



Human Behavior

Human Rights & Justice



| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Professional Identity | Ethical Practice | Critical Thinking | Diversity in Practice | Human Rights & Justice | Research Based Practice | Human Behavior | Policy Practice | Practice Contexts | Engage Assess Intervene Evaluate |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|

Who should use this book and how should it be used? Instructors in both undergraduate and graduate social work education programs can use this book to help their students gain HBSE content. The book is designed to meet the requirements of the Council on Social Work Education for HBSE foundation content at either the undergraduate or graduate level. At the undergraduate level, the book may work best in programs with a two-course HBSE sequence designed to provide content on HBSE from a multisystems perspective (individual, family, group, organization, community, and global systems). At the foundation graduate level, the book can be effectively used as the text in a single HBSE course or a two-course sequence designed to provide basic content across system levels and, in the case of graduate programs, prior to delivering advanced HBSE content. In addition, this book integrates content from the other CSWE required competencies into the HBSE area.

The purpose of human behavior and the social environment content within the social work curriculum is to provide us with knowledge for practice. We need to continually look at this content for how to apply what we are learning about human behavior and the social environment to social work practice and to our lives. As we move through the material in this book, we will struggle to integrate what we are learning here with what we have learned and are learning from our own and others' life experiences, from our other social work courses, and from our courses in the liberal arts and sciences. We will try to weave together all these important sources of knowing and understanding into an organic whole that can help us become life-long learners and guide us in our social work practice.

PURPOSES, FOUNDATIONS, AND ASSUMPTIONS



Social workers are expected to understand how diversity characterizes and shapes the human experience and is critical to the formation of identity. Why is it important that, as social workers, we must recognize the influences of our own diversity and culture in order to be competent practitioners?

Moving through the content of this book can be compared to a journey. Before we begin our journey we will place the content and purposes of this human behavior and the social environment (HBSE) book within the context of the purposes and foundations of social work education as they have been defined by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). The **Council on Social Work Education** is the organization responsible for determining and monitoring the accreditation standards for undergraduate and graduate (MSW) social work education programs in the United States.

Assumptions

Your journey through this book will be guided by several very basic assumptions:

1. How we view the world and its people directly affects the way we will practice social work.
2. The way we view the world and its people already affects the way we behave in our daily lives.
3. Our work as social workers and our lives are not separate from each other.
4. Our lives are not separate from the lives of the people with whom we work and interact.
5. While our lives are interconnected with the lives of the people with whom we work and interact, we differ from each other in many ways. As social workers we must respect these differences and learn from them. Our differences can be celebrated as rich, positive, and mutual sources of knowledge, growth, and change for all concerned.

6. The assumptions we make about ourselves and others are strongly influenced by our individual and collective histories and cultures.
7. Change is a constant part of our lives and the lives of the people with whom we work.

Such assumptions as these are reflected in what we will come to conceptualize as an alternative paradigm for thinking about social work. Before we discuss alternative paradigms further, we will explore the more general concept of paradigm.

PURPOSE OF THE SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION

According to the Council on Social Work Education:

The purpose of the social work profession is to promote human and community well-being. Guided by a person and environment construct, a global perspective, respect for human diversity, and knowledge based on scientific inquiry, social work's purpose is actualized through its quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons. (CSWE 2008: 1)

The purpose of social work will guide us throughout our journey to understand HBSE content. The purpose emerges from the history of the social work profession and its continuing concern for improving quality of life, especially for vulnerable populations.

Core Competencies



Social workers are expected to be knowledgeable about the value base of the profession. How might the fundamental values of the social work profession be reflected in and guide our efforts to gain knowledge about human behavior and the social environment?

Social work education programs (BSW and MSW) are required to prepare all students to demonstrate mastery of ten core competencies. These competencies, along with the knowledge, values, and skills necessary to achieve competence, and examples of practice behaviors that provide evidence of mastery of the competencies are summarized in Table 1.1.

While achieving competence in human behavior and the social environment (see Table 1.1, Core Competency #7) is the focus of this book, significant attention is also given to integrating the other nine core competencies with knowledge, values, and skills you gain in HBSE (see Table 1.1). In addition, Competency #9, “respond to contexts that shape practice,” is an integral element related to HBSE, since so much of what we will address in this book is intertwined with the “contexts” or “environments” (i.e., Human Behavior and the social **environment**) that both influence and are influenced by human behavior. The competencies acquired as you move through the book and your HBSE course(s) are clearly linked with the competencies you are acquiring in your other social work courses including field education.

It is difficult to imagine that competence in HBSE can be achieved without including content related to the other core competencies:

- ◆ The development of your professional identity as a social worker
- ◆ Ethical behaviors and dilemmas
- ◆ Critical thinking skills
- ◆ Human diversity
- ◆ Human rights and social and economic justice
- ◆ Research-informed practice and practice-informed research
- ◆ Social policy practice
- ◆ The processes involved in *doing* social work

It is difficult as well to imagine that achieving competence in the nine areas listed above could be accomplished without HBSE content. In essence, this book is intended to be an integral and interdependent part of your overall social work education.

In addition, the content of this book is grounded in the basic and fundamental values of the social work profession as identified by the CSWE: *service, social justice, the dignity and worth of the person, the importance of human relationships, competence, human rights, and scientific inquiry* (CSWE 2008). These values are and have historically been the underpinning for all of social work education and practice.

Table 1.1 EPAS 2008 Core Competencies, Definitions, Operational Practice Behaviors

| Competency | Necessary Knowledge, Values, Skills | Operational Practice Behaviors |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Identify as a professional social worker and conduct oneself accordingly. | 1. Social workers serve as representatives of the profession, its mission, and its core values. 2. Social workers know the profession's history. 3. Social workers commit themselves to the profession's enhancement. 4. Social workers commit themselves to their own professional conduct and growth. | 1. Advocate for client access to the services of social work; 2. Practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development; 3. Attend to professional roles and boundaries; 4. Demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, and communication; 5. Engage in career-long learning; and 6. Use supervision and consultation. |
| 2. Apply social work ethical principles to guide professional practice. | 5. Social workers have an obligation to conduct themselves ethically. 6. Engage in ethical decision-making. 7. Social workers are knowledgeable about the value base of the profession, its ethical standards, and relevant law. | 7. Recognize and manage personal values in a way that allows professional values to guide practice; 8. Make ethical decisions by applying standards of the National Association of Social Workers Code of Ethics and, as applicable, of the International Federation of Social Workers/International Association of Schools of Social Work Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles; 9. Tolerate ambiguity in resolving ethical conflicts; and 10. Apply strategies of ethical reasoning to arrive at principled decisions. |
| 3. Apply critical thinking to inform and communicate professional judgments. | 8. Social workers are knowledgeable about the principles of logic, scientific inquiry, and reasoned discernment. 9. They use critical thinking augmented by creativity and curiosity. 10. Critical thinking also requires the synthesis and communication of relevant information. | 11. Distinguish, appraise, and integrate multiple sources of knowledge, including research-based knowledge, and practice wisdom; 12. Analyze models of assessment, prevention, intervention, and evaluation; and 13. Demonstrate effective oral and written communication in working with individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and colleagues. |

| Competency | Necessary Knowledge, Values, Skills | Operational Practice Behaviors |
|--|---|--|
| 4. Engage diversity and difference in practice. | <p>11. Social workers understand how diversity characterizes and shapes the human experience and is critical to the formation of identity.</p> <p>12. The dimensions of diversity are understood as the intersectionality of multiple factors including age, class, color, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender identity and expression, immigration status, political ideology, race, religion, sex, and sexual orientation.</p> <p>13. Social workers appreciate that, as a consequence of difference, a person's life experiences may include oppression, poverty, marginalization, and alienation as well as privilege, power, and acclaim.</p> | <p>14. Recognize the extent to which a culture's structures and values may oppress, marginalize, alienate, or create or enhance privilege and power;</p> <p>15. Gain sufficient self-awareness to eliminate the influence of personal biases and values in working with diverse groups;</p> <p>16. Recognize and communicate their understanding of the importance of difference in shaping life experiences; and</p> <p>17. View themselves as learners and engage those with whom they work as informants.</p> |
| 5. Advance human rights and social and economic justice. | <p>14. Each person, regardless of position in society, has basic human rights, such as freedom, safety, privacy, an adequate standard of living, health care, and education.</p> <p>15. Social workers recognize the global interconnections of oppression and are knowledgeable about theories of justice and strategies to promote human and civil rights.</p> <p>16. Social work incorporates social justice practices in organizations, institutions, and society to ensure that these basic human rights are distributed equitably and without prejudice.</p> | <p>18. Understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination;</p> <p>19. Advocate for human rights and social and economic justice; and</p> <p>20. Engage in practices that advance social and economic justice.</p> |

continued

Table 1.1 Continued

| Competency | Necessary Knowledge, Values, Skills | Operational Practice Behaviors |
|---|---|--|
| 6. Engage in research-informed practice and practice-informed research. | 17. Social workers use practice experience to inform research, employ evidence-based interventions, evaluate their own practice, and use research findings to improve practice, policy, and social service delivery. 18. Social workers comprehend quantitative and qualitative research and understand scientific and ethical approaches to building knowledge. | 21. use practice experience to inform scientific inquiry and 22. use research evidence to inform practice. |
| 7. Apply knowledge of human behavior and the social environment. | 19. Social workers are knowledgeable about human behavior across the life course; 20. The range of social systems in which people live; and 21. The ways social systems promote or deter people in maintaining or achieving health and well-being. 22. Social workers apply theories and knowledge from the liberal arts to understand biological, social, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development. | 23. utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation; and 24. critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment. |
| 8. Engage in policy practice to advance social and economic well-being and to deliver effective social work services. | 23. Social work practitioners understand that policy affects service delivery and they actively engage in policy practice. 24. Social workers know the history and current structures of social policies and services; 25. Social Workers know the role of policy in service delivery; and 26. Social Workers know role of practice in policy development. | 25. analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being; and 26. collaborate with colleagues and clients for effective policy action. |
| 9. Respond to contexts that shape practice. | 27. Social workers are informed, resourceful, and proactive in responding to evolving organizational, community, and societal contexts at all levels of practice. 28. Social workers recognize that the context of practice is dynamic, and use knowledge and skill to respond proactively. | 27. continuously discover, appraise, and attend to changing locales, populations, scientific and technological developments, and emerging societal trends to provide relevant services; and 28. provide leadership in promoting sustainable changes in service delivery and practice to improve the quality of social services. |

| Competency | Necessary Knowledge, Values, Skills | Operational Practice Behaviors |
|--|---|---|
| 10. Engage, assess, intervene, and evaluate with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities | <p>29. Professional practice involves the dynamic and interactive processes of engagement, assessment, intervention, and evaluation at multiple levels.</p> <p>30. Social workers have the knowledge and skills to practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities.</p> <p>31. Practice knowledge includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identifying, analyzing, and implementing evidence-based interventions designed to achieve client goals; b. Using research and technological advances; c. Evaluating program outcomes and practice effectiveness; d. Developing, analyzing, advocating, and providing leadership for policies and services; and e. Promoting social and economic justice. | <p>Engagement</p> <p>29. substantively and affectively prepare for action with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities;</p> <p>30. use empathy and other interpersonal skills; and</p> <p>31. develop a mutually agreed-on focus of work and desired outcomes.</p> <p>Assessment</p> <p>32. collect, organize, and interpret client data;</p> <p>33. assess client strengths and limitations;</p> <p>34. develop mutually agreed-on intervention goals and objectives; and</p> <p>35. select appropriate intervention strategies.</p> <p>Intervention</p> <p>36. initiate actions to achieve organizational goals;</p> <p>37. implement prevention interventions that enhance client capacities;</p> <p>38. help clients resolve problems;</p> <p>39. negotiate, mediate, and advocate for clients; and</p> <p>40. facilitate transitions and endings.</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>41. Social workers critically analyze, monitor, and evaluate interventions.</p> |

Source: CSWE, 2008 455:3-7

HUMAN BEHAVIOR AND THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

So, specifically what does the CSWE expect of us in order to attain the required competence in HBSE? In order to become competent in applying “knowledge of human behavior and the social environment,” we are expected to be knowledgeable about:

- ◆ Human behavior across the life course
- ◆ The range of social systems
- ◆ The ways social systems promote or deter people in maintaining or achieving health and well-being

In addition, we are expected to be able to:

- ◆ Apply theories and knowledge from the liberal arts to understand biological, social, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development

We will know we have achieved these expectations when we can:

- ◆ Utilize conceptual frameworks to guide the processes of assessment, intervention, and evaluation
- ◆ Critique and apply knowledge to understand person and environment. (CSWE 2008:6)

In addition to being guided by the requirements of CSWE regarding HBSE, our journey through this book will be guided by a several very basic assumptions.

PARADIGMS AND SOCIAL WORK

A **paradigm** “is a world view, a general perspective, a way of breaking down the complexity of the real world” (Lincoln and Guba 1985:15). Paradigms constitute “cultural patterns of group life” (Schutz 1944). More specifically, Kuhn (1970 [1962]:175) defines a paradigm as “the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community.” Paradigms shape and are shaped by values, knowledge, and beliefs about the nature of our worlds. The values, knowledge, and beliefs about the world that make up paradigms are often so “taken for granted” that we are virtually unaware of their existence or of the assumptions we make because of them. For social workers the notion of paradigm is particularly important, because if we can become conscious of the elements that result in different world views, this awareness can provide us with tools to use to think about and to understand ourselves, others, and the environments we all inhabit. The notion of paradigm can help us understand more completely the past perspectives, current realities, and future possibilities about what it means to be human. Furthermore, the notion of paradigm can help us understand our own and others’ roles in creating and re-creating the very meaning of humanness.

Specifically, thinking in terms of paradigms can provide us with new ways of understanding humans’ behaviors in individual, family, group, organizational, community, and global contexts. The concept of paradigm can serve us very well to order and to increase our awareness of multiple theories, models, and perspectives about human behavior and the social environment. The notion of paradigm can help us understand the way things are, and, equally important for social workers, it can help us understand the way things *might* be.

Two Types of Paradigms: Traditional and Alternative

In this book we are concerned with exploring two quite different but not mutually exclusive kinds of paradigms. One of these we refer to as traditional or dominant paradigms. The other we will call alternative or possible paradigms. We explore in some detail the characteristics of both of these kinds of paradigms in Chapter 2. For now, when we refer to **traditional or dominant paradigms**, we simply mean the paradigms or world views that have most influenced the environments that make up our worlds. When we refer to **alternative or possible paradigms**, we mean world views that have had less influence and have been less prominent in shaping our own and others’ views about humans and their environments. For example, the belief that quantitative and objective approaches provide the most dependable (or the most accurate) avenues to understanding the world around us reflects two core elements of the traditional and dominant paradigm.

