, 1989). Positivist science falls short in Unger's view in part because its underlying assumptions about cumulative knowledge building have turned out to be unwarranted (Dahrendorf, 1997; Turner, 1994). Positivist science also falls short in part because of its "refusal to take the distinction between the formative context and the formed-routines, or between structure-preserving and structure-transforming conflict, as central to the practice of social and historical explanation" (Unger, 1987/2004c, p. 130). Deconstructionists in the Foucaultian tradition also fall short. Such theorists fail to construct, that is, as it subjects a current state of affairs to seemingly endless critical inquiry, deconstructionists fail to make a positive case for a desirable alternative that can withstand their own scrutiny.

As an alternative, Unger (1987/2004c) advances "super theory," that is, a set of social theory practices that informs general explanatory theories with historical particularities. Such a "super-theory" approach to constructing social theories, while empirically grounded in historical particulars, would "explore the interplay between the attractions of empowerment through the invention of less imprisoning social contexts and the countervailing forces that prod us into the prison"
The goal of this explanatory super-theory would be to "identify a formative set of institutional arrangements and of enacted beliefs about the possible and desirable forms of human action" to show how these "compulsive routines" are politically constructed and how they limit transformative political action (Shapiro, 1989, p. 478).

Mouzelis (1995) would take Unger (1987/2004a&c) to task for downplaying the vital role more limited or middle range theories can play in regard to improving the usefulness of social theory for purposes of problem solving. Nonetheless, both theorists retain agency as an essential component in social theory. Retaining agency precludes the over determination characteristic of contemporary social theorists such as Giddens (1984) and Bourdieu (1989). Concomitantly, both theorists retain the link between theoretically driven empirically based research and social transformation, while retaining the prospect of emancipation from unjust conditions. As such, their work is consistent with that of Albert, Cagan, Chomsky, Hahnel, King, Sargern, and Sklar (1986, p. 111) who have also explicitly linked social theory as a component of scientific inquiry to social theory as an instrument of social transformation. Their agendas for the development of social theory are consistent with Popper's criterion for good scientific theory, namely generating hypothetical statements that can be falsified, which, as Kumar (1995) acknowledges, many of the post-industrial and post-modernist theories do not satisfy (e.g., Baudrillard, 1987).

**Popper and the Truth-Value of Theories**

Karl Popper set out a model of natural science in *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (1959/1968) and he extended it to the social sciences in *The Open Society and Its Enemies* (1943/1966) and *The Poverty of Historicism* (1957/1961). Popper maintained that no scientific theory could ever be conclusively proved or declared true. The best we could do is to make predictions repeatedly and attempt to refute or falsify them. Social theories for Popper were regulative ideals or logical fictions constructed for purposes of deducing predictions that could be tested, or shown to be correct or incorrect. Popper saw no fundamental divide between natural or social science in the sense that
scientific truth claims were in principle hypothetical and potentially falsifiable. The test of falsification aided in the adjudication of competing scientific truth claims. Popper drew a divide, however, between science and metaphysics. The latter's truth claims were constructed in such a way they were not amendable to falsification, that is, to testing empirically. The test of falsification would be inappropriate to adjudicate truth claims across the scientific non-scientific divide.

Popper's anti-foundational approach to science defied the relativism associated with post-modernist theorists' denial of the validity of making truth claims (Baert, 2005; Kuhn (1962/1970). Unlike poststructuralists and pragmatists, Popper maintained that we could approach truth from experience. In this regard, he echoed the views of logical positivists who also believed that the only legitimate knowledge was that derived from experience (Edge, 2001). Popper objected to the logical positivists' view of science based primarily on verification and posited instead that truth could be approached primarily from errors.

In Popper's view scientific methods entailed the creative production of hypotheses that could lead to predictions that in turn could be verified or refuted by experience, with the potential for refutation or falsification as the more significant attribute of the two for scientific advancement. Hence, Popper regarded any discipline that did not lead to empirically testable predictions, such as Marxism or psychoanalysis, as a pseudoscience (Chessick, 2001). Instead, much like Unger (1987/2004a&c), Popper's contention that truth per se is best stated hypothetically and treated provisionally (that is, subject to testing empirically or to falsification) encourages a readiness to make bold assertions or conjectures in regard to how things are or are likely to be and the honesty to recognize and wherewithal to acknowledge when they are shown to be incorrect. That such conjectures can be shown to be incorrect Popper does not doubt, thereby removing him from the camp of post-modernists for whom truth is better abandoned as an object of inquiry (Anonymous, 1992) and who view theory less as a pragmatic test shot at empirical targets and more as a vital component of creating the object under study as well as their explanation (Alexander, 1988).
Popper's falsification criterion has been critiqued, correctly in my opinion, for insufficiently specifying what counts as falsifying criteria. The charge that failing the test of falsification in which a single counter-observation can falsify a theory (Somers, 1998) is, in my view, an overstatement and it may reflect a misunderstanding of his work (Magee, 1985, p. 19). Much depends on what a theory purports to explain and how adequately a crucial test is designed and implemented. A single counter-observation of a hypothesis need not result in rejection of a theory per se, especially in the absence of a competing theory that could be subjected to empirical test or even with the availability of an alternative theory that does not allow for such a test. Further, as Munro (2002) notes, if it is logically possible that an observation statement can be wrong, it is also logically possible that the theory, although apparently falsified by it, might nonetheless be true.

Popper's insistence on the importance of empirically-based methods as grounds for scientific truth claims and theoretical development should by no means be construed to imply that such methods were the only valid forms of inquiry for purposes of obtaining important insights into human development. Disciplines such as moral psychology and political philosophy, which benefit from logical argumentation, provide sufficient evidence that such is not the case (Indick, 2002). Nor should falsification be construed as the only criterion that theories must meet to be considered scientific, as Baert (2005, p. 82) contends. Coherency, logical consistency, and parsimony are also important. Nor should theory only provide researchers with statements that can be tested. Theoretical progress also consists in generating better researchable questions (Quadagno & Knapp, 1992).

The insistence in this essay is only to place ourselves as social scientists in the position such that our theoretical assertions about causal relationships have the potentiality of being shown to be wrong. In addition, we should admit as much when someone does so. Our ability to act accordingly is crucial in regard to truth claims about the efficacy of intervention strategies, whether designed by government to meet public purposes or by practitioners such as social workers to improve the social functioning of clients (Munro, 2002; Also
see Gomory, 2002a & b; Thyer, 2001a & b).

Bringing the state back in

The proper role of the state in the society in general and in the economy in particular continues to be one of ambivalence, if not contestation (Bernstein, 2001; Caputo, 1994; Wier & Skocpol, 1985). The increasing influence of international governing bodies and transnational corporations challenges the relevance of national governments and nation-states (Kentor, 2005; Strange, 1996). Evans (1995) notes that international bodies have a dampening effect on the expansion of the state’s role in the economy in countries that become major capital exporters, especially centers of international finance capital. These dampening effects should by no means be construed as a cessation of state influence or importance as an actor in global affairs. As Evans also notes, national governments are vitally important to expanding economies and international relations in developing countries. Caputo (2000) contends that the role of the state is vital for purposes of social justice to securing basic human rights for all citizens and, under specified laws, for non-citizens within nations. In addition, the state plays an important role in regard to poverty reduction, particularly in regard to the legitimate or just redistribution of wealth within as well as among countries (Caputo, 2005).

No one overarching theory of the state emerges from the plethora of historical and comparative studies of the state in the post-World War II period. The development of middle-range theories about state autonomy and capacity as a society-shaping and global-influencing institutional structure remain an elusive but nonetheless worthy goal (Evans, Rueschemeyer, & Skocpol, 1985; Jessop, 1990). How to achieve the right balance of prosperity, civility and liberty is no easy matter, but the role of the state remains crucial (Dahrendorf, 1997; Leadbeater, 2004). The need remains for state-related social theory amendable to falsification. The theoretical tasks at hand are to identify under what circumstances which components of the state can foster conditions for people to create public goods and to specify the causal links between government action and social benefits. Such links in turn can then be subject to empirical scrutiny. The empirical task is to check out whether the causal
Conclusion: Tying Together Theory, Falsification, and Normative Aspects of Social Justice

This essay concludes with examples of my own work that tie together theory, falsification, and normative aspects of social justice in regard to two social problems: health disparities and work-related discrimination. Caputo (2003) addresses health disparities; Caputo (2002) addresses work-related discrimination. Both studies rely on the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth, the 1979 cohort.

Before proceeding to my own work, however, it should be noted that I avoid "totalizing" social theories such as those of Parsons (1951) and Wallerstein (1974) which are primarily descriptive and leave little room for falsification (Kumar, 1995). I also take issue in part with political philosophers such as Berlin (1969, 1997) who limit the appropriate role of the state primarily to fostering "negative" liberty, as important as such related freedoms no doubt are (Also see Gray, 1996). Instead, relying on moral and political philosophers such as Rawls (2001, 1971), Barry (2005), and Nathanson (1998), I delineate criteria which if met can be used to justify a positive role for government to develop and implement policies with distributional effects aimed to achieve a more justice society than would be the case if market mechanisms were deemed the most appropriate arbiter of economic and social exchange. In doing so, my work is consistent with those whose social theory takes the form of moral or social philosophy (For a select review of such theorists see Holmwood, 2000; Rossides, 1998, pp. 295-297; for a direct application, see Plant, Lesser, & Taylor-Gooby, 1980; for a classic treatment on related themes, see Polanyi, 1944/2001). For a more general treatment applying normative criteria to assess the merits of policy-related programs whose outcomes are amendable to empirical testing see Caputo (1989). As such, my work falls within the evaluative strand of social theory as developed by Wagner (1963).

Caputo (2003) found that socioeconomic status and race/ethnicity were robust predictors of physical health and they
provided support for expanding Rawls's index of social goods to include social determinants of health. The theoretical issues boiled down to whether it would ever be reasonable and rational to accept a tradeoff in which some health inequality was (1) allowed in order to produce some non-health benefits for those with the worst health prospects or (2) reduced in order to produce health benefits for those with the worst health prospects. Justifiable grounds were examined for absolute gains in overall health even if some were made worse off (but not too seriously) and for relative health statuses in which resources would be redistributed to those worst off either at the expense of those better off (again, not to a serious or life-threatening extent) or with no overall gain in health. The purpose of the study was to determine under what conditions appeals for social justice might be warranted for absolute gains in health and for relative health statuses.

Falsifying conditions that would determine the merits of social justice arguments for government action to reduce health disparities included, for examples whether Blacks were found to be worse off than Whites or whether women fared worse than men in regard to measures of physical and mental health when controlling for a variety of hereditary, background, lifestyle, and other cumulative and structural factors over the life cycle. The finding that White and Black females fell below White males on the measure of mental health lent support to advocates of social justice who claim that the relative status of groups can form the basis of legitimate governmental and social interventions on their behalf. On the other hand, the finding that Black males were less likely than White males to fall below the typical U.S. person on the measure of physical health used in the study challenged blanket appeals for race-related interventions for redistribution of resources based on appeals to social justice. The implication was that absolute (i.e., aggregate) gains in physical health could be pursued even if Black males were not the beneficiaries or had no net gains.

The intent here is to present, not defend, these findings and their implications. Limitations of the study, such as the participation only of non-institutionalized persons in the NLSY79 sample and the infant/childhood mortality rates of Black males, can be found in the article (Caputo, 2003). For purposes
of this essay, the merit of the theoretically driven and normative based study is that it was done in such a way that findings are subject to falsification from further scrutiny and policy prescriptions are made with caution in mind since they would need to be modified accordingly if findings were shown to be incorrect.

Caputo (2002) examined work-related discrimination. This study pitted two social justice theories against one another: the classical utilitarian tradition of maximizing the greatest good vs. the liberal utilitarian tradition of maximizing good without worsening the situation of the most disadvantaged persons. On-going debates about affirmative action often pit justice claims of Blacks and women for preferential treatment on liberal utilitarian grounds against those of white males for merit-based decisions on classical utilitarian grounds. In the study, young labor force participants reporting discrimination in their efforts to get good jobs were found to obtain more additional education and job training than those who reported no such discrimination over the same time periods. Findings suggested net aggregate gains as well as gains by historically work-related discriminated groups (namely Blacks and women in this study) and as such challenged blanket social justice appeals for race- and gender-related interventions for redistribution of resources. Findings imply that social justice advocates would be on firmer footing to the extent they advance public policies ensuring access to education and training in the broadest possible sense affirming opportunity for all rather than specific disadvantaged groups.

As with Caputo (2003), the intent here is to present, not defend, these findings and their implications. The peer review process of the manuscript made clear that the findings are controversial. In the final analysis, they were deemed to warrant both further discussion (hence, the decision to publish) and scrutiny.

In conclusion, the merits of Caputo (2003) and Caputo (2002) are that 1) they are theoretically driven; 2) normatively based; 3) done in such a way that findings are subject to falsification; and 4) suggest appropriate state action in light of findings and limitations. These two studies are among several others of mine that to different degrees tie together theory,
falsification, and normative aspects of social justice in regard to social problems (e.g., see Caputo, 2004). What links much of my empirical work is that the studies are premised on the prospect of using normative criteria as a basis for deciding appropriate calls for state action to remedy social problems. Each is guided by social theory taking the form of moral or social philosophy for purposes of making an evaluation and each met Popper’s falsification criterion. Related hypotheses are constructed such that they could be shown to be met or not and the social justice arguments that identified a potential area of state intervention either held firm or fell accordingly. If social theory is not to wither or not to remain primarily an academic exercise which may address social problems in an epiphenomenal way rather than head on, then theoreticians should use Popper’s criterion as one of the main considerations when constructing theories, have a specific social problem in mind, and specify normative criteria upon which to judge whether study findings warrant state action to achieve social justice.

References


American Identity and Attitudes Toward English Language Policy Initiatives

CARLOS GARCIA
San José State University
Department of Sociology

LORETTA E. BASS
University of Oklahoma
Department of Sociology
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Introduction

The foreign born population of the United States grew
from 7.9 percent in 1990 to 11.1 percent, or 31.1 million residents by 2000 (Schmidley, 2001; U.S. Department of State, 2002). Since 2000 the United States has continued to welcome large numbers of immigrants admitting 1,063,732 in 2002 alone of which over 40 percent originated from Spanish-speaking countries (U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service 2001; U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2003).

Language is at the core of the policy debate over immigrants' impact on American culture (Lapinski, Peltola, Shaw, and Yang 1997). However, when we examine the research done on American attitudes toward English usage in public schools and the use of public tax money to teach immigrants English, the literature is modest. Some research has isolated correlates related to anti-immigrant attitudes (see Cowan, Martinez, and Mendiola, 1997 and Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, and Armstrong, 2001), but these conclusions have been based on small samples of college students and may not be representative of the general population. Research on sentiment toward making English the official language, as Propositions 187 and 227 in California intend, indicates the importance of language in shaping attitudes toward illegal immigrants (Cowan, et al. 1997). Americans who believe that English should be the only language in schools increased from 40 to 48 percent from 1993 to 1995 (Lapinski et al., 1997). This English-only sentiment is an important indicator of openness toward immigrants, especially if this trend continues. Preliminary analysis of our survey data shows this trend has become more pronounced with 66 percent of 395 respondents in 2001 reporting that English should be the only language used in public schools.

Using data from the University of Oklahoma's 2001 Survey of American Attitudes (SAA) national telephone survey we examine the individual-level factors that may predict more altruistic and open attitudes toward English language policy initiatives, such as whether English should be the only language used in public schools, and whether the same types of individuals who agree that tax money should be used to teach English to immigrant children also agree that tax money should be used to teach English to immigrant adults.

Throughout the twentieth century, the general trend in
public opinion has been a growing negativity toward immigrants (Simon, 1985; Jarret, 1999), possibly caused by the perception that these newcomers threaten existing American cultural identity, beliefs, and values (Espenshade and Calhoun, 1993; Esses et al., 2001). Because English language use is a salient component of American identity, the symbolic politics model is useful in framing this analysis. The symbolic politics model posits that cultural symbols, such as language choice, may signify what it means to be an American and can influence opinions on other related issues such as bilingual education or immigration policy in general (Citrin, Reingold, Walters, and Green, 1990a; Citrin, Haas, Muste, and Reingold, 1994). In this paper, we examine the importance of English as a cultural symbol. Using the symbolic politics model, we can predict that because speaking English is such an important part of American identity, Americans would be willing to support the use of public funds to teach English to immigrants, regardless of whether they are children or adults.

The labor market competition model has also been used to understand American public opinion toward immigrants and immigration policies. According to the labor market competition theory, persons with lower social and economic status are less likely to view increased levels of immigration as a good policy direction, because low-wage, low-skill workers compete with immigrants for jobs in the economy (Abowd and Freeman, 1991; Bean, Lowell, and Taylor, 1988; Borjas and Freeman, 1992; Oliver and Mendelberg, 2001). Indeed, it is reasonable that those with lower social and economic status in society would face greater competition and threat to their livelihood with an influx of less-educated immigrants, compared with those of higher status. However, as Smith and Edmonston (1997) note, this may be more perception than reality. Additionally, those with lower status and fewer skills are likely to resent that public money would be spent to provide English training exclusively for immigrants when they, too, are challenged with their own skill levels in the labor market but offered no publicly funded assistance or training.

Evidence suggests that those with more education, higher incomes, and high status jobs are more likely to hold more favorable attitudes toward increased immigration levels,
compared with those of lower status (Day 1990; Hoskin and Mishler, 1983; Simon, 1987; Simon 1985; Simon and Alexander, 1993; Sorensen and Krahm, 1996; Starr and Roberts, 1982). Some studies suggest that there may be variation across these social and economic categories (Burns and Gimple, 2000; Morris, 1985; Peterson and Kozmetsky, 1982). Other research provides additional weight to the importance of education in driving social status, showing that negative attitudes toward immigrants decrease with more education (Day 1990; Hoskin and Mishler, 1983; Moore, 1986; Starr and Roberts, 1982). A picture of higher status translates into more open, favorable attitudes toward immigration and immigrants. Thus, we would expect that those with higher status in society would hold more open attitudes toward English usage in public schools and the use of public funds to pay for the teaching of English to immigrants. Likewise, an extension to the labor market thesis would hold that Non-Whites may be less supportive or less open to immigrants because they are more likely to be in competition for lower status jobs (Jarret, 1999; Smith and Edmonston, 1997).

Espenshade and Calhoun (1993) established the need to control for individual-level demographic variables, such as age, sex, marital status, and race, when examining American attitudes toward immigrants. We therefore include these variables in our models. Further, Lapinski and associates (1997) distinguish between legal immigration and undocumented immigration when assessing Americans' attitudes toward immigration policies, because at the same time that more balanced beliefs are held regarding legal immigrants, negative attitudes are held of illegal immigrants. Other research (Passel, 1986) shows that it is important to separate immigrants and undocumented immigrants when examining attitudes toward immigrants or immigration issues. Cowan and associates (1997) in their survey of 140 Los Angeles area college students further established that attitudes toward undocumented immigrants are uniquely understood. Frendreis and Tatalovich (1997), using data from the 1992 American National Election Study, found that respondents' attitudes toward undocumented immigrants helped to predict support for English-only policy initiatives. These studies point to the need to control for respondents' general warmth perceptions toward
immigrants and undocumented immigrants when explaining open attitudes toward the specific English language policy initiatives that affect immigrants.

In this study, we improve on previous research in several ways. First, we use data gathered from a national sample. Second, we examine Americans' attitudes toward the public funding of teaching English to immigrant children and immigrant adults, and we consider how these attitudes may co-vary with individual characteristics. Third, we improve on earlier studies by using multivariate models to control simultaneously for many factors, like education and age, which have been previously established in bivariate analysis as related to open attitudes toward immigrants or immigration policy issues.

Drawing on the research that has been done on Americans' attitudes toward immigration, we expect that Americans will agree to English-only in public schools and support the use of public funds to teach English to immigrants, regardless of whether they are children or adults because speaking English is seen as an integral part of being American. Further we expect to find that those with less education are likely to compete directly with immigrants for jobs, and, hence, are less likely to be open to the use of public funds to provide English training to immigrants, which may make immigrants more competitive in the labor market. As an extension of the labor market thesis, we believe that because Non-Whites view immigrants as competition for low-level employment, they are less likely to hold open attitudes toward these English-language issues. Finally, we expect that those with warm feelings toward immigrants in general, and undocumented immigrants in particular, are likely to hold more open attitudes toward these English language policy initiatives, specifically English-only language use in schools and public funding to teach English to immigrant children and adults.

Data and Analytical Samples

The analysis in this article is based on data from a telephone survey, the Survey of American Attitudes (SAA), administered from August 27th through September 22, 2001 by the University of Oklahoma's Public Opinion Learning Laboratory.
Faculty and graduate students at the University of Oklahoma developed the SAA survey instrument. Trained interviewers collected data from 395 respondents, ages 18 years and older. Respondents were initially separated into pre-September 11\textsuperscript{th} and post-September 11\textsuperscript{th} groups, however preliminary analysis did not yield significant differences between the two groups on relevant variables, including baseline demographic and socio-economic variables and the dependent variables. They were subsequently treated as one sample for this research paper.

### Multivariate Methods

Overall, we specify 12 logistic regression models to examine three English language policy initiatives: 1) attitudes toward the use of English-only in public schools, 2) attitudes toward the use of tax money to teach English to immigrant children, and 3) attitudes toward the use of tax money to teach English to immigrant adults. Because the dependent variables of interest are dichotomous and their values fall between 0 and 1, ordinary least-squares (OLS) regression is likely to yield out-of-bound and therefore nonsensical predications (Aldrich and Nelson, 1984). We accordingly choose a logistic regression model to analyze these dependent variables. The statistical advantages of the logistic and multinomial logit specification over the linear probability model for binary and categorical variables are well known (e.g., King, 1989; Long, 1997). Models 1 through 4 examine the use of English only in public schools, and models 5 through 12 examine the use of tax money to teach English to immigrant children and adults, separately.

We use dichotomous variables to indicate whether or not an individual reported agreeing that English should be the only language used in public schools, that tax money should be used to teach English to immigrant children, and that tax money should be used to teach English to immigrant adults. Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following statements:

1) English should be the only language used in public schools.
2) Tax money should be used to teach English to children who immigrate to the United States.
3) Tax money should be used to teach English to adults who immigrate to the United States.

Across all three statements, we used one 'agree' category from those who reported that they strongly and somewhat agreed with the statements, and one 'disagree' category from those who reported that they strongly and somewhat disagreed with the statements. Each of these statements is a measure of openness toward English language policy initiatives for immigrants. For the first statement, we recoded the direction of English-only use, so that favorable or open attitudes toward all three of these policy issues can be interpreted across models in the same direction.

We include several socio-economic and demographic factors in the base model (see Table 1). Age is a continuous variable. Sex and marital status are two-level categorical variables: male or female, and married or not married. Education is a three-level categorical variable denoting high school degree or less, some college, and college degree or more. Race is a two-level categorical variable indicating White or Non-White.

