

Perspectives on Social Work

The Journal of the Doctoral Students of the
University of Houston
Graduate College of Social Work

National Submissions Inaugural Issue



Volume Four, Issue One
Spring 2006

Perspectives on Social Work

Co-Editors in Chief

Peter A. Kindle
Amy Russell

Managing Editors

Agnes Dulin
Jack Griffin-Garcia
Eusebius Small

Faculty Sponsor

Maxine Epstein

Editorial Policy

Perspectives on Social Work is a publication of the doctoral students of the University of Houston Graduate College of Social Work.

Submissions to the editor are selected by the editors and edited with the student's permission. Responsibility for the accuracy of the information contained rests solely with the individual authors. Views expressed within each article belong to the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the editors, the Graduate College of Social Work, or the University of Houston. All inquiries and submissions should be directed to:

Perspectives on Social Work
Graduate College of Social Work
University of Houston
Houston, TX 77204-4492

Or

Journal@sw.uh.edu

Table of Contents

From the Editors Amy Russell	3
CV Builder	4
Childhood Abuse, Substance Abuse, Social Support, Psychological Functioning Marina Lalayants, Irwin Epstein, Andrea Savage	5
How Can We Improve International Students' Cultural Adjustment in the U.S.A.? Jin Man Kyonne	10
Sex Panic, Welfare, and the Police State Benjamin Shepard	14
Crisis of Faith in Gay Christians: An Examination Using Transformational Learning Theory Denise L. Levy	18
Criminal Court Jurisdiction and Juveniles: Who Really Suffers the Punishment? Joy D. Patton	23
Causal Role of Marriage Formation in Welfare, Poverty, and Child Well-Being William D. Cabin	29
Bookworm's Corner	
<i>Clinical social work: Beyond generalist practice with individuals, groups and families</i> reviewed by Carol Grace Hurst	34
<i>Framing the victim: Domestic violence, media, and social problems</i> reviewed by Sherry Sheffield	36
Guidelines for Submissions	38

A special thanks and congratulations go to the scholars who contributed their work to compile this first national submission issue of *Perspectives on Social Work*.

**From The Editors
Amy Russell, LMSW**

I attended my first CSWE conference this February. While I was both excited and amazed, I must admit the experience was also terrifying. Luckily, I got to relax some this year since I am not yet in the same temporal position as the cohorts before me, interviewing, networking, and impressing. But the pressure felt all the same as I watched my classmates do the “on the market” dance. Anticipation and optimism of a prestigious potential faculty position looming in the future is also peppered with a certain publication panic, immediate disappearance of confidence, and the need to disguise any fears as scholarly aloofness. My point is simply that the process of transitioning from student to the potential faculty member is important and also very uncertain time, especially for those of us watching our peers go before us. It would not be so frightening if we did not want to be more than mediocre academics. A requirement of this idea of exceptionality is that we are open to the entire social work world, which attends CSWE conferences, and now, with this issue, has submitted to *PSW*.

At CSWE, my mentor introduced me to some of the scholars that will influence my dissertation and whose thoughts and research will shape me. And hopefully added to that, these persons will perhaps collaborate with me someday. While I admit I was intimidated and awestruck, the sense of community within this niche of social workers was warming and encouraging. This scholarly community is perfectly representative of this inaugural issue of *Perspectives on Social Work*, in which we placed a national call for submissions and received an impressive response. I have enjoyed talking with and reading the work of this social work community of students, faculty, and scholars. *PSW* is proud to showcase their manuscripts.

PSW welcomes and thanks our new managing editors, **Agnes Dulin, Jack Griffin-Garcia, and Eusebius Small**. I look forward to working with them throughout the next year as the responsibility for *PSW* is passed on to them.

Save this Date!
March 23, 2006
Second Doctoral Social Work Student Research Symposium
Today's Research - Tomorrow's Practice
Presented by
Perspectives on Social Work
The GCSW Doctoral Student Journal
and
**The University of Houston, Graduate College of
Social Work**

The CV Builder

University of Houston, Graduate College of Social Work

Perspectives on Social Work congratulates the following doctoral students on their accomplishments for 2005

Patti Aldredge presented at 51st Annual Program Meeting of the CSWE on “Field of dreams: A transforming model of gerontology program design” with Virginia Cooke Robbins.

Tristen K. Amador’s article “Recruitment and retention of ethnically diverse long-term family caregivers in research” has been accepted for publication by the *Journal of Gerontological Social Work* with S. S. Travis, W. J. McAuley, M. Bernard, and M. Thorton. She is Director of Social Services at BayWind Village Care Center and teaching as an adjunct professor at UHCL.

David Aurisano presented at the NASW/TX conference in November 2005 on “Working with survivors of suicide”.

Peter A. Kindle presented at the NASW/TX conference in November 2005 on “The new scarlet letter: Escalating employment discrimination against ex-offenders” and “Assessing power and control differentials: Understanding dysfunctional agency from the client’s perspective”; on “Junior scholars and publishing: identifying social work journals receptive to submissions from junior scholars” with Gary L. Norman at the 85th Annual Meeting of SSSA; on “Dual-process explanations for changes in thinking in older adults” at the 3rd Annual NGSWC; on “Need for cognition identifies adults most likely to develop postformal thought” at the 17th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Society; on “Burnout and faith development theory: Warnings for practitioners of faith” at the 55th NACSW Convention; and on “When discrimination is legal: The social costs of felony convictions” at the 20th National Meeting and Conference of SWAA. His publications included “A comparative analysis of adoptive family functioning with gay, lesbian, and heterosexual parents and their children” in the *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* with Stephen Erich and Patrick Leung; “Gay and lesbian adoptive families: An exploratory study of family functioning, adoptive child’s behavior, and familial support networks” in the *Journal of Family Social Work* with Stephen Erich, Patrick Leung, and Sharon Carter; “Perceptions of social support among heterosexual and homosexual adopters” in *Families in Society* with Stephen Erich; “Self-reflective helping: Foucaultian insights on helping and power dynamics” in the *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*; a review of the book *A stone of hope: Prophetic religion and the death of Jim Crow* in *Social Work and Christianity*; and “Religion and social welfare policy” with Howard Karger in the 5th edition of *American social welfare policy: A pluralist approach*.