An example of quantitative and objective elements of traditional or dominant paradigm thinking related to social work can be illustrated through the following approach to assessing and identifying community needs in order to design and implement services to meet those needs. According to the traditional or dominant approach, we assume that we can best understand the needs of the people in the community through use of a survey. We distribute a questionnaire to a random sample of community residents. We design the questionnaire using a list of specific possible needs from which the community respondents can select. We ask the respondents to make their selections by completing the questionnaire we have designed and returning it to us. Once the questionnaires are returned, we do a statistical analysis of the responses. Based on the frequency of responses to our questions we determine the community's needs. We then set about bringing into the community the resources and people we believe are necessary to design and implement services to meet the needs determined through the survey.

The belief that we can learn as much or more about the world around us from qualitative and subjective, as from quantitative and objective, approaches to understanding reflects an alternative and nondominant view of the world. Using the same social-work-related example as above, let's take an alternative approach to understanding the needs of a particular community in order to design and implement services to meet those needs. Our alternative approach will have us not simply asking community members to answer questions about typical community needs we have previously devised and listed in a questionnaire. We will instead first go into the community and involve as many different people representing as many diverse groups (not a random sample) as possible. We will involve these community members not primarily as respondents to predetermined questions but as partners in determining what the questions should be, how the questions should be asked (individual or group face-to-face meetings, perhaps), and who should do the asking (the community members themselves, rather than outside "experts," for example) (Guba and Lincoln 1989; Reason 1988). We are primarily interested in finding and understanding needs emerging from the real-life experiences of community people. We seek articulation of needs described in the language of the community members themselves. As this process is carried out, we continue to work as partners with community members in gathering resources and connecting people together to address the needs they have articulated. This process focuses on involving the community members directly in creating resources and in delivering services in their community.

The two processes described above represent quite different approaches to doing the same thing. Though the two approaches are not necessarily mutually exclusive, they do operate from very different assumptions about us as social workers, about the appropriate level of involvement of a community's citizens, and about our relationships with one another. Traditional approaches see the two groups of people—those doing the studying and intervening ("us") and those being studied and to whom interventions are directed ("them")—as separate from each other, with very different roles to play. Alternative approaches see the parties involved as interconnected partners in a mutual and emergent process.

Paradigm Analysis, Critical Thinking, and Deconstruction

Paradigm analysis is a helpful process for becoming more aware, constructively critical, and analytical in our interactions inside and outside the formal context of our education—in our work and in our interpersonal relationships.

Put simply, **paradigm analysis** is learning to “think paradigm.” It is a process of continually asking questions about what the information, both spoken and unspoken, that we send and receive reflects about our own and others’ views of the world and its people, especially people different from ourselves. It is a process of continually “thinking about thinking.” Paradigm analysis requires us to continually and critically evaluate the many perspectives we explore for their consistency with the core concerns of social work. It is important to recognize that such critical thinking as that required of paradigm analysis is a helpful, positive, and constructive process, rather than a negative or destructive one.

Paradigm Analysis

Paradigm analysis involves first of all asking a set of very basic questions about each of the perspectives we explore in order to determine its compatibility with the core concerns of social work. These questions are:

1. Does this perspective contribute to preserving and restoring human dignity?
2. Does this perspective recognize the benefits of, and does it celebrate, human diversity?
3. Does this perspective assist us in transforming ourselves and our society so that we welcome the voices, the strengths, the ways of knowing, the energies of us all?
4. Does this perspective help us all (ourselves and the people with whom we work) to reach our fullest human potential?
5. Does the perspective or theory reflect the participation and experiences of males and females; economically well-off and poor; white people and people of color; gay men, lesbians, bisexuals, and heterosexuals; old and young; temporarily able-bodied and people with disabilities?

The answers we find to these questions will tell us generally if the perspective we are exploring is consistent with the core concerns of social work. The answer to the final question will tell us about how the paradigm came to be and who participated in its development or construction. Both critical thinking and “deconstruction” are required to do paradigm analysis.

Critical Thinking

In debating the importance and possibility of teaching critical thinking in social work education, Gibbs argues that it is an essential part of the education process for social workers. A general definition of **critical thinking** is “the careful and deliberate determination of whether to accept, reject, or suspend judgment about a claim” (Moore and Parker in Bloom and Klein 1997:82). How does one engage in the process of critical thinking? Gibbs et al. describe the perspective and processes necessary to “do” critical thinking:

1. A predisposition to question conclusions that concern client care and welfare;
2. Asking “does it work?” and “how do you know?” when confronted with claims that a method helps clients, and also questioning generalizations about treatment methods;

3. Weighing evidence for and against assertions in a logical, rational, systematic, data-based way; and
4. Analyzing arguments to see what is being argued, spotting and explaining common fallacies in reasoning, and applying basic methodological principles of scientific reasoning. (1995:196)

Deconstruction

Deconstruction is a process of analyzing “texts” or perspectives “that is sensitive . . . to marginalized voices” (Sands and Nuccio 1992:491) and “biased knowledge” (Van Den Bergh 1995:xix). Through deconstruction “biased knowledge can be altered by reconstructing truth through inclusion of the voices of disempowered people. Knowledge that had previously been marginalized can then be centered” (hooks 1984 in Van Den Bergh 1995:xix). Deconstruction requires that we do “not accept the constructs used as given; instead [we look] at them in relation to social, historical, and political contexts. The deconstructionist identifies the biases in the text, views them as problematic, and ‘decenters’ them. Meanwhile, the perspectives that are treated as marginal are ‘centered’ ” (Sands and Nuccio 1992:491). Through this process of moving marginal voices to the center, more inclusive understandings of reality emerge. Missing or marginalized voices begin to be heard and begin to become a significant part of the paradigm creation process.

SEHB or HBSE?: A Critical Thinking Deconstructive Example

A critical thinking and deconstructive approach can and should be applied to your thinking about the subject of this book and the CSWE requirement that content on “human behavior and the social environment” be included as one of the foundations of your social work education. For example, we might question the very name of this foundation area—Human Behavior and the Social Environment. Why is “human behavior” first in the name and “social environment” second? How might the perspectives and content of this book and this course change if the course or the foundation area were referred to as “Social Environment and Human Behavior?” One might argue that if this were the name, a significant shift in both perspective and content would need to take place. The very order of the chapters in this book might need to be reversed. If the social environment is primary and human behavior is secondary in the name, rather than trying to understand individual human behavior (human development) first, we might focus first on the impact of larger systems on the individual human. We might begin by trying to understand the important influences of the larger social environment—global issues for example—on the individual’s development. As a result, you might explore Chapter 10—the “global” chapter—before you read Chapters 4 and 5—the chapters concerned with individual development. There might also be only one chapter focused on individual behavior and development rather than two.

To think critically about this question requires asking questions about more than this book or this course. It requires thinking about the priorities of social work education and practice. Should social work be primarily concerned with understanding and intervening at the level of the individual, or should our primary focus be understanding and intervening in the larger social environment in order to fulfill the purposes of social work? This is a question members of the profession have struggled with throughout much of our history.

It is an issue we will struggle with and will return to as we move through the chapters in this book. One way that we will do so is by including discussion of content from the perspective of the “social environment and human behavior” in a number of the remaining chapters. For example, with such a shift in perspective, would the priority given of the profession and commitment to poverty reduction change?

Poverty Reduction

Perhaps such a change in perspective would result in a return in the profession to a primary focus on poverty reduction that many in the profession believe has become underemphasized. If we look at a central purpose of social work—“to promote human and community well-being,” which is “actualized through its quest for social and economic justice” and “the elimination of poverty” (CSWE 2008:7)—we see poverty elimination as a prominent component. If we look at the current required competencies for social work education, we see one competency focused on “human rights and social and economic justice.” This competency is listed as #5 of the 10 competencies (see page 4 and Competency #5 in Table 1.1, “advance human rights and social and economic justice”). As we look at the various system levels of concern to us, we will consistently see that poverty status is closely associated with how well one does on virtually all social, educational, and health indicators at all system levels. Poverty is directly linked to barriers to attaining a good education, to maintaining health throughout the life course, to family and community well-being, to access to and use of technological resources, to violence and abuse, and to infant mortality and low-birthweight babies. Low birthweight is a predictor of many health and developmental risks in children. Rank and Hirschl argue, “whether the discussion revolves around welfare use, racial inequalities, single-parent families, infant mortality, economic insecurity, or a host of other topics, poverty underlies each and every one of these subjects” (Rank and Hirschl 1999: 201).

Poverty and Oppression

Perhaps most important as we proceed on our journey is to attend to the intertwining of oppression and poverty. For example, we need to carefully examine why being a member of an oppressed group—a person of color, a woman, a person with a disability—makes one so much more likely to be poor in U.S. society and globally than a member of the dominant group (white male of European heritage).

SEHB: A Global Context

Perhaps one of the most dramatic examples of the need to consider the social environment at least equally, if not first, in attempts to understand human behavior is the increasingly global and interdependent context in which we live. For people in the United States and to a large extent around the world, the events of September 11, 2001, and those unfolding since that tragedy brought a sense of urgency to consistently including the global context as an important sphere of the social environment. As you proceed through the chapters in this book, you will regularly explore individual, family, group, organizational, community, social, economic, and policy issues through a global lens.

Technological Poverty: Social Work and HBSE/SEHB

As we will see in the chapters that follow, constantly evolving technology continues to reshape our ability to communicate locally and globally, and it is also a major social and environmental influence on human behavior at individual, family, group, organizational, and community levels. As technology continues to play an increasingly influential role in our lives both at the individual and collective levels, it is essential that we become increasingly better able to assess and understand the impact of technology in multiple areas of human behavior and the social environment. We must learn to use technology as one of the important tools to assist us in achieving the purposes of social work.

However, we must approach technology and the changes it brings from a critical perspective. In order to accomplish this, we must think about both the benefits of technology and its limits. For social workers, it is especially important to recognize the potential of technology to increase rather than decrease the gap between the “haves” and the “have-nots” in the United States and more importantly in a global context. This increasing gap in access to technology and its benefits is referred to as the **digital divide**. As we proceed through coming chapters we will attend to the benefits and limitations of technology for increasing human well-being, alleviating poverty and oppression, and increasing our understanding of human behavior and the social environment at multiple levels. We will also explore policy and practice implications surrounding technology.

Paradigms and History

To help us apply a critical thinking approach to explore either traditional or alternative paradigms, we need to acquire a historical perspective about the contexts out of which these world views emerged. Neither the traditional nor their alternative counterparts came about in a historical vacuum. They instead emerged as points along a historical continuum marked by humans’ attempts to understand their own behaviors, the behaviors of others, and the environments in which they lived.

Pre-modern/Pre-positivism

A historical perspective can help us appreciate that the paradigms we will explore as traditional and currently dominant were considered quite alternative and even radical at the times of their emergence. For example, the emergence of **humanism**—a belief in the power of humans to control their own behaviors and the environments in which they lived—in Europe at the opening of the Renaissance (mid-1400s) and at the ending of the Middle Ages (the early 1400s) was an alternative, and for many a radical, paradigm at that time. Humanism was considered by many, especially those in power, to be not only alternative but also dangerous, wrong, and heretical. Humanism was considered an affront to scholasticism, the traditional paradigm or worldview that had been dominant throughout much of Europe in the Middle Ages (approximately A.D. 476–mid-1400s). **Scholasticism** (approximately A.D. 800–mid-1400s) was a worldview that saw a Christian god, represented by the Roman Catholic Church, as the sole determiner and judge of human behavior. This Christian god was the controller of the entire natural world or environment in which humans existed. Similarly, **Protestantism** was a worldview placed in motion by Martin Luther during the early 1500s. It questioned the absolute authority of the Roman Catholic Church and the Pope as

the sole representative of God, and was seen as another radical alternative affronting the existing worldview. The emergence of both humanism and Protestantism were alternative ways of viewing humans and their environments that called into question, and were seen as significant threats to, the then existing dominant and traditional ways of viewing the world (Manchester 1992; Sahakian 1968).

Modernism/Positivism

Another important perspective from which to get a sense of the historical continuum out of which paradigms emerge is that of the birth of worldviews explaining human behavior and the environments we inhabit through science. The emergence of worldviews that explained the world through science were in some ways extensions of the humanistic paradigm. Science was a powerful tool through which humans could gain control of their behaviors and of the universe they inhabited. **Science** allowed humans to understand the world by directly observing it through the senses and by carefully measuring, experimenting, and analyzing of what was observed. The emergence of scientific thinking or positivism during the period called the Enlightenment or the “Age of Reason” in the 17th and 18th centuries, however, was also a significant challenge to humanism and represented an alternative paradigm itself. Scientific thinking questioned humanism’s central concern for gaining understanding through such expressions as art, literature, and poetry. A scientific world view saw humanism and its reflection in the humanities as a traditional and insufficient way of viewing the world.

Science sought to extend, if not replace, humanism’s ways of knowing and understanding the world with a more reliable and comprehensive perspective that was *cosmos centered* rather than [*hu*]man centered (Sahakian 1968:119). The humanities raised questions and sought answers by looking to and rediscovering the great ideas and expressions of humans from the past, such as the classic works of the Romans and Greeks. Science offered keys to unlocking the secrets of the universe and the future through new ways of asking and answering questions. Science promised not only new questions and new ways of posing them but also answers to questions both new and old (Boulding 1964).

The empirical observations of Galileo Galilei in the first half of the 1600s confirming the earlier findings of Copernicus in the early 1500s, for example, literally provided a new view of the world (Manchester 1992:116–117). This new and alternative view moved the earth from the stable and unmoving center of the universe to one in which the earth was but one of many bodies revolving around the sun. The threat posed by such a dramatically different view of the world as that of Copernicus to the traditional Roman Catholic theology-based paradigm is captured eloquently by Manchester in his book *A World Lit Only by Fire*:

The Scriptures assumed that everything had been created for the use of man. If the earth were shrunk to a mere speck in the universe, mankind would also be diminished. Heaven was lost when “up” and “down” lost all meaning—when each became the other every twenty-four hours. (1992:229)

According to Manchester, it was written in 1575 that “No attack on Christianity is more dangerous . . . than the infinite size and depth of the universe” (1992:229).

Much about the traditional paradigms that we explore in the next chapters has its roots in science and scientific ways of thinking that we virtually take for granted today. These approaches to understanding our worlds are

centered in empirical observation and rational methods of gaining knowledge. So, science offers us a current example of what was, in a historical sense, an alternative paradigm becoming a traditional paradigm today. As has historically been the case, changes in paradigms currently taking place—what we will call *alternative paradigms*—call into question, challenge, and seek to extend our world views beyond those that have science and a scientific approach as the central tool for understanding human behavior and the social environment.