We use a continuous variable that shows a respondent's overall warmth or coolness toward immigrants and undocumented immigrants, respectively, as a ranking from 1 indicating extremely cold, negative feelings toward immigrants to 10 indicating extremely warm, positive feelings toward immigrants. A response around 5 indicates neither warmth nor coolness toward a group. The warmth measure for immigrants has a mean of 5.62 and includes 387 valid responses. The warmth measure for undocumented immigrants has a mean of 3.71 and includes 382 valid responses. This higher level of warm feeling toward documented immigrants compared with undocumented immigrants indicates that respondents felt differently toward these two groups. Furthermore, it would suggest that attitudes toward English education and the use of public funds may vary based on the documentation status of immigrants.
Table 1. Reported Attitudes toward English-only Use in Schools and Using Tax Money to Teach English to Immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%*</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total 18 years and older</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Male</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-27</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38-47</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-57</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58-67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; or = 78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school grad or less</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate or greater</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>86.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.  **Percentages refer to those who thought that English should not be the only language used in public schools, and that tax money should be used to teach English to immigrant children and immigrant adults.
Table 1 presents the bivariate relationships between the independent and dependent variables. While most respondents (66 percent) indicated that English should be the only language used in public schools, they also reported being strongly in favor of spending tax dollars to teach English to immigrant children (79 percent) and immigrant adults (74 percent). These findings indicate an overall support of the English language as a cultural symbol for Americans, and the willingness to pay for the cultural and social integration of immigrants. Findings such as these are consistent with previous research which shows that Americans are willing to support bilingual education and its associated costs because English language is seen as an integral part of American culture and identity (Huddie and Sears 1990; Citrin et al., 1990a; Citrin et al., 1994).

The bivariate relationships suggest that younger individuals and unmarried individuals hold more open attitudes across all three policy questions. In addition, women report higher rates of support for bilingual education and tax money to teach English to immigrant children, compared with men. Those with more education hold more open attitudes toward using tax money to teach English to immigrant children and immigrant adults, but this relationship between education and bilingual education does not appear to be in the hypothesized direction of each level of increased education translating into more open attitudes. Thirty-five percent of high school graduates or less, 29 percent of those with some college education, and 37 percent of those with a college degree or more in education agreed that English should not be the only language used in public schools. Non-White individuals have much higher levels of agreement that English should not be the only language used in public schools, which supports the cultural affinity hypothesis. The high levels of agreement across White and Non-White racial/ethnic categories indicates further support for the symbolic politics argument mentioned above, because English language is an American cultural symbol that they are willing to use tax money to support.

We next consider these variables in multivariate analyses to determine whether these relationships hold once we account
for other inter-correlated variables.

Table 2. Odds of Not Agreeing that English Should Be the Only Language Used in Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds SE</td>
<td>Odds SE</td>
<td>Odds SE</td>
<td>Odds SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>(.01) .97***</td>
<td>(.01) .97***</td>
<td>(.01) .97***</td>
<td>(.01) .97***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (.24)</td>
<td>1.46 (.24)</td>
<td>1.52* (.25)</td>
<td>1.35 (.25)</td>
<td>1.37 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married (.24)</td>
<td>1.34 (.24)</td>
<td>1.41 (.25)</td>
<td>1.41 (.25)</td>
<td>1.45 (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Less (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College (.30)</td>
<td>.79 (.32)</td>
<td>.67 (.32)</td>
<td>.79 (.33)</td>
<td>.72 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College (.29)</td>
<td>1.45 (.30)</td>
<td>1.15 (.31)</td>
<td>1.38 (.32)</td>
<td>1.23 (.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White (.34)</td>
<td>2.80*** (.35)</td>
<td>2.72*** (.36)</td>
<td>2.82*** (.36)</td>
<td>2.69*** (.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth toward immigrants (.06)</td>
<td>1.20***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth toward undocumented immigrants (.05)</td>
<td>1.18***</td>
<td>(.06) 1.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>6 n=376</td>
<td>7 n=369</td>
<td>7 n=363</td>
<td>8 n=357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***significant at p<.01, **significant at p<.05, *significant at p<.10

Multivariate Results

Table 2 shows respondents' odds of not agreeing that English should be the only language used in schools. Model 1 shows that age and race are significant variables. With each increasing year of age, a respondent is more likely to believe that English should be the only language used in public schools. In contrast, Non-White respondents show more openness toward language usage, being more than twice as likely to report that English should not be the only language used in schools. These effects hold throughout the analysis and support the cultural affinity hypothesis (Espenshade and Hempstead, 1996). In Model 2 we see that a respondent's warmth toward immigrants is also a significant predictor of agreeing that English should not be the only language used in public schools. A similar effect is observed when the independent effect of warmth toward undocumented immigrants is added in Model 3. However, when both warmth measures are included in Model 4, the measure for respondents' attitudes toward undocumented immigrants, specifically, is the dominant variable driving this warmth effect. Age, race, and the warmth measures are significant predictors of whether a respondent will agree that English should not be the only language used in public schools.

Table 3 shows the odds of respondents agreeing that tax money should be spent to teach immigrant children English, and Table 4 shows the odds that respondents agree tax money should be spent to teach immigrant adults English. Marital status, education, and the warmth measures are significant predictors of whether a respondent thinks that tax money should be spent to teach English to immigrants. Across both models, with each level of additional education, respondents' attitudes are more favorable to using public funds to teach immigrants English. Table 3 shows that female respondents are more likely to agree that tax money should not be spent to teach English to immigrant children, but there is a significant relationship between sex and agreeing that tax money should be spent to teach English to immigrant adults. Warmth toward immigrants in general and warmth toward undocumented immigrants, specifically, are significant predictors of whether a respondent will agree that tax money should be spent to
Table 3. Odds of Agreeing that Tax Money Should Be Spent to Teach Immigrant Children English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>(.28)</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>(.31)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
<td>(.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>.248***</td>
<td>.189**</td>
<td>.245***</td>
<td>.198**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>(.35)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>(.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>.587***</td>
<td>.383***</td>
<td>.507***</td>
<td>.378***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>(.40)</td>
<td>(.43)</td>
<td>(.44)</td>
<td>(.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toward</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.139***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.132***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undocumented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=378</td>
<td>n=372</td>
<td>n=366</td>
<td>n=360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***significant at p<.01, **significant at p<.05, *significant at p<.10

Table 4. Odds of Agreeing That Tax Money Should Be Spent to Teach Adult Immigrants English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 9</th>
<th>Model 10</th>
<th>Model 11</th>
<th>Model 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odds</td>
<td>Odds</td>
<td>Odds</td>
<td>Odds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
<td>SE Ratio</td>
<td>SE Ratio</td>
<td>SE Ratio</td>
<td>SE Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>(.26)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>(.26)</td>
<td>1.64*</td>
<td>(.27)</td>
<td>1.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School or Less (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>(.29)</td>
<td>2.46***</td>
<td>(.30)</td>
<td>2.04**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
<td>5.88***</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td>4.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(R)</td>
<td>(R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>(.37)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth toward immigrants</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>1.35***</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>1.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth toward undocumented immigrants</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>1.29***</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>1.81***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 Log Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***significant at p<.01, **significant at p<.05, *significant at p<.10

teach English to immigrant children (Model 7 and Model 8 of Table 3) and adults (Model 11 and Model 12 of Table 4). These results remain significant when both warmth toward immigrants and warmth toward undocumented immigrants are included in the analysis, indicating that the independent effect of each immigration warmth measure is a significant predictor of respondents' attitudes toward the English language policy issues of using tax money to teach English both to immigrant children and adults.

One difference across the models presented for immigrant children and immigrant adults is that women are 1.7 times as likely as men to report that they agree that tax money should be spent to teach English to immigrant children in Table 3. In contrast, women are not significantly more likely than men to report that they agree that tax money should be spent to teach English to immigrant adults.

Discussion

The bivariate relationships between our dependent variables and age, education, and marital status did not always hold true with multivariate analyses. Moreover, unique sets of factors emerge as predicting opinions in the two distinct areas of inquiry relating to English-language issues. While we find that being young is a significant predictor of open attitudes toward non-English-only use in schools, and as previously noted by Espenshade and Calhoun (1993) to influence general opinions of immigrants, it is not a significant predictor of favorable attitudes toward publicly funding English classes for immigrant children or immigrant adults. Furthermore, being young and single are related to open attitudes regarding the use of public funds to teach English to immigrants, but we find that education and marital status do not co-vary with attitudes of English-only usage. These findings are consistent with previous research on the attitudes of married and unmarried respondents (Shapiro and Mahajan, 1986; Conver, 1998).

In contrast, Non-White respondents are more likely to support the use of languages other than English in public schools, yet they are not more likely to support the use of public funds to teach immigrants English. This suggests that
individual-level factors shape opinions of immigrants differently even within the same issue area. Non-Whites are much more open than Whites to having languages other than English used in public schools, but no relationship exists between race and the public funding of teaching English to immigrant children or to immigrant adults. This suggests that the bivariate race association may actually be due to an education effect. Indeed, Whites are much more likely to fall in the highest education category, 41 percent, compared with just 18 percent of Non-Whites. Alternatively, this effect may be due to an increased desire to assimilate immigrants to American culture as suggested in the symbolic politics model.

Across our models, as found previously (Passel, 1986; Cowan et al., 1997; Frendreis and Tatalovich, 1997; Lapinski et al., 1997), the measures of general warmth toward immigrants and general warmth toward undocumented immigrants are significant predictors of attitudes toward English-only usage in school or the use of public funds to teach English to immigrant children and to immigrant adults. Further, the warmth toward undocumented immigrants' measure bears out as a major explanatory variable once both are included in our models, suggesting that the sentiment toward specific English language services offered to immigrants may be shaped through a filter of general warmth of the undocumented immigrant population. This finding supports earlier research on the centrality of sentiment toward undocumented immigration in framing opinions on a variety of issues associated with immigrants more generally (Espenshade and Calhoun, 1993; Citrin et al., 1990a). Alternatively, it is unclear in which direction these relationships exist. Is it that general warmth affects open attitudes toward English-language issues or is it that attitudes toward English-language issues shape general warmth?

One might expect that attitudes toward immigrant children would be overwhelmingly more altruistic than for adults, because social norms posit that childhood is a time of protection, education, and vulnerability (Corsaro, 2004). However, our results show for the most part that respondents hold very altruistic and similar attitudes toward the use of public funds to teach English both to children and adults (74 percent and 79 percent, respectively [Table 1]). Likewise, the factors relevant
for predicting open attitudes toward using public funds to teach children English – marital status, education, and general warmth toward immigrants – are also salient in explaining public attitudes toward funding to adults. Altruism, however, may not be entirely at the core of attitudes such as these. An alternative explanation, and one that is consistent with the symbolic politics model, is that immigrants are expected to abandon cultural practices of their sending country for those of the core culture of the receiving country (Gordon, 1964).

Finally, while our results largely indicate little difference in what drives attitudes toward funding the teaching of English to immigrant children and immigrant adults, there does appear to be a gender difference. It is striking that women are 1.7 times as likely to agree that tax money should be used to teach English to immigrant children (Table 3, Model 8), all else being equal. Further, it is striking that women hold more altruistic attitudes than men when it comes to the use of public tax money to fund the teaching of English to immigrant children, but their attitudes do not diverge significantly from men when considering adults (Table 3, Model 12), all else being equal. This gender difference in more altruistic attitudes toward children for women may be reflective of their greater caretaking role of children in American society.

Conclusion

An important lesson culled from the debate over Proposition 187 in California is the importance of the English language to Americans. As the foreign-born population continues to grow and migrate to nontraditional locations this is an issue that will inevitably resurface (Saenz, 1996, Hernandez-Leon and Zuniga, 2000; Garcia, 2005). Previous scholarship highlights the importance of how English language policies are presented and framed, because this affects Americans’ attitudes of these policies (Huddie and Sears 1990; Citrin et al., 1990a). Other studies emphasize the importance of English language use for American identity and culture (Citrin, Reingold, and Green, 1990b; Espenshade and Calhoun 1993).

This analysis offers additional support to the symbolic
politics model as a tool to explain attitudes toward immigrants. Not only do most respondents believe that English should be the only language used in public schools, but they are also open to using tax money to teach English to immigrant children and immigrant adults. This indicates that respondents view English language as a cohesive force solidifying the United States citizenry, and that a strong willingness exists to meet immigrants half-way in their assimilation process by providing English language education. This in turn may help explain the higher level of openness expressed when documented immigrants are included in the model, as they may be perceived as following the rules to become a part of American culture. Overall, our findings suggest that English language is a cultural symbol that respondents are willing to support with money from public tax coffers.

When examining the willingness to use tax money to fund English training for immigrants, we also find some support for the labor market competition thesis. At each increment of more education, individuals express more open attitudes, agreeing that tax money should be spent to teach English to immigrants. It is reasonable that those with less education are less likely to support English training initiatives that would make immigrants yet more competitive for the low-status jobs they are likely to hold.

This research addresses an important piece of the debate over what factors distinguish Americans' views of English language usage in schools and the level of commitment to incorporate immigrants socially and culturally into American society. We find that while unique variables explain English-only preferences and attitudes toward public funding to teach English, the general warmth toward immigrants measures bear out as salient in patterning attitudes toward specific English language policy initiatives. While the directionality cannot be confirmed using cross-sectional data, our research suggests that attitudes toward specific services offered to immigrants go hand in hand with warmth regarding the immigrant population in general and the undocumented immigrant population in particular. These findings help explain public attitudes toward English-language issues as they concern immigrants.
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Regulatory politics—the struggle for control over the administrative levers of power and policy shaped within government agencies—is central to government activity in the United States (Harris and Milkus, 1989, p. viii).

Regulations control implementation of laws. This vital fact concerning the policy process can often be overlooked in the euphoria of winning a legislative battle or in the dispirit-ing crush of losing a vote. Either way, significant opportunities exist in the post-legislative process to affect policy, a fact noted in the scant social work literature on the subject (Albert 1983; Bell & Bell 1982; Haynes & Mickelson 1997; Hoefer 2000; Jansson 1999). Most of this social work literature, however, is concerned with explaining what the regulatory process is and how it fits into the policy process rather than with researching how best to affect the process, particularly for the interest groups that try on a daily basis to affect policy.

Moving the administrative levers of policy requires influence and power. Interest groups that understand the importance of regulatory policymaking want to be as effective as possible in their pursuit of this task. The study of interest group effectiveness (IGE) (a type of political power) is a subject of great interest and importance, yet one that is controversial because skeptics doubt that the concept can ever be measured. The search for interest group influence has been equated with "a blind man searching for a black cat in the coal bin at midnight" (Loomis 1983, p. 194). Less lyrically, Sloof (1998, p. 247) states: "...the prospects for a comprehensive model of the polit-ical influence of competing interest groups on government policy look rather dim."

The major problem with demonstrating interest group influence is connected with the "second face of power" argument (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962). This posits that truly influential groups are at work behind the scenes so that proposals contrary to their interests are never put on the decision agenda. If this were true, we would not need to study interest group
effectiveness, for it would be clear that interest groups visible in the process were not key actors in the agenda-setting or decision-making processes of government. Their actions would be mere window-dressing to confuse the masses into believing that their voices and actions (as reflected in interest group activity) were meaningful.

While the power to control the agenda is clearly important, the second face of power argument is not the end of the story. Important issues of concern to various interests are publicly debated and acted on by elected officials. The literature on agenda setting notes that issues are put onto the decision agenda in various ways, including crises or prominent events, changes in widely respected indicators, a gradual accumulation of knowledge and perspectives among specialists, and the development of new technology (Kingdon, 1995, pp. 16-17). Baumgartner and Jones (1993) describe how shifts in the way an issue is viewed are instrumental in changing the political agenda. Thus, exceptions to a powerful actor’s ability to control the agenda exist. Once a topic is on the agenda (whether by interest group activity or other means), interest groups then act to try to influence the outcome of the political battle. While interest groups may not control the agenda, Kingdon (1995, p. 50) argues that they “affect the alternatives considered”, surely a significant type of power and one that might profitably be investigated.

For researchers not dissuaded from approaching this difficult subject, different approaches have been tried in an effort to measure interest group effectiveness. Similarly, review of the extant literature reveals a variety of different statistical methods used to identify the predictors of effectiveness and to understand the interrelationships among them. This paper presents research that adopts a different statistical technique to re-test Hoefer’s (2000) ordinary least squares (OLS) model of interest group effectiveness in the Federal regulation-writing process using structural equation modeling (SEM).

Although a number of other types of analysis have been used in studying interest group power (notably, probit [Hojnacki & Kimball, 1998; Wiggins, Hamm & Bell, 1992], logit [Evans, 1996], and regression analysis [Grenzke, 1989; Haider-Markel, 1999], as well as modeling based on game theory [Sloof, 1998]),
SEM has rarely, if ever, been used despite its potential advantages. SEM is better in handling a dependent variable that is continuous (not possible with probit and logit techniques) and is better able to handle the multiple, overlapping variables and indirect pathways involved in this analysis than is regression analysis. It also allows for confirmatory factor analysis to ensure that the measured variables are truly aspects of their respective theoretical constructs.

It is incumbent upon social work researchers to use the best theory and the most powerful tools available to test our understanding of phenomena of interest. Ordinary least squares regression techniques are powerful, but SEM is able to handle vexing issues that cannot be dealt with successfully using OLS. While Hoefer (2000) is a good example of the use of OLS, we believe the re-analysis of the data using structural equation modeling is justified because SEM is a more powerful technique for taking into account "the modeling of interactions, correlated independent variables, measurement error, correlated error terms, [and] multiple latent independent variables, each measured by multiple indicators..." (Garson, 2002, p. 1). SEM thus appears useful both to determine how robust Hoefer's original results are and to facilitate a more precise measurement of determinants using latent structures and multiple indicators that theory posits are important.

After describing past research to understand current thinking about measuring the concept of IGE and identifying the oft-cited determinants, this paper describes the results of testing the original model with SEM. Drawing from the interest group literature over the past decade, an alternative model with increased fit is proposed, which introduces new predictors absent in the original model. Findings are then discussed in the context of the existing literature and suggestions for future directions of research are presented.

Measuring Interest Group Effectiveness (IGE)

Two major approaches to measuring IGE are well documented. The first is measuring a group's reputation and the second is looking at "objective" indicators of influence, such as votes or bureaucratic decisions. A third approach, asking the
group itself how effective it is, is less common. Each strategy has advantages and disadvantages.

Reputational studies ask respondents how much influence particular other groups have. The logic behind this approach is that other interest group leaders, legislators or other policy actors have a sense of which groups are effective in achieving their goals and which groups are not effective. In this way, an interest group such as the National Rifle Association or the American Association of Retired Persons can be rated among the most powerful in their policy arena. The main advantages of this approach are that it is relatively easy to obtain, and is at least somewhat plausible. Unfortunately, it may be that other groups or actors see only a portion of a group's whole effort and may thus underestimate the group's impact. This approach may also overestimate group power if the group is caught in the currents of a legislative movement, riding the wave, rather than having stirred the waters itself.

Objective indicators, such as counting how often legislators vote in accordance with an interest group's wishes, are another way to measure IGE. The myriad studies of the effect of Political Action Committees on votes in Congress or in committees provide examples of this approach. This approach has a strong advantage in that the dependent variable is observable and countable. This greatly aids statistical analysis of the data collected. The downside of this approach is that it severely limits what is meant by interest group influence, thereby reducing the types of decisions that can be studied.

A third approach, not often used, though employed in this study (as in Hoefer, 2000 and Hoefer, 2005), is to ask group leaders how effective their own groups are. This straightforward approach allows for group leaders to weigh all of their efforts, both public and behind-the-scenes. It also allows for a continuous dependent variable, thus aiding statistical analysis. The major disadvantage to this approach is in not knowing how accurate it is.

Several arguments can be used to support its use, however. First, as controversy exists on how to measure the concept of IGE, it seems reasonable to use a measure with considerable face validity. Second, self-reported effectiveness is useful because it moves us away from a simple “win-lose”
perspective on government decision-making. Groups may
know a defeat is coming, but be able to soften the blow. This
should be considered as constituting an example of influence,
even if the overall result is not what the group desires (Evans,
1996; Hojnacki & Kimball, 1998). Finally, in the only empiri-
cal study where all three types of IGE measures (reputational,
objective and self-report) were collected on the same groups
(Hoefer, 1994a), the measures of objective and self-reported ef-
fectiveness were highly correlated ($r = .758$, $p < .01$). In the
present study, as in the original Hoefer (2000) OLS model, in-
terest group effectiveness consists of a single-item indicator,
which is operationalized as the interest group member's per-
ception of the percentage of time that the organization is con-
sidered to be successful in achieving its policy goals through
affecting regulations.

Determinants of IGE

According to Sloof (1998, p. 18), when discussing legisla-
tive policymaking, "most studies...report a significant influ-
ence of lobbying on policy." While some studies use a "black
box" approach to understanding what leads to this influence,
much of the literature on legislative policymaking describes
various factors that impede or increase an interest group's in-
fluence. Hoefer (2000) is one of the few to turn to a quantita-
tive analysis of these factors in the Federal regulation-writing
process. (For more details on the Federal regulation-writing
process, see Albert [1983], Hoefer [2000] or Kerwin [2003].)

Using ordinary least squares regression, Hoefer (2000) de-
termines that four factors influence interest group effective-
ness. These factors are both internal and external to the group
and can be categorized as: 1) group access to policymakers;
2) group policy positions; 3) group strategy; and 4) group re-
sources. While the original OLS model utilized single-item in-
dicators as predictors of interest group effectiveness, the alter-
native SEM aims to more fully define these complex constructs
by incorporating both latent factors and observed variables. A
short description of the literature in each of these areas follows.
In the interest of parsimony, the authors limit their discussion
to the extant literature around the effectiveness indicators
proposed for the alternative structural equation model. Although significant in the original OLS model, Group Resources was not a significant determinant of IGE and was thus eliminated from the final structural equation model. (For a complete review of the original OLS model and findings, see Hoefer [2000]).

**Group Strategy**

Two basic strategies for interest groups have been discussed in the literature. These are the inside strategy and the outside strategy (Walker, 1991). According to Walker (1991), neither strategy is inherently better than the other; both are ways to retain organizational viability, depending on the group’s environment, membership and financing mechanisms. Hoefer (1994b), however, found that the use of inside tactics leads to greater levels of self-reported effectiveness in trying to affect the executive branch. Recasting the concept of strategy into when it is used in the regulation-writing process, Hoefer (2000) finds that interest groups using a “pre-publication” strategy of proactively bringing ideas regarding proposed regulations to policymakers are more successful than are groups not using that strategy. Using a pre-publication strategy is a conscious choice by a group, as it takes an allocation of resources “up-front” to research and prepare ideas for presentation to decision-makers. Even if the ideas are not immediately used in the proposed regulation, the group is able to access the policy actors involved and gain additional information regarding what ideas are being considered. This allows the group to modify its proposals to fit better into the agency’s thinking. Hoefer’s findings in the two manuscripts are consistent because a pre-publication strategy is an inside strategy, as the term is used by Walker (1991). (For more details on the regulation-writing process and the various strategies that may be used, see Hoefer, 2000).

On the basis of these findings, Hypothesis 1 is that greater use of a “pre-publication” strategy will lead to greater effectiveness. Related, Hypothesis 2 is that the more a group uses a pre-publication strategy, the more access it will have to information and policy actors.
**Group Position**

One of the key aspects of interest groups is what they perceive as their interests and thus what policy positions they take. This has an impact on how effective they are, as groups with positions outside of the mainstream or not in tune with Congressional or Administration priorities are likely to have less influence (Greenwald, 1977; Ziegler, 1964). Hoefer (2000) found that the group’s policy position was important in understanding a group’s level of effectiveness. While the Clinton administration is widely viewed as more “centrist” or “moderate” than liberal (Stoesz, 1996), Clinton’s government was more apt to see increases in government programs and authority in a favorable light than were the governments of Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush, his immediate predecessors.