Brett Needham has accepted a position with the Community Behavioral Health Project. A collaborative effort between the Harris County Hospital District, the Council on Alcohol and Drugs Houston and Baylor College of Medicine, he is one of ten Behavioral Health Specialists providing psychotherapy, counseling, and education at Harris County Hospital District satellite clinics (and one school based clinic). Up until July of last year, anyone presenting in the satellite clinics with a mental health issue was referred to Ben Taub. The purpose of the CBHP is to make these services available in the community and is partially funded by a grant from the Hogg Foundation.

Lucinda Nevarez presented at the NASW/TX conference in November 2005 on “A comparison of three groups of young fathers and program outcomes: Those in school, drop-outs, and high school graduates” with Maxine Weinman.

Gary L. Norman presented at the 85th Annual Meeting of SSSA on “Junior scholars and publishing: identifying social work journals receptive to submissions from junior scholars” with Peter A. Kindle. He is also the new Case Management Coordinator at Montrose Counseling Clinic.

Moisés Próspero presented at the NASW/TX conference in November 2005 on “College motivation and integration for first-generation students” with Shetal Vohra-Gupta; and on “Strategies for gender and ethnic minorities in overcoming barriers to professional advancement” at the 85th Annual Meeting of SSSA.

Leslie Raneri is a finalist for the New Investigator Award for an abstract and paper submitted for the 2006 Society for Adolescent Medicine Annual Meeting. She will present her paper, “Which adolescent mothers are most at risk of repeat pregnancy?” at the March 2006 meeting in Boston, MA and will receive a cash award and certificate as one of 4 finalists. Her presentation abstract is included in the February 2006 of the Journal of Adolescent Health.

Amy Russell presented at the NASW/TX conference in November 2005 on “Texas taxation and revenue: Knowledge for effective social work”, “Making the connection: Social workers and political action”, and “Lobby training skills for social workers” with Elena Guarjardo and Mary Bishop. She also continues to be politically active on NASW/TX’s political action committee, TPACE.

Mahasin Saleh presented “Young fathers participating in fatherhood program: Their expectations and perceived benefits” at the 51st Annual Program Meeting of CSWE; on “Young African American fathers and their children: Dimensions of paternal involvement” at the January 2006 SSWR conference and on “Dimensions of paternal involvement: Young African American fathers and their children” at the 52nd Annual Program Meeting of CSWE. Ruth Buzi, Maxine Weinman and Peggy. B. Smith were co-authors on this research.

Dana Smith was named Executive Director of the Greater Houston Area Health Education Center on January 1, 2005. Dana is a part-time student in the Ph.D. program. In her new role, she will oversee fiscal operations and personnel management of this non-profit organization dedicated to improving the health of our communities by developing a quality health workforce and helping address unmet health needs.

Shetal Vohra-Gupta presented at the NASW/TX conference in November 2005 on “College motivation and integration for first-generation students” with Moisés Próspero, and she presented at the NASW-TX Houston chapter meeting in February 2006 on “Utilization of mental health services by Asian-Americans.”

Nicole Willis presented at the NASW/TX conference in November 2005 on “Effectiveness of a school-based intervention for adolescents with incarcerated parents: Findings and implications for practice, policy, and research” with Marilyn Gambrell. She also presented “U-turn: The intersection of DFPS and university partnerships in improving the image of social workers in child welfare creatively with media” and with Patrick Leung “The impact of a Title IV-E training program: A repeated-measures study of CWEP graduates in Houston” at the 9th Annual Title IV-E Federal Region VI Roundtable Conference, New Braunfels, TX in June, 2005. She is also presenting a poster at the February 2006 CSWE conference in Chicago, IL, titled “Title IV-E Child Welfare Training Program: Outcomes of a repeated measure study” with Patrick Leung. She is also the Bilingual School Social Worker at Long Middle School in Houston and an adjunct instructor at the UHCL.

Childhood Abuse, Substance Abuse, Social Support, Psychological Functioning: Study of Low-Income Women in Recovery

Marina Lalayants, MPA, PhD (ABD), Irwin Epstein, PhD, and Andrea Savage, PhD

The detrimental effects of childhood physical, sexual, or emotional abuse on psychological functioning in adulthood have been reported in numerous studies. Negative outcomes include dissociation, depression, and difficulties in interpersonal relationships. (Gauthier, Stollak, Messe, & Aronoff, 1996; Sanders & Becker-Lausen, 1995). Stein, Leslie, and Nyamathi (2002), in a study of women homeless in shelters, found that childhood abuse directly predicted later depression and low self-esteem. Not surprisingly, post-traumatic stress

disorder (PTSD) has been described as a highly co-morbid disorder, and is likely to co-occur with depression and anxiety disorders, alcohol abuse, smoking, and drug abuse (Perkonig & Wittchen, 1999).

A significant amount of research confirms that early childhood victimization is a central factor in female addiction (El-Bassel et al., 1996; Sheridan, 1995; Stewart, 1996). Barrett and Tepper (1991) mention for women who have experienced abuse as children “drugs serve a powerful function beyond that usually attributed to them” (p. 130). Hence, failure to address issues of victimization may lead to unsuccessful substance abuse treatment outcomes such as failure and relapse (Root, 1989; Rohsenow, Corbett, & Devine, 1988).