Postmodernism/Post-positivism

Berman (1996), for example, notes that the basic methods and assumptions of the traditional scientific paradigm that emerged during the 17th-century Enlightenment have not solely resulted in progress for people and the earth. Berman (1996:33) argues that the scientific, also referred to as “the mechanical paradigm sees the earth as inert, as dead, or at best as part of the solar system, which is viewed as a kind of clockwork mechanism . . . and one consequence of [this view] was the opening of the door to the unchecked exploitation of the earth.” In addition Berman suggests that science leaves little room for the spiritual and subjective elements of the world and its mechanistic tendencies leave little motivation for seeing the world as a living system. He makes an important observation that: “As a tool, there is nothing wrong with the mechanistic paradigm. But for some reason, we couldn’t stop there; we had to equate it with all of reality and so have arrived at a dysfunctional science and society at the end of the twentieth century” (Berman 1996:35). We will explore in more detail both the elements of scientific method and alternatives to the scientific paradigm in the next two chapters.

For now we simply need to recognize that today there is considerable discussion and considerable disagreement as well, about whether we have moved or are moving in history to the point that we live in a post-positivist or post-modern world in which science and scientific reasoning are less likely to be considered the only, the best, or even the most accurate means for understanding the world around us.

Historical periods in summary

Before we proceed to look at social work in the context of history it may be helpful for us to try to get an overview (though a very incomplete and oversimplified view) of some basic periods of history. Below is another different perspective on the past that can help us do this. The perspective is provided by Lather (1991) and uses the notion of modernism as central to looking at the past and the present in terms of knowledge production, views of history, and the economy.

Three historical eras profiled by Lather:

1. Premodern: Centrality of church/sacred basis of determining truth and knowledge; feudal economy; history as divinely ordered.
2. Modern: Centrality of secular humanism, individual reason, and science in determining truth; the industrial age, capitalism, and bureaucracy as bases of economic life; history as linear in the direction of constant progress driven by human rationality and science. Ideal of ignorance to enlightenment to emancipation of human potential as the “inevitable trajectory of history.”

3. Postmodern: Existing/traditional knowledge and knowledge creation processes intensely questioned. Emphasis on multiple ways of knowing through processes that are non-hierarchical, feminist influenced, and participatory; economy more and more based on information, technology, and global capitalism; view of history as non-linear, cyclical, continually rewritten. “Focus on the present as history, the past as a fiction of the present.” (Lather 1991:160–161)

Social Work History: Science and Art

That we should wonder about alternative approaches to those based solely on a scientific approach to understanding HBSE is significant and timely for us as social workers (and soon-to-be social workers). A scientific approach to doing social work has been a major avenue used by social workers to attempt to understand and intervene in the world during the short history of social work as a field of study and practice. Although we have claimed allegiances to both art and science, many of us have preferred that science guide our work. This is not surprising, given the power and faith in the scientific approach that has pervaded the modern world of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The period of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries coincides with the birth and development of social work as an organized field of knowledge and practice.

Many of the historical arguments and issues concerning traditional and alternative paradigms—humanism, science, religion—for understanding our worlds and ourselves have parallels in the history of social work. The mission, concerns, and purposes of social work all reflect beliefs about the nature of the world and people. The concern of social work with individuals, families, and communities in interaction and interdependence, as well as its concern for social reform to bring about improvements in individual and collective well-being, reflects important beliefs about the nature of the world and its inhabitants.

Goldstein (1990:33–34) reminds us that social work has followed two quite distinct tracks to put its mission into practice. These two distinct tracks parallel in a number of ways the two quite different world views or paradigms represented by humanistic and scientific perspectives. Goldstein reminds us that, while social work adopted a scientific approach to pursuing its mission, it did not discard completely its humanistic inclinations. These divergent paths have led us to multiple approaches to understanding humans’ behaviors and the environments they inhabit and within which they interact. These paths have at times and for some of us led to “Freudian psychology, the empiricism of behavioral psychology, and the objectivity of the scientific methods of the social sciences” (1990:33). At other times we have followed much different paths in “existential, artistic, and value-based” alternatives (1990:35). Goldstein found social workers today (as he found the social sciences generally) turning again toward the humanistic, subjective, or interpretive paths. This is a direction quite consistent with the alternative paradigms for understanding human behavior and the social environment that we will explore in the chapters to come. This alternative path allows social workers “to give more serious attention to and have more regard for the subjective domain of our clients’ moral, theological, and cultural beliefs, which . . . give meaning to the experiences of individuals and families” (England 1986 in Goldstein 1990:38).

Evidence-Based Practice (EBP)

More recently this ongoing debate has focused on what is referred to as evidence-based practice. **Evidence-based practice (EBP)** is “the conscientious, explicit, and judicious use of current best evidence in making decisions about the care of individuals” (Sackett, Richardson, Rosenberg, and Haynes, 1997, in Gambrill 1999). According to Gambrill:

It involves integrating individual practice expertise with the best available external evidence from systematic research as well as considering the values and expectations of clients. Hallmarks of evidence-based practice (EPB) include: (1) an individualized assessment; (2) a search for the best available external evidence related to the client’s concerns and an estimate of the extent to which this applies to a particular client; and (3) a consideration of the values and expectations of clients (Sackett et al., 1997). Skills include identifying answerable questions relating to important practice questions, identifying the information needed to answer these questions, tracking down with maximum efficiency the best evidence with which to answer these questions, critically appraising this evidence for its validity and usefulness, applying the results of this appraisal to work with clients and, lastly, evaluating the outcome. Evidence-based practice requires an atmosphere in which critical appraisal of practice-related claims flourishes, and clients are involved as informed participants. A notable feature of EBP is attention to clients’ values and expectations. (1999)

Witkin and Harrison (2001) question the shift to evidence-based practice. They argue that “social workers see the heart of their practice as ‘person in situation,’ in expanding problem understanding to include social and environmental elements. Social work practice involves seeing people as much for their differences as for anything that links them to classifiable problems or diagnoses. It values the often subjugated perspectives of the people we serve and attempts to understand their individual and collective narratives of their situations and conditions” (Witkin 2001: 294). Witkin suggests that too much reliance on an evidence-based practice approach limits social work practice and aligns it too closely with dominant paradigms. He suggests that the “person and environment” perspective requires social workers to individualize their work and use multiple lenses to focus on the actual lived experiences of persons in interaction with groups and communities. He points out, for example, that “these interactive accounts of people in their situations are not just tools for understanding, but the essential components of the individual’s experience of social problems, medical conditions, and behavior. We learn to listen for discrepancies between the public discourse of disadvantaged people dealing with more powerful systems and the internal discourse within groups and individuals that frequently offer different understandings. In this sense, social workers often are cultural bridges, able to deal in multiple worlds of understanding” (Witkin and Harrison 2001:294). It is clear that the historic debate in social work over the proper balance of art and science in effective practice is alive and well and will continue.

Both/and not either/or

Much of the emphasis in this book is on shifting to alternative paradigms and transcending the limits of traditional and dominant paradigm thinking. It is important to realize, though, that our journey to understanding Human

Behavior and the Social Environment (referred to as HBSE throughout this book) is not to *either* one *or* the other worldview. Our journey will take us to *both* traditional *and* alternative destinations along the way. After all, traditional scientific worldviews have revealed much valuable knowledge about ourselves and our worlds.

We will try in this book to learn about alternative paradigms and to challenge and extend ourselves beyond traditional paradigms in which science is the single source of understanding. However, in order to understand alternative paradigms, we need to be cognizant of traditional theories about human behavior and development. We will challenge traditional paradigms as incomplete, as excluding many people, and as reflecting biases due to the value assumptions and historical periods out of which they emerged. These inadequacies, however, render traditional theories nonetheless powerful in the influences they have had in the past, that they currently have, and that they will continue to have on the construction and application of knowledge about human behavior and the social environment. Traditional approaches provide important departure points from which we may embark on our journey toward more complete, more inclusive, and less-biased visions (or at least visions in which bias is recognized and used to facilitate inclusiveness) of HBSE. Many of the alternative paradigms we will visit began as extensions or reconceptualizations of existing traditional worldviews.

There is another very practical reason for learning about theories that emerge from and reflect traditional paradigms. The practice world that social workers inhabit and that you will soon enter (and we hope transform) is a world constructed largely on traditional views of human behavior and the social environment. To survive in that world long enough to change it, we must be conversant in the discourse of that world. We must have sufficient knowledge of traditional and dominant paradigms of human behavior and development to make decisions about what in those worldviews we wish to retain because of its usefulness in attaining the goal of maximizing human potential. Knowledge of traditional and dominant paradigms is also necessary in deciding what to discard or alter to better serve that same core concern of social work.

Understanding the historical flow or continuum out of which differing world views emerged over time is an important means of recognizing the changes in perspectives on the world that at any given moment are likely to seem stable, permanent, and unchangeable. Even the changes occurring over time in the Western worldviews illustrated in the examples above give us a sense that permanency in approaches to understanding our worlds is less reality than perspective at a particular point in time. One way to conceptualize these fundamental changes occurring over time is to think in terms of paradigm shift.

Paradigm Shift

A **paradigm shift** is “a profound change in the thoughts, perceptions, and values that form a particular vision of reality” (Capra 1983:30). To express the fundamental changes required of a paradigm shift, Thomas Kuhn (1970) uses the analogy of travel to another planet. Kuhn tells us that a paradigm shift “is rather as if the professional community had been suddenly transported to another planet where familiar objects are seen in a different light and are joined by unfamiliar ones as well” (p. 111). The elements of this analogy—travel, another planet or world, viewing both familiar and new objects in a different light—are consistent with our efforts in this book to travel on a journey toward a more complete understanding of HBSE. Our journey will take us to

other people's worlds and it will call upon us to view new things in those worlds and familiar things in our own worlds in new ways and through others' eyes. As we continue on our journey we should try to appreciate that the process of taking the trip is as important and enlightening as any final destination we might reach.

Paradigms are not mysterious, determined for all time, immovable objects. Paradigms are social constructs created by humans. They can be and, in fact, have been changed and reconstructed by humans throughout our history (Capra 1983:30). Kuhn ([1962] 1970:92), for example, discusses scientific and political revolutions that result in paradigm shifts and changes. Such changes, Kuhn suggests, come about when a segment of a community, often a small segment, has a growing sense that existing institutions are unable to adequately address or solve the problems in the environment—an environment those same institutions helped create. The actions taken by the dissatisfied segment of the community can result in the replacement of all or parts of the older paradigm with a newer one. However, since not all humans have the same amount of influence or power and control over what a paradigm looks like and whose values and beliefs give it form, efforts to change paradigms involve conflict and struggles (Kuhn [1962] 1970:93).

Use of the notion of paradigm shift will enable us to expand our knowledge of human behavior and the social environment and to use this additional knowledge in our practice of social work. It can free us from an overdependence on traditional ways of viewing the world as the only ways of viewing the world. It can allow us to move beyond these views to alternative possibilities for viewing the world, its people, and their behaviors.

The concept of paradigm shift allows us to make the transitions necessary to continue our journey to explore alternative paradigms and paradigmatic elements that represent the many human interests, needs, and perspectives not addressed by or reflected in the traditional and dominant paradigm. The concept of paradigm shift is also helpful in recognizing relationships between traditional and alternative paradigms and for tracing how alternative paradigms often emerge from traditional or dominant ones. Traditional or dominant paradigms and alternative or possible paradigms for human behavior are often not necessarily mutually exclusive.

As we discussed in our exploration of paradigms and history, different paradigms can be described as different points in a progression of transformations in the way we perceive human behavior and the social environment. The progression from traditional and dominant to alternative and possible that we envision here is one that reflects a continuous movement (we hope) toward views of human behavior more consistent with the core concerns and historical values of social work and away from narrow perspectives that include only a privileged few and exclude the majority of humans. In some cases, this progression will mean returning to previously neglected paradigms. Such a progression, then, does not imply a linear, forward-only movement. It might more readily be conceived as a spiral or winding kind of movement. The worldviews illustrated in our discussion of history, for example, represented the perspectives almost exclusively of Europeans. Very different world views emerged in other parts of the world. Myers (1985:34), for example, describes an Afrocentric worldview that emerged over 5,000 years ago among Egyptians that posited the real world to be both spiritual and material at once. This holistic perspective found God manifest in everything. The self included "ancestors, the yet unborn, all of nature, and the entire community" (Myers 1985:35). Many scholars suggest that this paradigm continues to influence the worldviews of many people of African

descent today. This Afrocentric paradigm clearly offers an alternative to European humanist or scientific paradigms that emerged during the Renaissance. Such an alternative emphasizing the interrelatedness of individuals and community and their mutual responsibility for one another encompasses much that is valuable and consistent with the core concerns of social work. The notion of a continuum helps us to understand the importance and usefulness of knowing about dominant paradigms at the same time that we attempt to transcend or shift away from the limits of traditional paradigms and move toward ones that are more inclusive and that more fully reflect the core concerns of social work.

Paradigm Shift, Social Work, and Social Change

The concept of paradigm change has significant implications for us as social workers. If you recall from earlier discussion, the basic purposes of social work include social change or social transformation in their call for us to be involved in social and political action to promote *social and economic justice*. Social change is also required in our call to enhance human well-being and to work on behalf of oppressed persons denied access to opportunities and resources or power. When we as social workers become a part of the processes of changing paradigms and the institutions that emerge from them, we are, in essence, engaging in fundamental processes of social change and transformation.

We can use the information we now have about paradigms and paradigm analysis to change or replace paradigms that create obstacles to people meeting their needs and reaching their potential. Since paradigms are reflected throughout the beliefs, values, institutions, and processes that make up our daily lives, we need not limit our thinking about paradigms only to our immediate concerns here about human behavior and the social environment. We can apply what we know about paradigms and paradigm change throughout our education and practice. For us as students of social work, that means we must become aware of the nature of the paradigms reflected throughout all areas of our studies in social work necessary to achieve the 10 core competencies required of professional social workers (see Table 1.1). We certainly also must begin to analyze the nature and assumptions of the paradigms we encounter through our course work in the arts and humanities (music, theater, visual arts, philosophy, literature, English, languages, religious studies), social sciences (economics, political science, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history), and natural sciences (biology, physics, chemistry, geology, geography) as well as through our own personal histories and life experiences.

Socialization is the process of teaching new members the rules by which the larger group or society operates. Socialization involves imparting to new members the knowledge, values, and skills according to which they are expected to operate. For example, the social work education process in which you are currently involved is a process for socializing you to the knowledge, values, and skills expected of professional social workers. (We will explore the concept of socialization further in a later section.)