Because the data were collected at a time when President Clinton was in office, Hypothesis 3 is that more liberal positions will lead to greater group effectiveness and Hypothesis 4 is that the more liberal a group’s position, the more access it will have to information and policy actors in the Clinton executive branch.

**Group Context**

Several authors suggest that the context within which the interest group operates (particularly the level of conflict) is an additional aspect of a group’s situation that influences its level of effectiveness (Walker, 1991). The more conflict in an issue area, the less likely any group is to be effective (Evans, 1996). The existence of interest groups with opposing positions decreases interest group influence (Sloof, 1998). Wiggins, Hamm and Bell (1992) show that elected officials can limit interest group influence as well. Policymakers want competing interests to bring forth proposals that are acceptable to all concerned. When no such acceptable compromise exists, decision-makers may try to delay a vote (Evans, 1996; Kingdon, 1989). Groups prefer to specialize in a narrow niche and to avoid direct competition with other groups (Browne, 1990; Walker, 1991). Given that the policy arena for the groups in this study is human services, oftentimes seen as a redistributive type of policy, we may expect a fairly high level of conflict to exist. Based on prior work, Hypothesis 5 is that the greater
the level of conflict in the group's environment, the less effective it will be.

**Group Access to Information and Policy Actors**

One of the key elements of lobbying is gaining access to and cooperation from policymakers (Rosenthal, 1993). Without access, little effective lobbying can occur (Greenwald, 1977; Culhane & Hacker, 1988). Hoefer (2000) shows that when agency personnel contact interest groups to provide information, interest group self-reported levels of effectiveness increase. Access to policy actors is also potential access to greater levels of information, as noted above. Thus, what might be considered two separate variables are combined here into one latent construct. On the basis of these findings, Hypothesis 6 proposes that higher levels of access to information and policymakers will lead to greater effectiveness.

In addition to this expected direct path between access and IGE, it seems logical to believe that the degree of access that a group has to information and policy actors is influenced both by the strategy it uses and the positions it takes. As one leader of a group interested in equal rights for gays, lesbians and transgendered people said regarding the administration of the first President George Bush: "We didn't even get in the door of their offices." As such, Hypothesis 7 is that access to information and policy actors will mediate the effect of strategy on effectiveness. Related, Hypothesis 8 is that access to information and policy actors will mediate the effect of position on effectiveness. In other words, we believe that strategy and policy position have both direct effects on IGE (Hypotheses 2 and 4) as well as indirect effects through access to information and policy actors.

**Hypothesized Model**

Coalescing the correlates of IGE, Figure 1 displays the hypothesized structural equation model of interest group effectiveness. The causal ordering and specific hypotheses are drawn from interest group theory and empirical precedents of IGE.
Data and Sample

The data originally used by Hoefer (2000) were collected in 1995 from Washington, D.C.-based interest group staff using a mailed survey. In order to be included in the research, a group needed to be active in social policy and attempt to influence both the legislative and executive branches. Groups were initially identified through the 1993 Washington Information Directory, published by Congressional Quarterly. A phone contact was made to determine if the interest group met the
criteria for inclusion in the study. At that time, the person who was most responsible for trying to influence the executive branch was determined. The survey was pre-tested on a small number of organizations and 10 personal interviews were conducted using the draft survey in order to improve and finalize the instrument.

A typical mail survey process was used, with initial mailing, post-card follow-up and a second full mailing to all non-respondents after 3 weeks. A new survey was sent to remaining non-respondents after an additional 6 weeks. Of the 295 groups initially determined to fit the study criteria, usable responses were received from 127 groups, for a response rate of 43%, a very respectable return rate for surveys such as this.

**Measures**

In the present study, *group strategy* refers to an overall approach to influencing policy. This latent construct is comprised of two of the three items from the original survey that were designed to measure the “pre-publication” strategy. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to select the following two indicators: 1) work to bring shortcomings of current regulations to the attention of executive branch agencies, and 2) offer drafts of regulations prior to agency publication of proposed regulations. Factor loadings were 0.90 and 0.58 respectively. Each indicator is operationalized by responses on a 6-point, Likert-type scale to questions regarding the importance of these organizational activities in achieving policy goals. Higher scores reflect increased importance of the respective activities.

*Group position* is defined as the extent to which the group advocates for a larger role for the federal government in solving social problems, which we label as being a more “liberal” point of view. Position consists of a latent factor with four indicators, which were selected on the basis of construct validity from among six items on the original survey. CFA produced high factor loadings that ranged from 0.70 to 0.82. Each item is operationally defined as the interest group leader’s perception of the organization’s policy regarding the desired level of expenditure by the federal government for health, social, housing and civil rights services. Higher numbers correspond with an organizational policy that supports an increased amount of
Table 1
Definitions of Measures and Descriptives of Model’s Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR/VARIABLE</th>
<th>LABEL</th>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>In regard to influencing the executive branch and the writing of regulations, organizations may engage in a variety of activities in order to achieve their public policy goals. Please indicate your best estimate of the importance of each activity to your organization. (1 = not engaged in; 6 = one of most important.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive branch: Work to bring shortcomings of current regulations to the attention of executive branch agencies.</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public: Offer drafts of regulations prior to agency publication of proposed regulations.</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>For each of the following policy areas, please indicate which statement reflects most accurately the policy of this organization concerning the level of expenditures or provision of services by the federal government: (0 = no position; 5 = much more.)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-health</td>
<td>Non-health human services</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>Housing and urban policy</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Civil rights</td>
<td>Civil rights and civil liberties</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>Intense conflict</td>
<td>This organization works in a policy arena marked by intense conflict or disagreement over fundamental policy goals.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict erupts</td>
<td>This organization works in a policy arena where conflict erupts very often.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elected oppose</td>
<td>Some important elected officials oppose the policy aims of this organization.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Org groups oppose</td>
<td>Some organized groups oppose the policy aims of this organization.</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACTOR/VARIABLE</td>
<td>LABEL</td>
<td>SURVEY ITEM</td>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND POLICY ACTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Organizations may use several different ways to keep abreast of pending changes in regulations. How important are the following methods to you? (1 = not engaged in; 6 = one of most important.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federal register</td>
<td>Reading the Federal Register</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># agencies interacted</td>
<td></td>
<td>How many different cabinet departments and independent agencies of the federal government did this organization communicate, consult or interact with during the past year? (1 = none; 5 = more than 5)</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td>For the federal agency with which this organization communicates, consults, or interacts the most, how often does this organization interact with it? (1 = almost never; 4 = frequently interacts)</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
federal expenditures (i.e., a more liberal position).

Group context refers to the milieu in which the group is operating, one which can be more or less conflictual. This construct is a latent factor comprised of four observed indicators, which were selected from among eight items on the original survey using CFA. Factor loadings were moderate to high, ranging from 0.56 to 0.86. The indicators were operationalized by responses on a 5-point, Likert-type scale to questions concerning the accuracy of proposed descriptive characteristics to each respective organization. Higher scores indicate increased accuracy of the respective organizational descriptions.

Group access to information and policy actors denotes the extent to which a group has a variety of information sources upon which to draw and have the ability to provide information to agency decision-makers. Access is a latent construct operationalized by four indicators, which were selected from the original survey as the most theoretically relevant indicators of an interest group’s access to information and policy actors. CFA produced factor loadings for these items that ranged from 0.53 to 0.87. Two of the four indicators were measured on 6-point, Likert-type scales in which higher scores indicate that accessing government agencies and reading the Federal Register have increased importance. One variable was measured on a 5-point scale in which higher numbers connote an increased number of attempts to communicate, consult or interact with different cabinet departments and independent agencies. The remaining variable was measured on a 4-point scale in which higher values reflect an increased frequency of interactions with federal agencies.

Interest group effectiveness (IGE) refers to the organization’s perceived success in achieving policy goals through influencing regulations. This single-item indicator is defined by respondents’ answers to the survey question: “Thinking about all of the times your organization tries to achieve its policy goals through affecting regulations, what percentage of the time do you think it is successful?” Higher scores indicate a greater percentage of perceived success. The operational definitions, means and standard deviations for all variables in the SEM are detailed in Table 1.
Results

Analysis of Hoefer's Original OLS Model Using SEM

Hoefer's (2000) original OLS model was re-analyzed using SEM. Given that the original model was not designed as a structural model, it violates several of the assumptions of SEM and clearly does not maximize this technique's unique strengths. Nevertheless, the re-analysis is justified given the aims of our paper. Slight differences in findings between the OLS and the SEM models resulted from the analysis. While two variables—degree of access and strategy—were stronger determinants of interest group effectiveness in the SEM model, the remaining predictors—policy position and resources—displayed weaker loadings than in the OLS model. Policy position, which was a statistically significant predictor in the OLS model, had a non-significant factor loading in relation to effectiveness in the SEM model. Both models explained relatively the same amount of variance in effectiveness (27% via OLS and 26% via SEM).

Overall, goodness-of-fit indicators for the structural model indicate that the SEM is not a solid-fitting model. Due to the influence of sample size on the chi-square goodness-of-fit statistic, Byrne (2001) suggests the ratio of the chi-square statistic to the degrees of freedom (CMINDF) of less than 2.0 as an alternative indicator of a good-fitting model. The CMINDF value for the SEM model was 7.9. The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) was .958 (desired value above .90 or .95 by more conservative estimates), while the RMSEA was far outside the desired range at 0.234 (desired value < 0.05).

In light of these findings, we proceeded to develop an alternative model that would take advantage of SEM's strengths by creating latent factors for the original variables in the OLS model from the literature on interest group effectiveness. Additionally, the alternative structural equation model introduces a new factor, policy context, which was absent from the OLS model.

Analysis of Alternative Structural Equation Model for Interest Group Effectiveness

Given that structural equation modeling is a multi-stage
process, confirmatory factor analysis was first used to determine whether the measured variables were considered to be valid indicators of their underlying constructs (Bollen, 1989). Factor loadings for all indicators in the three overidentified measurement models—position, context and access—were moderate to high and all loadings were statistically significant, lending credence to the convergent validity of the indicators (Hatcher, 1994). One measurement model—strategy—was underidentified due to insufficient number of known data points, yet was included in the full structural model on the basis of content validity.

Figure 2. Hypothesized full model of interest group effectiveness. (Note: All paths statistically significant at p<.05.)

The measurement models were combined into a full latent variable model and a structural equation analysis was conducted using the AMOS 5.0 program and the maximum
Likelihood estimation method. The Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) method of estimation was used to handle all missing data (Arbuckle, 1996). Missing data for this sample were relatively low, ranging from 0 to 20% of the total number of valid responses across all predictor variables. The full latent model displayed in Figure 2 produced a testable, overidentified model with 83 degrees of freedom.

Table 2 presents the goodness-of-fit estimates for the full model. Based on the measures of overall fit, there is evidence that the hypothesized alternative model of interest group effectiveness is a sound-fitting model, considering the small sample size used here. The CMINDF value of 1.3 is indicative of a good-fitting model, demonstrating a considerable improvement in fit from the 7.9 value displayed in the first SEM model of Hoefer's OLS re-analysis. The CFI and Incremental Fit Index (IFI) were also both well above the acceptable cut-off value, displaying values of .961 and .963, respectively. The Normed Fit Index (NFI) constitutes a widely used criterion within the literature, yet because this index tends to underestimate fit when sample sizes are small, the IFI was preferred on the basis of the sample size used in this study. The RMSEA of .050 reflects a good-fitting model and represents a substantial improvement from the RMSEA value of .234 from the first SEM model. The relatively narrow confidence interval ranging from .017 to .074 indicates a high degree of precision (Byrne, 2001). As such, one can be 90% confident that the true RMSEA value in the population is located within the range of .017 and .074. Finally, the overall R-Square for IGE in the revised model was 0.301. Thus, the four hypothesized latent constructs account for 30% of the variance in interest group effectiveness. Based on existing $R^2$ values cited in the literature, strategy, resources, position and access collectively account for a total of 27% of the variation in interest group effectiveness (Hoefer, 2000). One advantage of SEM over OLS here is that given the use of latent constructs in SEM, the variance modeled constitutes true latent variance since the measurement error is excluded and modeled separately (Byrne, 2001).
Table 2
Overall Goodness-of-Fit Estimates for Modeling Interest Group Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIT INDEX</th>
<th>ESTIMATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Chi Square (CMIN)</td>
<td>109.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom (DF)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance (P)</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parameters (NPAR)</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discrepancy/Degrees of Freedom (CMINDF)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incremental Fit Index (IFI)</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI)</td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normed Fit Index (NFI)</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA lower bound</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA upper bound</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall R-Square (for Interest Group Effectiveness)</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the individually hypothesized relationships among the variables in the revised model, the initial speculations were fairly accurate. Standardized regression coefficients are listed in Table 3 and explained more fully below by predictor variables.

The data failed to support our first hypothesis: greater use of a "pre-publication" strategy will lead to greater effectiveness. Group strategy was not found to positively impact effectiveness. However, the data did support our second speculation that the more a group uses a pre-publication strategy, the more access it will have to information and policy actors. Results showed that group strategy had a significant, positive effect on access to information and policy actors, with a standardized weight of 0.89 (p<.001). As the strongest coefficient in the
**Levers of Power**

model, the relationship between group strategy and access to information and policy actors constitutes a unique contribution to the existing interest group literature, given that previous studies have solely assessed the direct effects of group strategy on interest group effectiveness, rather than possible indirect effects through another mediating variable (Hoefer, 2000).

Table 3

Standardized and (Unstandardized) Parameter Estimates for the Structural Model for Interest Group Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Access to Information and Policy Actors</th>
<th>Interest Group Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>.892 (.902)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>.286 (.196)**</td>
<td>-.262 (-4.167)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.233 (-4.827)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Information and Policy Actors</td>
<td></td>
<td>.503 (11.677)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy x Access (Indirect Effect)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position x Access (Indirect Effect)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.877</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05  ** p<0.01  *** p<0.001

Regarding the third hypothesis, *more liberal positions will lead to greater group effectiveness*, contrary to what we expected, position had a significant, *negative* impact on effectiveness. The standardized effect of position on IGE was -0.26 (p<.05). However, we did find support for our fourth hypothesis: *the more liberal a group’s position, the more access it will have to information and policy actors*. Position was found to have a significant, positive effect on access to information and policy actors, with a standardized path of 0.29 (p<.01).
The fifth hypothesis, the greater the level of conflict in the group's environment, the less effective it will be, was also supported by the data. Policy context was found to have a significant, negative impact on overall levels of interest group effectiveness, with a standardized weight of -0.23 (p<.05). This finding also confirms earlier results found in the literature indicating that conflict and opposition in the policy arena have a negative effect on interest groups' perceived success levels in achieving their policy goals through affecting regulations (Evans, 1996; Sloof, 1998).

Likewise, we found support for our sixth hypothesis: higher levels of access to information and policymakers will lead to greater effectiveness. Indeed, access had a significant, positive effect on IGE. The standardized structural path coefficient was 0.50 (p<.001). This, too, is in line with prior research (Hoefer, 2000; Rosenthal, 1993).

Finally, the data also support our final two hypotheses on the indirect effects of strategy and position on effectiveness: access will mediate the effects of strategy (Hypothesis 7) and position (Hypothesis 8) on effectiveness. As speculated, access significantly and positively mediated the effects of strategy (0.45, p<.001) and position (0.14, p<.05) on effectiveness. The indirect effects of both constructs on IGE—mediated through access—are novel findings within the interest group literature.

Discussion and Implications

The use of SEM to re-evaluate the same data analyzed with OLS by Hoefer (2000) has led to some different results, highlighting the importance of continually testing our knowledge base with the best analysis techniques possible. Of our eight hypotheses, six are confirmed, one is found to be non-significant and one is found to be the reverse of what we expected.

Hypothesis 2 (Prepublication strategy leads to greater access), Hypothesis 4 (Liberal position leads to greater access), Hypothesis 5 (Conflict leads to less effectiveness) and Hypothesis 6 (Greater access leads to higher effectiveness) are all confirmed. As these are all well-grounded in the literature, this is welcome news. In some ways, these results seem like "common sense" but they have important implications for social work advocates.
First, related to Hypothesis 5, we must strive to eliminate conflict if we want to achieve our goals. Working within coalitions and moving across old boundaries of conflictual relationships are important tools for our advocacy. At the same time, when other groups are active, pushing proposals that are inimical to client interests, we can see that it pays to be a very squeaky wheel, as conflict can bring a halt to further regulatory action, making the other group less effective.

Another implication is that what social work interest groups choose to do in terms of the strategy they use and the positions they take has a significant impact on whether they can get in the door of policymakers' offices and gain access to the information there (Hypotheses 2 and 4). Thus, in the regulation-writing process, becoming involved before the regulations are published in the Federal Register is vital. Efforts must be made to understand the importance of this part of the policy process, to influence or at least find out to which agency the regulation is being assigned for writing and whom the lead author will be. A relationship should then be created quickly so that the group's ideas are able to be put into the process. Of course, all this advice presupposes that the organization has ideas developed and ready to promote. All of these actions are under the control of the organization's leadership.

In addition, the results clearly show that having access to information and policy actors makes an important difference in how effective a group perceives itself to be. While social work groups clearly do not want to compromise their values, it pays to understand how important the positions taken and the strategy used are for getting results.

Hypothesis 1 (Strategy choice affects effectiveness directly) was not supported by the data. In combination with support for Hypotheses 2 and 7, however, we find that choice of strategy is important, but not directly. While a bit surprising, this result shows the importance of using the best analytical methods available. Previous research did not tease out the important mediating effect of access to information and policy actors. Structural Equation Modeling has shown its usefulness in providing a clearer picture of the relationships between the concepts explored here and in previous research. As noted earlier, access is vital to achieving success within an "inside" or
"pre-publication" strategy. Without access, there is no chance of presenting ideas or having them inserted into policy. The results thus reinforce the idea that access is vital if an inside strategy, such as the pre-publication strategy, is to be effective.

The most surprising finding is that a group's more liberal position directly leads to less, rather than more perceived effectiveness, which was what we predicted in Hypothesis 3. Again, SEM has provided us a valuable insight not seen before in the literature. More liberal positions are associated with working with more agencies, seeing them more frequently and believing these connections are more important; but these liberal positions, in and of themselves, lead to less effectiveness in affecting regulations.

A possible explanation for these apparently contradictory findings is that there is a bit of a gap in the executive branch between the civil servants working on the regulations and the political appointees who make the final decisions. The civil servants who interact with interest group representatives may themselves be more liberal than those above them in the hierarchy who are beholden to the President for their jobs. Because President Clinton was a centrist, trying to balance liberal and conservative views in order to maintain his influence over social policy issues, groups that were "too liberal" may have found themselves coming up short when the overall policy decisions were made by political appointees (not the civil servants with whom the interest groups would have worked).

One example of President Clinton's balancing-act proclivities can be seen in his signing the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA). This law dismantled the entitlement program Aid to Families with Dependent Children and created the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families program, a policy decision which many liberals decried. It should be remembered that President Clinton faced Republican majorities in the House and Senate from 1994 to 2000, which was during most of his two terms in office. This finding and possible explanation indicate how important it is to social workers to have people in the White House and in Congress who have a strong mandate to work on progressive social issues. It makes an important difference for us and our clients who is in office.
Finding that a group's more liberal policy positions are related to its effectiveness only when mediated by access is an important contribution to the literature. Practically speaking, it implies that groups with access may be creating "internal lobbyists," that is, civil servants who can argue for more liberal regulations on a constant basis from within the agency. Providing these civil servants with convincing data and arguments to counteract their politically motivated bosses (of whatever party) may be one of the most important roles that human service advocates can play in trying to influence the executive branch.

Every study has its limitations, however, and these must be acknowledged. First, from a methodological perspective, the use of several skewed variables and a small sample size inhibits our ability to generalize the model to the larger population. The results would also be more generalizable if the response rate were higher. Another methodological limitation is the nature of the data themselves. The variables are all self-reported measures and are open to the biases any self-reported data may have. Finally, changes in the political environment happening since these data were collected may lead to different results. Thus, until further data collection is done, these results should be considered somewhat tentative.

Conclusion

Despite the study limitations, this paper has important implications, both for social work practitioners and for social work researchers. Substantively, it presents information that largely confirms the previous literature and adds additional nuances to other parts. As budget deficits created by tax cuts and foreign wars wreak havoc on social spending at the federal level, leaving millions of program recipients with fewer resources, the study of how interest groups and social workers in general can impact the policy process becomes ever more important. Using limited resources as effectively as possible becomes not just important, but the "right thing to do." Research such as this, using the best data and analytical tools available, should lead current practitioners to perform their
This paper also challenges social work researchers. It illustrates that the choice of analytical technique is important and we should always be willing to test our past understanding by subjecting our data-derived conclusions to further scrutiny using more advanced analytical methods. Understanding what techniques are appropriate and translating results into best practices for practitioners becomes more important as analytical techniques become more complex. As always, the most important message to researchers is to keep skills sharp and models flexible. Moving forward with theory-based research and the most powerful appropriate tools available, we can then have findings that can be translated into evidence-based practice guidelines. This process is vital for all of us affected by the social work profession, whether we are researchers, practitioners, clients or policymakers.
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KAREN MORGAIN

Portland State University
Graduate School of Social Work

Over the past 15-20 years there has been a dramatic increase in transnational social movements including the movement to eradicate violence against women. This paper examines the development of the transnational women's movement and the prioritizing of violence against women (VAW) as a universal women's agenda using the United Nations (U.N.) human rights conferences as a focal point. As one form of VAW, domestic violence (DV) has been placed into the human rights context by many organizations globally. The implications and possible limitations of universalizing a framework for DV are explored using salient examples from various areas of the world. It is suggested that the framing of DV as a human rights violation is relevant to social work in light of social work's role in the critical analysis of framing of social problems and the emergent movement in the United States for social work to become more internationally-focused.
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Linking violence against women (VAW) to human rights is rooted in the movement to recognize "women's rights as human rights" (Bunch, 1990) and to recent United Nations (U.N.) conventions and declarations, including the 1993 Declaration to Eliminate Violence against Women, the 1992 19th General Recommendation made by the Committee to Eliminate...
Discrimination against Women and the 1995 Beijing Declaration (Keck & Sikkink, 1998). This linking of VAW and human rights has influenced the transnational women's movement and women's movements around the world. Funding entities, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and state governments have all taken up the challenge to work towards the elimination of violence against women (Dauer, 2002; Keck & Sikkink, 1998; Merry, 2002).

In recent years domestic violence (DV), as one form of VAW, has been examined using a human rights framework with much of the accompanying dialogue centering on the applicability of international law to DV—primarily focusing on the debate regarding the so-called private nature of DV and how private, individual violence can be addressed through international law (Amnesty International, 2005; Beasley & Thomas, 1994; Coomaraswarmy, 2000; Hawkins & Humes, 2002; Levesque, 1999; Moore, 2003; Roth, 1994; Zorn, 1999).