Some theories hypothesize that positive social support (i.e., practical assistance from friends) can alleviate and/or prevent some stressful life events, provide a sense of belonging, and improve satisfaction with life. Alemi et al. (2003) found individuals receiving such assistance are likely to have fewer physical and mental problems. Whatever the explanation, social support has been shown to be a significant factor in predicting during-treatment and post-treatment outcomes (Knight & Simpson, 1996).

Substance abusing women receive various kinds of social support: constructive support that encourages resisting drugs and destructive support that uses drugs with the subjects (Falkin & Strauss, 2003). Unfortunately, it has been found that constructive social support available to substance abusers is often limited (Dunlap & Johnson, 1992). Also, given the high incidence of traumatic childhood experiences for these women, one would expect a high incidence of dysfunctional family relationships and dysfunctional support network (Harmer, Sanderson, & Mertin, 1999).

This study was undertaken with an urban sample of low-income women with a history of substance abuse and trauma. First, the relationships between types of childhood abuse and subsequent adult functioning in the following domains were examined: psychological functioning, substance abuse severity, and social role functioning. Next, childhood abuse and adult functioning in the aforementioned domains were correlated while controlling for social support. It was hypothesized that the strength of the relationship between childhood abuse and adult functioning would be decreased when social support was controlled for.

Sample

The non-random purposive sample consisted of 261 women who were enrolled in three residential substance abuse programs in New York—two in the Bronx and one in Upper Manhattan. To be eligible for this study, women were required to have a history of co-occurring substance abuse and mental health problems as well as a history of a traumatic event. The women ranged in age from 18 to 59 ($M=37.0$, $SD=8.54$). The race of the sample was 68.6% Black/African-American, 24.2% Hispanic/Latina, 7.3% White/Caucasian, 3.4% Native American, and 22.2% other.

Results

Eighty-five percent (85.4%) of women in this sample reported incidents of some type of physical or/and sexual abuse in childhood (as measured by the Life Stressor Checklist developed by Wolfe & Kimerling, 1997, and modified by McHugo et al., 2005). Physical abuse alone was reported by 34.1% ($n=89$), sexual abuse alone was indicated by 8.8% ($n=23$), and both sexual

abuse and physical abuse were reported by 42.5% (n=111) of the women. The average age of first sexual abuse or physical abuse was approximately 13 years.

Well over half (74.3%) of the women reported current or past use of alcohol to the point of intoxication (measured by the drug abuse subscale of the Addiction Severity Index, McLellan et al., 1992). Forty-eight percent (47.9%) indicated use of illegal drugs, other than marijuana.

A significant relationship was found between type of childhood abuse and scores for total psychological functioning (measured by the Brief Symptom Inventory, Derogatis, 1992) ($F=6.5$, $p<.001$). Significant differences among the four typological categories were found for eight subscales: somatization ($F=5.2$, $p<.01$), obsessive-compulsive ($F=5.4$, $p<.001$), interpersonal sensitivity ($F=5.9$, $p<.01$), depression ($F=6.3$, $p<.001$), anxiety ($F=7.0$, $p<.001$), phobic ($F=3.2$; $p<0.5$), paranoid ($F=4.3$, $p<.05$), and psychotic ($F=5.4$, $p<.01$). In each case, the mean value suggests that women with no experience of childhood abuse were at lower risk for psychological distress, while those who experienced purely physical abuse were at higher risk. Those who experienced purely sexual abuse reported greater symptoms of psychological distress than the first two groups. Finally, those who experienced both physical and sexual abuse were most at risk for psychological distress.

There was a significant relationship between posttraumatic stress (PTS) symptoms (measured by the Posttraumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale, Foa, 1995) and childhood abuse ($F=10.04$, $p<.001$). As expected, women with no experience of childhood abuse were at lowest risk for PTS, while those who experienced both sexual and physical abuse reported greater PTS.

The number of people comprising the social support network of women (measured by the modified Social Network and Support Questionnaire, El-Bassel, Chen, & Cooper, 1998) ranged from 0 to 9, with the mean of 1.96 ($SD=1.46$). Family members such as siblings, grandparents, aunts and uncles (43.7%) as well as parents (34.5%) were most often named by sample. Friends were included in the networks of 22.6% women. The majority of women (86.2%) reported that the individuals in their support network encouraged and helped them to stop using drugs. Well over the half (77.8%) of women identified individuals who provided emotional support helping them heal from trauma.

Psychological functioning, PTS, substance abuse, and social role functioning (measured by the Social Role Functioning questionnaire modified from BASIS-32, Eisen, 1996) were correlated with type of childhood abuse while controlling for social support. The partial correlation coefficients remained statistically significant for the psychological functioning ($r=0.269$, $p<.001$) and all the subscales, the PTS ($r=0.319$, $p<.001$), and the social role functioning ($r=0.117$, $p<.05$). The strength of the initial somatization-childhood abuse ($r=0.230$, $p<.001$) relationship decreased ($r=0.171$, $p<.001$) when controlling for social support. To a lesser degree, when social support was held constant, the bivariate psychotic-childhood abuse relationship ($r=0.232$, $p<.001$) was decreased ($r=0.221$, $p<.001$) as well. However, for all other dependent variables, social support appeared to have no mediating effect. Thus, social support did not present significance statistically for the relationship between social role functioning and childhood abuse.

Discussion and Conclusions

The results of this study provide evidence that, among low-income women with current or past substance abuse, history of mental illness, and trauma, the experience of different types of childhood abuse is associated with later psychological functioning, including somatic and

obsessive issues, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, paranoid, and psychotic symptoms, and posttraumatic stress. Conversely, it was found that women with no experience of childhood abuse or only physical childhood abuse were at lowest risk for psychological distress. Those who experienced sexual abuse and/or both physical abuse and sexual abuse reported greater symptoms of PTS. These findings are similar to the results of earlier studies (Marcenko et al., 2000; Rohsenow et al., 1988). Those who experience both are clearly most at risk. These findings stress the need for early interventions that successfully address the emotional consequences of sexual abuse. Despite the fact that this study did not find statistically significant relationship between substance abuse severity and types of abuse, this relationship should be further explored. Consideration of age of onset and frequency of abuse may alter this finding.