In a more general sense, we are socialized to and interact with others in the social environment from paradigmatic perspectives. These perspectives are not only imparted to us through formal education in the schools but also through what we are taught and what we learn from our families, religious institutions, and other groups and organizations as well. We are influenced by worldviews and we reflect the worldviews to which we have been socialized. The worldview likely to have influenced us most if we were socialized through the educational system in the United States is the traditional or

dominant paradigm. The influence of this paradigm is pervasive, even if the worldviews of our families or cultures are in conflict with parts or all of the traditional or dominant paradigm. Because of the power accorded thinking consistent with the traditional paradigm, it is extremely difficult for alternative paradigms to be accorded legitimacy. It is not, however, impossible. As we shall see, it is quite possible through understanding traditional and alternative paradigms and the dynamics of paradigm change that we can exercise choice in the paradigms or worldviews through which we lead our lives. We suggest here that social changes resulting from shifts in worldviews inherently and inextricably flow from changes in the way we as individuals view our worlds. This position is consistent with the suggestion of much alternative paradigm thinking, in particular that of feminism, that *the personal is political*.

In order to use our understanding of paradigms to support processes of social change/transformation we must first engage in the process of paradigm analysis we described earlier. Paradigm analysis, you might recall, requires us to ask a set of questions that can guide us, in our education and practice, toward adopting and adapting approaches to understanding human behavior and the social environment that incorporate perspectives consistent with the core concerns of social work.

As we suggested earlier, a significant responsibility for us as social workers is assisting people whose needs are not met and whose problems are not solved by the institutions and processes in the social environment that emerge from and reflect the dominant/traditional paradigms. Much of what social work is about involves recognizing, analyzing, challenging, and changing existing paradigms. An essential step in fulfilling this important responsibility is learning to listen to, respect, and effectively respond to the voices and visions that the people with whom we work have to contribute to their own well-being and to the common good. In this way paradigms that too often have been considered permanent and unchangeable can be questioned, challenged, altered, and replaced. More important, they can be changed to more completely include the worldviews of persons previously denied participation in paradigm-building processes.

Such a perspective on knowledge for practice allows us to operate in partnership with the people with whom we work. It allows us to incorporate their strengths, and it provides us an opportunity to use social work knowledge, skills, and values in concert with those strengths in our practice interactions.

The possible or alternative paradigms of human behavior with which we will be concerned are those that enrich, alter, or replace existing paradigms by including the voices and visions—values, beliefs, ways of doing and knowing—of persons who have usually been left out of the paradigm building that has previously taken place. It is interesting, but not coincidental, that the persons who have usually been left out of paradigm-building processes are often the same persons with whom social workers have traditionally worked and toward whom the concerns of social workers have historically been directed.

Much of our work as we proceed through the remaining chapters of this book will involve understanding, critiquing, and analyzing traditional or dominant paradigms as well as alternative, more inclusive paradigms. We will engage in these processes as we explore theories and information about individual human behavior in the contexts of families, groups, organizations, communities, and globally. Central to understanding, critiquing, and analyzing paradigms is consideration of the concepts of culture, ethnicity, and race in relation to paradigms.

PARADIGMS, CULTURE, ETHNICITY, AND RACE

A paradigm, as the concept is used here, encompasses a number of different but interrelated elements. Among the elements that can help us understand the complexities and variations of worldviews or paradigms held by different people are culture, ethnicity, and race. Even though, as Helms (1994:292) notes these terms “are often used interchangeably . . . neither culture nor ethnicity necessarily has anything to do with race, as the term is typically used in U.S. society.” Each of these terms include a variety of meanings and are used in different ways depending on the context of their use and the worldview held by their users. For example, each of these concepts, in the hands of their users, can either be a very strong and positive force for unity and cooperation or an equally strong and negative force for divisiveness and domination. We will examine some of the interrelated meanings of these concepts next.

Culture and Society: Multiple Meanings

A very basic and traditional definition of **culture** is that it is the “shared values, traditions, norms, customs, arts, history, folklore, and institutions of a group of people” (NCCC, 2004). Even more basic is the definition offered by Herskovits that culture is “the human-made part of the environment” (Lonner 1994:231). **Society** can be defined as a “group of people who share a heritage or history” (Persell 1987:47–48). Lonner (1994:231) suggests that culture is “the mass of behavior that human beings in any society learn from their elders and pass on to the younger generation.” This definition links the concepts culture and society as converging on or uniting with one another and adds the suggestion that culture is learned from others in the society. The transmission of culture can happen in two ways. It can occur through **socialization**, which is the teaching of culture by an elder generation to a younger one very explicitly through formal instruction and rules. This transmission process can also occur through **enculturation** by “implicitly or subtly” teaching the culture to the younger generation “in the course of everyday life” (Lonner 1994:234).

These definitions reflect the sense that culture is constructed by groups of people (societies), is made up of beliefs, practices, and products (artifacts), and is passed from one generation to another. However, many people would argue that culture is considerably more complex and varied than is implied by the definitions above.

Helms (1994) suggests, for example, that culture might be thought of as at least two very different entities or types: “a macroculture (symbolized here as CULTURE) and a variety of subsidiary cultures identified with particular collective identity groups (symbolized here as ‘culture’).” Helms’ definition of *culture* as “the customs, values, traditions, products, and sociopolitical histories of the social groups” seems quite similar to the traditional definitions given above, however, her reference to these cultures as “subsidiary” and existing “within a CULTURE, where CULTURE refers to the dominant society or group’s [belief system] or worldview” (1994:292) provides a significantly alternative perspective. Helms has added the dimension of dominance and power to the concept of culture. As we will see later the notion of power differences is an important element necessary for understanding differences between traditional or dominant and alternative paradigms.

The definitions above all emphasize similarities and commonalties among the people who make up cultures and societies. It is very important for us as social workers to be careful not to overgeneralize about these similarities. We need to recognize that “culture does not simply make people uniform or homogenize them: It rather sets trends from which in some cases it allows, and



How might the people in this photo and their activity reflect the concepts of culture, ethnicity, and race? How might the meaning differ depending on whether the people in the photo or others (you, for example) provide the definitions?

in other case even encourages, deviation: be it by attributing differentiating roles, or simply by encouraging individual differences in fashion, imagination, or style. In other words, a culture seems to need both uniformity and individuality" (Boesch 1991 in Lonner 1994:233).

Ethnicity

Ethnicity is "socially defined on the basis of cultural criteria. . . . Thus, customs, traditions, and values rather than physical appearance per se define ethnicity" (Van Den Berghe in Helms 1994:293). Helms (1994:293) suggests that ethnicity might "be defined as a social identity based on the culture of one's ancestors' national or tribal groups as modified by the demands of the CULTURE in which one group currently resides." As with her definitions of culture, Helms includes the impact of dominant or more powerful groups on other groups in her definition of ethnicity. She notes that the social identity that is ethnicity may be adapted or altered by groups as a result of demands of dominant or more powerful groups. However, she is careful to note the limits of a more powerful group in determining ethnicity for another group. She does this by differentiating between ethnic classification and ethnic identity. **Ethnic classification** is defined "from the outside in" and it "may be inferred from external criteria such as physical characteristics or symbolic behaviors (for example, ethnic dress)." **Ethnic identity**, on the other hand is "defined from the inside (of the person) out (to the world)" and is "self-defined and maintained because it 'feels good' rather than because it is necessarily imposed by powerful others" (Helms 1994: 293–294).

Multiple Meanings of Race

The word **race** has historically had a variety of meanings. These meanings have varied over time. Consistently, though, the very term *race* in U.S. society is highly charged emotionally and has different meanings and very different

consequences for different people. We will explore race here as a multifaceted concept and as a concept that must be considered contextually. We will also find that the meaning of race is consistently used in U.S. society as an arena for power struggle. Racial distinctions are often used as a means of attaining and holding power by dominant group members over less powerful groups. At this point, we address the concept of race in terms of its cultural and social meanings and we give some attention to misconceptions that race is primarily a biological rather than primarily a social construction with biological elements only secondary. We briefly explore the uses of racial designations for oppression and for solidarity and liberation. Chapter 2 addresses the dimensions of traditional and alternative paradigms dealing with whiteness, diversities, and oppressions.

RACE: BIOLOGY, CULTURE, OR BOTH

There has been ongoing argument in this society over what we mean by “races.” Spickard (1992:13–14) suggests that “the most common view has been to see races as distinct types. That is, there were supposed to have been at some time in the past four or five utterly distinct and pure races, with physical features, gene pools, and the character qualities that diverged entirely one from another.” The biological terms related to this purist view of races as types are **genotype**, which means genetic structure or foundation, and **phenotype**, which means physical characteristics and appearance.

Spickard (1992:15) also stresses that:

in the twentieth century, an increasing number of scientists have taken exception to the notion of races as types. James C. King (1981), perhaps the foremost American geneticist on racial matters, denounces the typological view as “make-believe” (p. 112). Biologists and physical anthropologists are more likely to see races as subspecies. That is, they recognize the essential commonality of all humans, and see races as geographically and biologically diverging populations. . . . They see all human populations, in all times and places, as mixed populations. There never were any ‘pure’ races.

Most scientists today have concluded, “that race is primarily about culture and social structure, not biology . . . [and that] while it has some relationship to biology . . . [it] is primarily a sociopolitical construct. The sorting of people into this race or that in the modern era has generally been done by powerful groups for the purposes of maintaining and extending their own power” (Spickard 1992:13–14).

RACE AND POWER

Spickard (1992:19) argues, “from the point of view of the dominant group, racial distinctions are a necessary tool of dominance. They serve to separate the subordinate people as ‘Other.’ Putting simple, neat racial labels on dominated peoples—and creating negative myths about the moral qualities of those peoples—makes it easier for the dominators to ignore the individual humanity of their victims. It eases the guilt of oppression.” For example, in U.S. society “the typological view of races developed by Europeans arranged

the peoples of the world hierarchically, with Caucasians at the top, Asians next, then Native Americans, and African at the bottom—in terms of both physical abilities and moral qualities” (Spickard 1992:14).

While race is often used as a tool of domination, it

is by no means only negative, however. From the point of view of subordinate peoples, race can be a positive tool, a source of belonging, mutual help, and self-esteem. Racial categories . . . identify a set of people with whom to share a sense of identity and common experience. . . . It is to share a sense of peoplehood that helps locate individuals psychologically, and also provides the basis for common political action. Race, this socially constructed identity, can be a powerful tool, either for oppression or for group self-actualization. (Spickard 1992:19)

Race: Biology, culture, power

As we noted earlier the concepts of culture, society, ethnicity, and race are closely intertwined. Helms and Gotunda (in Helms 1994) argue that race as it is used in the United States has three types of definitions that reflect this intertwining of multiple concepts:

1. Quasi-biological race: based on visible aspects of a person that are assumed to be racial in nature, such as skin color, hair texture, or physiognomy [facial features]. “Group-defining racial characteristics generally are selected by the dominant or sociopolitically powerful group. . . . Thus, in the United States, White people specify the relevant racial traits and use themselves as the standard or comparison group.” For example, “Native Americans are considered ‘red’ as compared to Whites; Blacks are black in contrast to Whites.”
2. Sociopolitical race: “efforts to differentiate groups by means of mutually exclusive racial categories also imply a [hierarchy] with respect to psychological characteristics, such as intelligence and morality, with gradations in skin color or other relevant racial-group markers determining the group’s location along the hierarchy. On virtually every socially desirable dimension, the descending order of superiority has been Whites, Asians, Native American, and Africans.”
3. Cultural race: the customs, traditions, products, and values of (in this instance) a racial group. (Helms 1994:297–299)

Social Work and Cultural Competence

It is not enough for social workers to simply understand the abstract complexities that make up definitions of culture, society, ethnicity, or race. Because respect for diversity is so central to social work values and practice and because culture is such an important tool for understanding human diversity, social workers are beginning to make considerations about culture and cultural differences central to what we consider to be competent social work practice. The notion of culturally competent social work practice and what it involves has been described for multiple levels and areas of practice including individual practitioners and clients, families and agencies.

Cultural Competence is a set of cultural behaviors and attitudes integrated into the practice methods of a system, agency, or its professionals, that enables

them to work effectively in cross cultural situations (National Center for Cultural Competence 2004). According to the National Center for Cultural Competence (NCCC), cultural competence comprises two dimensions:

- ◆ **Surface Structure:** Use people, places, language, music, food, and clothing familiar to and preferred by the target audience.
- ◆ **Deep Structure:** Involves socio-demographic and racial/ethnic population differences and the influence of ethnic, cultural, social, environmental, and historical factors on behaviors (National Center for Cultural Competence 2004).

The NCCC also suggest three major characteristics of culturally competent service delivery (see box below).

Culturally competent social work practice—its meaning and its application—is emerging as one of the most critical aspects of social work practice. It is especially important as the diversity of the U.S. population continues to increase. Culturally competent practice is also increasingly important as we become more and more interrelated with other people in the world as a result of the rapid shifts toward ever more global economics, communication, and transportation. Culturally competent social work practice is addressed in more detail in Chapter 3 as one of the “Tools for Social Work Practice.”

Paradigms, Culture, and Society

Paradigms or worldviews simultaneously shape and reflect the institutions and processes shared by people in a society. However, there is a great deal of variation in the specific paradigmatic elements—the parts that constitute a paradigm—and the degree to which these parts are shared by different persons in the same society. This is especially true in the United States, although it is often unrecognized. Paradigmatic elements include the processes, beliefs, values, and products that make up cultures and give multiple meanings to such concepts as ethnicity and race. They include and are reflected in such varied expressions of cultures as art, music, science, philosophy, religion, politics, economics, leisure, work, and education. As Logan (1990:25) suggests, “culture must be viewed in the sense of the spiritual life of a people as well as material and behavioral aspects.” As in the case of the concept of society, there is tremendous variation in the nature of the paradigmatic elements that constitute different cultures and the degree to which these elements are shared by the peoples of the United States and the world. It is contended here that this variation, this diversity, is a rich and essential, although underutilized, resource for understanding human behavior and the social environment.

Characteristics of Culturally Competent Service Delivery

Available: Availability of services refers to the existence of health services and bicultural/bilingual personnel

Accessible: Accessibility is contingent on factors such as cost of services, the hours of service provision, and the geographic location of a program.

Acceptable: Acceptability is the degree to which services are compatible with the cultural values and traditions of the clientele. (National Center for Cultural Competence 2004)

Social Work and the Liberal Arts



Social workers apply theories and knowledge from the liberal arts to understand biological, social, cultural, psychological, and spiritual development. Why do you think this is a necessary component of education for competent social work practice?