This paper summarizes the rise of the international women's movement in relation to human rights and violence against women and examines a number of examples from the global DV movement to illustrate how the tendency towards using universal frameworks may be problematic. The examples demonstrate how Northern conceptualizations of DV, which some would argue may be driving the human rights movement (Grewal, 1999; Mertus & Goldberg, 1994), have influenced the framing of DV and interventions in various cultural contexts. The North/South distinction used throughout this paper characterizes the North geographically and symbolically as the site of most of the world's privileged and affluent countries versus the South as the site of countries that are economically, socially and politically marginalized. This geographical distinction is based on the Northern/Southern hemispheres yet also is used symbolically to differentiate between the privileged and marginalized peoples, regardless of geographical location (Dirlik, 1997; Mohanty, 2002). This exploration is relevant to social work given of the role of social workers in framing and intervening in social problems as well as the current focus on the globalization of social work practice (Caragata & Sanchez, 2002; Mohan, 2005).
Violence against Women and Human Rights

The United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women defines violence against women as physical, sexual, and/or psychological violence within the family, the community, and/or any violence that is condoned by the state. Some examples included in the definition are marital rape and spousal abuse, sexual harassment, and trafficking (U.N., 1993, Article 2).

Given that there has been a general consensus through international committees and conventions on the Declaration's definition of VAW, this will be the working definition that will be used throughout the paper. A critical area of concern however, is the degree to which various cultural groups define VAW in a different manner and whose voices may have been left out of the international dialogue regarding VAW. Future research to illuminate these issues should examine the impact that universalizing language and conceptualizations of violence in international human rights has had upon various groups—particularly groups that either may be less represented in the international human rights arena or groups that may have a different construction of human rights.

In 1948 the U.N. General Assembly created the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which, while not binding, set in motion the development of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). Taken together, these covenants provide the basis for what is seen as transnational human rights (U.N., 1978). Both the ICCPR and the ICESCR indicate that the rights should be ascribed equally to men and women. The Convention to Eliminate Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) ultimately holds ratifying states accountable for insuring that women's rights are protected under the ICCPR and the ICESCR. Additionally, this convention provides a framework in which ratifying states are held accountable to change cultural norms that oppress women (Freeman, 1993).

Transnational Social Movements

Transnational social movements (TSM) have dramatically
increased over the last 15-20 years, in part due to the end of the Cold War, increased challenges due to globalization and increased communication technology. As multilateral organizations such as the World Trade Organization and the North American Free Trade Alliance were established to address transnational development, TSM have continued to grow to address the social, economic and environmental changes that multilateral organizations and corporations have wrought. These movements have also grown in conjunction with the increased role of the United Nations (U.N.) in addressing human rights, peace, and environmental issues (Smith, 2004).

One of the primary avenues for growth and exchange of ideas for TSM organizations has been U.N.-sponsored conferences, particularly the numerous conferences held in the 1990s (Ferree & Mueller, 2004; Smith, 2004). These conferences have been seen as avenues for training, resource exchange, and networking, and as targeted arenas for the development of international, national and local political campaigns. In addition to the U.N.-sponsored conferences, additional meetings have occurred in conjunction with the conferences with the strategy of "piggy-backing" on international meetings employed by many TSM organizations (Smith, pp. 322-3).

Keck and Sikkink (1998) state that the transnational women's movement or “international women's networks” (p. 168) were almost completely aligned with the U.N. conferences beginning in Mexico City in 1975 and culminating in Beijing in 1995. The high profile nature of these conferences helped to create legitimacy for the claims and issues that were prioritized by global women's movements. Of note is whether this alignment was truly transnational or simply a consensus among the countries and organizations that were represented at the U.N. conferences, which possibly narrowed the scope of whose voices were included.

One critique of the importance that has been given to the U.N. conferences is that not all social movement organizations are able to attend and/or actively participate primarily due to financial constraints as well as restrictions on NGO participation in the conference activities (Mertus & Goldberg, 1994). These formal limitations from the U.N. events result in less representation from organizations based in poorer regions
Domestic Violence and Human Rights

of the South and in a reframing of issues to more closely resemble issues of importance to the wealthier North (Stienstra, 2000). Tensions among individuals and organizations from the North and the South were apparent despite an increase in Southern representation at select conferences. Participation in the women's caucuses increased from approximately 1,000 individuals at the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo to over 1,300 groups involved in the women's caucus at the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing. Although the caucuses provided a venue for greater participation in the conferences, the leadership of the caucuses was maintained by groups from the North. Participation in caucus activity is often driven by location and economics, as the majority work is done by volunteers and is often centered in New York City (Steinstra, 2000). Increased inclusiveness in the global conferences has been supported by funding from the U.N. and other funding organizations (Smith, 2004). Such actions have promoted increased participation from the South, yet disproportionate representation is an issue that needs to be addressed if the activity of the U.N. and the U.N.-sponsored conferences continue to have a significant influence on transnational social movement activity.

Universalizing Violence against Women

Linking Women's Rights with Human Rights

Although viewing women's rights in a human rights context had been identified through CEDAW, which was adopted in 1979 (Charlesworth, 1994), it appears to have been taken up in earnest in the late 1980s and early 1990s with the work of Charlotte Bunch, director of the Center for Global Issues and Women's Leadership. In "Women's Rights as Human Rights: Toward a Re-Vision of Human Rights," Bunch (1990) states that the Northern concept of human rights limits the rights of women, particularly socioeconomic rights, by placing more importance on rights of free speech and press which are of greater value to men and to individuals in more developed countries. Bunch indicates that issues of socioeconomic rights and violence against women are critical to the well-being of women and that states should be held accountable for the
more "private" abuses directed towards women. Bunch also describes the way in which CEDAW fails to address violence against women in a significant manner.

In 1992, General Recommendation No. 19 was added to CEDAW, which more explicitly addresses the issue of violence against women by stating that gender-based violence is discriminatory (CEDAW, 1992). The recommendation also notes that previous state reports to the committee did not "adequately reflect[ed] the close connection between discrimination against women, gender-based violence, and violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms" (CEDAW, 1992). As a result of this deficit, the committee proposed General Recommendation No. 19 to provide a more specific linking of violence against women and discrimination so that state parties would address the issue of VAW in their reviews and reports to the committee.

Subsequent to this addition was the development of the Declaration on the Elimination of Violence against Women at the 1993 World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna. The declaration was developed through input from three regional non-governmental caucuses and preparatory conferences held in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Asia. The resolution platform identified by the African regional meeting was precedent-setting with regards to the issue of cultural norms and traditions, as the declaration charges governments with the responsibility to universally protect women from violence that is perpetuated by traditional practices and religious extremism (Sullivan, 1994). Although non-binding, the declaration has been viewed as a significant step in the attempt to universalize concern about violence against women.

Transnational Networks: Why Violence against Women?

Why is it that violence against women became the hallmark of the Vienna convention given that there is a multiplicity of structural problems that perpetuate women’s oppression, especially in developing countries? Mertus and Goldberg (1994) describe a growing emphasis from all regions of the world to focus efforts on violence against women, stating:

As this awareness [of the pervasive nature of violence against women] crystallized in the minds of women
throughout the world, a common understanding emerged in the work of women advocating for women's rights protection. Violence against women has been segmented and sequestered out of the public discourse on human rights, just as its occurrence has been kept hidden from public scrutiny (p. 209).

It may have been inevitable that women would unify around the issue of violence against women because all women could agree on and support the issue as a human rights violation. The issue was particularly salient due to the extensive media coverage and public outrage about the rapes of women in the former Yugoslavia at the time of the Vienna convention. Although there was virtually unanimous support for the platform, a group of Arab women lobbied at the convention for literacy to be included, yet this request was ultimately denied for strategic reasons. In the hope of gaining acceptance for the violence against women platform, the Women's Caucus did not want to include additional concerns, fearing that shifting from the agenda of violence against women would compromise their position (Mertus & Goldberg, 1994).

What was left out or silenced, given the singular focus on violence against women, were issues such as literacy, gender segregation, divorce, and citizenship—issues that may have been of more salience to women from developing nations than industrialized ones. For some women who were working on women's and/or human rights in their countries, but could not attend the conferences, these exclusions essentially shut out their voices and concerns from the dialogue and proceedings process (Mertus & Goldberg, 1994). The pressure to maintain a singular focus on violence against women and the exclusion of more structural issues such as poverty and citizenship appeared to be strategic in terms of using violence as a stepping-stone to open up dialogue. This was also an agenda that Northern feminists and Southern activists could agree upon. Given their privileged status and lack of personal experiences with issues such as dire poverty and literacy, Northern feminists may have seen violence as the over-riding issue.

Yumi Lee (1997) provides an insightful critique of the singular focus on violence against women and on Northern representations of violence. She points out that while Section D of the Beijing Document from the Fourth World Conference on
Women states that low socioeconomic status of women can be seen both as a cause and an effect of VAW, the document does not elaborate on issues of economic oppression and state policies that perpetuate women’s oppression through economic, structural, and political means. She indicates that there are four categories of violence—direct, indirect, regressive, and alienating—and yet the Beijing Document fails to address any violence other than sexual and domestic violence. Pointing out that up to 70% of the world’s most extremely poor are women, Lee writes that “while it is simple to frame laws to charge husbands who abuse their wives, it is not as simple to deal with the economic violence of capitalism” (p. 50).

It is important to consider how the focus on direct violence against women serves to obfuscate issues such as economic oppression which allow and perpetuate violence against women. Keck and Sikkink (1998) indicate that certain patterns are clear in the development of a transnational movement which include increased global awareness, a coalescing of this awareness when a “target” emerges—such as the 1993 World Conference and the Beijing Conference, and a “condensation symbol”—such as the rapes in former Yugoslavia (p. 181). In addition, during this emerging movement substantial funding from the Ford Foundation supported NGO formation and growth while creating an asymmetric funding system that favored the United States and Europe. The Center for Women’s Global Leadership, located at Rutgers University, NJ was also a catalyst to the women’s human rights campaign. Explaining the choice of violence against women as a platform, center materials indicated that violence crosses national, class, racial, age, and ethnic lines and this content alliance provided a strategic and cross-cultural platform (Keck & Sikkink).

In their examination of the linkage between human rights and domestic violence in the international arena, Hawkins and Humes (2002) provide a theoretical model that suggests possible reasons for growth during the 1990s. The model examines leaders, followers and nonconformists in the international human rights/domestic violence movement using North and South America as an example of how the interaction of “policy windows” and international socialization of normative behaviors provides the opportunity for social movements to take
hold (p. 241). The grassroots battered women's movement that had managed to stay afloat in unfavorable political climates and the shift in the administration in the early 1990s provided these policy windows and helped the U.S. become a clear leader in the DV movement. With the signing of the Violence against Women Act in 1994, the U.S. set an agenda in terms of responding to domestic violence while, at the same time, international norms regarding violence against women were being developed through the 1993 Vienna Convention.

Starting with the Decade of the Woman through the Fourth World Conference on Women in 1995, VAW has become a hallmark of international efforts and a significant transnational movement to gain international acceptance of women's rights as human rights has taken place. The large-scale and visible conventions and the declarations that were developed helped to legitimize the human rights agenda although the local and global impact of the development of this universalizing framework has yet to be fully explored.

Challenges in Implementing a Universal Framework

The idea that violence against women and domestic violence are violations of women's human rights seems, at face value, to be an accurate and viable framework for international intervention. Yet, it remains unknown if such constructs are being applied to individual communities in ways that are empowering and take into account local and regional history, political structure, and culture. How various cultures construct their ideas about family, marriage, rights, law and violence are some of the factors that must be examined in order to understand the practicality of applying a universal framework to local contexts. Complex issues such as Muslim religious law, Hawaiian constructions of the etiology of domestic violence, the changing political landscape in Russia, and power differentials between the North and South, are examples that illuminate the need to critically analyze the universal application of the human rights framework.
Lisa Hajjar (2004) explores three political frameworks in the Muslim societies—communalization, nationalization and theocratization—through which the interaction of state power, *shari'a* (Islamic law), intrafamily violence, and women's rights struggles can be analyzed. Hajjar successfully analyzes the problematic nature of the universal human rights discourse by revealing the complex and diverse nature of Muslim societies. Over the past 25 years there have been two important historical factors operating, possibly with counter purposes: the Islamic movement, often tied to nationalism with the goal of social order and preservation of religion, culture and a patriarchal familial system, and the international women's rights and human rights movements which is becoming more widespread throughout the Middle East, Africa and Asia. In terms of the domestic violence movement, the issue of gender equality versus social stability is often a contested issue in many Muslim communities. An impasse emerges as women's rights advocates position gender equality as paramount to the elimination of domestic violence and Islamists position hierarchical gender relations as legitimate under *shari'a*, and necessary for social order.

Hajjar (2004), temporarily "bracketing" the issue of the accuracy of the interpretation of *shari'a*, examines the issue of harm versus right in the context of *shari'a* and raises the question of the historical and social contexts in which Islamic law has been interpreted (p. 7). Religious law is communalized in some states in which personal status laws that regulate family relationships are governed by diverse religious groups. In these states religious law is invoked in each individual case concerning family relationships with power vested in the religious leader or institution as opposed to the state. The purpose of providing autonomy to each religious community is to promote stability in a country that is largely religiously pluralistic. In countries where the official religion is Islam and the state uses religious law to inform and guide policies, the dominant interpretation of *shari'a* is often used to challenge state authority. In theocratic countries, *shari'a* is state law. Hajjar sees all three legal systems as oppressive to women and, in some
instances, to men, when citizens’ rights are defined by dominant interpretations of religious texts. Although Hajjar does not necessarily support cultural relativism, especially regarding issues of domestic violence and the safety of women, she does present an important analysis by revealing the complexity of religious law in Muslim countries. In doing so, she suggests the importance of understanding how universal international law sanctioning violence against women has different meanings in different contexts.

Intervention within a Local Context

If the goal of the international women’s movement is to avoid the tendency to be culturally imperialistic, intervening in DV needs to be appropriately understood and contextualized. Merry (2001), in her study of three varied approaches to domestic violence in Hilo, Hawaii, explores the import and export of Northern ideologies and the counter-approach of applying indigenous knowledge. The Alternatives to Violence Program is a feminist-based batterer intervention program that was developed using the Duluth Model, a model of domestic violence intervention developed in Duluth, Minnesota in the late 1970s. The second program grew out of the Pentecostal Christian church movement and the third, ho'oponopono, is an indigenous problem-solving and healing model.

Merry (2001) traces the historical developments of the three intervention models in Hilo, identifying different conceptualizations of the etiology of violence and the intervention into violence which are apparent in all three models. The Christian intervention and the ho'oponopono intervention share some similar foundations in terms of the identification of supernatural powers being solely or partially responsible for violent behaviors. The Duluth Model strongly supports men to be accountable for their use of violence and places violent acts into the context of “power and control,” maintaining that men use violence to maintain dominance over their partners (p. 49). Interestingly, the juxtaposition of these three interventions reveals a local response to domestic violence that places the issue of secular versus religious intervention and beliefs at the forefront of the debate, similar to the secular versus
religious debate which Hajjar examines.

The ho'oponopono intervention also incorporates restorative justice as a response to domestic violence. Restorative justice programs, which often depend on community involvement and hold the perpetrator accountable on a community level, have been developed in both indigenous communities and in the North and have been based on indigenous practices. The more localized approach of restorative justice is not without its own challenges and criticisms. Restorative justice has been viewed by some as a counterpoint to retributive justice, which is based on punishment and as a feminist criminal justice response as opposed to an authoritarian response (Daly, 2002). Given the on-going debate about the effectiveness of traditional criminal justice approaches in alleviating DV, restorative justice might seem to be an ideal response to the problem, yet strong opponents and proponents exist. Proponents of restorative justice suggest that the inclusion of the larger community is a way to continue to break the silence that surrounds DV and to create greater community awareness and involvement in standing up against violence against women (Braithwaite & Daly, 1998; Pranis, 2002). Additionally, restorative justice has often been based on indigenous communitarian approaches such as Maori and Navajo circles (Braithwaite & Daly; Coker, 2002) and has been seen as having potential to adapt more readily to diverse cultures and communities as opposed to retributive justice that has often disproportionately targeted communities of color (Coker, 2002). These communitarian approaches have some common elements in that they provide a community structure for dispute resolution in which members of both the victim’s and the perpetrator’s communities come together to provide support. These circles or conferences work to involve the larger community and to address emotional and symbolic reparation in addition to economic reparation (Braithwaite, 1999). Restorative justice interventions are seen as differing from a strictly retributive justice response to domestic violence, which serves only to punish the offender (Braithwaite & Strang, 2002).

Opponents suggest that some of the primary problems with restorative justice are the potential for reprivatizing DV; the potential lack of victim safety; the on-going nature of DV
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rather than an isolated one-time act; and the possibility that men who batter their partners may be held less accountable in restorative justice and/or may see restorative justice as a less serious response and therefore may not take their violent actions seriously. Additional critiques indicate that involving the community in sentencing could include members of either the offender’s or victim’s support system who will support the offender’s violence and blame the victim, as opposed to holding the offender accountable. There is also the potential to homogenize and romanticize indigenous cultural practices (Busch, 2002; Coker, 2002; Hudson, 2002; Smith, 2005).

Merry’s (2001) research and the ongoing debate about the applicability of restorative justice to DV point out the need to critically engage in continued assessment of the effectiveness of interventions and to avoid the assumption that a program that is effective in one location should be exported to another location. Although adopting a universal framework with which to understand DV does not automatically suggest the adoption of a universal intervention for DV, it is important to remain cautious of this probability as demonstrated by Hemment’s (2004) research in Russia.

Exporting ‘Best Practices’

Hemment (2004) examines the influence of the transnational women’s movement on the development of women’s crisis centers during 19 months of ethnographic fieldwork in Moscow, Tver’ and Pskov. Hemment critiques what she sees as Northern attempts to universalize women’s experiences with domestic violence. Because post-communist Russia, like all nations, has a unique history, it follows that the women in Russia would prioritize needs in a specific manner relevant to their own history and therefore, may approach domestic violence in a manner in line with their own experiences.

Hemment (2004) states that two contributing factors to the development of women’s crisis centers in Russia were the increase of U.S. and European funding to Russia during the early transitional years and the ease with which violence against women provoked outrage and mobilized women on an international front. By the mid 1990s, crisis centers began to follow the established Northern response to domestic and
sexual violence against women, using a “blueprint” supplied by the transnational women’s networks (p. 824).

One women’s advocate in Tver’ envisioned a crisis center as an “anti-crisis center” (p. 826), a place where women could come for support regarding economic or workplace discrimination. Other centers adopted a Northern or “international standard” (p. 828) for their framework yet responded to local needs with broader programs, focusing little on domestic/sexual violence. Over time, Hemment witnessed that pressure to conform more closely to a Northern model came from funding sources and NGO staff and donors. In Tver’ the Northern model “won out” over the “anti-crisis center” (p. 830) and Zhenskii Svet was created as a domestic violence and sexual assault crisis center, backed by transnational women’s movements and funding sources.

Hemment reported that by 2001 uncertainty and lack of conviction were present in conversations with the directors of the crisis centers. Ambivalence regarding services seemed to center around expectations from outside funding sources who appeared to be losing interest in domestic and sexual abuse programs while gaining interest in addressing issues of sex trafficking. Summarizing the influence international funding sources had on the development of social services for women, Oktiabrina, a crisis center founder, said, “We have to be like chameleons to please the foundations. Even if you don’t want to take it [trafficking] on, you have to!” (2004, p. 834).

Can a Human Rights Framework be Colonizing?

Does bringing the issue of domestic violence into a global context vis-à-vis a human rights framework reinscribe Northern hegemonic feminism in ways that are either ineffectual or oppressive and colonizing to women in developing countries? The human rights framework privileges individual rights above collective rights and assumes that there is a universal acceptance of the concept of autonomous rights; yet this is a Northern, not universal construct. Group rights or the rights of a collective body are often marginalized by Northern discourse, which places claims for collective rights into the category of tradition while privileging the autonomous
individual above the collective (Grewal, 1999, p. 341).

Another way in which the human rights discourse and the inherent privileging of the U.N. conventions and treaties could be problematic is the tendency of advocates in the North to place themselves in a role of rescuer for those in the South who are victims of human rights violations. From this position the U.S. and other Northern countries marginalize the practices and people of developing countries as 'backwards' and in need of guidance. For example, in the United States VAW has often been framed as a public health issue rather than a human rights issue while VAW in developing countries has been framed as a human rights abuse (Grewal, 1999).

Even if framed as a human rights abuse, universalizing domestic violence as a global agenda for all women is not without problems. Grewal (1999) astutely points out the danger of de-contextualizing domestic violence, both in how 'domestic' and 'violence' are defined and understood as well as how the issue is best approached. She also identifies the importance of the critique of the US domestic violence movement by women of color who have challenged the movement for its lack of a comprehensive and culturally-sensitive approach to domestic violence (see Crenshaw, 1994; Incite, 2005). The almost exclusive focus on a "crime control discourse" (Ferraro, 1996) also needs to be taken into account when examining the framing of and subsequent intervention into DV. If the United States domestic violence agencies and organizations are engaged in a struggle to equally support white women, women of color, immigrant, and refugee women, they should be willing to examine how they position themselves with regards to how other countries address domestic violence, allowing a two-way dialogue to emerge rather than a one-way delivery of ideas and intervention strategies.

Social Work Implications

Elisabeth Reichert (2003) believes that within the U.S., social workers have not embraced the human rights framework in the same manner as social workers in other countries. Basing her analysis on the U.S. based National Association of Social Workers (NASW) 1996 Code of Ethics; Reichert indicates that
although the code echoes many of the same ideals as human rights documents, it does not specifically mention human rights. She posits three factors at play in the reluctance of U.S. social workers to engage more actively in the human rights dialogue: a social justice rather than human rights perspective, a tendency to equate human rights solely with political rights, and a local worldview rather than a more international perspective in policy and practice (pp. 7-8).

If social workers in the US are already supporting human rights in their work—whether explicitly or implicitly—what role do they have in the critical examination of DV as a human rights violation? Social workers play a significant role in the framing of social problems and in developing interventions to address the social problems they help to define. If placing DV into a human rights context has indeed become part of the dominant discourse about DV, it is important that social workers engage in critical thinking about the implications of this framing to help illuminate the benefits and challenges of this framework. For example, in the US, framing DV as primarily a criminal justice issue has had a damaging impact on some DV survivors—particularly marginalized groups such as women of color, immigrant women, and their children (Ferraro, 1996; Incite, 2005). Identifying the limitations of certain frameworks has implications for defining social problems and their interventions. While placing DV in a human rights context may appear on the surface to be beneficial, recognizing that some cultural groups may be disproportionately targeted by the use of the human rights framework and that the framing may create an over-reliance on legal interventions is an important element in critically examining the discourse.

As U.S. social workers are being encouraged to increase their engagement on a global level, it becomes even more critical that the profession gain a greater understanding of international issues. Caragata and Sanchez (2002) point out the importance of internationalizing social work curricula and support an expanded focus on global issues in North American schools of social work. Social problems such as world hunger, environmental changes, and development must be understood by social workers so that they can move beyond a local vision of social problems and develop a more global context for issues
that transcend borders. Avoiding the uncritical practice of exporting Northern knowledge into developing countries and promoting increased understanding of global social problems can support social workers to engage in reciprocal learning with persons from other countries—this approach allows for collaboration and an increased understanding of local and universal issues.