This study reveals a greater complexity to the relationships between women substance abusers and others in their social worlds than previously thought. The women in this sample have about four times fewer supporters than found in previous research on similar populations (Falkin & Strauss, 2003). However, most of them were able to identify at least one positive supporter. Lack of social support may be due to a reluctance to ask for support. Additionally, it may explain why social support had so little effect on their psychological functioning. Some authors mention that given the high incidence of aversive childhood experiences for the women, one would expect a high occurrence of dysfunctional family relationships (Sheridan, 1995; Ladwig & Andersen, 1989). Women who felt unloved or unwanted in their families of origin would be unlikely to consider these people as part of their support network in adulthood. However, the social support they do have appears to have little influence. It may also be that the benefit of social support is nullified by continuing preoccupation with trauma.

A limitation of this study may be its reliance on self-report and retrospective; therefore, it must be acknowledged that this may have influenced some of the responses to the questions that were asked. Women were asked to think back to the time when they were in the community before they entered drug treatment (usually a time when they were using drugs). The interview was conducted when they were in treatment. However, they had been detoxified. Their responses to questions, such as how people had helped them, may have been altered somewhat through their current perspective of abstinence from drug use. The impression, however, is that the women were generally interested and responsive in the interviews, appreciated the opportunity to tell their stories, and typically made every attempt to answer the questions as candidly and accurately as possible.

The unique nature and current life circumstances of the women in this study pose some interesting questions and further research. In further studies with post-treatment cohorts it will be interesting to see whether women with high social support get a greater benefit from treatment than those with low support. Further investigations with larger numbers of subjects and the use of regression techniques may help to differentiate the pathways of influence of different types of childhood trauma and mediating factors such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, loneliness, homelessness, and so on. Additionally, post-treatment follow-up qualitative studies with these women may further explore their social support networks and relationships with family members.

Acknowledgements

This study is a part of a larger federally funded cross-site study. This project was supported by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Cooperative Agreement to Study Women with Alcohol/Drug Abuse, and Mental Health (ADM) Disorders who have Histories of Violence: Phase II (GFA No. TI

00-003, March 2000). The views expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the sponsoring agencies. The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of Anna Hayward for help with instrument development in collaboration with Lisa A. Russell, ETR Associates. This work would not have been possible without the hard work of the interviewer team and the generosity of the women respondents in our study. We gratefully acknowledge them and the support of Palladia, Inc. in NYC.

References

- Alemi, F., Stephens, R., Llorens, S., Schaffer, D., Nemes, S., & Arendt, R. (2003). The orientation of social support measure. *Addictive Behaviors, 28*(7), 1285-1299.
- Barrett, M. J., & Trepper, T. S. (1991). Treating women drug abusers who were victims of childhood sexual abuse. In C. Bepko (Ed.), *Feminism and addiction* (pp. 127-146). Binghamton: Haworth Press.
- Derogatis, L. R. (1992). *Administration, scoring and procedures manual-II*, Second ed. Baltimore: Clinical Psychometric Research.
- Dunlap, E., & Johnson, B. D. (1992). The setting for the crack era: Macro forces, micro consequences (1960–1992). *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs 24*, 307–321.
- Eisen, S. V. (1996). Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale (BASIS-32). In L. I. Sederer and B. Dickey (Eds.), *Outcomes Assessment in Clinical Practice* (pp. 65-69). Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.
- El-Bassel, N., Chen, & Cooper, D. (1998). Social support and social network profiles among women on methadone. *Social Service Review, 72*(3), 379-401.
- El-Bassel, N., Gilbert, L., Schilling, R. F., Ivanoff, A., Borne, D., & Safyer, S. F. (1996). Correlates of crack abuse among drug-using incarcerated women: Psychological trauma, social support, and coping behavior. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 22*, 41- 56.
- Falkin, G. P., & Strauss, S. M. (2003). Social supporters and drug use enablers: A dilemma for women in recovery. *Addictive Behaviors, 28*, 141-155.
- Foa, E. B. (1995). *Posttraumatic Stress Diagnostic Scale Manual*. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems, Inc.
- Gauthier, L., Stollak, G., Messe, L., & Aronoff, J. (1996). Recall of childhood neglect and physical abuse as differential predictors of current psychological functioning. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 20*, 549-559.
- Harmer, A., Sanderson, J., & Mertin, P. (1999). Influence of negative childhood experiences on psychological functioning, social support, and parenting for mothers recovering from addiction. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*(5), 421-433.
- Knight, D., & Simpson, D. D. (1996). Influences of family and friends on client progress during drug abuse treatment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 8*(4), 417-429.
- Ladwig, G. B., & Anderson, M. D. (1989). Substance abuse in women: Relationship between chemical dependency of women and past reports of physical and/or sexual abuse. *International Journal of Addiction, 24*, 739-754.
- Marcenko, M. O., Kemp, S. P., & Larson, N. C. (2000). Childhood experiences of abuse, later substance use, and parenting outcomes among low-income mothers. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 70*(3), 316-326.
- McHugo, G., Caspi, Y., Kammerer, N., Mazelis, R., Jackson, E., Russell, L., Clark, C., Liebschutz, J., & Kimerling, R. (2005). The assessment of trauma history in women with co- occurring mental health and substance use disorders and a history of interpersonal violence. *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research, 32*(2), 113-128.
- McLellan, A.T., Kushner, H., Metzger, D., Peters, F., Smith, I., Grissom, G., Pettinati, H., & Argeriou, M. (1992). The fifth edition of the Addiction Severity Index. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 9*, 199-213.
- Perkonig, A., & Wittchen, H-U. (1999). Prevalence and comorbidity of traumatic events and post-traumatic stress disorder in adolescents and young adults. In A. Maercker, M. Schutzwohl, & Z. Solomon (Eds.), *Post-traumatic stress disorder: A lifespan developmental perspective* (pp. 113-136). Seattle: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Rohsenow, D. L., Corbett, R., & Devine, D. (1988). Molested as children: A hidden contribution to substance abuse? *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment, 5*, 13-18.
- Root, M. P. (1989). Treatment failures: The role of sexual abuse victimization in women's addictive behavior. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59*, 542-549.
- Sanders, B., & Becker-Lausen, E. (1995). The measurement of psychological maltreatment: Early data on the child abuse and trauma scale. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 19*, 315-323.
- Sheridan, M. J. (1995). A proposed intergenerational model of substance abuse, family functioning, and abuse/neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 19*, 519-530.