In order to help prepare us for culturally competent social work practice, we will search for ways to become aware of the many paradigmatic elements that influence our day-to-day lives and the ways we experience our worlds. Because paradigmatic elements are so interwoven with the many expressions of cultures and societies, it is essential for social workers to have as wide a range of opportunities as possible to learn and to think about these important elements and expressions. One way this is accomplished is through requirements that all social work education be based on a foundation of studies in a wide range of multidisciplinary liberal arts and sciences courses. Our studies in these courses can provide us new avenues to understand our own cultures and the cultures of others.

Social workers have recognized these valuable avenues to understanding human behavior and the social environment for a long time. They are considered so important in the overall education of social workers that content in the liberal arts and sciences disciplines is part of the knowledge required to achieve competence in applying knowledge of human behavior and the social environment in your social work practice (CSWE 2008).

As we proceed we will try, through this book, to connect what we are thinking and learning about human behavior and the social environment with the experiences and knowledge we have (we all have a great deal!) and are continually gaining through the liberal arts and sciences.

Lather suggests a helpful way of thinking about the liberal arts and sciences as “human sciences” which encompass social, psychological, and biological sciences as they relate to humans. The definition of “human science” she puts forth suggests a broader, more inclusive approach to understanding human behavior through the liberal arts and sciences. **Human science** “is more inclusive, using multiple systems of inquiry, a science which approaches questions about the human realm with an openness to its special characteristics and a willingness to let the questions inform which methods are appropriate” (Polkinghorne quoted in Lather 1991:166). This more inclusive and open approach to achieving understanding is consistent with the perspective or stance we take in this book toward alternative paradigms for understanding HBSE.

Howard Goldstein (1990), a social worker, suggests that broad knowledge from the liberal arts (the humanities) can help us do better social work. He suggests that much understanding about the continuously unfolding and complex nature of the lives of the people with whom we work (and of our own lives) can be achieved through study in the liberal arts. According to Goldstein, this broad range of knowledge includes art, literature, drama, philosophy, religion, and history.

Creative thinking that helps us ask questions that lead us toward understanding the experiences and the worlds of the people with whom we work, as well as our own, is central to what social work practice is all about.

Paradigms, Power, and Empowerment

Examination of the paradigms that simultaneously shape and are reflected in cultures and societies such as those in the United States can tell us much about power relations and the differential distribution of resources. Concerns about power, inequality, and resource distribution are, we must remember, core concerns for social workers. Our study of paradigms can help us understand a number of things about inequality and differences in power and resources.



Social workers understand the forms and mechanisms of oppression and discrimination, advocate for human rights and social and economic justice, and engage in practice to advance social and economic justice. How can understanding the concept of power and its inequitable distribution help us achieve these expectations?

Power: Social and economic justice

Of major concern to social workers are power and resource differences (social and economic justice) that result from one's gender, color, sexual orientation, religion, age, ability, culture, income, and class (membership in populations-at-risk). These differences have resulted in the exclusion of many persons from having a place or a voice in dominant or traditional paradigms that guide decision making in this society. Differences such as those listed above have resulted in the worldviews of some individuals and groups having much more influence than others on the institutions and processes through which human needs must be met and human potential reached. It is the contention in this book that when some of us are denied opportunities to influence decision-making processes that affect our lives we are all hurt. We all lose when the voices and visions of some of us are excluded from paradigms and paradigm-building processes. By listening to the voices and seeing the world through the eyes of those who differ from us in gender, color, sexual orientation, religion, age, ability, culture, income, and class we can learn much about new paradigms or worldviews that can enrich all our lives. Close attention to, and inclusion of the voices and visions of, persons different from us can greatly expand, with exciting new possibilities, our understanding of human behavior and the social environment—and our understanding of what it means to be human.

Empowerment

Empowerment is a concept helpful to us as we think about the importance of power for understanding paradigms and its role in achieving the basic purposes of social work. Empowerment involves redistributing resources so that the voices and visions of persons previously excluded from paradigms and paradigm-building processes are included. Specifically, **empowerment** is the process through which people gain the power and resources necessary to shape their worlds and reach their full human potential. Empowerment suggests an alternative definition of power itself. A very useful alternative definition of power has been suggested by African American feminists. This definition rejects the traditional notion of power as a commodity used by one person or group to dominate another. It instead embraces “an alternative vision of power based on a humanist vision of self-actualization, self-definition, and self-determination” (Lorde 1984; Steady 1987; Davis 1989; hooks 1989, cited in Collins 1990:224). This alternate vision seems much more consistent with the purposes and foundations of social work than traditional conceptualizations of power that define power as “power over” someone else.

As social workers we are especially concerned, in our explorations of alternative visions of power, with the empowerment of those persons who differ from the people whose voices and visions are represented disproportionately in the traditional and dominant paradigms. The persons most disproportionately represented in traditional paradigms are “male, white, heterosexual, Christian, temporarily able-bodied, youthful with access to wealth and resources” (Pharr 1988:53). Our alternative vision seeks the empowerment of women, people of color, gay men and lesbians, non-Christians, non-young, persons with disabilities, non-European descended, low-income, and non-middle- or non-upper-socioeconomic-class persons.

The purpose of **empowerment is in essence the purpose of social work:** *to preserve and restore human dignity, to benefit from and celebrate the diversities of humans, and to transform ourselves and our society into one that welcomes and supports the voices, the potential, the ways of knowing, the energies of us all.* “Empowerment practice in social work emerged from efforts to

develop more effective and responsive services for women and people of color” (Gutierrez et al. 1995:534). Empowerment focuses on changing the distribution of power. It “depicts power as originating from various sources and as infinite because it can be generated in the process of social interaction” (Gutierrez et al. 1995:535). As we proceed through this book and consider a variety of perspectives on individuals, families, groups, organizations, communities, and the world, we need to keep in mind their potential for empowering all persons and for facilitating social change or social transformation. As we proceed we will continually weigh what we discover about any of the paradigms and perspectives we explore against the historic mission and core concerns of social work—“[the] quest for social and economic justice, the prevention of conditions that limit human rights, the elimination of poverty, and the enhancement of the quality of life for all persons” (CSWE 2008:1). The tasks we set for ourselves as we continue our journey toward more complete understanding of HBSE are certainly challenging ones. However, like the assumptions of interconnectedness and interdependence we made at the beginning of this chapter about social work, ourselves, and the people with whom we work, the topics and tasks we take on as we proceed through this book are interconnected and interdependent.

SUMMARY/TRANSITION

This chapter has presented you with information and perspectives in a number of areas. It has introduced you to the place and importance of human behavior and the social environment content in the social work curriculum. It has described HBSE content as required content for all accredited social work education programs that, in concert with a wide range of content from the liberal arts and sciences, builds a foundation of knowledge upon which to base social work practice. The chapter has presented a number of guiding assumptions about the interrelationships among ourselves, others, and social work practice.

Definitions of the concept of paradigm or worldview have been presented, along with discussions of the related notions of paradigm analysis and paradigm shift and their significance for social workers and social change. This chapter has introduced the notions of traditional or dominant paradigms and alternative or possible paradigms. These concepts have been placed in context through discussion of their emergence and change over time within a historical continuum. Attention has been given in this chapter to the purposes and foundations of social work that form its historic mission to enhance human and community well-being and alleviate poverty and oppression. Issues of power and empowerment as they relate both to understanding paradigms and to the core concerns of social work have been discussed. The exclusion of many diverse persons from traditional and dominant paradigms has been introduced. In addition, the complexities and multiple definitions of culture, ethnicity and race were introduced. The concepts and issues in this chapter present the basic themes that will guide us throughout our journey to understanding human behavior and the social environment in the chapters that comprise this book. The concepts and issues presented in this chapter are intended to provide a base from which to explore in more detail dimensions of traditional and alternative paradigms in the next chapter.



1

CHAPTER REVIEW



Log onto **www.mysocialworklab.com** to watch videos on the skills and competencies discussed in this chapter. (If you did not receive an access code to **MySocialWorkLab** with this text and wish to purchase access online, please visit www.mysocialworklab.com.)

PRACTICE TEST

1. Which of the following statements is inconsistent with social work values?
 - a. Social worker's professional relationships are built on regard for individual worth and dignity.
 - b. Social workers respect people's right to make independent decisions.
 - c. Social workers require clients to follow their instructions.
 - d. Social workers are responsible for their own ethical conduct.
- 
 2. A social worker who weighs evidence for and against assertions in a logical, rational, systematic, data-based way and asks "does it work?" and "how do you know?" about treatment methods is using:
 - a. the scientific method
 - b. evidence based practice thinking
 - c. critical thinking
 - d. empirical thinking
3. A profound change in the thoughts, perceptions, and values that form a particular vision of reality is called a(n) _____.
 - a. paradigm shift
 - b. paradigm analysis
 - c. thinking paradigm
 - d. alternative paradigm
4. The process of gaining understanding about ourselves through art, literature and poetry can be referred to as _____.
 - a. secularism
 - b. humanism
 - c. empiricism
 - d. post modernism
5. _____ is an example of what was originally an alternative paradigm and is today considered a traditional paradigm.
 - a. scholasticism
 - b. premodernism
 - c. science
 - d. critical thinking
6. Two divergent worldviews influencing social work are scientific and _____ perspectives.
 - a. positivistic
 - b. interpretive
 - c. hedonistic
 - d. deterministic
7. _____ is a social identity based on the culture of one's ancestor's national or tribal group as modified by the demands of the CULTURE in which one group currently resides.
 - a. ethnicity
 - b. society
 - c. enculturation
 - d. socialization
- 
 8. The _____ of a group is "defined from the inside (of the person) out (to the world)" and is "self-defined and maintained because it 'feels good'".
 - a. culture
 - b. ethnic identity
 - c. race
 - d. ethnic classification
9. Kuhn defines _____ as "the entire constellation of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on shared by the members of a given community".
 - a. paradigm
 - b. culture
 - c. community identity
 - d. social thinking
10. Which of the examples listed below is NOT a characteristic of Lather's Postmodern Era?
 - a. importance of individual reason in determining truth
 - b. emphasis on multiple ways of knowing
 - c. history is viewed as non-linear
 - d. importance of participatory, feminist-influenced, non-hierarchical means of truth seeking

Log onto **MySocialWorkLab** once you have completed the Practice Test above to take your Chapter Exam and demonstrate your knowledge of this material.

Answers

1) c 2) c 3) a 4) b 5) c 6) b 7) a 8) b 9) a 10) a

ILLUSTRATIVE READING 1.1

Social Work Education in the Homeland: *Wo'Lakota Unglu'su'tapi*.¹ EPAS or Impasse? Operationalizing Accreditation Standard 6.0

Richard W. Voss
West Chester University

Albert White Hat, Sr.
Sinte Gleska University
Rosebud Sioux Tribe

Jim Bates
Eastern Washington State University
Yankton Sioux Tribe

Margery Richard Lunderman
Ring Thunder Ti'ospaye
Oglala Sioux Tribe

Alex Lunderman, Jr.
Ring Thunder Ti'ospaye
Rosebud Sioux Tribe

This article examines the broader historical context of American colonial Indian education policy, the challenges American Indian students face with successful performance in higher education today, the legacy of active resistance to culturally destructive educational policy, and the critical role of tribal colleges in preserving traditional prerogatives and values, while providing access to higher education for American Indian students living in the homelands. It examines the Council on Social Work Education's accreditation standard 6.0 and offers practical ways social work educators can collaborate with tribal colleges to further support indigenous social work education in culturally compatible and affirming ways to strengthen bicultural identity and tribal sovereignty.

My grandmother always told me that the White man never listens to anyone, but expects everyone to listen to him. So, we listen! . . . We have survived here because we know how to listen. The White people in the lower forty-eight talk. They are like the wind, they sweep over everything. (Coles, cited in Nabokov, 1991, p. 431)

Over the years the first author has spent time listening to traditional Indian people from the Great Sioux Nation, specifically what they think about professional social workers and their ideas about help and healing. One of the most eye-opening findings was the perception that some social workers were perceived as “books, not real live people, more interested in enforcing regulations than responding to [the needs of] people” (Voss, Douville, Little Soldier, &

Richard W. Voss is associate professor, Undergraduate Social Work Department, West Chester University. **Albert White Hat, Sr.**, is instructor of Lakota Studies, Sinte Gleska University. **Jim Bates** is professor emeritus, Eastern Washington University. **Margery Richard Lunderman** is an elder and **Alex Lunderman, Jr.** is a community activist, Ring Thunder Community, Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation.

Journal of Social Work Education Vol. 41, No. 2 (Spring/Summer 2005). © Copyright 2005 Council on Social Work Education, Inc. All rights reserved.

Note to Reader: Illustrative Reading 1.1 was written prior to the implementation of the 2008 CSWE Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards. As a result, references to specific standards and policies by number in the reading reflect the numbering used in the 2001 document. However, the questions and issues addressed in the reading remain quite relevant in the context of the 2008 document, as well.

¹The term “homeland” which connotes a place of safety, wellbeing, and sovereignty is preferred by the *Sicangu* Oyate (Rosebud Sioux Tribe) over the term “reservation” to describe the land allocations established by treaty with the U.S. Government. This Lakota term means, “strengthening our Lakota way within oneself and in relationship with creation.”

Twiss, 1999b, p. 233). The first author has also visited tribal colleges and community colleges on the homelands (reservations) and noticed that all of these institutions offer either the associate of arts degree or a bachelor of arts degree in human services, or both—rather than the baccalaureate social work degree. When asked about this, administrators have explained that this curriculum decision has been based not only on resource limitations (the lack of social work faculty available to teach on the reservation), but they also note the perception that accredited human services and counseling programs are less rigid and more accommodating to incorporating traditional pedagogy and cultural prerogatives than the social work curriculum (Personal Communication, S. L. Klein and B. Clifford, Sinte Gleska University, 2001).

These findings are corroborated by the authors' review of "Tribal College Profiles" (see the Appendix in *Globalization of Tribal Colleges and Universities*, 2000), which included profiles of 18 tribal colleges. The profiles included information about the respective majors offered at the tribal colleges and report on the types of majors their institutions offer. These profiles showed the following: Only two offered the associate of arts degree in social work and the Red Crow Community College in Alberta, Canada was in the process of developing a joint BSW program in concert with the University of Calgary. Most of the colleges offered other related majors which included associate of arts degrees in the following concentrations: human services, community health education, and alcohol and drug abuse studies. The associate of science degrees were also offered and include the following areas: chemical dependency counseling, social science, public and tribal administration, health information technology, and criminal justice. Sinte Gleska University offered three related bachelor of science degree programs including criminal justice, mental health, and chemical dependency. Oglala Lakota College offered the BS in human services, and Sitting Bull College offered the BS in Native American human services. The Turtle Mountain Community College offered the BS in social work in partnership with the University of North Dakota (*Globalization of Tribal Colleges and Universities*, 2000).