Further Questions

A human rights approach to DV appears to have gained legitimacy and salience over the past 15 years, yet the question remains, how has this reframing influenced the field of domestic violence prevention, intervention, and advocacy, and what has been gained and lost by using this new framework? Has the North driven this linkage of DV with human rights and, if so, how can the non-included voices be heard? Has the dramatic rise in transnational organizations related to VAW and DV been helpful for developing nations to create their own social change agendas or has the North unduly influenced the course of these agendas? How have developing nations resisted or accepted the influence of the North with respect to the framing of the problem of domestic violence and the development of policies and programs aimed to reduce and eventually eliminate DV?

Currently, I am examining whether the national DV movement in the United States has adopted the human rights framework. I believe that gaining an understanding of the position of the US will help to identify whether this movement is inclusive or whether it is being utilized by the North to redefine DV in the South yet is not being used within our own borders. I will pay specific attention to the use of this discourse within marginalized communities and thus, will employ the symbolic differentiation of North and South as opposed to the geographical differentiation (Dirlik, 1997). This study may provide a context from which the broader international questions could be examined in the future.
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African American women were instrumental in developing social welfare services for African American girls as a means to uplift the race, and more specifically, as a means to protect “true Black womanhood”. Through the National Association of Colored Women (NACW), these women united to formalize social welfare services to meet the needs of the community. They established orphanages, old age homes, kindergartens, homes for working girls, homes for wayward girls, as well as other programs (DuBois, 1898; Hodges, 2001; Lerner, 1974; Salem, 1994). These clubwomen provided services (e.g. literary clubs, mother’s clubs, religious studies) to the African American community through women’s and girl’s clubs. They
also provided activities for boys (e.g. literary clubs, supervised sports activities) as a means of protecting young girls (Carlton-LaNey, 1999).

African American clubwomen were keenly aware of the negative perceptions that whites had of them. They were indefatigable in their efforts to improve the image of the race through the social uplift of its weakest elements, particularly delinquent African American girls. This quest for uplift motivated them to provide educational services, multilayered social welfare services, and refinement activities designed to teach social graces to those of the lower classes ("Charlotte Eugenia Hawkins Brown Papers, 1883-1961,"; Gilmore, 1994; Hodges, 2001; Hunter, 1983).

During the early 20th century, North Carolina's African American clubwomen gained support from the African American community and from progressive whites as they sought to meet the increasing needs of delinquent African American girls. Despite the semblance of aid, these women also battled elements that worked against their efforts. According to Carlton-LaNey (1994), this was a common occurrence. In examining Birdye Haynes' pioneering settlement house work, Carlton-LaNey found that Haynes was required to be diplomatic, tactful, and reticent as she interacted with the professionals, educators, advisory boards, and clients who were all key players in demanding success, yet they expected failure. At the same time, as a middle-class professional, she was expected "to inspire and share training and experiences" (p. 269).

Social welfare work among African American women required a skillful balancing act between interracial cooperation and commitment to the community.

African American women have historically been accustomed to concerted efforts to weaken their child-saving efforts, particularly as they touch upon the sometimes conflicting agendas of gender and race (Lerner, 1972). Whites were not willing to openly address race issues due to the social and political customs of the era. Likewise, men were not willing to openly address gender issues. African American women, however, were concerned with issues of race and gender. Yet, loyalty to both race and gender issues threatened notions of white privilege and male privilege (Beale, 1970; Cooper, 1892;
Leslie, 1977). While there were those who acknowledged the disparate situation of delinquent African American girls, the level of aid was dependent upon their willingness to relinquish some aspect of their own privilege. As a result, there was a 'comfortable level' of backing manifested through positive action towards these delinquent girls. However, beyond that comfort zone, a seemingly contradictory level of assistance was manifested.

This article seeks to examine these undermining efforts as they relate to the inmates at Efland Home for Girls. Further, this article will provide evidence of efforts to thwart progress in the African American and white communities as they relate to the provision of comprehensive services to delinquent African American girls in North Carolina. Finally, this article will explore this phenomenon regarding legislative, economic, and public health efforts, as well as general attitudes towards delinquency among African American girls, and the efforts of African American clubwomen to meet the needs of this population.

**Efland Home for Girls**

The North Carolina Federation of Negro Women (NCFNW) founded the North Carolina Industrial Home for Colored Girls, also known as the Efland Home for Girls, in 1921. These clubwomen were motivated by the state of North Carolina's gross neglect of delinquent African American girls. They were also motivated by the desire to save African American womanhood. One clubwoman wrote, "As mothers and sisters, we want to save the young colored girls who are going astray" (Brown, 1920). Efland Home served as that facility by which to save the delinquent African American girl.

Efland Home was a frame cottage with nine rooms and a fully equipped kitchen, located on 147 acres of land, in Efland, Orange County, North Carolina. This facility housed approximately 22 residents, ages six to sixteen years of age. The facility was governed by a Board of Trustees made up of seven to thirteen influential, predominantly African American, clubwomen representing various regions of the state. Efland Home was staffed by a superintendent, a matron, up to two
teachers, and a farm supervisor. The board required that the superintendent be a trained social worker, which was a significant request because there were only thirteen professionally trained African American social workers in the state during this time (Crow, Escott, & Hatley, 1992).

There was a straightforward referral process. Candidates deemed 'problems in their communities', particularly those described as having 'immoral characteristics' were referred to the home by a number of sources, including the North Carolina Board of Charities and Public Welfare (the state child welfare agency), county juvenile court systems, Efland’s Board of Trustees, and community members. The referral source submitted a written application to the board. If the applicant was deemed suitable by the board, the child welfare agency petitioned the county juvenile courts for commitment orders to Efland Home. The applicant was then admitted to Efland Home as a parolee of the juvenile court system. Residents of Efland Home were referred to as inmates (North Carolina Board of Public Welfare-Institutions and Corrections, 1920-1939).

The plight of delinquent African American girls

Efland Home was a necessary facility in the state. Between 1919 and 1939, North Carolina’s juvenile courts handled approximately 192 cases annually involving African American girls. Efland Home was the only facility for delinquent African American girls in the state of North Carolina. It was privately run and funded, receiving a meager stipend from the state. Although at the inception of the home the state adequately funded facilities for delinquent boys of both races, and for white girls, it did not fund a facility for African American girls until 1943. Efland Home provided a second chance for African American girls to lead a productive and meaningful life.

From the initial conception of providing a formal system of care for delinquent African American girls, these clubwomen received contributions from the African American community and from whites. This aid included assistance with legislative efforts, economic provisions, and guidance with addressing public health needs. Contributors seemed to be cognizant of the predicament of African American girls, and to appreciate
the reform efforts of African American clubwomen.

Although there was approval from the African American community and progressive whites towards the perilous condition of delinquent African American girls, there is evidence of efforts to destabilize progress from that same group of supporters. There were activities designed to damage legislative efforts, economic backing, and public health strategies. These undermining efforts spoke volumes of the prevailing negative attitudes towards delinquent African American girls and the clubwomen who provided services to them.

During the early 20th century, North Carolina’s juvenile justice system addressed the needs of delinquent white girls and boys of both races. By 1923, there were two training schools for white boys, one training school for African American boys, and one training school for white girls. There was no hint of intention to establish a facility for African American girls, although the court system was inundated with cases involving this population (North Carolina Board of Public Welfare-Institutions and Corrections, 1920-1939). These young girls were systematically remanded to adult penitentiaries or returned to their community without rehabilitative treatment. The state did not respond to the needs of this population until 1943.

Supportive Legislative Efforts

Beginning in 1928, Efland Home founders attempted to lobby the state legislature for financial aid. These clubwomen were prepared to make the following contract with the state:

The North Carolina Federation of Colored Women’s Clubs agrees to give the State of North Carolina title to the property located at Efland, North Carolina, on condition that the State assume responsibility for the payment of a first mortgage...and further, that the State provide adequate funds for the operation of the Home as a training school for delinquent Negro girls (Efland Home Board of Trustees, 1938).

The North Carolina Charities and Public Welfare commissioner, Mrs. W. T. Bost, and board, African American business leaders, and the African American community backed this
contract. Several state and local newspapers, such as the Charlotte Observer, the Winston-Salem Journal, the News and Observer (Raleigh), and the Carolina Times (Chapel Hill), included editorials that brought attention to the issue of a state funded facility for delinquent African American girls.

As proponents strategized, they realized the need to have the support of the "right people" in the state. There was a collaborative effort between prominent members of the African American community and progressive whites in the quest to gain state funding for comprehensive service delivery to delinquent African American girls. In a letter to Charles C. Spaulding, president of North Carolina Mutual Insurance which was the nation’s largest African American owned insurance company, William Johnson, a consultant on Negro work to North Carolina’s Charities and Public Welfare, and supporter of this cause wrote:

...realizing that the establishment and maintenance of a home for delinquent Negro girls to be a state responsibility, we feel that if the interest and support of the right people is aroused, the 1939 General Assembly can probably be persuaded to take favorable action toward the establishment of such an institution (Johnson, 1938).

Spaulding and his business partners had already provided help for the home primarily through the underwriting of loans for operations and maintenance. They were consequently active in the lobbying efforts of the home.

While the Department of Charities and Public Welfare sought collaborative support in these legislative efforts, African American clubwomen likewise sought help from across the state. Minnie Pearson, president of Efland Home’s Board of Trustees and member of the Negro Advisory Committee to the Board of Charities and Public Welfare, informed William Curtis Ezell, the Director of Corrections and Public Institutions, of the following collaborative efforts: "...I have contacted Mr. C. C. Spaulding, Dr. J. E. Shepard, and other influential men of the state, who pledge their interest and support" (M. Pearson, 1939a). She provided updates regarding the aid of these legislative efforts when she wrote:
Your inspiring information came this morning and it makes us feel that we are getting somewhere. I have written dozens of letters to influential men, clubwomen and organized groups, soliciting them to contact their representatives to support the bill. Representative William T. Hatch replied very encouragingly to letters sent him from Mr. C. C. Spaulding and Prof. J. A. Cotton. Many thanks for your untiring efforts and advisement in behalf of Negro delinquent girls (M. Pearson, 1939b).

This letter not only demonstrated the web of support by various organizations and individuals, but it also showed the influence that these supporters had on individual members of the state legislature.

Many local African American organizations, civic groups, and clubs, such as the Negro Civic Club of Wilson, the Warren County Sunday School Convention, and the Rocky Mount Civic Forum responded to this call for action. In addition, Dr. Ferdinand D. Bluford, president of the Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, a historically Black college in Greensboro, responded to this call to lobby the state legislature for assistance with the efforts at Efland Home. In a letter to William Johnson, Bluford vows to “get in touch with members of the General Assembly of Guilford County, and urge them to support the matter when it comes before the House” (Bluford, 1939).

Many prominent white organizations responded to this call for action as well, including the North Carolina Conference for Social Services, headed by Dr. John B. Bradway, a professor at Duke University; the North Carolina Legislative Council, headed by Mrs. J. Henry Highsmith, a prominent clubwoman; and the Juvenile Protection North Carolina Congress of Parents and Teachers, headed by Mamie Dowd Walker, a Durham County juvenile court judge. (North Carolina Board of Public Welfare-Institutions and Corrections, 1920-1939).

Evidence of undermining legislative efforts

Although the African American community provided the majority of assistance in the efforts at the home, there were
 factions of the community that waffled, giving one opinion to one audience and another opinion to another. Prominent African American business leaders seemed lukewarm towards the initial efforts of establishing a facility for delinquent African American girls. In a 1919 letter, Dr. Charlotte Hawkins Brown wrote of initial efforts of establishing a facility for African American children and the level of support from prominent African American men. Brown wrote, in part, that:

Eight years ago we started this same movement. Our men halted us and said they were going to take it in hand and asked the women to follow. We have waited during these years and have been thoroughly disgusted with the factions among our men in North Carolina. Their absolute inability to set aside personal differences and come together for the good of our youth (Brown, 1919).

Brown’s words indicated the frustration the African American clubwomen experienced as they sought African American men’s endorsement and cooperation.

These same men expressed support for legislative efforts throughout the tenure of the home and thereafter. However, when it was time to provide meaningful support, there was a lukewarm response. Although there is evidence that prominent African American men wrote letters to state legislators backing these efforts, when asked to appear before a legislative committee to express this endorsement, one of the most prominent men wrote the following letter:

...I regret that a previous engagement in Durham will prevent my attending the public hearing at 9:30 tomorrow morning in Raleigh on the bill to establish an institution for delinquent Negro girls....I sincerely hope a spirit of fairness will prevail among the members of the Committee in order to convince them of the absolute necessity of establishing such an institution... (Spaulding, 1939).

Spaulding goes on to intimate that he has little faith that the political process will be fair towards the dilemma of these
African American girls. Despite his level of power within the African American community, he seems to be paralyzed by the inequality characteristic of the caste system of segregation. Spaulding's letter was written in response to an urgent letter sent on March 8, 1939 by Ezell, regarding the probability that "the bill may not get a favorable report unless a favorable attitude on the part of the membership of the committee is enlisted at the time of the hearing" (Ezell, 1939a). Ezell further states the following: "...For that reason we feel that those who are concerned over the need for the establishment of the school should arrange to be present, thus indicating their interest".

Progressive-thinking whites also engaged in activities to damage efforts regarding the problem of delinquent African American girls. As part of the quest for legislated state support of a facility, an interracial commission was established to explore options for such a facility. These options included using the existing Efland Home property, finding suitable property elsewhere, or converting the facility for African American boys into a co-gendered facility. Interestingly, the use of the existing Efland Home property was never considered an option by anyone other than members of the NCFNW. There were many instances where white observers noted the poor quality of the facilities. In a letter to Judge William York, a Greensboro juvenile court judge, Mrs. W.T. Bost, wrote:

...we [the Efland Home Board of Trustees and the State Board of Charities and Public Welfare] both realized that it was a sub-standard institution and that perhaps it might be standing in the way of the development of a really constructive program for delinquent Negro girls (W. T. Bost, 1939).

This sentiment suggested that this facility was not salvageable. Due to the political climate of the era, whites were not comfortable devoting money to the maintenance of the home, but were comfortable criticizing it. There were no plans to develop a "constructive program" for this population.

There was difficulty in finding suitable property elsewhere to be used as a facility for delinquent African American girls. Whites who expressed concern for this population were
often not willing to provide definite backing. For instance, Edwin C. Gillette, vice chairman of Home Missions of the Congregational and Christian Churches wrote the following when asked to consider the use of the Christian College property in Franklinton for this purpose. After stating that he may not be the right person to speak to because he is “only the Vice-Chairman” of the Board, Gillette made the following contradictory statement:

I feel confident, however, that those who are interested in the program that is planned for the use of the property at Franklinton would not feel that they could lease it for the work which you are interested in. That is a great work and would seem in some respects to be a more adequate use of the property. However, on the other hand, there are interests that would have to be considered and I feel quite sure that it would not be voted by the Board....Let me say that I feel that the work for delinquent Negro girls must be a most important one and deserving of very special consideration (Gillette, 1938).

This attitude was typical of whites who were seemingly sympathetic toward the predicament of these young girls, but were unwilling to provide the concrete assistance necessary to meet those needs. This lack of material assistance may have influenced the state legislature’s reluctance to provide aid to such a facility. Despite the letter writing and telegram campaigns of support, concrete efforts were not realized, thus providing legislators the justification of further neglecting this population.

Supportive economic efforts

The privatized efforts at Efland Home for Girls were defended by the African American community and by progressive whites. African Americans provided support through Sunday schools, club and civic groups, as well as through individual philanthropy (North Carolina Board of Public Welfare-Institutions and Corrections, 1920-1939). These philanthropic efforts are largely characterized as “nickel and dime” campaigns (Martin and Martin, 1985). Because African Americans in early 20th century North Carolina were generally
impoverished, they did not have the financial reserves to make large donations to worthy causes. Characteristic of many efforts in the African American community, they contributed sums as meager as nickels and dimes. It is these small efforts that significantly contributed to the operations of Efland Home. These financial donations were often supplemented by in-kind donations, such as the donation of farm animals, dishes and utensils, maintenance services, and clothes for the inmates (W.G. Pearson, 1926, 1927; W. G. Pearson, 1928).

The white community, likewise, provided financial support, particularly through the efforts of white clubwomen. The North Carolina Federation of Women, the white counterpart to the NCFNW, provided ongoing financial support to the efforts at Efland Home (W.G. Pearson, 1926, 1927; W. G. Pearson, 1928). Whites were often lobbied by members of the African American community for in-kind donations to the home. However, due to the social customs of the era, the granting of these requests only occurred after verification from state officials, as is demonstrated in the following letter from a social worker at Duke University to the Lily N. Mitchell, director of Public Welfare:

One of our colored orderlies has asked me to help him get some clothes and other things for the children in the Efland Home run by "Mr." and "Mrs." Pearson. Do you know about this place and if they are worthy? If so, I think I can assist him in the work as he is very much interested and wants to do something for the children. He says there are eleven there, ages five to thirteen (Hobgood, 1934).

This letter exemplified the diverse endorsement from the African American community for the maintenance of the home. It also exemplifies the level of support sometimes provided by whites.

Evidence of undermining economic efforts

Efland Home was never adequately funded by the state, nor by its supporters. The attitudes of community leaders in both the African American and white communities clearly
influenced the level of support that community members provided. In addition, the harshness of the Great Depression left few resources to go around. And, in the ultra-conservative South, the idea of sharing these meager resources with African Americans was not considered favorably.

Whatever the reason for this lack of adequate funding, a declaration of support was touted along with a noncomittal message—leaving one to wonder if there existed any groups beyond the NCFNW who generally cared about these girls’ welfare. Individual faculty members of the University of North Carolina’s School of Public Welfare and Social Work were seemingly interested in the cause of delinquent African American girls, evidenced by the school sponsored field trips for its social work students to Efland Home, although the frequency of these trips is not clear in the historical records. On one particular visit, they found less than ideal circumstances at the home. After the visit, George Lawrence, the director of field education at the School of Public Welfare and Social Work, wrote an apparently unsolicited letter to Ezell suggesting that the program be abolished and the inmates be “confined to the county jail”. Lawrence wrote:

I have been aware for the past few years of the extreme lack of equipment and facilities of this little institution, and I have long thought that it should be greatly strengthened or abolished. Yesterday’s trip, however, was a rather shocking revelation of the total absence of just about everything essential toward the conduct of an institution for delinquent [N]egro girls. I would just about as soon have a [N]egro girl to be confined to the county jail as committed to the school at Efland.... My own feeling is that the place is worse than useless because it is entirely an ineffectual attempt for care at [illegible] institution. It might be possible to get further with the program by not having an institution at all than by perpetuating such a farce as I believe this place to be....I feel that the present conditions at Efland are a disgrace to all of us interested in the Public Welfare Program (Lawrence, 1938).

Lawrence goes on to say that Dr. Wiley B. Sanders, the dean
of the School of Public Welfare and Social Work, "subscribes to my general feelings". Whether Sanders actually agreed with Lawrence is not known, however, there is evidence that Sanders did not avidly support other African American causes in the State.

Dr. Sanders had significant influence in the state of North Carolina, as well as in the social work profession. At a time when African Americans were denied entry to the School of Public Welfare and Social Work, Sanders successfully thwarted the efforts of Dr. James E. Shepard, president of North Carolina College for Negroes, a historically Black college in Durham, to establish a professional school of social work at his institution. While providing a semblance of support to Shepard in petitioning the American Association for Schools of Social Work for accreditation, Sanders simultaneously urged the accrediting body not to support Dr. Shepard's quest to establish a social work program (Armfield, 1998). This undermining activity suggests that Sanders, and the School of Public Welfare and Social Work, reflected the state of North Carolina's racist social politics.

In addition, Lawrence's letter provides yet another example of supporters' willingness to criticize Efland Home, without acknowledgement of the impact of inadequate funding on the physical plant of the facility. Lawrence also reaffirms the sentiment that these delinquent girls are better deserving of the "county jail" than rehabilitation in a treatment facility. In 1939, Efland Home closed due to a lack of adequate funding to meet the needs of this population.

Supportive public health efforts

During the early 20th century, female delinquency was often equated with sexual delinquency. Young girls were adjudicated delinquent based on behaviors that were deemed crimes of morality, such as "vagrancy, beggary, stubbornness, deceitfulness, idle and vicious behavior, wanton and lewd conduct, and running away" (Brenzel, 1975). Wanton and lewd conduct is characterized as sexual behaviors outside of the institution of marriage.

Many of the young inmates at the Efland Home for Girls were sexually delinquent and consequently were infected with
sexually transmitted diseases, the most prominent of which was syphilis (Brice, 2005). In 1936, Hilda C. Allen, superintendent of Efland Home wrote Ezell saying:

I am writing you in the interest of the health of our girls. In that I have had Wasserman Blood tests taken of all the girls here. I find it necessary to take vaginal smears in two cases, which are positive Wassermans” (Allen, 1936).

There were public health concerns as to how to treat these inmates at the home without placing the other inmates and staff at risk for contracting the disease. There was a great deal of misunderstanding regarding the transmission of the disease, thus the focus on the treatment of the disease was in the context of the casual transmission to others. For example, the matron and staff were concerned with sharing restroom facilities with a syphilitic inmate for fear of spreading the disease.

There was a great deal of support for the treatment of this disease from the medical community. Lincoln Hospital, the segregated Durham medical facility that treated African Americans, offered reduced and pro bono services to the inmates at the home. The medical staff at the hospital provided pro bono diagnostic services as part of the intake screening process to inmates remanded to the home.

The white medical community offered limited support to the inmates at Efland Home. A local white physician, Dr. G. D. Tyson, of Mebane, would often provide home-based medical services to the girls at Efland Home for a fee of $2.50 per visit (W.G. Pearson, 1927).

On the other hand, the African American community provided a great deal of support to public health efforts at Efland Home. As was typical of African American communities, these public health efforts were carried out by midwives, teachers, home demonstration efforts of the National Public Health Service, sorority and clubwomen, nurses, dentists, and physicians (Smith, 1995). These individuals and groups provided support to the home through education, consultation and volunteerism.
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Syphilis was a major public health issue for the supporters of Efland Home. Many of the inmates were infected with this then-incurable disease. There were efforts to provide care to these young girls; however, there is also evidence that people harbored feelings of disgust towards the inmates. Supporters were seemingly influenced by the sentiment that the girls were the culprits and not really deserving of care and concern.

The eugenics movement gained significant momentum during this era. Eugenics, also known as "race hygiene" (Mehler, 1988), is the science of human improvements through programs of controlled breeding (Selden, 1999). Physicians influenced by this movement believed that the African American race, as well as other "undesirables", would eventually become extinct if disease and other factors were allowed to run their course without intervention (Kline, 2001; Mehler, 1988; Selden, 1999). This coupled with strict racial segregation, limited the number of physicians who were motivated to treat syphilitic African American girls. Consequently, the inmates at Efland Home made an 80 mile round trip to get medical treatment at Durham's Lincoln Hospital.