- Stein, J. A., Leslie, M. B., & Nyamathi, A. (2002). Relative contributions of parent substance use and childhood maltreatment to chronic homelessness, depression, and substance abuse problems among homeless women: mediating roles of self-esteem and abuse in adulthood. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 1011-1027.
- Stewart, S. H. (1996). Alcohol abuse in individuals exposed to trauma: A critical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 120, 83-112.
- Wolfe, J., & Kimerling, R. (1997). Gender issues in the assessment of posttraumatic stress disorder. In J. Wilson & T. M. Keane (Eds.), *Assessing psychological trauma and PTSD* (pp. 192-238). New York: Guilford.
-

How Can We Improve International Students' Cultural Adjustment in the U.S.A.? **Jin Man Kyonne, MSW**

At the University of Missouri-Columbia (UMC), over 1,300 international students were enrolled during the 2005 academic year. Their family members, as well as international faculty members who included visiting professors, resided in the city of Columbia near the UMC campus. A support system in the form of an International Center is operated on campus, but it is not sufficient to cover international students' diverse needs, because the major roles of the center are focused on official works. The purpose of this study was to find an effective way of improving international students' relationships with American citizens, in order to assist in the international students' cultural adjustment within, and ultimately their integration into American culture. This research surveyed Korean students as a target group, because they are one of the major international student groups at UMC. Based on the data received, these students' perceptions of their cultural adjustment were analyzed on their behavioral characteristics, such as the frequency of meeting American friends or neighbors per week, by using analysis of variance (ANOVA) / covariance (ANCOVA), and testing the term of residence as a covariate.

The Major Stresses of International Students

Many researchers have addressed international residents' difficulties in terms of their psychosocial transitions (Alfred & Knute, 1982), proficiency in English (Oliver, 1991; Parasnis, 1996; Casado & Leung, 2001), and cultural adjustment (Haj-Yahia, 1997; Aubrey, 1991). These particular stresses can handicap international students' communication with American residents. According to the World Health Organization's (WHO) classification, a handicap in orientation, communication, physical independence, mobility, social integration, occupation or economic self-sufficiency is described as "a disadvantage for a given individual, resulting from an impairment or a disability, that limits or prevents fulfillment of a role that is normal (depending on age, sex, and social and cultural factors) for that individual" (Oliver, 1991, p.107). Therefore, we can consider international students' difficulties as handicapping situations, in which they might decrease their social behaviors and reduce their experiences of positive activities. Based on its effort to understand the causes of these stresses, this study provides a particular context in which to consider international students' relationships with their American friends or neighbors as the behavioral characteristics in connection with their cultural adjustment.

Cultural Difference and Adjustment

Among the total group of international students (undergraduate and graduate) at the University of Missouri-Columbia (UMC), Asian students made up about 77 percent in 2002 (The

International Center of UMC, 2001/2002). Therefore, these students' difficulties in terms of the differences to be navigated between Western and Eastern culture should be strongly regarded as critical problems within their lives. For instance, in the case of Arab residents within Western societies, they could have conflicts between such things as a belief in predestination versus human free will, in heritage-oriented values versus future-oriented values, in following predecessors versus valuing innovation, in collectivist versus individualist values, and in vertical versus horizontal values (Haj-Yahia, 1997). Because East Asians' cultures are similar to those of the Middle East in many respects, Asians such as Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans could experience similar conflicts as they attempt to integrate culturally within American society. At this point, Burke (1989) insisted that international students, especially Asians, needed to go through a period of cultural adjustment as part of their university studies. According to these conceptions, this study defined Asian students' cultural adjustment in the U.S. as their integration within American culture.

Method

In convenience sampling, 58 students among 235 total Korean students at UMC were surveyed on their demographic characteristics, perceptions to cultural adjustment, and behavioral characteristics by a questionnaire based on the theoretical background above. The respondents signed on the informed consent letter approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Missouri-Columbia. The cultural adjustment of international students was considered as a dependent variable with continuous level (question: If you have ten different ideas or opinions from a teacher's, how many will you keep in your mind without showing them?).

In a Likert scale, this study assessed two independent variables of the relationship with American friends or neighbors (question I: I have an American friend or neighbor in a good relationship) and the frequency of meeting American friends or neighbors (question II: How many times do you usually meet American friends or neighbors per week?). The question I consisted of a 5-point response format, which ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Higher scores reflect greater relationship. The question II consisted of a 3-point response format (1: 0 to 1 time per week, 2: 2 to 4 times per week, and 3: 5 times more per week). Their residential terms were treated as one covariance.

Using the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) test, the following null hypotheses were set, null hypothesis I: There is no significant difference between the levels of the relationship with an American friend or neighbor on their cultural adjustment, null hypothesis II: There is no significant difference between the different levels of the frequency of meeting American friends or neighbors on their cultural adjustment, and null hypothesis III: There is no significant difference between the levels of the relationship with an American friend or neighbor and the levels of the frequency of meeting on their cultural adjustment.