The report *Creating Role Models for Change: A Survey of Tribal College Graduates* (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Institute for Higher Education Policy, & Sallie May Education Institute, 2000) offers additional information about courses of study at tribal colleges and includes a summary of tribal college graduates' major fields of study. Among its findings, it showed that 19% of the graduates majored in nursing and health care, 13% in computer and office technology, 11% in education/teaching, and 11% in psychology/social work/human services (p. 8). These data document interest in social work among American Indian students² attending tribal colleges, despite the apparent barriers to the BSW. Interestingly, all of the tribal colleges included in the tribal college profiles in *Globalization of Tribal Colleges & Universities* (2000) reported that they had established international partnerships and exchanges as institutional priorities, and many had developed

²The authors have decided to use the terms "American Indian," "native indigenous people or students," "Indian," or "tribal people" interchangeably when discussing generic issues, concerns, and ideas about the subjects of this essay. The authors are well aware of the historical, social, and political complexity and controversy associated with any terms used to identify culturally distinctive groups of people and note that the term "American Indian" is the legal title of federally recognized tribes holding jurisdiction on reservation lands in the United States. The terms "native indigenous" and "tribal people" connote the originality of the people's association with creation, the land, and the Creator, and their natural, extended, familiar relationship bonds which define them. Likewise the term "homeland" is preferred over "reservation" since the latter connotes a fenced in place where animals are kept; it connotes a place of containment or restriction whereas the former term better reflects the sense of kinship, a place of safety and origin, and deep-felt affection the Lakota and other traditional people feel for their ancestral homeland.

partnerships with sister universities across the United States—so there is interest in inter-institutional partnerships and collaborations here.

Similar findings about the social work curriculum, tribal concerns, and the needs of American-Indian students have been identified and discussed by Jim Bates, a Lakota/Nakota and an enrolled member of the Yankton Sioux Tribe, professor emeritus, Eastern Washington State University, social work educator, consultant to various tribes, and an American-Indian student advocate (personal communication, 1999). Professor Bates has noted how he has had to re-educate American-Indian graduates from accredited social work programs to function competently in tribal social services. Professor Bates noted that many tribes did not want to hire professional social workers for tribal services as they were not viewed as effective with Indian people, in that they were “just too complicated” for Indians to trust. Professor Bates often spoke about the need for a “shadow curriculum” for native indigenous students, a curriculum that would be grounded upon core indigenous values and traditional philosophical assumptions; a curriculum that would more appropriately prepare traditional Indians for social work in their respective tribes within the framework of their own traditional heritage (personal communication, 1999).

These observations have been further supported by Weaver’s study about the experiences of American-Indian social workers in social work programs (2000). Respondents noted that, “psychodynamic theories and research methods [being] taught were sources of conflict” (p. 422); other respondents reported deep, pervasive conflicts related to broad institutional expectations. Weaver reported the following:

Some experienced conflict between the holistic spiritual community they came from and the hierarchical, bureaucratic educational system. The emphasis on written methods to communicate knowledge was also a struggle. Some felt they must compromise their cultural identity to succeed in school. One respondent stated that, “in the small groups I try to assimilate further by being more verbal as that is important it seems and also lengthy eye contact is something I continue to work on.” (p. 423)

Weaver’s findings document the intensity of cultural shock and dislocation experienced by Native-American students during their transition from leaving home and attending classes in a foreign university environment, far from their homeland (reservation). Weaver (2000) quoted one respondent, who stated.

If [I] hadn’t been staying at [a nearby tribal college] the first year I went to [a social work program at a large university] I don’t think I would have made it; me and my roommates would take turns crying . . . because it was so different from us, especially just coming from a boarding school . . . We only had each other for support. (p, 424)

Parallel to these discussions, a traditional Oglala medicine man³ and other elders who live in a traditional community on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation have discussed their concerns about and the need for social work on the reservation, the need for developing a core curriculum for tribal social workers, and the pressing needs of American-Indian people (personal communication, 2000). This medicine man asked for more discussion between traditional tribal educators and elders with mainstream educational institutions (and their respective accrediting bodies) particularly around building a curriculum that

³It is customary not to include the names of medicine men and elders in publications out of respect.

could interface with traditional knowledge keepers. He was really calling for a two-way process, one where professional social workers would collaborate with the medicine men and traditional elders, teaching basic or core helping skills, and also where the traditional knowledge-keepers would inform social work practice. He wondered why American social workers were so influenced by “English social work” when there were traditions of social work–like functions among traditional (American-Indian) people.

In the midst of these discussions, the first author found himself straddling two worlds. In the summer of the year 2000, he was adopted as a Hunka son by an Oglala elder, a descendent of Chief Red Cloud, and given the name *Ohitika Wicasa* that was translated as “Keeps His Word.” It is from this relational context, with one foot in each of these worlds, that this article is written with permission from his respective elders and extended family.

The above data from traditional tribal communities suggest that the significant differences inherent in culturally diverse groups, particularly native indigenous (Indian) students are not being adequately addressed in practical, reciprocal, and developmental terms for these students in their experiences with formal social work education. The differences that come to bear are poignantly illustrated in the Red Road Approach developed by Gene Thin Elk (Red Dog, personal communication, 1999), which contrasts the “unnatural world” of the dominant culture influenced by “how one feels” versus living in the “natural world” that is not guided by “how one feels” but by responding to all life based on a spiritual understanding, by “acting responsibly and doing the right thing.” The different trajectories from these epistemological stances powerfully illustrate how the values of the dominant culture have been infused into a curriculum that overly emphasizes the exploration of feelings versus the exploration of right action: “how do you feel about that?” or “reaching for feeling(s)” versus using the pedagogy of tribal values, spirituality, and traditional teaching.

The question arises, Is it possible to bring these apparently incompatible worldviews into a dialogue? Will the Council on Social Work Education’s (2001) accreditation standard 6.0 offer any real avenues for dialogue and cooperation between social work educators and institutions with traditional people and their respective tribes and nations, or will it sustain the present pedagogical impasse evident in the data presented in the following discussion? When traditional people do not approve of something, the way they express their disagreement is not to show up—they will “just walk away.” To illustrate this point, an elder would ask, “Do you know how the people used to vote a bad leader out of office?” He answered, “When the chief woke up one morning and all the tipis had moved away. *Then* he knew something was up. No one would tell him, ‘Hey Chief, you’ve got a problem here.’ It was understood that he should have known better and paid more attention to what was going on” (Little Soldier, personal communication, 1999). This article is a wake-up call for social work education in the homeland.

Social Work Education and Post-Colonial Resistance

The history of American-Indian education policy is problematic on many levels. The early pedagogy driven by assimilation theory attempted to extinguish what was perceived as uncivilized and untamed in Indian children and instill within them the values and work ethic seen as indispensable for productive citizenry. Many Indian children were removed from their respective reservations, separated from their families, and routinely introduced to Christianity as a civilizing methodology. They were prohibited from speaking their native languages

and practicing their native spirituality. In this vacuum, they were socialized into a materialistic lifestyle in an institutional (boarding school) setting (Douville, personal communication, 1997; Little Soldier, personal communication, 1997; White Hat, personal communication, 1997; see Standing Bear, 1975, pp. 123–176).

Today few American-Indian families have not been affected by the legacy of the Indian boarding school experience. While some Indian people claim to have benefited from their boarding school experience, it is often associated with the loss of culture, loss of language, and loss of identity. In their findings from their study of historical trauma and identity, Weaver and Yellow Horse Brave Heart (1999) report that over half of the respondents rated their boarding school experiences as negative and 58% reported physical abuse by boarding school staff. Seventy-one percent reported experiencing racism from school staff; interestingly, more men reported physical and sexual abuse than women (p. 28). Currently, educators are looking at culture as a resource for students and understand that cultural identity is not a static concept, but is a dynamic and adaptive resource. We now see that exposure to diverse cultures may actually make individuals stronger and enable them to function in two or more cultural worlds, as the situation requires (McFee, 1968; Oetting & Beauvais, 1991; Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999).

“Historical trauma” describes the cumulative cultural wounding across generations as well as present-day effects on one’s current life circumstances (Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999, p. 22) in response to systemic oppression and genocide. For American-Indian people the legacy of genocide includes imposed distortions of one’s tribal identity, devalued sense of self, and suppression of tribal cultural values and traditional practices (Holler, 1995, p. 110; Lane Deer, 1992, p. 230; Voss, Douville, Little Soldier, & White Hat, Sr., 1999a; Voss et al., 1999b). While group identity continues to be strong among traditional Lakotas, it includes some features that have led to a group identity formed on the status of being persecuted and oppressed (Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999, p. 23). For the Lakota, the sense of self has traditionally been associated with an intimate bond with the group (Lakota Nation) and with a profound sense of kinship with all of creation, including the natural universe and ancestral spirits articulated in the Lakota imperative *Mitakuye oyas’in!* which has been translated as “All my relations!” For the traditional Lakota self-identity does not exist apart from the spiritual world, the nation, and all creation (Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999). In response to historical trauma, Lakota and other Indian people have developed various coping styles and survival strategies (trauma responses) that may appear dysfunctional when viewed outside of the historical context. Care must be taken to comprehend the level of unresolved grief, deprecated group status, and devalued self-image that continue to affect some indigenous native homelands (Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999, p. 23).

Oetting and Beauvais (1991) found that an individual’s identification with one culture is independent of their identification with any other culture. Therefore, increasing identification with one culture does not necessarily demand a reciprocal decrease in identification with another culture (Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999, p. 21). In order to develop a strong identity with the predominant culture, an individual need not relinquish his or her identity with his or her native culture, which was the faulty assumption of the early boarding school innovators. We now know that individuals may and do identify with more than one culture for a variety of reasons, and that there are multiple sources of strength and support for overcoming even great adversity (Crozier-Hogel & Wilson, 1997).

Educational Failure as a Form of Cultural Resistance

In a survey of post-secondary school achievement of American Indians, Robert N. Wells (1997) found that the 1st-year retention rate of American-Indian students in post-secondary education was 45%, with a graduation rate of 25%. This survey found the most frequently identified factors that hindered college-level achievement for American-Indian students were the following: inadequate preparation, poor adjustment to the college environment, personal and family problems, and financial difficulties (Wells, 1997). Failure rates of American Indian students who go to college directly from reservations reportedly run nearly 70% and higher (Harriman, 2000, pp. 1–2). American Indians have the lowest level of educational attainment of any racial or ethnic group in the United States. According to the 1990 Census data, among American Indians 25 years and older, only 66% graduated from high school and only 9% had earned a bachelor's degree or higher. We also know that one out of five American Indians live on reservations where access to higher education continues to be limited (Census Bureau, 1998). In the report "Creating Role Models for Change: A Survey of Tribal College Graduates" the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), together with the Institute for Higher Education Policy and Sallie May Education Institute (2000), noted that

The history of higher education for American Indians in the United States largely has been one of systemic failure. For hundreds of years, the primary goal of post-secondary education efforts for American Indians at predominantly white, mainstream institutions was cultural assimilation rather than students' educational development and progress. (p. 1)

The pedagogical dilemmas affecting American-Indian students today must be understood in the historical context of the liberal educational legacy inherited from the 1800s which embraced a "cookie cutter" or an industrial conveyor belt one-size-fits-all, or "one best system" of education built on uniformity, productivity, and compliance (Johnson & Reed, 2002). This, coupled with the legacy of the Carlisle Indian School's liberal philosophy inspired by Colonel Richard C. Pratt's notion of "kill the Indian . . . save the man" (1973), established the pedagogical template and basic philosophical foundation for American-Indian education policy in the United States for the next century. Colonel Pratt's distinction of "kill the Indian, save the man" was actually a liberal revision of the previous master text, which read "the only good Indian, is a dead Indian," and literally sought to strip the Indian youth of his or her tribal identity. This overtly racist ideology set the brutal historical context of Indian education policy, the legacy of which frames the present challenges facing contemporary social work educators interested in addressing the systemic failure in post-secondary performance measures for many American-Indian students today.

Challenging the Script of Indian Education: The Legacy of Zitkala Ša at the Carlisle Indian School

In order to better comprehend the legacy of Indian education policy one also needs to consider the legacy of resistance and the push toward intellectual sovereignty against the pedagogies that have silenced the voices of Indian children. A particularly powerful testimony of this academic resistance is found in the writings of Zitkala Ša, a turn-of-the-century Yanktoni Dakota Sioux woman (aka Gertrude Bonnin, see Fisher, 1979; Enoch, 2001), who became an Indian teacher at the Carlisle Indian School. Zitkala Ša would later

construct an impassioned critique of the pedagogy of cultural and spiritual annihilation that supported and sustained the colonizing-assimilating institutions affecting Indian people. She wrote.

For the white man's papers I had given up my faith in the Great Spirit. For these same papers I had forgotten the healing in trees and brooks. On account of my mother's simple view of life, and my lack of any, I gave her up, also. I made no friends among the race of people I loathed. Like a slender tree, I had been uprooted from my mother, nature, and God. I was shorn of my branches, which had waved in sympathy and love for home and friends. The natural coat of bark which had protected my oversensitive nature was scraped off to the very quick. (Zitkala Ša, cited in Enoch, 2001, p. 127)

By articulating her self-understanding, Zitkala Ša offers insight into the psychologically destructive pedagogy of the Indian boarding school experience that replaced the familiar self inscriptions of Indian life and culture, with the master script of the "civilized" White school masters. Zitkala Ša actively resisted full assimilation by consciously reflecting on the multiple layers inherent in the process of ideological indoctrination incorporated in Indian education, noting the following:

As months passed over me, I slowly comprehended that the large army of white teachers in Indian schools had a larger missionary creed than I had suspected. It was one which included self-preservation quite as much as Indian education. (Zitkala Ša, cited in Enoch, 2001, p.117)

Zitkala Ša's testimony of academic survival and resistance provides insight into the power of education to subvert culture, undermine identity, and erode tribal sovereignty by a colonizing curriculum.

Core Social Work Values and Traditional Indian Wisdom: Decoding the Social Work Script

Higher education continues to be based on a modern, secular, liberal, scientific model of empiricism and interpersonal objectivity, requiring critical, detached scrutiny that assumes the investigator is separate from the subjects studied. This is not the way traditional American Indians see their world; for them the world (earth) and the above (sky) are intimate relatives, so intimate the traditional Lakota Sioux use the personal relational terms of *Maka* ("mother"), *Unci* ("grandmother"), *Ate* ("father"), and *Tunka'sila* ("grandfather") respectively. For the traditional Lakota and other traditional American Indians these are not metaphors. These are terms of endearment and reflect a way of speaking about a highly personalized environment where everything is intimately related and connected. This conflict creates an epistemological crisis for many American-Indian students whose outlook on life and the understanding of the world is holistic. Lionel Bordeaux, president of Sinte Gleska University noted, "We do have a very holistic outlook. . . . We find it difficult to separate various things within ourselves" (Harriman, 2000, p. 2).