Classism also influenced a two-sided response towards public health efforts. Syphilis, for example, was viewed as a disease of the lower classes. In fact, one African American physician stated, "...there are absolutely no records of any real value regarding the prevalence of syphilis among the Negro teachers, professional men, business men, or students" (Hazen, 1937). This sentiment influenced the mode of treatment for these young girls. The middle class African American clubwomen who provided the material support to Efland Home held great disdain for syphilitic inmates, so much so that they eventually decided not to accept delinquent girls for admission if they were infected.

General attitudes towards the plight of delinquent African American girls

There was a great deal of provision for delinquent African American girls; however, there was a great deal of undermining activities that influenced the level of help provided. The concept of parallel societies is evident. Due to social policies,
there was an African American society and a white society. Very rarely did the two societies meet on equal grounds. Both groups were distrustful of each other. This distrust is evident when exploring undermining attitudes towards delinquent African American girls.

This concept of parallel societies opposed and undercut activities. For instance, Ezell, who appeared to be one of the staunchest defenders of the work at Efland Home for delinquent African American girls, wrote of the history of Efland Home, in a less than flattering manner, in a letter to Dr. Sanders, regarding a social work student wanting to research early records of the home as part of her Master’s thesis. He suggested the following as factors for the demise of Efland Home:

...Throughout the whole period since the beginning of the efforts to establish the school, there have been internal bickerings and jealousies within the Negro group. In an earlier letter, which is in our files, one of the Negro Federation Officials wrote that one handicap to the development of the school was the inability of the Negro men to agree among themselves. During a recent hearing before the Appropriations Committee, there developed very definitely a dissention in the group which was in Raleigh as to who would represent them (Ezell, 1939b).

While there was lukewarm response by African American businessmen and community leaders regarding the condition of this population, there is little evidence to suggest that this is an accurate depiction of the demise of Efland Home. African American clubwomen established this home despite the lukewarm response by these men. In fact, several of the members of the Efland Home Board of Trustees were the wives of prominent African American business leaders. These women were able to glean economic aid despite the weaker conceptual support from their spouses. Anna Julia Cooper wrote of the quality of aid provided by African American men of their pioneering spouses, “While our men seem thoroughly abreast of the time on almost every subject, when they strike the woman question they drop back into sixteenth-century logic” (Cooper, 1892). African American clubwomen had to contend with
barriers of gender and race. Nonetheless, they were able to negotiate necessary resources to serve the needs of delinquent African American girls.

Ezell made further questionable statements about the lack of adequate financial provision from the state throughout the tenure of Efland Home. He wrote:

"...Another letter in our files written by the superintendent at the school complains that the disagreement among the board members is a severe handicap. Even when the members from the Budget Commission visited the school, board members so disagreed on what the school needed that the Budget Commission was unable to find any clear idea as to needs for appropriation (Ezell, 1939b)."

Ezell's observations fly in the face of the reality that the historical records reveal. The NCFNW and the Efland Home Board of Trustees kept meticulous records of their activities. There is no evidence of such disagreement that would be significant enough that state officials would be puzzled about the budgetary needs of the home. In fact, there is evidence that the Board of Trustees was consistently very clear as to the financial needs of the home. The home's records are replete with financial statements that detailed the financial needs of the home. In addition, the financial records were maintained by Dr. William G. Pearson, a Business Education professor at the North Carolina College of Negroes. Dr. Pearson was a successful businessman, having co-founded the North Carolina Mutual Life Insurance Company; the Mechanics and Farmers Bank, an African American financial institution in Durham; the Durham Drug Company; as well as other businesses in the Durham area. These records, prepared by Dr. Pearson, were used to lobby state legislators and philanthropists (W. G. Pearson, 1926, 1927; W. G. Pearson, 1928; W. G. Pearson, 1929, 1931).

Ezell made further disparaging statements about the conditions of Efland Home. He stated that there were very few records of the school (Efland Home) and "There seems to be no fairly well organized material on the history and background but considerable correspondence regarding the early
she had no record of the school or its early development but she does have some early correspondence with the Governor, one letter from him stated that the appropriation was in response to her considerable interest in such an enterprise.

Ezell portrayed Bickett as one who was only tangentially committed to Efland Home. This, however, is totally inaccurate. Mrs. Bickett was closely aligned with Efland Home and its early success. As the governor’s wife she used her influence to garner state funds for the home. While the annual appropriation of $2000 was indeed meager, it is likely that the home would not have received any funds but for Bickett’s influence.

In this same letter, Ezell minimized the role of the African American clubwomen who founded, established, and continually supported the home. He suggested only the names of white women for corroborating information. In fact, he stated, “…that the Federation of Women’s Clubs (White) had taken considerable interest in the enterprise and very possibly had in their records some of the early history of the school”. He further listed the names of five white women whom he suggested “…would probably be able to help interpret some of the influences active in its incipiency, growth, and death”.

Was Ezell an advocate or critic of Efland Home? Whatever the case, he was certainly guilty of engaging in activities that sabotaged the progress towards addressing the needs of delinquent African American girls. He obviously looked upon white efforts with much more favor than he did the work of African American clubwomen. He seemed unable to reconcile the fact that African American women established this enterprise while white women’s roles were peripheral. Ezell avidly stated his support for Efland Home, yet his letter to the dean of the School of Public Welfare and Social Work, is bereft with negative, disparaging and almost slanderous commentary. Ezell ends this letter with an admonishment to Sanders in regards to this social work student. He suggested that this student “make her study in such a way as to bring in these
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rather subtle influences...it would, I believe, give us some light on why the school has had such poor support” (Ezell, 1939b). This letter provides some light as to the influence of social mores of the time on meeting the needs of delinquent African American girls. Despite there being a mutual interest in this population, the manifestation of that interest differed based on the audience.

A climate of distrust was evident between African American and white professionals. For instance, Ezell solicited input from Paul Boyd, the director of Morrison Training School for Negro Boys, when exploring options for a facility for delinquent African American girls. One option was to convert Morrison into a co-gender facility, so as to accommodate delinquent African American girls. There had been significant research on co-gendered facilities, which indicated that this was a feasible option in the treatment of delinquency. Boyd was open to this option. However, when he asked to see research findings as it relates to the specific effects of this arrangement on girls, the following was written:

I showed Mr. Boyd the correspondence that I had from other states in regard to such a plan. He asked to have copies of such letters made for him because some of them gave him some ideas about operating his own school. I told him I would ask you [Bost, director of Public Welfare] if he might have copies. I told Mr. Boyd that to the present time the State Board had not taken any stand as to how such a school should be provided but were insistent that facilities should be made available (Ezell, 1938).

There seemed to be resistance in sharing information with Boyd, while at the same time insisting that he make his facilities available to the state.

Finally, there was an attitude suggesting that the proposed facilities for delinquent African American girls should at best be comparable to the facilities at Morrison Training School for Negro Boys (W.T. Bost, 1938). This is typical of the unspoken rule of the southern whites, described by Billingsley and Giovonnioni (1972): “...in relation to the provision of children’s services: no [W]hite child shall be any worse off than any Black child; no Black child shall be any better off than any [W]hite
Female delinquency is a phenomenon with no regard to race, however, the social customs and policies of this era dictated that delinquency be addressed in regards to race, not gender. This is evidenced by the notion that these young girls be placed in a racially segregated facility with African American boys, as opposed to a gender-specific facility with white girls.

Conclusion

African American clubwomen made great efforts to address the needs of delinquent African American girls in early 20th century North Carolina and beyond. However, they were faced with challenges from individuals who advocated for the facility on one hand, but subtly or blatantly tried to dissuade public opinion on the other. These clubwomen had allies among African American men, progressive whites, and the public welfare officials, however, these same allies often engaged in tactics to weaken the indefatigable efforts of these women. Consequently, delinquent African American girls suffered in the process. They were faced with a facility that provided inadequate services due to a lack of adequate funding. They were faced with the eventual closing of that facility, thus affecting their opportunity for a second chance at womanhood. The state of North Carolina eventually provided financial sponsorship for a facility to address the needs of this population. The North Carolina State Training School for Negro Girls was opened in 1943. Despite the multiple challenges of gaining state assistance, withstanding the damaging and undermining activities, the efforts of these African American clubwomen were not in vain.
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2006 marked the tenth anniversary of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. The 1996 law was the culmination of decades of erosion in backing for basic provisions of the U.S. social safety net. The following reviews the political campaign that undermined the foundation for this vital component of the New Deal/Great Society income supports. A series of panics diminished approval for the welfare state, leading to the 1996 "reform." Panic discourse increasingly accompanies policy debate. Examples of anti welfare, anti outsider panic discourses are explored.
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February 25th, 2004, President Bush proclaimed gay marriage was a threat to "the most fundamental institution of civilization," (Sandalow, 2004). With this declaration, public concern over war and budget deficits receded as a sex panic over gay marriage and abortion shifted the terms of public debate. Faced with a 'threat' to a "fundamental institution of civilization," the electorate awarded Bush a second term. And he claimed a mandate to dismantle core foundations of the U.S. welfare state (Krugman, 2005).

2004 was not the first time a sex panic had struck fear into U.S. electorate, thus undermining support for public welfare...
provisions. Panic has long accompanied shifts in the ways public policy enters and exits public life. In this, the tenth year since the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, better known as 'welfare reform', it is useful to consider the generation-long political campaign that undermined public backing for this and other safety net provisions. While many consider the 1996 law a success, others describe it as regressive and punitive (Abramovitz, 2000). Explanations vary as to when Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) first lost support. Some suggest that the racialization of welfare is the primary reason for the loss of confidence in the program (Hancock, 2004; Schram et al, 2003). Others suggest that since 90 percent of the program’s recipients are women, sexism is a primary cause for the program’s lack of popularity (Abramovitz, 2005, p. 387). This essay posits that a series sex and moral panics, encompassing these themes, undermined support for the welfare state, leading to the 1996 “reform.”

Paralleling the demise of the welfare state, there has been a proliferation of sex and moral panics (Cohen, 1972/2002; Crimp et al, 1998; Duggan, 1995; Goode and Ben-Yehuda, 1994; Hall et al, 1978; Thompson, 1998). Studies of the discursive contours of moral panics highlight the ideological quandaries at the center of thirty years of debate over social welfare policy. A number of recent comparative studies of current welfare policies (Sidell, 1998, p. 26-27; Wagner, 1997a, p. 42-48) have specifically located conditions of moral panic within policy debates over public assistance and services for the poor. Other studies (Abramovitz, 1996, 2000; Piven and Cloward, 1993) consider the increase in policies aimed at the moral regulation of the personal and sexual lives of those on public assistance. These works consider the backlashes over public sexuality and the ensuing social controls which usually follow sex panics.

At their core, studies of sex and moral panics investigate social hierarchies. These studies become inquiries into social tensions, ambiguities, and fears, as themes of gender, race, crime, youth, immigration status, and social upheaval are projected onto highly charged acts including public sex, drug use, non-monogamy, birth control, and teenage pregnancy. These symbolic acts—and the calls for their suppression—can be
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used to assess shifts in social and economic life. For scholars of panic, discourses of fear typically inspire pessimism, which result in the allocation of resources to secure a worthy 'us' from fear of an 'impure' them (Altheide, 2002; Glassner, 1999; Morone, 2003).

"Sex panics, witchhunts, and red scares are staples of American history," Lisa Duggan (1995) elaborates. "While often promoted by relatively powerless but vocal minorities hostile to cultural difference, they have been enthusiastically taken up by powerful groups in an effort to impose rigid orthodoxy on the majority" (p. 75). In the case of the panics over the welfare state, "moral reform" functions as a trope for the neglect of substantive social problems related to income inequality, race, and sexism.

The concept of sex panic builds on the idea of moral panic first coined within British sociology and cultural studies described by sociologist Stanley Cohen (1972/2002). The term builds on themes from sociology of deviance, collective behavior, social problems, structuralism, and critical theory. It conceptualized a process in which cultural institutions draw perimeters around deviance to generate hysteria. Here outsiders are viewed as social threats, and a spiral of condemnation from interest groups, including politicians, the media, and police follows. For Cohen, who analyzed British youth subcultures in the 1960s, the moral panic scapegoat becomes a "folk devil" onto whom cultural anxieties can be projected. In the case of the welfare state, the folk devil in question has consistently been the promiscuous "welfare queen" who has transgressed community norms. Sociologist Jeffrey Weeks (1985) concisely describes the cycle:

The mechanics of a moral panic are well known: the definition of a threat in a youthful event (a youthful 'riot', a sexual scandal); the stereotyping of the main characters in the mass media as particular species of monsters (the prostitute as 'fallen woman', the pedophile as 'child molester'); a spiraling escalation of the perceived threat, leading to a taking up of absolutist positions and the manning of moral barricades; the emergence of an imaginary solution; a symbolic court
action; followed by the subsidence of the anxiety, with its victims left to endure the new proscription, social climate and legal penalties (1985, p. 45).

As theorists grappled with public policies aimed at alleviating social problems such as AIDS, homelessness, and poverty, dynamics of moral panic overlapped with debates about the urban “underclass.” Here a distinct panic discourse took shape. Political scientist James Morone (2003) suggests panic discourse involves a familiar schema. In times of social flux, interest groups: 1) stir a moral frenzy; 2) identify a demon; 3) mobilize interests; and 4) increase police powers.

Goode & Ben Yehuda (1994) have outlined five specific indicators of collective behavior that occurs during such episodes. These include: volatility, hostility, measurable concern, consensus and disproportionality. Panics over the welfare state share many of these historic discursive contours. A racialized view of women on welfare combined with anxiety about shifts in the nuclear family contributed to the volatility witnessed within debate involving ‘doing something about welfare.’ Fear about the social threat presented by outsiders resulted in hostility. Most panics involve unsanctioned activities or cultural groupings that threaten the status quo or the traditional family. This helps explain the rise of panics around teenage pregnancy (Luker, 1996; Sidell, 1998). Shifting sexual mores have inspired measurable concern (McClaren, 1999; Thompson, 1998). Similar panics involve questions about the control of behaviors believed to lead to disease (Wagner, 1997a). This is where panics over sex and drug use accompany public policies ranging from methadone maintenance to HIV, prevention, and service provision for undocumented immigrants. Here, panic over the use of public services resulted in a consensus about the need to do something to address the problem (Altheide, 2002). Concern about welfare could be witnessed in poll after poll by the 1990’s. And while anxiety disproportionately expanded beyond proportion of the actual threat, the signs of collective behavior which propelled the welfare panic took a life of their own.

Each marker of panic has significance as a cultural symbol. French structuralist philosopher Michel Foucault described the
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social, professional, and linguistic construction of such symbols as elements within "discourses." By discourse, he referred to a linkage of symbolic representations to a series of social actions and actors. Their interaction produces social meanings embodied by cultural "objects," including those that become the subjects of moral panics (Zukin, 1995). A theoretical approach to studying moral panics is to analyze "discourses" that regulate and demarcate hierarchies of what is normal or natural, neutral or immoral, worthy or unworthy (Thompson, 1998: 72).

In a study of the birth of the modern prison, Foucault asserts, "A corpus of knowledge, techniques, 'scientific' discourses is formed and becomes entangled with the practice of power to punish" (1977, p. 23). This framework assumes that tools of professional knowledge, diagnosis, and assessment influence the ways actors are rendered sane and insane, healthy and unhealthy, normal and abnormal, worthy and unworthy. These forms of what Foucault called 'bio-power' help establish parameters of the normal, while pathologizing otherness. Here government programs, from police to social services, use bio-power to regulate and control social interactions. Along the way, desires are regulated, described, punished, organized, and sanctioned by dominant social, economic, and cultural discourses (Warner 1993, p. xxv-viii; Floersch, 2000).

Kenneth Thompson notes that many studies of sex and moral panics "focus on processes of representation and on mapping the discourses which the mass media use to construct a view of events which gives rise to a sense of increasing risk and possibly moral panics, particularly about sexuality" (1998, p.72). Most sociological analyses of moral panics focus on discourses organized by stakeholders to frame arguments about social issues. Thompson suggests that discourses over worthy vs. unworthy sexuality address a central concern of modern life: the besieged nuclear family. "Familial ideology is obliged to fight a continual rear guard action in order to disavow the social and sexual diversification of a culture which can never be adequately pictured in the traditional guise of the family of cohabitating parents and children," (1998, p. 72-73). Such discourses provide the raw evidence of the panics and their impacts (Cohen, 2002, p. viii). Here social interactions involving dominant and dominated social groups are impacted by an
ongoing process of social and cultural demonization (Zukin, 1995).

Panics over public welfare involve four key themes: laziness, drugs, violence, and, of course, sex (Morone, 2003: 17). What emerges within such cases is a series of competing narratives and intersecting discourses that frequent discussions of public sexuality. On the one hand, social movements aim at reducing inequality, while increasing social mobility; on the other, countervailing forces call for regulation and social controls, which halt the advances of social outsiders into fuller democratic participation (Fraser 1989). The following examines four such welfare panics: the Newburgh panic of 1961; the Goldwater race panics; the teenage pregnancy panics; and, the panics over public sexuality which raged throughout the ‘Welfare Reform’ debates in the mid 1990s.

Moral panics overlap with countless chapters of U.S. history. Even the Witch Trials have been described as a “panic” (Godbeer, 2005, 7). Here, hysteria justified stifling a challenge to sexual norms which might have established more egalitarian social relations (Federici, 2004, 22). As social mores shifted toward increased social autonomy, fears of insurrection followed (Heale, 1990). Richard Hofstadter (1964) has come to describe this mode of thinking as the “paranoid style” of US political thought. “Whatever combination of guilt, sexuality, aggression, or other impulses produce the counter-subversive mindset, Americans have never suffered from a shortage of scapegoated aliens,” Ellen Schrecker (1998) writes. In addition to the witches, the list of ‘others’ – native Americans, slaves, Catholics, immigrants – who represented a threat - is not short. By the 20th century, communists, anarchists, queers, suffragettes, and welfare queens followed in this long line of, “substitute others” (p. 47). The association between these “substitute other[s]” feeds a cultural xenophobia in any number of policy debates. As Gayle Rubin notes, “Popular sexual ideology is a noxious stew made up of ideas of sexual sin, concepts of psychological inferiority, anti-communism, mob hysteria, accusations of witchcraft, and xenophobia” (1984/1997, p. 108). This logic mirrors much of the rise and fall in history the U.S. welfare state (Reisch and Andrews, 2003).

Panic discourse extended well into the formation of the
New Deal. The notion that the New Deal was a plan to undermine free-market capitalism was a frequent conspiracy theory of the 1930s. Many contended that the U.S. government was being taken over by communists (Hofstadter, 1964, p. 31). This anxiety about collectivist thought often undermines efforts at broad social programs (Skocpol, 1995). It also resulted in a widespread hostility toward the growing welfare state and the people it employed. More workers lost their jobs in the federal government for being alleged "sex perverts" than "communists" during the peak McCarthy years of the 1950s (D'Emilio, 1983). Despite the limited numbers of communists located, the link between sexual nonconformity and government established a framework for forty years of sex panics over the welfare state.

Just as the Red Scare was receding, a new and profoundly influential anti-welfare discourse emerged. Newspapers in June 1961 raised an alarm over relief services for "migrant relief cheats" in Newburgh, New York (Abramovitz 1996, p. 318-28; Levenstein, 2000). Much of the anxiety unfolded with City Manager Joseph Mitchell's new policy of limits on recipients for Aid to Dependent Children (ADC, the predecessor to AFDC). Here, ADC was thought to subsidize promiscuity among black women who had migrated north. From 1950 to 1960, the African American population of Newburgh rose 151 percent, while the white population declined 14 percent. Many hailed Mitchell's efforts to impose work requirements, preventing licentious women from "milking unwed mother aid." Since the 1930's, ADC had been understood as a pension for widows. With the Newburgh panic, views of this program were transformed through a media frenzy, as news stories highlighted the looming menace of "lazy welfare cheats" who migrated to Northern cities. In fact, only 2.9 percent of Newburgh's population received welfare services, and white people constituted a majority of the recipients (Levenstein, 2000).

Panics often emerge to justify policies aimed at controlling outsider groups, in this case those receiving public aid in a period of rapid economic and demographic flux. As the backlash takes hold, panics conflate race, sex, and ideological biases into a moralistic frame, as talk of traditional "values" conceals
social bias. The symbolic linkage between women on public assistance and "promiscuity" in Newburgh built on age-old conceptions of social purity. Racism is, after all, said to find its fait accompli in the sexualization of otherness (Calvin, 1988, p. xii-xiii; Kushnick, 1999; Nagel, 2003).

Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater was particularly impressed with Mitchell's work in Newburgh. Goldwater sent the city manager a letter stating he thought the cuts to services were as "refreshing as breathing the clean air of my native Arizona." The Senator added that he would "like to see every city in the country adapt the plan" (Levenstein, 2000). In many ways, the Newburgh welfare panic anticipated the Goldwater/Nixon southern strategy that followed (Kushnick, 1999).

By far, the most influential welfare panic began with the southern strategy race, crime discourse advanced by Goldwater. Crime first became a national issue during the presidential campaign of Republican candidate Barry Goldwater in 1964. While he "sounded the alarm" about "crime in the streets," initially few Americans were concerned about the issue. Public opinion polls at the time cited war, civil rights, poverty, and unemployment as more important issues to most voters. Still Goldwater's language about the danger to mothers and children presented by escalating crime rates and the threats of desegregation represented the makings of a classic sex/moral panic (Chambliss, 1995).

Although the strategy did not work in 1964, a coalition of conservative legislators, the crime control industry, and media continued to push the issue. By 1968, years of race riots offered fertile ground for a political shift. This time, the anti-crime strategy proved successful. Faced with a shift in social foundations, the right wing succeeded in generating a moral panic over race, crime, and declining public order. It did so by sustaining public anxiety over threats from specific population groups, including youth, people of color, and welfare recipients (Hall, 1978; Victor, 1998: 547). By linking crime and race, the conservative coalition justified an ongoing expansion of federal authority in the arena of crime control under the guise of a War on Drugs. Along the road, they created a new scapegoat – the War on Poverty and the welfare state. "People react to fear, not love" a Machiavellian Nixon explained. "They
don't teach you that in Sunday school, but its true," (quoted in Glassner, 1999, p. xxviii). In the ensuing years, support for public education and services dwindled while programs aimed at control of those on public assistance gained support (Chambliss, 1995; Davey, 1995; Harcourt, 2001).

The Goldwater, Nixon panic triggered a profound transformation in U.S. policy priorities. In the years after 1968 and more intensely after 1972, discourses of fear helped divert attention away from real problems, which if solved could shift power arrangements away from the elites (Hall, 1978). Faced with an oil embargo, cheap foreign goods and labor, and business downturn, a well-connected elite comprised of a triumvirate of America’s upper social classes, corporate communities, and policy formation organizations lobbied to restrict policies that created jobs for the unemployed, made health and welfare policies more generous, helped employees gain workplace rights and protections, and helped workers organize. Social and economic policies which redistributed income upward, cheapened the cost of labor, shrunk social programs, weakened progressive social movements, and limited the role of the federal government. This panic discourse served as a key ingredient of the New Rights’ efforts to turn back the progress of the Labor, Civil Rights, and Women’s Movements (Abramovitz, 2000, p. 17). It helped advance an agenda supporting tighten concentrations of wealth, social inequality, and increased mechanisms of social control (Domhoff, 1998). Following 1968, neo-liberal political ideology continued to support privatization, while watering down of the state’s ability to address social needs. Wide-spread social anxiety and alienation only followed as discord between community, work, and family become widespread. As the viscous cycle continued, the Right offered solutions to this anxiety which amounted to still further technologies of control requiring additional sacrifice of social liberties (Knight 2003). Fear remained a piece of new right political advocacy.