Findings

In the main effect of the frequency of meeting American friends or neighbors (see Table 1), there was a significant difference between the frequency levels on their cultural adjustment $F(2, 52) = 3.87, p = .027$ and the null hypothesis II was rejected. The partial eta squared was large (.13) and the observed power was desirable (.68). However, there was no significant difference in the relationship with American friends or neighbors. In the interaction effect (see Table 1),

also, there was no significant difference between the levels of the relationship and the levels of the frequency on the dependent variable $F(8, 52) = .35, p = .705$ and the null hypothesis III was not rejected. The partial eta squared was medium (.01) and the observed power was not desirable (.10).

Table 1. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects on International Students' Cultural Adjustment

<i>Source</i>	Df	F	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
The Relationship with American Friends or Neighbors	4	.19	.00	.07
The Frequency of Meeting American Friends or Neighbors	2	3.87*	.13	.68
The Interaction between the Relationship and the Frequency	8	.35	.01	.10

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Using the Post hoc test (see Table 2) to find the differences of the frequency levels, the Scheffe test was applied because it is more strict and conservative, compared to Tukey and Bonferroni. As a result, there was a significant difference between the level 1(0 to 1 time per week) and the level 3 (5 times more per week) of the frequency of meeting American friends or neighbors on their cultural adjustment ($p < .05$). However, there was no significant difference between 1 and 2 (2 to 4 times per week) and 2 and 3 levels on their cultural adjustment (level 1 and 2, $p > .05$; level 2 and 3, $p > .05$).

Table 2. Post Hoc Test of the Frequency Levels of Meeting American Friends or Neighbors

	Levels	Levels	Mean Difference	Std. Error
Scheffe	1	2	-6.18	2.98
		3	- 8.45*	3.05
	2	1	6.18	2.98
		3	-2.26	3.48
	3	1	8.45*	3.05
		2	2.26	3.48

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Using the analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) test to treat the residential term as a covariance, the homogeneity of regression was met because the null hypothesis that the slopes are equal was not rejected in the significance level of .05 (the relationship*the residential term, $p = .124$, the frequency*the residential term, $p = .114$). The residential term was an efficacious covariance because there was a significant difference between the scores of the term on cultural adjustment at the significance level of .05, $F(1, 51) = 4.20, p = .046$. The partial eta squared was large (.08) and the observed power was minimally desirable (.52).

In the main effect of the relationship with an American friend or neighbor (see Table 3), there was no statistically significant difference between the dependent variable means of the relationship levels after controlling for the effect of covariance $F(1, 51) = 1.38, p > .05$. The partial eta squared was medium (.03) and the observed power was not desirable (.21). In the main effect of the frequency of meeting American friends or neighbors (see Table 3), there was a

significant difference between the means of the frequency levels, after controlling for the effect of covariance $F(1, 51) = 3.62, p < .05$. The partial eta squared was large (.12) and the observed power was desirable (.64). In the interaction effect (see Table 3), there was no significant difference between the levels of the relationship and the levels of the frequency on their cultural adjustment, after controlling for the effect of covariance, $F(1, 51) = .21, p > .05$. The partial eta squared was small (.01) and the observed power was not desirable (.08).

Table 3. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects on the Cultural Adjustment with Residential Term

Source	Df	F	Partial Eta Squared	Observed Power
The Relationship with an American Friend or Neighbor	4	1.38	.03	.21
The Frequency of Meeting American Friends or Neighbors	2	3.62*	.12	.64
The Interaction between the Relationship and the Frequency	8	.21	.01	.08

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Comparing the source table for ANCOVA with ANOVA, the p value of the relationship (.245) of ANCOVA was smaller than the p value (.663) of ANOVA. The partial eta squared and observed power of the relationship of ANCOVA were larger than those of ANOVA. The p value of the frequency (.034) of ANCOVA was larger than the p value (.027) of ANOVA. The partial eta squared and observed power of the frequency of ANCOVA were smaller than those of ANOVA. The p value of the interaction (.809) of ANCOVA was larger than the p value (.705) of ANOVA. The partial eta squared and observed power of the interaction of ANCOVA were smaller than those of ANOVA. These differences explained that the residential term was a beneficial covariance, impacting the outcomes.

Conclusions

Results of the study indicated that Korean students became better culturally adjusted if they had had more chances to meet American friends or neighbors. Specifically, the students who met their American friends or neighbors five times more per week were ultimately better culturally adjusted than those who met only one time per week or less. Therefore, the Korean students' efforts to meet Americans seem to have improved their integration within American culture. However, the residential term should be considered as a critical factor within this result, because it provided a beneficial covariance.

The limitations of the present study should be considered when interpreting these findings. Because the cultural predilections specific to these Korean students could not arguably represent the general cultural characteristics of all international students, future studies should continue this effort by surveying a broad spectrum of students from as many international cultures as possible, but still in a manner that is based on their particular cultures. Also, as the present study was limited by its convenience sampling, it is recommended that in the future a random sample design be utilized in order to understand international students' cultural adjustments within the U.S. In addition, the validity and reliability of the measurements and their techniques should be retested.

Despite the limitations of the study, the findings nevertheless provide a further contribution to the growing body of literature that indicates the significance of addressing international students' demographic and behavioral characteristics as a function of their cultural adjustment. The research indicates that support systems should be provided for international students by introducing Americans to them and thus improving their relationships with the native culture, which encourages the international students to meet more frequently with American friends or neighbors, and promotes their integration within American culture. These efforts can enhance international students' cultural adjustment within the U.S.