While present-day century social work education would not consciously or overtly ascribe to Colonel Pratt's "kill the Indian, save the man" ideology, social work education is, nonetheless, situated within the broader educational institution historically embedded in the American experience. Within this broader educational context, vestiges and residues of the earlier civilizing pedagogy may be found in the profession's most fundamental values. Consider the profession's emphasis on "intervention" and ethical stance on

“client self-determination” and “client confidentiality.” Traditional Indian people understand their close ties to all of their relatives and ancestors who respond to their needs when they ask for help. The spirits give many options to the individual in the healing process and are always available to help the individual. The individual seeking help knows that answers are not always immediate, so he or she waits with patience and fortitude (*wo’wacini tanka*) and knows that understanding will come in the space of time. The individual knows that his or her problems will be dissolved, often in a way that is not expected. Here the spirits (relatives) really challenge one’s mind or reasoning power to recognize the solution(s) as it (they) unfold in day to day life. There is great respect for the intelligence of the individual throughout this process.

What is perceived as being most real, genuine, and good (ethical) for traditional Indian people is the rhythm, interconnectivity, and cycle of creation, which is reflected in their view of all life. Here, the individual is viewed as intimately related to all of creation that includes immediate and extended family, both living and ancestors who have passed on to the spirit world, as well as the tribal family and nation. Within this cultural context the very core social work values of client “self-determination” and “confidentiality” must be nuanced carefully and may be perceived as antithetical to traditional wisdom and knowledge, and perhaps unwittingly, subvert basic traditional Indian understandings of life which revolve around shamanism and tribalism (Voss et al., 1999b). There can be cultural dissonance between these traditional Lakota prerogatives and social work practice models that overly emphasize interventions with individuals, client self-determination based on Western personality theories, and the idea of an individualistic sense of confidentiality which can place a family member at odds with his or her *Ti’Ospaye* (extended family). Such interventions may be perceived as intrusive, intimidating, and culturally subversive.

Traditional Lakota culture resonates more with social work approaches that use pragmatic, community-based, prevention-oriented, risk reduction strategies that are holistic and engage the extended family and community as the primary helping system and affirm and incorporate cultural values and tribal prerogatives in interventions (Voss et al., 1999a; White Hat, personal communication, 2004). Cognitive therapies that emphasize personal and social responsibility and incorporate a discussion about the “false self” and the “true self” more closely correspond to the traditional Indian understanding of the challenges of choosing the good over the bad and learning from both. Within this tribal context, the individual is not alone in this arduous and difficult process; he or she has powerful spiritual resources that are available in the helping process. This well illustrates the concept incorporated into the title of this article, *Wo’Lakota Unglu’su’tapi*, “Strengthening our Lakota way within oneself and in relation with creation” and provides the nuance in understanding a traditional Lakota view of personal responsibility or self-determination.

Traditionally, the extended family was responsible for dealing with the problems of living that arose in pre-reservation tribal society (Douvile, personal communication, 1997; Voss et al., 1999a; White Hat, personal communication, 1997, 2004). The idea of an elder sitting down with a social worker who is not a relative, perhaps a non-Indian, a stranger really, often someone much younger and inexperienced with life; who comes into his or her home asking personal questions and discussing personal matters, often recording or writing down what is said would be viewed as a cultural violation by most traditional people (White Hat, personal communication, 2004). “Out of respect for the visitor the elder will talk to the social worker politely,” but there are deep questions about

why such personal information is necessary (White Hat, personal communication, 2004). If and when such information is later used in court, there is a sense of deep betrayal and mistrust. If it is known that the social worker is a relative, he or she risks being ostracized by, and even cut-off from extended family. The situation is fraught with risk and danger. American-Indian social workers providing social services in native homelands (reservations) walk a tight-rope between these two confounding worlds. The first author has often heard the advice that social workers working with Indian people in the homelands "should not live on the reservation" (Matthew Cash, personal communication, 2004) so they can avoid being overly involved with their clients "in order to be professional." This conventional advice underscores the challenges and pressures tribal social workers face as they seek to engage in more culturally compatible practices with their relatives in their homelands.

The post-modern take on "kill the Indian, save the man" comprehends the destructiveness in the modern liberal interpersonal split between the subjective (personal) self and the objective (professional) self. This philosophical stance, consistent with 19th-century missionary ideals, focuses on socializing the student in core social work values that embed the message that shamanism (spirit-calling) and tribalism (multiple kinship attachments and loyalties) as foundational to traditional Indian identity (Voss et al., 1999b) are unprofessional because they are nonempirical (superstitious), undifferentiated (primitive), and undefined (porous)—all code words for the "savage" or shadow curriculum. The jury is still out on whether there is any way to bring these different worldviews into any kind of meaningful dialogue. The Council on Social Work Education (2001) accreditation standard 6.0, however, extends such an opportunity for bicultural social work educational transformation.

Role of Tribal Colleges in Native Indigenous Homelands

In order to address the lack of access to higher education, and fueled by the American Indian self-determination movement that coalesced in the 1960s, 33 tribal colleges and universities were established in the United States and Canada to help increase access to higher education by American Indians who live on remote tribal lands (AIHEC et al., 2000, p. 1). Located on homelands (reservations) and administered by American-Indian staff, the tribal colleges and universities are a unique resource in bridging traditional American-Indian knowledge, understandings, and cultural practices to the academic disciplines (Red Bird & Mohatt, 1976). The development of these colleges was further supported by the developing "theory of Indian-controlled schools" (Clifford, 1974), which rejected the assimilation process in education and asserted the new Indian ideologies and belief systems that looked to the "internal forces in the Indian community," demanding local control of Indian education that could promote social change from within the reservation. Clifford identified five critical elements of Indian-controlled schools. First of all, there would be an immediacy of contact between young and old; second, it would promote rootedness in the local environment and encourage exploration of traditional wisdom through modern technology; third, it would provide a forum for cultural expansion and creativity; fourth, it would provide employment at the local level; and finally, it would establish control of federal monies to better leverage and promote Indian development and capital. So the shifts in traditional Indian views toward formal education have a long history of Indian intellectual resistance and tribal commitment to the preservation of cultural prerogatives. The authors argue these components are relevant to social work education, particularly in light of the Council on Social Work Education

(CSWE) (2001) accreditation standard 6.0, Nondiscrimination and Human Diversity.

As we look at the troubling failure rates discussed above we must also look at this situation in the context of developing strategies to implement the CSWE (2001) Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) curriculum. To what extent are our post-secondary educational settings and credentialing bodies developing culturally competent curricula and partnerships with tribal colleges as critical cultural resources? Or do they uncritically (unconsciously) apply a set of social expectations inherited from an arcane 19th-century American-Indian education policy modeled on forced assimilation which, unwittingly, creates hostile learning environments for native indigenous (American-Indian) students. Perhaps the under-representation of traditional American Indians within the profession of social work, and overall, low retention and completion rates in the academy provide evidence of active resistance to continuing cultural genocide.

Accreditation Standard 6.0, Nondiscrimination and Human Diversity

The CSWE (2001) EPAS accreditation standard 6.0 mandates that “specific, continuous efforts to provide a learning context in which understanding and respect for diversity . . .” are practiced and “*the program provides a learning context that is nondiscriminatory and reflects the profession’s fundamental tenets* [italics added]”. While the term “diversity” is not defined in the document, it is significant that “learning environment” is, i.e., that it should be *nondiscriminatory*. Based on the above data documenting the failure of the academy to retain and graduate native indigenous, American-Indian students living in their homelands, how does the CSWE (2001) EPAS accreditation standard 6.0 measure whether, and to what degree, accredited social work programs serving a native indigenous student population meet this standard? Again the CSWE (2001) accreditation standard 6.0 is very clear in identifying criteria to measure compliance in this area, these include “*faculty, staff, and student composition; selection of agencies and their clientele as practicum settings; composition of program advisory or field committees; resource allocation; program leadership; speakers series, seminars, and special programs; research and other initiatives* [italics added].”

To what extent do we see CSWE-accredited programs located near traditional homelands (reservations) incorporating American Indians in these areas? Alex Little Soldier, former chairman of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe viewed tribal sovereignty (see Pevar, 1992, p. 79) as a critical issue in the restoration of tribal identity for his people (Lunderman/Little Soldier, 1992). This issue was also raised by Paul Boyer in his discussion about the critical role of tribal colleges in educating both tribal leadership, native students, and the larger community about sovereignty as a reality for Indian people and not just rhetoric (Boyer, 2004). How does accreditation standard 6.0 incorporate tribal sovereignty into its diversity standard? To what extent are CSWE-accredited programs actively engaged in dialogue with tribal governments and colleges and jointly developing social work curricula that can respond to the realities of our native indigenous homelands (reservations), integrating shamanism and tribalism (Voss et al., 1999b) in substantive ways where the “diversity” standard actually supports tribal sovereignty and cultural integrity? How can accredited social work programs serving native indigenous (American-Indian) students living in their native homelands provide a “nondiscriminatory learning environment” without literally having one (programmatic) foot in the student’s homeland (reservation)? Recall the respondent in Weaver’s (2000) study who

noted, “if [I] hadn’t been staying at [a nearby tribal college] the first year I went to [a] social work program . . . I don’t think I would have made it” (p. 424). Clearly, the tribal college was part of this student’s survival strategy in completing the program, and by extension is a natural resource for CSWE programs seeking cultural proficiency in serving Indian people.

Integrating the “Shadow Curriculum” into the Academy

The route for the effective integration of the shadow curriculum (traditional Indian way) into the institutionalized curriculum (dominant master script) begins by building familial and community connections between the social work program (and respective host university institution) and the student’s extended family and respective tribe, including both formal and informal tribal leaders that reflect the student’s primary support system. In the dominant institutional model, faculty rarely interact with students’ family, generally only on very special circumstances, e.g., at new student orientation, when students are either in academic jeopardy or being recognized for academic excellence, and at commencement. Otherwise faculty-student-family interaction is generally not encouraged. It is viewed as intrusive to the broader expectation that the student should be dealt with as an autonomous individual responsible for him or herself—the mark of maturity. Privacy and confidentiality laws and regulations reinforce this standard. The shadow curriculum begins with a view of the family, extended family, ancestors, and tribe as the most important and essential relational bond between the university and the student. In tribal colleges, extended family members are in positions of power as teachers, administrators, advisors, counselors, and consulted elders and spiritual advisors. Here, non-Indian faculty and staff assimilate tribal values and comprehend traditional practices and also appreciate and support effective survival strategies—there is a deep-felt sense of cultural understanding or awareness (*wo’a’blaza*).

Universities whose mission and purpose are to educate a diverse student population and are interested in the inclusion of traditional American Indians in their respective settings can implement a number of feasible measures to both integrate and infuse traditional content and traditional indigenous native (American-Indian) pedagogies that respect and support both tribal and pedagogical sovereignty as standards for practice.

First of all, social work programs serving traditional Indian homelands should examine the biases in their theoretical orientations and practice frameworks to ensure that alternative theory and value bases are included in their curricula. The incorporation of ethnography and use of narrative theory drawing on cultural oral traditions, the use of contextual and family-systems approaches to social services that emphasize prevention and use risk reduction strategies may reduce the cultural dissonance experienced by indigenous native students from homeland (reservation) communities, by providing theoretical frameworks that are much more consistent with traditional values than more individualistically-oriented intervention approaches. Schriver (2004) offers a detailed discussion of alternative models and approaches in social work practice that addresses this concern. Along with an examination of cultural bias in theoretical models, social work programs should also look at their student service policies to see if there is sufficient flexibility to accommodate cultural needs of Indian students, e.g., are there ample leave or “stop-out” policies that allow Indian students to return home for periods of time to assist family members and to participate in cultural practices (mourning periods, spiritual commitments, etc.)? This specific question was raised by Professor Bates (personal communication, 2004) and echoed by Marjane Ambler (2004)

in the “Editor’s Essay” in the recent edition of the *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*.

Second, social work programs that are situated near native indigenous homelands can explore ways to work together to advance mutual goals and interests; recognized tribal elders may be invited to participate as consultants and advisors or cultural guides to assist university personnel in navigating the cultural differences and issues that will often surface in cross-cultural dialogue between the dominant and traditional communities of the academy and traditional tribal leadership groups (both formal and informal). Social work faculty from CSWE-accredited programs can arrange visits to tribes and develop relationships on a one-on-one basis with faculty at tribal colleges; faculty might also attend the annual AIHEC conference that addresses many of the issues discussed in this paper in practical terms. A directory of tribal colleges is available through AIHEC. Where there is interest and openness, faculty may coordinate student visits and exchanges to, and workshops with, the respective native homelands and tribal colleges. In such a dynamic social context faculty can encourage inter-cultural student discussions, visits with community and reservation elders and cultural keepers, thereby establishing some common ground for collaboration in creating a “nondiscriminatory learning context” effectively building their own respective “shadow curriculum.” Where tribal colleges and visiting institutions identify common and compatible interests and mutual trusts, they may develop more formal agreements of cooperation and become partners where they identify ways of sharing resources, developing innovative recruitment programs that include collaboration with high schools serving a majority Indian population on reservations, providing pre-college preparatory programs that specifically address the academic vulnerabilities identified by Wells and others (1997) discussed above (e.g., Upward Bound programs, etc).

For collaborating institutions the options for ensuring cultural proficiency are endless. They can develop cross-listed courses, distance learning/tele-courses, Blackboard chats around topics of interest, as well as jointly developing opportunities for innovative practicum, faculty exchanges, collaborative studies and research projects, etc. with tribal colleges and community colleges serving native indigenous students. It is in this later stage that CSWE-accredited social work programs begin to access the “shadow curriculum” in a meaningful way and find opportunities to infuse the shadow with the institutionalized curriculum, where both can benefit from the new synthesis or even newly uncovered antitheses (e.g., ethical dilemmas, value conflicts, relational patterns, etc.), which may create or sustain impasses. Here cooperating institutions can work together to overcome such obstacles once they are identified.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper is an invitation for an engaged dialogue and creative exploration of common concerns and interests between tribal colleges, traditional spiritual leaders, tribal leaders, and elders with social work educators, social work practitioners, and educational policy advocates. The authors conclude with a sense of optimism and hope that CSWE (2001) accreditation standard 6.0 can serve as the catalyst to help shape a traditional shadow curriculum in true partnership between accredited social work programs and tribal colleges genuinely committed to supporting tribal sovereignty. Such partnering will challenge the colonial residue from the 19th-century American-Indian education policy in the U.S. and better reflect and assert the profession’s commitment to

cultural competence by inventing and designing more inclusive, fluid, responsive, and non-discriminatory educational environments for the development and delivery of social work curricula and practice with Indian people in the homelands. The CSWE (2001) accreditation standard 6.0 is really a mandate for such innovation.