By the 1980s, these policies became a fait accompli. Panic took countless forms. While some panics inspired grassroots responses, others further undid the work of progressive social movements. Panics over an “underclass” in poverty-ridden urban areas involving crime, crack, and teenage pregnancy
were used to scale back social programs for the poor (Goodwin and Jasper, 2003, p. 259). These panic discourses over family, race, poverty, and sexuality anticipated the call to do away with AFDC itself in 1996.

Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush both exalted a new political philosophy of "family values," while Attorney General Edwin Meese hammered away about the dangers of predation against children. After 1977, preoccupation with normal sexuality and the safety of children led to an unending discourse on their seduction. One example was the Meese Commission's use of child seduction hysteria. Here, the message became that women should get their kids out of nurseries and daycare facilities. The best way to do this was to leave work to stay home with the kids. Anti-censorship feminists succeeded in pointing out that child sex panic was employed to turn back the advances of the women's movement, justifying keeping women out of the labor force (Michelson 1996, p. 8-10).

The panic did not end with Meese. By the mid 1980s, the persistent poverty of U.S. inner cities could be viewed as one of the primary concerns of end of the 20th century. In attempting to explain the ongoing and deeply ingrained poverty among African Americans, many began to reconsider the role of the 1935 Social Security Act, which laid a foundation for the U.S. welfare state. At its most controversial, Social Security was credited with incorporating "racial and gender assumptions that led millions of women to become dependent on the most stigmatized and limited forms of public aid" (Luker, 1996, p. 52). "What some writers are calling 'the coming welfare wars' will be a largely wars about, even against, women," noted Nancy Fraser (1989, p. 144).

These "welfare wars" would include inquiry into the most intimate aspects of women's lives as the autonomy of the women on public assistance became contested terrain. From inquiries into their sexual lives (Gordarn, 2001), to crusades against reproductive choice (Hunter, 1985), to renewed calls for a "man in the house", to increased funding for abstinence-only sex education programs (Bader, 2002), panic discourses would take countless forms. Yet, they all involved calls for control of "deviant sexual behavior" of low-income women (Handler, 1972, p. 34-5).

A primary arena of this struggle involved debate about
teenage pregnancy. Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, teen pregnancy, child-rearing, and the sex lives of those on public assistance became the primary subjects of the "welfare wars." Reports suggested that nearly a million teenagers were becoming pregnant each year, at profound costs to both themselves and the public welfare rolls (Christensen and Rose, 1996). For many, welfare programs seemed to encourage "irresponsible" sexuality; thus it came to be viewed as a "dysfunctional" government program (Miller and Markle, 2002).

A nationwide debate over the urban "underclass" ensued. While many of the themes of this debate can be traced back to the 19th century, the prime mover of the contemporary discussion was Charles Murray. With his 1984 work, Losing Ground, the "underclass" poor, particularly "immoral" single mothers and their illegitimate kids, were depicted as a threat to social norms. For Murray, social problems related to the poor stemmed from a decline in moral values, permissiveness and access to welfare benefits. He called a moral revitalization and stigmatization of social outsiders and welfare beneficiaries (Thompson, 1998: 89-90). Others would suggest that if advocates such as Murray really cared about the welfare of children, they would have to "move beyond the moral panic and denial that so often distort the discussion" (Christensen and Rose, 1996).

"There is a welfare queen who has three different names," Reagan famously bemoaned, building on the Goldwater and Nixon panics over the validity of public welfare. This use of labels thus transformed poor women from citizens into "welfare mothers." Murray's work was an inspiration for Reagan, providing cover for his reversal of tax policy from progressive to regressive favoritism of the affluent. By labeling those who used these services as lazy and dishonest, Reagan delegitimized the validity the welfare state itself (Kushnick, 1999). While social welfare advocates fought for social mobility for the poor, Reagan advanced panic after panic which supported policies supporting social control and mandatory reproduction (Abramovitz, 2000, p.92-3,36-7).

Perhaps the most paradigmatic episode to be addressed in this essay involves the panics which paved the way for the passage of 'welfare reform' in 1996. Ruth Sidell suggests that
in the wake of the Cold War, welfare recipients filled a distinct void in U.S. politics (1998) becoming one of a long list of convenient "others" (Heale, 1990). Like the ungodly communists before them, welfare recipients offered a convenient distraction. As House Republicans debated welfare reform in 1995, they actually referred to women on welfare as wild animals, "breeding mules," and "monkeys" (Kushnick, 1999: 160). By dehumanizing welfare beneficiaries as "others," it became all that much easier to claim they were undeserving (Miller and Markle, 2002). "A society does not simply discover its others," Ruth Sidell explains, "it fabricates them" (1998, P. 24).

Throughout these years, panic discourses conflated permissiveness, sex, crime and race with public assistance and the unworthy poor. This justified countless forms of subtle and not-so-subtle control of women's lives (Luker, 1996). This pattern reached an apex in 1996. As a result, much of the substance of the 1996 law aimed to regulate female sexuality. Among other things, the law tied financial aid to a woman's age, marital status, and the number of children she had on public assistance. It furthered a family ethic by stigmatizing single motherhood, encouraging the formation of two-parent families, and calling for a family cap. Here, it rewarded states that reduced non-marital births and abortions while earmarking money to states that promoted ineffective abstinence-only sex education programs (Flanders, 1998). This policy continued with Bush's push to divert welfare funds from poverty reduction to marriage promotion (Badar, 2002).

A core component of the dividing process of the mid-1990s was an effort by municipalities across the country to shut down public spaces where social outsiders build community around non-monogamy (Dangerous Bedfellows, 1996). In 1997, a group argued that the local and national manifestations of these trends, including New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani's Quality of Life crusade, fit a distinctively political schema:

This is not the first time that officials have launched repressive measures against sex in the name of public good. Since the nineteenth century, it has been a recurrent pattern: Public morals and health have been invoked; scapegoats have been found in homosexuals, sex workers and others who are unlikely to fight back; and a fantasy of purity is held up as the norm. Historians have come to call this pattern a "sex panic" (Crimp et al, 1998).
The group, dubbed SexPanic!, recognized a Temperance-era logic in the crusade to close adult businesses, curtail welfare provisions, and sanitize urban space (Wagner, 1997a).

The Quality of Life crusade was chock-full of contradictions. While Giuliani (1998) called for work - rather than welfare - to become the center of life for all New Yorkers, the cornerstone of the crusade called for zoning changes that would close adult businesses that he found distasteful. Yet, by pushing to shut down businesses where many women and men made their living, the mayor simultaneously contributed to unemployment in New York City (Warner, 1999). “This is an economic issue. I am really frightened. I am really angry, not just for myself but for the thousands and thousands of women who are going to be unemployed and out of work,” Cindra Feuer, one of the organizers against the proposed zoning changes who also worked in an adult business, explained in a 1998 radio interview. “And as we all know, unemployment is really high; its above the national average in our city. Jobs are not easy to come by.” Like many others, Feuer, whose place of work was shut down, faced an uncertain future.

SexPanic! recognized that adult entertainers, men who have sex in public, and those with children on welfare are attacked because of a similar sex-phobia. Douglas Crimp specifically referred to these patterns of state-sanctioned control of sexual choice:

Not so long ago it was illegal and considered unnatural for people of different races to have sex with each other. Our country has a long and ignominious history of fearing and punishing nonwhite people for their sexuality and particularly having sex with white people. The history of lynching black men is largely a history of murdering them for accusations that they desired white women. Today, poor women of color are forced to cede reproductive choices to qualify for welfare benefits. Men of color are routinely treated more harshly when entrapped and arrested on charges of public lewdness (1997, p. 12).

Such debates about public sexual culture involve core themes of public-sphere theory originated by Jürgen Habermas (1962/2000) and Nancy Frazier (1989). Habermas contends
that only those with capital can participate in the formal confines of the public sphere and its social privileges. Those with capital enjoy social privileges, including privacy from the public glare. Those who do not own or maintain control of their living spaces - and thus must have sex in “public” - are considered socially deviant and relegated to outsider status (Rubin, 1984/1997). Wagner (1997B) notes that the deviant behavior of poor people is harder to conceal because low-income people - including the homeless, queer youth, and people on welfare - have fewer resources to enable them hide their activities from public view, subjecting them to increasingly aggressive “zero tolerance” policing of public space (Dangerous Bedfellows, 1996; Harcourt, 2001).

While the era of big government for social programs ended in 1994, big government for policing has expanded. While rates of crime decreased from 1975 to 1995 “a moral panic about crime and lawlessness [was] in full swing throughout the country” (Platt, 1995). And controls followed with the passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and the Patriot Act of 2001. Thus, over the final decades of the 20th century, the policy landscape in the U.S. shifted from an emphasis on public welfare toward crime control (Chambliss, 1995; Davey, 1995). Today, one of the fastest growing public spaces is prisons (Kolodner, 2006; Zukin 1995).

Race, crime, and sexual panics function in the same fashion. They are part of a frenzied drive to cultivate support for polities favoring a better business climate for economic polices poised to privatize, control, and profit from everything from water to public space to social welfare services (Duggan, 2003).

As of today, welfare services are diminished, while policing and military expenditures only grow. In 1964, Herbert Marcuse alluded to a merging of mass media, corporate power, and the blurring of social welfare programs into ever-greater mechanisms of social control. “The society of total mobilization, which takes shape in the most advanced areas of industrial civilisation, combines in productive union the features of the Welfare State and the Warfare State” (p. 19). He continues, “The main trends are familiar: concentration of the national economy on the needs of big corporations, with the government as a stimulating, supporting, and sometimes even controlling force,” (p. 19). Here media, public opinion, and market pressure
creative a coercive context to further erode line between the welfare and warfare state. Services fade; neo-liberal policies advance and the welfare state recedes (Duggan, 2003). The panics serve as the distractions to the process. When fear rises, policing follows. Yesterday, they were welfare queens. Today, they are immigrants and Arabs. The beat goes on.
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In the eight chapters of this ambitious, posthumously published book, the late Richard Harvey Brown, a former professor of sociology at the University of Maryland, provides an erudite commentary on many of the major shifts occurring in American society and culture. These chapters explore such themes as American exceptionalism; race, class, and corporate power in the United States; the sources of legitimacy and its crisis in the American society; politics, religion, social movements, and individualism and identity in our post-liberal era; the strains in the American family as reflected in the changing relations between genders and generations; and the transformation in the realm of art and aesthetics which too have been contaminated by the pervasive cult of consumption and commercialization.

The book focuses on the central tendencies in American life along with a number of their countervailing social movements. There are trenchant observations on the trends and tensions in contemporary America throughout the book. For example, the world is being Americanized even as America itself is being globalized. The U.S. may be the world’s lone superpower, but it is experiencing a relative decline in its position vis-à-vis other nations. Globalization is being promoted and championed by the United States all over the world, but it is encountering resistance from a majority of Americans who are concerned about losing their jobs as a consequence. Similarly, while racial boundaries are getting somewhat blurred, structural racism is alive and well, and identity politics is receiving a new momentum. At times it appears that racial equality is more of a dream than destiny. America has made more
progress in "racial civility than in racial equality," writes Brown pointedly and accurately. He sees the U.S. as a kaleidoscope rather than a melting pot or a mosaic.

There are other tensions in American society and culture—tension between the principle of rational calculation and the principle of subjective individualism; between American nativism and cultural pluralism; between modernity based on utilitarianism and the "postmaterialistic" pieties that have given rise to feminist, anti-war, environmental, and pro-animal rights movements; and tensions between the pervasive American creed of individualism and a civilized society's need to address community concerns.

The author is incisive in his discussion of the rise and growing role of the corporate state, the wide acceptance of the semi-militarization of the American economy, the replacement of a civic culture by market ethos in American institutional life, the consolidation of neo-liberal capitalism, with its attendant challenge to democracy, citizenship, and civil society, and the increasingly manifest inadequacy of the "Third Way" to redress economic injustice.

Brown offers a persuasive critique of advanced capitalism. The dominance of the culture of consumption in the advanced capitalist society, he asserts, undermines authority and legitimacy in society. He shows how the mighty institutions of state operate in coordination with mega-corporations. He highlights the paradoxes and ambiguities, even contradictions, in American politics, economics, and culture. He notes, for example, the strange coexistence of rampant racism and the sincerely held vision of civic inclusion, the American bias for decentralization and the enormous power of a corporate and interventionist state, and the weakening of class-based politics in spite of mounting inequality of wealth and income in America.

Brown is not the first to examine the process or consequences of America's transition from an industrial to a post-industrial society, from a modern to a postmodern culture, and from a continental to a global economy, nor is he alone in depicting the trend from a future-oriented pursuit of production to a present-oriented preoccupation with consumption, from an other-directed communal to an individualistic and even
narcissistic mindset, with its emphasis on lifestyles rather than life chances, but he does it with considerable flair for building upon and synthesizing a vast body of knowledge from American history, literature, and classical and extant social science theories, and through an acute eye and ear for current events and controversies in religion, politics, the arts, and the corporate world.

This is a book of analysis and interpretation, not a manual or manifesto for action or intervention. It has the perspective and, for the most part, the circumspection of a widely read social scientist, not the passion or the commitment of an agent of social change. The book essays a commentary on the narrative of consumption, but has a disappointing omission of the narrative of religious fundamentalism and its byproducts. For a book so audacious in scope, it has surprisingly little discussion of extremism and terrorism for, like it or not, terrorism, whatever its sources, and the muscular and militaristic response to it, rooted in a queer mix of paranoia and real politic, is already beginning to have a more than passing impact on America. An understanding of this relatively new phenomenon is necessary in order to make sense of the changing American society and culture.

Shanti K. Khinduka
Washington University in St. Louis


*The Logic of Social Research* provides a very different and fascinating perspective for understanding social research. Most of social research addresses its conduct covering topics such as the various steps and procedures one needs to include in research design, the specifics of the independent, dependent, and intervening variable, and so forth. This text examines how best to understand the research components. The author's intention is to orient students to a set of logical problems that the four major research methods (quantitative, historical, ethnographic, and experiential) must address to study social
causation. This approach is significantly different to understanding causation as it addresses the relationship between cause and effect across research methods.

The interesting approach Stinchcombe presents is that historical exploration of causal theories must be viewed in regard to the social, economic and political impacts over time. It is most helpful to understand how major policies and human behavior are affected by the social environment at a particular point in time. It is least helpful to understand those policies if one applies current conditions to previous situations. As the author notes, the context of social action is shaped by the path history has taken, which is a very important key to understanding causation.

As a means to understanding Stinchcombe’s presentation, he presents his argument in chapters dealing with topics such as “Methods for Sociology and Related Disciplines”, “Using Data to Refine Concepts of Distances between Units of Analysis”, “Units of Analysis and Mechanisms: Turning Causes into Effects” and “Testing Theories by Testing Hypotheses with Data”, and “Improving Theories with Data.”

It is important to note that Stinchcombe’s work centers on the logical arguments presented in each research format rather than focusing on how each research format is conducted. For example, central to his argument is the importance of distance in study design and how distance impacts the relationship between cause and effect. He then uses the importance of distance in any social research effect.

One must recognize that in his framework “all causation is a relation between a distance of some sort or a cause and a distance of some sort on the effect.” (p. 22). To understand whether causal information has a defined effect, one must be able to measure the difference “between at least two units of analysis.” (p. 22). One is then in a position to determine the actual distance between two points and therefore better understand the extent to which cause and effect relationships are real.

When he frames the discussion of cause and effect to include the context and time in which the research takes place, one is struck with the importance of including the processes by which the social action takes place. For example, in the public
health epidemiology model, the environment is a powerful and intervening force in considering the interaction between the host and the causative agent leading to a specific outcome. In other words, the environment can either alleviate, exacerbate, or maintain the relationship between the specific causative agent and the individual or host. For example, when trying to get people to reduce or stop smoking, the impact of tobacco, where marketing and advertising are promotional activities and are key agents in the process, one must remember that each is external/environmental to the primary relationship between tobacco intake (agent) and the individual host. Thus social research must continually take into account the particular context or environment and period of time when social studies are conducted. Stinchcombe’s perspective refers his brief introduction to his check of the core logical issues and problems in sociology and methods that have formed the bases of his argument. These issues include outlining the argument; economy in data collection; using data to refine concepts; using data to find mechanisms and processes; theory testing and using data to refine theories.

To place his thoughts in perspective, one must view with caution today’s commentaries on the Civil Rights Movement, the War on Drugs, the War on Poverty, when the measurement and analysis fails to take into account the social, economic and political context of the time when these societal efforts emerged, and the relative impact such had on society over time. Thus, affirmative action, and substance abuse diversion programs are examples of specific programs which emerged in response to critical needs at that time, and which are often examined and judged by today’s “standards.”

Marvin D. Feit
Norfolk State University


David Stoesz’s *Quixote’s Ghost* is an odd, infuriating and engaging book, one that can cause a sort of intellectual
whiplash: it moves from sharp observation to absurd generalization to reasoned analysis to wild assertion, sometimes within the same paragraph. I felt a bit like Quixote myself - or more accurately, like Sancho Panza, chasing after a madman, not sure whether to protect the world from him or him from the world. That, I suspect, was part of the intent. Stoesz wants to explain why contemporary American social policy has failed to better provide safety and security, or to adapt to the post-industrial world, and he clearly wants be an equal opportunity offender — that’s all to the good, for the Republican and Democratic parties surely share the blame. Republicans may be callous and stingy, guilty of sins of commission, Stoesz suggests, but Democrats have been blind to political reality and bereft of bold ideas, guilty of sins of omission. The passion with which he makes his case, and his determination to think beyond liberal-conservative paradigms are admirable, but Stoesz’s arguments and analyses — compelling at first glance — cannot bear up under the weight of careful scrutiny. Quixote's Ghost is provocative, but ultimately unsatisfying.

His argument is this: Republican ascendancy in social policy is attributable to their successful efforts to build “networks of influence” in the aftermath of Goldwater’s 1964 defeat, efforts driven by think tanks that would come increasingly to embrace empiricism, Stoesz asserts, to advance their cause. They adapted pragmatism — what he identifies as a Liberal philosophy of the New Deal - to their own ends. By contrast, those Liberal pragmatists who could once be counted upon for constructive participation in policymaking have retired to their ivory towers, been consumed by post-modern theories that have caused them to “reject empiricism in favor of identity politics,” and, as a result, have been in “denial of conservative control of social policy” and failed to provide an alternative to the obsolete paradigm that was the hallmark of the twentieth century. These ineffectual intellectuals are Stoesz’s “Liberati.” Guilty too is the social work profession, which has similarly been obsessed with identity politics (witness the National Association of Black Social Workers’ policy against trans-racial adoption, he says). They too have rejected empiricism in favor of ideology, leaving anthropologists and sociologists to produce the most important works of policy research. And they are also
in denial, stubbornly refusing to acknowledge the successes of conservative achievements, like 1996's welfare reform. Worse, they have failed to convince policymakers of the need for fundamental reform in child welfare and other arenas.

Hence the whiplash—the radical critique is so bound up with casuistry and conventional wisdom that it is difficult to know where to begin. Let me focus here only on one of the largest problems: I heartily agree that the Democratic Party has failed those most in need of their advocacy, that the academy has produced some very silly scholarship under the rubric of post-modern theory, that social work education is insufficiently rigorous, and that social work practice can too often suffer from crippling naiveté. But to lay the blame for decades of regressive social policy at the feet of post-modern professors and social workers is to blame Sancho Panza for the destruction Don Quixote leaves in his wake. To claim that the Liberati are complicit would seem defensible. But surely there are more proximate causes, and more powerful actors to attend to, if we truly seek to explain the current state of social policy.

Stoesz's solution to these and other problems is a call for "radical pragmatism," an approach that is "post-conservative" and "post-liberal," decentralized and democratic, and which depends upon technical expertise and acknowledges the efficiency of market mechanisms. Much of this sounds like an updated Progressivism (if anything united the Progressives it was a belief in expertise, and in practicality), and seems too little informed by the messy reality of politics and policymaking. Ask Harvard professor Mary Jo Bane, the Clinton advisor who resigned in the aftermath of welfare reform once she saw what the political process had done with her careful, practical, pragmatic scholarship. Good policy ideas are useless if one cannot control enough of the political system to enact and implement them, and Stoesz's radical pragmatism takes little account of, for example, the debts Democrats and Republicans both owe to very similar sets of narrow interests who have little stake in social policy; of the manipulation, by Democrats and Republicans alike, of Congressional districts, which hardens their monopoly over elected offices and reduces their accountability to the public; and of the manner in which mainstream media so poorly serve democratic interests and so rarely help
citizens make informed appraisal of the policy choices before them, leaving them susceptible to partisan propaganda.

Too much in Quixote’s Ghost is asserted or assumed, and it is the lack of evidence, just as it was with Thomas Frank’s best-selling What’s the Matter with Kansas, that constitutes its fatal flaw. Indeed, Frank’s entertaining book is a useful comparison: the more one reads, the less the engaging prose and the provocative theses are able to obscure the thinness and incoherence of what lies beneath. Quixote’s Ghost seems to be a book about the politics of social policy, but isn’t, because it pays too little attention to politics and to policy analysis. Ironically, what Stoesz offers is a work of political philosophy—his own kind of post-modern theory, nearly bereft of the empiricism he so yearns for.

Stephen Pimpare
Yeshiva University


The workplace of the 21st century will increasingly become leaner, technologically reliant, and more aggressive in pursuit of a healthy bottom-line. The global competition for resources and customers creates tensions between corporations’ fiduciary responsibility to their shareholders and their ethical responsibility to their employees, their host communities and the environment. Forward looking work organizations recognize that, amid these trends, recruiting and retaining a productive and loyal workforce is dependent on careful attention to employees’ well being and on their ability to assist employees in balancing the often conflicting demands of work and family. Sheila Akabas and Paul Kurzman’s book, Work and the Workplace is the definitive scholarly text on occupational social work practice. Building on their extensive research, teaching, and practical experiences, the authors review the history, contemporary practices and new professional opportunities for social work in the workplace, and create a comprehensive
resource for management, labor, social service and government organizations.

The book begins with a thorough discussion of the origin and definition of occupational social work in national and international contexts. The first chapter introduces the authors' conceptual framework of occupational social work and sets the foundation for the rest of the book. Their framework is inspired by the Settlement House Movement and is firmly rooted in core social work concepts of ecology, social systems, and person-in-situation perspectives. By carefully delineating these conceptual underpinnings, Akabas and Kurzman demonstrate that practice in the world of work is strongly linked to the social work profession's very foundation. Social work practitioners, regardless of their practice specialization or micro or macro orientation, must understand the complex meaning of work in the lives of service consumers. The authors emphasize the fluid relationship between the "three worlds in which we live"—family, community and work. They note that these worlds are in a continuous state of interaction and mutual interdependence, thus presenting opportunity and challenge for the social work practitioner.