References

- Alfred, H., & Knute, M. (1982). *A handbook of services for the handicapped*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Aubrey, R. (1991). International students on campus: A challenge for counselors, medical providers, and clinicians. *Smith College Studies in Social Work*, 62 (1), 20-33.
- Burke, B. (1989). *Overseas students in Australia: policy and practice: A collection of invited papers*. Canberra, Australia: IDP.
- Casado, B., & Leung, P. (2001). Migratory grief and depression among elderly Chinese American immigrants. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 36 (1/2), 5-26.
- Haj-Yahia, M. (1997). Culturally sensitive supervision of Arab social work students in Western universities. *Social Work*, 42 (2), 167-170.
- Cornes, P. (1991). Impairment, disability, handicap and new technology. In *Research highlights in social work 21: Social work/disabled people and disabling environments*, edited by M. Oliver, pp. 98-114. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd.
- Parasnis, I. (1996). *Cultural and language diversity and the deaf experience*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- The International Center of UMC. (2001/2002). Guide to living in Columbia: Fast facts. Retrieved on October 1, 2005, from <http://international.missouri.edu/iss/living/mu.html>

Sex Panic, Welfare, and the Police State **Benjamin Shepard, LMSW**

In the wake of the 2004 presidential election, one observer noted: "The Democrats' mistake was thinking that a disastrous war and national bankruptcy would be of concern to the electorate. The Republicans saw, correctly, that the chief concern of the electorate was to keep gay couples from having abortions," (Ricardo Dominguez, personal communication, January 31, 2005). Instead of the election becoming a referendum on a war begun under the auspices of missing weapons of mass destruction which never materialized, a sex panic over abortion and a homosexual menace shifted the course of debate. Faced with the threat to their civilization, the electorate awarded Bush a second term. With victory in hand, Bush claimed a mandate to dismantle core foundations of the U.S. welfare state.

The 2004 election was not the first time a sex panic had struck fear into U.S. politics while undermining support for public welfare. Panic has accompanied countless shifts in the ways public policy emerges and fades from public life. 2006 marks the tenth anniversary of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, the culmination of a generation-long erosion in support for basic provisions of the U.S. social safety net. As this anniversary approaches, it is worthwhile to consider the political campaign that undermined support for one the last vestiges of the New Deal. While conservatives consider welfare reform a success, others describe the 1996 law as regressive and punitive (Abramovitz, 2000).

Explanations vary as to when Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) first lost support. A number of studies suggest that the racialization of welfare is the primary reason for the loss of confidence in the program (Schram et al., 2003). Others suggest that since 90% of the program's recipients are women, sexism is a primary cause for the program's lack of popularity (Abramovitz, 2005). I suggest a series of sex and moral panics undermined support for the welfare state, leading to the 1996 "reform."

Paralleling the demise of the welfare state, there has been a proliferation of literature on sex and moral panics (Cohen, 1972/2002; Duggan, 1995). Studies of the discursive contours of moral panics highlight the ideological quandaries at the center of thirty years of debate over social welfare policy. A number of recent comparative studies of current welfare policies (Sidell, 1998; Wagner, 1997) have specifically located conditions of moral panic within policy debates over public assistance and services for the poor. Other studies (Abramovitz, 2000) consider the increase in policies aimed at the moral regulation of the sexual lives of those on public assistance. These works consider the simultaneous social control of deviance and backlashes concerning public sexuality that inspire sex and moral panics.

Studies of sex and moral panics investigate social hierarchies. Thus, these studies become inquiries into social tensions, as themes of gender, race, crime, and social upheaval are projected onto charged acts, including public sex, non-monogamy, and teenage pregnancy. These symbolic acts - and the calls for their suppression - can be used to assess shifts in social life, including demands for the overhaul of the welfare state.

Duggan (1995) argues:

Sex panics, witchhunts, and red scares are staples of American history. While often promoted by relatively powerless but vocal minorities hostile to cultural difference, they have been enthusiastically taken up by powerful groups in an effort to impose rigid orthodoxy on the majority. In this context, "moral reforms" and the like have been the public relations mask for what is in fact an abnegation of any responsibility to confront and address very real problems, that is poverty, militarism, sexism, and racism (p. 75).

The concept of sex panic builds on the idea of moral panic first coined within British sociology and cultural studies. As theorists grappled with public policies aimed at alleviating social problems such as AIDS, homelessness, and poverty, conceptions of moral panic overlapped with debates about the urban "underclass." Of the many panics that have emerged over the last thirty years, sex and moral panics over welfare share many themes and discursive contours as a racialized, dehumanizing view of women on welfare combined with anxiety about shifts in the nuclear family fuel such panics. Sociologist Stanley Cohen (1972/2002) suggests that as cultural institutions draw parameters around deviance, they create moral panics. The moral panic scapegoat becomes a "folk devil" onto whom cultural anxieties can be projected. With the welfare panic, the folk devil in question has consistently been the promiscuous "welfare queen."

Most panics involve unsanctioned activities or cultural groupings that threaten the status quo or the traditional family. This helps explain the rise of panics around teenage pregnancy (Luker, 1996; Sidell). In some cases, panics involve questions about the control of vice known or believed to lead to disease (Wagner, 1997). This is where panics over sex and drug use overlap with public health issues ranging from HIV prevention to the use of birth control. Recent years have witnessed increased crackdowns on public spaces where social outsiders meet to build networks and establish contact (Dangerous Bedfellows, 1996). Other panics involved use

of public resources for family planning services or to support art not considered appropriate by social conservatives (Luker; Duggan, 1995). Thus, recognition of panic initiates a question about democratic political process and debate, who and what is appropriate within political discourse.

Each marker of panic has significance as a cultural symbol. French structuralist philosopher Michel Foucault described the social and linguistic construction of such symbols as “discourses.” By discourse, he referred to a linkage of symbolic representations to a social actions and actors. Their interaction produces social meanings embodied by cultural “objects,” including those that become the subjects of moral panics (Zukin, 1995). One approach to studying sex panics is to analyze “discourses” which establish hierarchies of the normal, moral, or worthy (Thompson, 1998).