Accreditation Standard 6.0: Inviting Social Work Educators to Think Out-of-the-Box: Suggestions for Transformation in American-Indian Social Work Education

The authors recognize there are countless pressures and pulls from multiple constituencies on all CSWE-accredited social work programs, and that the last thing our colleagues often need is yet another demand for accountability from yet another constituency. The purpose of this article is not to ask the impossible of our social work programs and require ever-greater expenditures with ever-decreasing resources in the ever-increasingly competitive educational environment. What the authors are asserting is that when CSWE-accredited universities partner with or otherwise collaborate with tribal colleges, a new synergy can actually be generated and valuable resources shared among both educational partners, with potential benefits to faculty, students, and administration. Such transformative activities can also have a ripple effect in the way we view the mission, scope, and very identity of the social work profession. We are suggesting that partnerships between CSWE-accredited university programs located near federally recognized American-Indian reservations present a potential cost benefit to both partners. The authors are concerned that social work education is not being incorporated in tribal colleges and that the perception that human services and other counseling degree programs are more workable for Indian students may limit tribal access to professional social work, further alienating the profession from tribal relevance (see above discussion by Klein and Clifford). Accreditation standard 6.0 provides an opportunity for re-engagement by the profession with the federally recognized tribes. It's not too late. Maybe some fresh ideas are needed to activate action.

Contemporary Chinese Social Work Education: Cross-Cultural Comparisons of Resistance and Transformation in Social Work Education

Accredited social work programs interested in partnering with federally recognized tribes could take some cues from our Chinese colleagues who are involved in broad-based educational reforms that are prompting a rigorous analysis of social work practice and education across China that promise to have ripple effects across the profession. Presently, the very core mission of the social work profession is coming under close scrutiny in the face of historical and cultural analysis by indigenous Chinese social work educators and others. This Chinese analysis is relevant to traditional American-Indian experience, particularly in that indigenous Chinese scholars have scrutinized the profession's western biases embedded in its core identity, methods, skill-sets and knowledge-bases, its historical association with Christian evangelization, and the over-emphasis on individual (casework) treatment and empiricism over communal (tribal) and cultural (shamanic) resources and strategies for intervention (Fulcher, 2003; Nimmagadda & Cowger, 1999; Ng, 2003; Tsang, 2000; Tsang & Yan, 2001; Yuen-Tsang & Wang, 2002). There is a growing chorus arguing for substantial change in the way social work is taught and practiced in China, including increasing calls for greater indigenization in social work education and pedagogy through the 21st century (Cheung, Sharon, & Liu, 2004; Jinchao, 1995; Voss, 2004; Xia & Guo 2002).

Policy Themes for American Social Work Transformation in the American Indian Homelands: Cues From the Contemporary Chinese Experience

In the wake of modernization that re-established social work as a sanctioned profession in China in 1986 after its formal abrogation in 1952 (Chamberlain, 1991), Yuen-Tsang & Wang (2002) analyzed developments in social work education in China over the past decade. They noticed some important features that could have bearing on this discussion about social work education in the homelands. A few parallels will be drawn here after summarizing the researchers' key points. They noted that Chinese social work educators rejected borrowing directly from the West and "indiscriminately transplanting those universally accepted standards and models *en bloc* to the Chinese context. Instead, they took a complementary stance whereby universal norms and standards were used as helpful guidelines and references to complement indigenous understanding and practices" (p. 382). Likewise, among tribal colleges across our native homelands, American-Indian faculty and their colleagues are critical of blindly incorporating non-Indian standards and models, and are engaged in a broad-based indigenization process across their curriculum (see AIHEC et al., 2000; White Hat, 1999). From their analysis of this developmental process, Yuen-Tsang & Wang (2002) noted three major features of Chinese social work education transformation in contemporary China, which the authors assert are also relevant to social work education in our native homelands.

First, they noticed a *commitment to community development and social integration*. In response to the China Association for Social Work Education where "it was unanimously agreed that the role of social work education was 'to develop high quality social work expertise, to enhance social development, and to improve the welfare of the people,'" they noticed that "social work education positioned itself as a catalyst for community improvement and social development" (p. 382). In many ways, this is true about social work in the native homelands. Social work should not be an abstraction or just about the administration of mandated social and child welfare programs. It must be a catalyst for social transformation and community improvement. Likewise, research or methods of social inquiry must be related to these transformation goals as well. Here, participatory action research (PAR) (Healy, 2001) is particularly fitting as it draws on core assumptions that reinforce genuine social transformation. PAR assumes that the causes of social problems and oppression lie in macro-social structures and that authentic social change can only be achieved by social transformation. Second, it argues that social forces reinforce the privileges of the "haves" over the "have-nots" and that the dynamics of society maintain this relationship. Finally, PAR seeks "to empower participants to take control of the political and economic forces that shape their lives" (Healy, 2001, p. 95). Selener (1997) noted that "participatory research assumes that returning the power of knowledge generation and use to ordinary, oppressed people will contribute to the creation of more accurate, critical reflection of social reality, the liberation of human potential, and the mobilization of human resources to solve problems" (p. 28).

Second, Yuen-Tsang and Wang (2002) also noticed the pragmatic role that developing *partnerships with government in educational and service development* played in Chinese social work programs. The fact that most social work graduates are employed by the government drew a close connection between social work education and a "heavy emphasis on knowledge and skills pertaining to working with the government bureaucracy" (p. 384). Similarly, most graduates of tribal

colleges, for example, from Sinte Gleska University, the tribal college affiliated with the Rosebud Sioux Tribe are recruited for tribal service, often as tribal police, health-care providers, and in support of other tribal services, e.g., human services, drug and alcohol treatment, and tribal administration (White Hat, personal communication, 2004). So, social work education in the homelands needs to teach and relate to tribal law, customs, and procedures on a priority basis—not the other way around, i.e., learning non-Indian law, practices, and procedures and only afterward learning the indigenous bureaucracy.

Finally, Yuen-Tsang and Wang (2002, citing Wang) noted in their analysis “a commitment to the *indigenization of theory and practice in social work in the Chinese context*” (p. 384). Here, “indigenization” was defined as the need to “consider the traditional Chinese culture, the impact of the market economy on people’s livelihood, as well as the impact of collectivism and welfarism on the mentality of the people.” (p. 384). Curricula at tribal colleges are committed to the indigenization and integration of traditional knowledge, values, and prerogatives throughout the curriculum. Social work education needs to actively engage in this discovery process, not with a rigidly prescribed *a priori* set of standards, but with the capacity to transform its core knowledge, values, and skills within the tribal context in which it is to function. The process needs to be dynamic and interactive versus static and reactive.

It is argued here that if social work education is to be relevant to traditional American Indians living on federally recognized reservations, American social work education must enter a similar period of transformation and indigenization in our native homelands (reservations) as our Chinese colleagues are currently engaged. CSWE-accredited social work programs can support and assist in this creative developmental process. The CSWE (2001) accreditation standard 6.0 provides an impetus for such developmental work.

In closing, the authors recognize they speak from a distinct Lakota cultural and tribal vantage point, and are aware that indigenous people across the Americas and around the world have very different and varied cultural practices, styles of relating, and views about education and pedagogy. This paper is offered not as an overgeneralization about traditional indigenous people, but as an affirmation that traditional indigenous people everywhere have something very important to contribute in educating future social workers. As we reflect on the 30 years that have passed since the American-Indian Movement occupation and confrontation with the U.S. government at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, the authors challenge the social work profession to re-examine the plight of American-Indian education policies and indigenous experiences in light of CSWE (2001) accreditation standard 6.0 to ensure that this standard is not an empty document—words on paper without a commitment to real social change.

References

1. Ambler, M. (2004). The rights and responsibilities of sovereignty. *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 16(1), 8–9.
2. American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Institute for Higher Education Policy, & Sallie May Education Institute. (2000, May). *Creating role models for change: A survey of tribal college graduates* [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 24, 2005, from <http://new.aihec.org/research.html>
3. Boyer, P. (2004). Sovereignty: The rhetoric v. the reality. *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 16(1), 10–13.
4. Chamberlain, E. R. (1991). The Beijing seminar: Social work education in Asia and the Pacific. *International Social Work*, 34, 27–35.

5. Cheung, M., Sharon, B., & Liu, M. (2004). The self-concept of Chinese women and the indigenization of social work in China. *International Social Work*, 47, 109–128.
6. Clifford, G. M. (1974). *The theory of Indian controlled schools*. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Office of Indian Education.
7. Cross, T., Bazron, B. J., Dennis, K. W., & Isaacs, M. R. (1989). *Towards a culturally competent system of care: A monograph on effective services for minority children who are severely disturbed* (vol. 1). Washington, DC: CASSP Technical Assistance Center, Georgetown University Child Development Center.
8. Crozier-Hogle, L., & Wilson, D. B. (Compilers). (1997). *Surviving in two worlds: Contemporary Native American voices*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
9. Enoch, J. (2001). Resisting the script of Indian education: Zitkala Ša and the Carlisle Indian School. *College English*, 65(November), 117–141.
10. Fisher, D. (1979). *American Indian stories*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
11. Fulcher, L. C. (2003). The working definition of social work doesn't work very well in China and Malaysia. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 13, 376–387.
12. Globalization of Tribal Colleges & Universities: Proceedings and Reference Guide [Electronic version]. (2000, August). Washington, DC: United States Agency for International Development and the United States Department of Agriculture. Retrieved February 24, 2005, from www.aihec.org/AIHEC%20Documents/PDFS/proceedings.pdf
13. Harriman, P. (2000, March). Indian Series. Brain power and the native dream: SD universities, tribal colleges partner to bridge educational gaps [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 24, 2005, from http://nl.newsbank.com/nlsearch/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=0F6ABA5711427
14. Healy, K. (2001). Participatory action research and social work. *International Social Work*, 44(1), 93–105.
15. Holler, C. (1995). *Black Elk's religion: The Sun Dance and Lakota Catholicism*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
16. Jinchao, Y. (1995). The developing models of social work education in China. *International Social Work*, 38, 27–38.
17. Johnson, T. W., & Reed, R. F. (Eds.). (2002). *Historical documents in American education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
18. Lamé Deer, A. F., & Erdoes, R., (1992). *Gift of power: The life and teachings of a Lakota medicine man*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Company.
19. Lunderman, A. (aka Little Soldier). (1992). *Federal policy and social disparity on Indian reservations: Problems and solutions for the 1990s*. Unpublished manuscript. Mission, SD: Sinte Gleska University.
20. McFee, M. (1968). The 150% man, a product of Blackfeet acculturation. *American Anthropologist*, 70, 1096–1103.
21. Nabokov, P. (Ed.). (1991). *Native American testimony: A chronical of Indian-White relations from prophecy to the present*. New York: Penguin.
22. Ng, H-Y. (2003). The 'social' in social work practice: Shamans and social workers. *International Social Work*, 46, 289–301.
23. Nimmagadda, J., & Cowger, C. (1999). Cross-cultural practice: Social worker ingenuity in the indigenization of practice knowledge. *International Social Work*, 42, 261–276.
24. Oetting, E. R., & Beauvais, F. (1991). Orthogonal cultural identification theory: The cultural identification of minority adolescents. *International Journal of the Addictions*, 25(5A and 6A), 655–685.
25. Pevar, S. L. (1992). *The rights of Indians and tribes: The Basic ACLU guide to Indian and tribal rights* (2nd ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
26. Pratt, R. D. (1973). Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Corrections. In R. H. Pratt (Ed.), *The advantages of mingling Indians with Whites: Americanizing American Indians: Writings by the "friends of the Indian" 1880–1900* (pp. 260–271). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1892).

27. Red Bird, S., & Mohatt, G. (1976). *Identity through traditional Lakota methods, detailed report*. Rosebud, SD: Sinte Gleska University Archives.
28. Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians [Web site]. Retrieved July 26, 2004, from <http://www.kstrom.net/isk/maps/mn/redlake.htm>
29. Schriver, J. M. (2004). *Human behavior and the social environment: Shifting paradigms in essential knowledge for social work practice* (4th ed.). New York: Pearson.
30. Selener, D. (1997). *Participatory action research and social change*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Participatory Action Research Network.
31. Standing Bear, L. (1975). *My people the Sioux*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. (Original work published 1928).
32. Tsang, N. M. (2000). Dialectics in social work. *International Social Work*, 43, 421–434.
33. Tsang, A. K. T., & Yan, M-C. (2001). Chinese corpus, western application: The Chinese strategy of engagement with western social work discourse. *International Social Work*, 44, 433–454.
34. Voss, R. W., Douville, V., Little Soldier, A., & White Hat, Sr. (1999a). Wo'Lakol Kiciyapi: Traditional philosophies of helping and healing among the Lakotas: Toward a Lakota-centric practice of social work. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work*, 7 (1/2), 73–93.
35. Voss, R. W., Douville, V., Little Soldier, A., & Twiss, G. (1999b). Tribal and shamanic-based social work practice: A Lakota perspective. *Social Work*, 44, 228–241.
36. Voss, R. W. (2004). Building global relations through ethnography—Indigenous traditions of help and healing: An East-West dialogue. In I. M. Corbett, G. Sankaran, & W. W. Cai (Eds.), *Connections and Collaborations in Higher Education* (pp. 69–78). West Chester, PA: West Chester University Printing Services.
37. Weaver, H. N., & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, M., (1999). Examining two facets of American Indian identity: Exposure to other cultures and the influence of historical trauma. In H. N. Weaver (Ed.), *Voices of First Nations People* (pp. 19–33). New York: Haworth Press.
38. Weaver, H. N. (1999). Indigenous people and the social work profession: Defining culturally competent services. *Social Work*, 44, 217–225.
39. Weaver, H. N. (2000). Culture and professional education: The experiences of Native American social workers. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 36, 415–428.
40. Wells, Jr., R. N. (1997). *The Native American experience in higher education: Turning around the cycle of failure II*. New York: St Lawrence University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED414108).
41. White Hat, Sr., A. (1999). *Reading and writing the Lakota language. Lakota Iyapi un Wowapi nahan Yawapi*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
42. Xia, X., & Guo, J. (2002). Historical development and characteristics of social work in today's China. *International Social Welfare*, 11, 254–262.
43. Yuen-Tsang, A. W. K., & Wang, S. (2002). Tensions confronting the development of social work education in China: Challenges and opportunities. *International Social Work*, 45, 375–388.