In the second chapter of their book, Akabas and Kurzman provide an insightful discussion of the differential meaning of work in people's lives. They note that people's jobs define who they are more than other characteristics, such as their ancestors, religious affiliation or educational attainment. Of particular importance is the authors' scholarly examination of diversity (gender, race, sexual orientation and disability) as it relates to economic, social, and psychological conditions in the world of work. Chapters three through six examine how practitioners can intervene to foster harmony between work, family and community in people's lives. The authors describe current policy issues in the context of the rapidly changing work environment, examine the corresponding practice issues in occupational and traditional social work settings, and discuss the common problems that are characteristic of work settings. They also identify prevalent models of service delivery and new approaches in occupational social work service delivery systems. Together, these chapters give the reader an exceptionally comprehensive view of micro to macro practice
in the world of work. Chapters seven and eight use employee disability to illustrate the potential for positive impact inherent in collaborations involving management, labor, and government, and examine social workers as workers and social service organizations as employers vis-à-vis issues of productivity, accountability, mobility and unionization in the workplace.

Akabas and Kurzman summarize current trends and potential for the occupational social work field in the ninth and final chapter of their book. Here the authors present their contention that there are many opportunities for making a difference in the lives of people, and in the circumstances facing organizations and communities. By targeting the workplace and acknowledging the significance of work in people’s lives, they ably argue that social work is uniquely qualified to further work organization and employee personal goals.

Akabas and Kurzman’s book is the finest yet by these recognized leaders of the occupational social work movement in the U.S. and abroad. It expands our understanding of the intricate relationships between employees and their work organizations, and provides a seminal contribution to the scholarly knowledge base of the social work profession. The case examples that are embedded in the text illustrate innovative interventions and evidence-based best practices, and bring to life the more scholarly content. These case examples would be helpful for instructors using this book as a main or supplemental text. This book is an outstanding resource for scholars, policy makers, social workers, union leaders and management practitioners who are interested in improving the well being of workers, work organizations and communities.

Michâlle Mor Barak
University of Southern California

At its website, the Child Welfare League of America is described as “an association of more than 900 private and public agencies that assist more than 3.5 million abused and neglected children and their families each year....” Its counterpart in Canada, the Canadian Child Welfare League assists an array of agencies offering services to vulnerable Canadian children and families. Given the centrality of child and family welfare in contemporary social services, Xiaobei Chen’s revisionist history is welcomed. Informed by the prodigious scholarship of the postmodernist philosopher Michel Foucault, she explores the complex trajectories and meanings of child protection in the late 19th and early 20th centuries and concludes with a provocative essay on early 21st century Ontario child protection. Her work is a welcome addition to the pioneering scholarship which deepened understanding of how Western societies assisted vulnerable and dependent children within contexts of changing power relationships. It complements the research of Anthony Platt, who in the 1960s wrote about child savers in the United States and the invention of delinquency and the pioneering work of Philippe Aries on the evolution of childhood and family life.

Primary sources, such as the records of the Toronto Children’s Aid Society and the papers of J.J. Kelso, a prominent Canadian child welfare pioneer, reveal the gender and Eurocentric dimensions of child saving. Most work done to save neglected children was led by men but carried out by women. The society justified intervention into the lives of families who neglected their children by not providing appropriate guidance and discipline by using gardening metaphors which taught that children, like plants, needed careful tending and cultivation in order become reliable, responsible Christian adults and good citizens. In effect, children had socially constructed citizenship rights to sound nurturing. The disciplinary message to parents was clear: if they did not cultivate good habits in their children the society might remove them from their homes.
The social class dimensions of early child saving are apparent and important. Middle and upper class child savers did not expect their wards to assume upward trajectories of social mobility. They guided children to become reliable and dependable working class citizens: boys would be factory or farm workers; girls, household servants. To carry out its work and to ensure parents would comply with its orders, the society used new helping technologies such as case record keeping, reports, home visits, a shelter for neglected children and a detention room for delinquents. These innovations enforced discipline and parental compliance. The history of the children's shelter which opened in 1892 is instructive for contemporary child welfare professionals. Initially, the shelter provided temporary refuge for children who were removed from their parents or for those who voluntarily sought refuge. As time went on, children remained in the shelter for more than the recommended one month and the society was criticized for assuming parental child rearing responsibilities. Eventually, the society eliminated the residential shelter, ending a community resource which has no contemporary counterpart. Today, foster homes have become the preferred placement for children needing placement because of abuse or neglect.

Adhering to her mentor Foucault's dictum that history can inform the present, the last chapter is a provocative analysis of child protection in Ontario at the beginning of the 21st century. In contrast to early child savers who believed their work was an investment in good citizenship building and that children had rights to community support, today it is assumed that children have narrow, individualized citizenship rights, exemplified by preoccupation with the right to personal safety.

Lurid accounts of child abuse in Canada and the United States focus on children as victims of parental abuse and neglect. Chen argues that this individualizes the phenomenon of abuse, leading to a nearly exclusive focus on perpetrators, who are often impoverished single parents and their punishment, rather than on the broader social issue of childhood poverty or other marginalization factors which contribute to children's and parents' vulnerability. The early child saving vision of children and parents as persons who could be guided to become morally responsible citizens seems to have been
abandoned. In Ontario reports and recommendations to attack child abuse do not advocate revisions of child protection policies and services that would change the current emphasis on punishment of abusers. Societal preoccupation with personal safety and punishment trumps efforts to create a sense of collective responsibility for social problems such as the vision of the early child savers who saw child protection, rather than punishment, as an obligation of a moral and just society. A vision of the collective good could allow investments in supportive infrastructures such as day care which could reduce the stress of parenting and perhaps reduce child abuse and neglect. This book is an insightful comparative history of how communities at different times conceptualized children's citizenship rights and how those ideas have informed child protection.

John M. Herrick
Michigan State University


This book extends knowledge on issues of diversity in the workplace into a global context. The focus is interdisciplinary, drawing on research and theory from the academic disciplines of social psychology, sociology, and economics, as well as from the human resource and employment literatures. The chapters tackle issues of central importance to those interested in considering the inter-relationships among social policy, social work, and employment in today's world economy.

The book is divided into three sections. The first section sets the "macro" context for conducting business in the world today. Detailed data and analyses are presented on cross-national trends in social policy, population growth and migration, socioeconomic indicators, and educational levels. The second section considers "micro/mezzo" dimensions of diversity, which include individual and inter-group experiences. These chapters look at workforce diversity from different social psychological perspectives, including prejudice and
discrimination, and review concepts and research on social inclusion-exclusion, culture and communication, and interpersonal relationships. The third section of the book focuses on employer practices related to managing a diverse workforce in the global context explicated in the previous sections. The highlight of this final section is that Mor Barak moves the reader away from a focus on diversity toward a focus on inclusion, which is more consistent with European perspectives and scholarship in this area.

The inclusive workplace model Mor Barak presents is based on an ecological framework that views the organization as embedded in different levels of the environment. Inclusion occurs at four levels—the workplace, the community, the nation state, and cross-nationally. While diversity perspectives may focus attention on the benefits of valuing differences among individuals within an organization's workforce, the inclusive workplace model she presents includes discussion of why firms should be, and how firms can be, involved in the larger community and in broader social change efforts. In doing so, the model bridges the worlds of social policy analysis and employer practice and offers unique insights into the role of the public and private sectors in forging a new future for today's workers.

A major strength of the volume is the ongoing clarification of what attention to workplace diversity means in everyday corporate practice. Mor Barak makes a convincing case that consideration of diversity is not about attending to differences in the attributes of people that make each person unique. Rather, it is about attending to those characteristics of individuals that yield negative or positive consequences, which can vary by country and in different cultures. This framing allows her to employ examples from a wide range of nations and cultures while maintaining a clear focus. She argues that although the sources of meaningful differences among peoples may vary within and across workplaces, communities, and nations, there are common reasons and strategies for structuring workplaces for inclusion, that is, for minimizing the negative consequences of individual, and inter-group, differences.

The examples provided in the book should be enough alone to interest most readers; they certainly enrich the value
of the book for classroom teaching. The book is infused with cases from around the world that well exceed the usual line-up of "enlightened" European nations. Readers will learn about employment laws and practices in Malaysia, Ghana, India, South Africa, Namibia, and Ethiopia, to name but a few of the countries drawn on in the volume. Moreover, the examples included are not just "best practices." They highlight ethical challenges and limitations to corporate citizenry such as the Bhopal disaster and attempted cover-up by Union Carbide, Denny’s treatment of African American customers. Although there is ample attention to firms in the United States, the US is not the starting place for most comparisons or the yardstick by which initiatives are measured. The viewpoint of the book is truly global.

A related strength of the volume is that it is infused with a Human Rights perspective: individuals are viewed as holders of rights regardless of their individual characteristics and nationality. Indeed, Chapter Two includes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1948. The workplace is regarded as a possible arena for fostering understanding and tolerance among the peoples of the world, a stance that seems particularly relevant today.

There are only a few and minor limitations to the volume. One is that the divide between the macro and meso/micro perspectives on diversity discussed in the first two sections of the book is not always bridged. Some discussions remain at a psychological level. Inclusion is defined largely by how individuals feel, for example, the extent to which they think they have access to information and are included in decision-making. A second limitation is that scholars might have more confidence in the conclusions drawn were citations used more frequently to support assertions. That said, Mor Barak brings in the empirical literature throughout the chapters and the book seems balanced in terms of its assessment of extant knowledge. By integrating established knowledge on diversity issues with contemporary perspectives on inclusion and globalization, this book pioneers the next generation of scholarship on issues of workforce diversity.

Susan J. Lambert
University of Chicago
Book Notes


Nearly ten years have passed since the passage of the 1996 welfare reform legislation. By some measures, welfare reform has been an astonishing success, evidenced by the national welfare caseload shrinking by 50 percent. Of course, this statistic obscures the fact that not all women leaving welfare are able to lift themselves and their families out of poverty. These women are faced with multiple challenges in their daily lives, and one of the most central dilemmas they face is how to balance the requirements and responsibilities of both breadwinner and caregiver. In a new edited volume, Duerr Berrick and Fuller offer a collection of research findings, drawn primarily from qualitative studies, which richly describes the tensions and negotiations inherent in the lived experience of families after welfare reform.

The book is divided into three sections: women's roles as workers and mothers, policy effects on children, and fathers' roles within this policy context. The first section includes chapters regarding families' economic self-sufficiency, childcare arrangements, and caregiving capacities. The chapter on caregiving, by Laura Frame, provides the most original contribution in this section. Frame explores parents' psychological experience of caregiving under conditions of poverty and the extent to which welfare reform exacerbates or ameliorates conditions associated with poverty and caregiving. All the chapters in Section I point out that economic self-sufficiency for families leaving welfare is contingent not only upon finding a good job, but also upon additional supports that ensure consistent and quality child care while parents are working.
Section II consists of two chapters that focus on the effects of welfare reform on children. Both chapters provide a synthesis of evidence from quantitative and qualitative perspectives, nicely illustrating the added dimension that the qualitative data provide. This section captures the range of factors, in addition to parental employment, that impact child well-being, concluding with policy recommendations, such as removing the family cap on TANF payments, which may foster child well-being.

The last section of the book addresses the role that fathers play in these families. In their introduction, Duerr Berrick and Fuller point out that while welfare reform contains important provisions related to fathers and their financial obligations, not enough is known about "fathers' experiences and capacities vis-à-vis their affective relationships with their children and their former partners" (p. 10). Pate's chapter in this section provides a counterpart to the "deadbeat dad" image of these fathers, giving voice to several men who are trying to meet their responsibilities as fathers, while under significant financial duress themselves.

Overall, this is a solid collection of articles that makes a significant contribution to our understanding of poverty, the effects of welfare reform, and the lived experience of families transitioning from welfare to employment. Each article provides a useful lens through which to understand these issues, and as a whole, reinforces the simple, yet extremely important fact that policies related to welfare reform affect families, not just the mothers making the transition into work activities.

_Mellissa Martin-Mollard, University of California, Berkeley_


Since the passage of welfare reform in 1996 there has been extensive research on its implementation and the impact of its provisions on children and families. In addition to the wealth of articles produced for academic journals, a number of recent
books also deal with the subject of welfare reform chronicling families’ experiences negotiating the welfare system. Although most of these books present stories of families dealing with the fallout from welfare reform, Ellen Reese’s book, *Backlash Against Welfare Mothers Past and Present*, provides a historical analysis of the attacks on the women who receive benefits from the system from the late 1940s to the present.

Reese, a professor of Sociology at the University of California, Riverside, traces the history of political attacks against poor mothers’ access to public assistance to assess how and why regional welfare attacks in the early days of the welfare state led to the strong, national assault on welfare we are experiencing today. Part I focuses on the causes and consequences of welfare opposition, looking at the impact of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996 that imposed strict limits on welfare use. The initial chapters trace the early history of mothers’ aid and explore how class, race, and gender politics have historically interacted to provoke powerful cross-class support for welfare cutbacks. Part II deals with the first welfare backlash between 1945 and 1979 following the expansion of welfare after World War II when employment declined and caseloads swelled. Public assistance became more inclusive of unwed and minority mothers leading to increased controversy. This section also discusses the role of large farmers whose interest in maintaining a pool of cheap labor impacted the development of welfare policy. Part III focuses on the contemporary welfare backlash from 1980 to 2004. Reese examines the rise of the Republican Right, business interests, conservative think tanks, and their role in the attacks on welfare culminating in the current reform of welfare policies. In her final chapter, Reese presents an agenda for rebuilding a welfare state that advocates a “New Deal for Working Families” to include improved access to jobs, training, and education, help for workers to make ends meet, and help for workers in balancing the dual obligations of work and family.

Reese’s book serves an important function by analytically and comprehensively exploring the assaults against welfare over the past 60 years. A major strength of the book is the exhaustive research undertaken by the author. This will be
helpful to those who desire more than a cursory knowledge of social welfare history in the United States. This book will be valuable for anyone interested in this area, but particularly for social work graduate students, researchers, and instructors. The level of detail presented may overwhelm undergraduates. One drawback of the book is that its proposals for policy reforms in the final chapter are too brief and could be more fully fleshed out. Overall, readers of this volume will come away with a deeper understanding of US welfare policy and the history of attacks against public assistance programs that seek to support needy families.

Allison De Marco, University of California, Berkeley


Interpersonal trauma is experienced by survivors within the context of their culture, and healing is likewise shaped by culture. Unfortunately, this is not yet routinely recognized by the helping profession and it is assumed that the experience of trauma is universal. Exploring the cultural meanings of trauma opens opportunities for stronger recovery by both individual survivors and the people in their lives. Considering the increasingly diverse demographic of the U.S. and the growing acceptance of cultural competence as essential to social work practice, literature that integrates multiculturalism and trauma is greatly needed.

Bryant-Davis's book is a blend of scholarly review, self-help guide, case study and creative writing. She includes not just traditions and identity based on ethnicity and race, but disability, gender, migration status, religion, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status as well. Interpersonal trauma is defined as any violation against a person or group of people that leads to feelings of powerlessness and emotional, cognitive, physical and spiritual wounds. An important contribution of Bryant-Davis is her emphasis on *thriving* after trauma, in contrast with recovery from trauma. To thrive, survivors
work to move beyond symptom reduction to attain empowerment, awareness of one’s strengths, and hopefully a level of functioning greater than before the trauma.

The author presents an insightful and practical exploration of cultural dynamics within several themes, such as trust and shame. The discussion of religion as culture is particularly beneficial, as spirituality is not often considered outside of its role as a positive source of strength for coping. Here, the influence of religion on survivors’ interpretations of, and reactions to, the traumatic incident is explored, and may include feelings of guilt over a having a crisis of faith, valuing self-sacrifice over self-care, and avoidance of non-spiritual coping strategies. Bryant-Davis’ discussion of religion, and the other cultural categories, is balanced; she presents both the positive and negative contributions to a survivor’s healing.

Numerous creative examples of clinical activities for survivors are included. Although the combination of scholarly and practical content in this book creates a unique resource, the tone of the writing is inconsistent. Bryant-Davis acknowledges that her intended audience is both professionals of various clinical approaches and survivors. However, there are passages that seem alternately ill-suited to one of these audience groups, either because of insufficient explanation of theoretical concepts or the use of the imperative mood in the writing. A secondary critique is that several sections within the chapters consist of a single sentence or two, because each cultural category was discussed separately in relation to the theme of the chapter. This left an impression of a rigid format.

However, the merits of the book far outweigh these critiques. The voices of various survivors are strong and moving and enhance the theoretical and empirical discussion. These voices are presented in case examples and in poetry by the author and her clients. The opening poem provides a powerful statement on the importance of cultural considerations in trauma that cannot be expressed by prose alone. In this way, the author puts into practice her call for greater recognition of the strengths of survivors.

Rose M. Barreto, University of California, Berkeley
Immigration has become a hot topic. Public opinion is sharply divided over President Bush’s proposals to establish a guest worker program and there is much disagreement about whether illegal immigrants should be given amnesty and allowed to settle permanently. Among academics, opinions on immigration are also divided. Some take the view that the ability of American society to assimilate more immigrants is being sorely tested while others point out that the cultural differences between recent immigrants and those who came from Europe in the 19th century are so great that continued immigration poses a significant challenge to social cohesion and stability.

Similar debates have been raging in Europe and, if anything, have been more intense. Several European countries introduced guest worker programs in the post World War II era, but it is clear that most of those who came as guest workers have become permanent settlers. Despite religious, ethnic and racial differences, their children often regard themselves as Europeans and have limited identification with their “home” countries. While some immigration experts believe that this is indicative of a longer-term assimilationist trend, others are skeptical pointing out that recent immigrants to Europe are so different in religion, language and culture that they will remain separate, living within culturally distinct enclaves.

Lucassens’s book makes a useful contribution to these debates by reviewing the experience of immigration in different European countries at different periods of time and assessing the extent to which immigrants were integrated into the host culture. The first part of the book provides examples of what the author calls ‘old migrants’—they include, Irish immigrants to Britain in the 19th century, Poles in Germany during the early 20th century and Italian immigrants in France during the same period. Part two of the book deals with Caribbean immigrants to Britain since 1948, Turkish immigrants to Germany since 1960, and the immigration of Algerian Muslims to France since 1945. Based on the historical evidence, Lucassen concludes that it is very likely that newer immigrant groups
will integrate into European societies in much the same way as did the "old immigrants". The problem, he contends, is the limited opportunities for new immigrants to integrate rather than their willingness to identify with their new societies. Continued unemployment, racism, limited educational opportunities and other factors pose a greater threat to social stability than immigration itself.

Lucassen's book is well written and extremely well researched. The author draws on a great deal of interesting historical and ethnographic information and he obviously knows the material extremely well. His case studies are well chosen and provide important insights into the way different immigrant groups adapted to host societies in different periods of time. His conclusions are thoughtful and balanced. His book makes a significant contribution to current immigration debates and should be widely consulted.


As the baby boom generation approaches retirement age, and as members of this generation expect to live healthier, longer lives, the body of literature on retirement and the "second half of life" or "the third age" is growing. *The Experience of Retirement*, Robert Weiss' view of the lives of 89 retirees, is both timely and insightful. The book focuses on the experience of retirement through all of its stages: planning for it, leaving the workforce, and adapting to it. The method of conducting in-depth interviews before, during, immediately after, and one year after retirement provides rich longitudinal data to document this major phase of the life course. It also gives the reader the opportunity to view the experience of retirement as a multi-year process.

Weiss begins with a summary of multi-disciplinary perspectives on retirement by providing economic, psychological, and sociological definitions of retirement. Next, an exploration of the transition period, from the workforce world to the retirement world, is presented. In this exploration of the
transition period between the roles of worker and retiree, he addresses three topics: (1) reasons for retirement (attractions of leisure, disabilities, desire to leave a particular workplace, workplace-initiated retirement, or a reframing of unemployment); (2) the actual departure from the job; and (3) specific gains and losses commonly perceived. This exploration incorporates especially poignant discussions, and direct quotes from respondents, around the issues of identity and community.

Weiss then brings us into the world of retirement by weaving respondents' stories through a framework consisting of four dimensions: money, social isolation, time, and personal relationships. His investigation into all four of these dimensions sets the stage for further research. Particularly worth exploring further are the issues of social isolation and personal relationships, including marriage and family issues as well as the provision of care between family members. Again, the words of respondents themselves are skillfully interspersed to illustrate the diverse personal experiences across dimensions.

The retirement experience of those less secure financially, and those who pursue unconventional retirement experiences are not addressed in this book. However, Weiss' documentation of the experience of the traditional upper-middle-class view of retirement provides an excellent framework that ties together what he calls “the scattered probings and economic research” into the experience of retirement. This framework provides a foundation for future “probings” of the experiences not captured by Weiss.

The book is engaging and accessible to both academic and general audiences, and comes at a point in time when the experience of retirement will likely begin to change significantly. Just as the baby boom generation has altered each stage of the pre-retirement life course, this cohort will surely alter the views and practices around retirement in the future. This puts Robert Weiss at the forefront of helping to change the view of retired people from marginalized members of society to productive, active, healthy adults. As the body of literature on retirement continues to grow, this book provides a much needed framework for future research.

Nancy Giunta, University of California, Berkeley
Child welfare, like many social service areas, has seen its share of trends. A recent trend in child welfare is centered around the use of the family and community in the child welfare decision making process. These family involvement programs stem from the idea that families are experts on themselves and with their community, can identify resources and supports that may not have been immediately identifiable to the child welfare agency. There are three main types of these programs in use in the United States: these are first, Team Decision-Making as part of the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s Family to Family Initiative; second, Family Team Conferencing; and third Family Group Conferencing. All of these programs were developed around the idea of family involvement, however they vary in the degree to which they involve families in the decision-making process. For example, in Team Decision-Making the team, which includes family members, community members, and professionals, works together to reach a consensus around decision, whereas in Family Group Conferencing, families make decisions during their own private time away from a larger group that also includes agency staff and community members.

In their book, Joan Pennell and Gary Anderson undertake the challenge of providing a guide to the history, theory, practice, and evaluation of Family Group Conferencing. The authors focus their efforts around Family Group Conferencing as used in child welfare in the United States and Canada. The book is divided into four main sections. The first section details Family Group Conferencing through chapters on preparing for a conference, cultural safety, and community partnerships. The second section provides a guide to policy and practice change with discussions of agency planning, training of staff and key personnel, and how to involve policy and the legislative process. The third section reviews the evaluation of Family Group Conferencing, including how to assess model fidelity, determining short and long term goals for evaluation, and
conducting a cost-benefit analysis of social service programs. The final section, entitled “Reshaping Child Welfare” provides a roadmap to current child welfare services, including handling domestic violence issues, a comparison of the various family involvement programs mentioned above, integrating child welfare and juvenile justice systems, and a review of Family Group Conferencing in the larger child welfare arena.

The book will be useful for anyone who is interested in the use of Family Group Conferencing in the United States and Canada. It is well written and an easy read for both practitioners and academics. The authors provide detailed instructions for the micro and macro practice of Family Group Conferencing including how to prepare for and conduct conferences as well as how to deal with the larger child welfare agency and policy arenas. What makes this book an essential read is the attention to evaluation and placement of Family Group Conferencing within the larger child welfare context. The authors provide a comparison of other family models and discuss the difficulties of evaluating such programs. The authors provide a critical and systematic approach to their subject and the result is a book which should be a required read for anyone interested in the current state of child welfare.

Anne Abramson-Madden, University of California, Berkeley
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