In a study of the birth of the modern prison, Foucault (1977) asserts, “A corpus of knowledge, techniques, ‘scientific’ discourses is formed and becomes entangled with the practice of power to punish.” (p. 23). Here, tools of professional knowledge, diagnosis, and assessment create the discourses which influence the ways actors are rendered sane and insane, healthy and unhealthy, normal and abnormal, worthy and unworthy. These discourses transmit forms of what Foucault describes as “bio- power.” Government programs, from police to social services, use bio-power to regulate and control. Here, individual desires are regulated, sanctioned, organized, even dictated by dominant social, economic, and cultural discourses - mechanisms of the normal.

Discourses over worthy versus unworthy sexuality address a central concern of modern life: the besieged nuclear family. Thompson (1998) explains, “Familial ideology is obliged to fight a continual rear guard action in order to disavow the social and sexual diversification of a culture which can never be adequately pictured in the traditional guise of the family of cohabitating parents and children” (pp.72-73).

Political scientist James Morone (2003) suggests panic discourse functions within a familiar schema. In times of social flux interest groups: One, stir a moral frenzy; Two, identify a demon; Three, mobilize interests; and Four, increase police powers. These “panics,” which can be traced to the country’s earliest days.

Panic discourse establishes the context in which U.S. social policy forms and shifts, particularly as the welfare state has become a space for contestation (Davey, 1995). Moral panics over public welfare involve four core themes: laziness, drugs, violence, and, of course, sex, which makes the other three pale in comparison. Morone (2003) argues, “Here lies the central moral theme and the most unsettling bundle of questions. Sexuality challenges the fundamental Puritan precept: control thyself.” (p. 17) explains. Mixed with debates about gender, the politics of sex involves struggles over abortion, divorce, queerness, women’s rights, and most importantly the control over children and family. Thus, social controls are asserted over sex and marriage as markers, boundaries between a civilized us and a dangerous them. Responses to these sins tend to fall into solutions based on pledges of abstinence, restrictions on reproductive services, increased funding for police, and more get-tough laws, all part of the proverbial “Thou shalt not!” (p. 17).

What emerges is a series of competing narratives that typically accompany discussions of public sexuality. Feminist philosopher Nancy Fraser (1989) suggests such discourses involve struggles between affect mobilization and social control. While some advance the cause of social movements aimed at the alleviation of poverty, others advance the panicked anti-welfare rhetoric, which distracts rather than creates solutions to struggles related to poverty alleviation, social inequality and movement mobilization. Debates over social welfare intersect with these competing narratives, some aimed at increasing social mobility and personal freedom; others

involve and call for moral regulation and social controls, which halt the advances of social outsiders, such as queers and women on welfare into fuller democratic participation.

From Welfare State to Police State

While the era of big government in the realm of social programs ended with the failure of Clinton's healthcare initiative in 1994 and the passage of welfare reform in 1996, big government in the arena of policing only expanded with the passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 and the Patriot Act of 2001. While rates of crime had decreased over the twenty years from 1975 to 1995, evidence of moral panics over crime control could be witnessed in states across the union (Platt, 1995). Panic over race helped legitimize the shift in public expenditures from health and supportive services toward policies aimed at social control.

Thus, over the final decades of the 20th century, the policy landscape in the U.S. shifted from an emphasis on public welfare toward crime control - from a welfare state to a police state (Davey, 1995). Today, sociologist Sharon Zukin (1995) explains: "the fastest growing kind of public space in America is prisons." (p.24) These prisons are part of a frenzied drive to support neoconservative politics favoring a better business climate for neoliberal economic policies poised to privatize, control, and profit from everything from water to public space to social welfare services. Panic discourse advanced this process.

The presence of people on welfare has constantly been accompanied by panic. Discourses of decline resulted in calls for criminalization rather than service provision and public welfare. And a profound shift unfolded. The welfare state shrunk while police and military expenditures increased. As far back as 1964, Frankfurt School social theorist Herbert Marcuse alluded to a merging of mass media, corporate power, and the blurring of social welfare into ever-greater social control. "The society of total mobilization, which takes shape in the most advanced areas of industrial civilization, combines in productive union the features of the Welfare State and the Warfare State," Here, Marcuse (1964) explains, "The main trends are familiar: concentration of the national economy on the needs of big corporations, with the government as a stimulating, supporting, and sometimes even controlling force." (p. 19) Along the road, the mass media, public opinion, and market pressure create a coercive context that blur opposites and opposition, further eroding the line between welfare and social control. If the journey from welfare state to warfare state has an overarching theme, it is the use of distraction to support the re-appropriations that allow the military- corporate-industrial complex to expand and thrive. Thus the expression "moral politics," functions as a code-word for a call for an increased warfare state.

References

- Abramovitz, M. (1996). *Under attack, fighting back*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Abramovitz, M. (2005). "Review: Race and the politics of welfare reform." *Social Service Review*. 79 (2) 382-387.
- Cohen, S. (1972/2002). *Folk devils and moral panics*. London: Martin Robinson.
- Dangerous Bedfellows. (1996). *Policing public sex*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Davey, J. (1995). *The new social contract*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Duggan, L. (1995). "Sex panics." In L. Duggan and N. D. Hunter. *Sex wars: Sexual dissent and political culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage.
- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly practices*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Luker, K. (1996). *Dubious conceptions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One dimensional man*. Boston MA: Beacon Press.

- Morone, J. A. (2003). *Hellfire nation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Platt, A. (1995, 1 June). Crime rave. *Monthly Review*, 47, 35.
- Schram, S F; Soss, J. & Fording, R. C. (Eds). (2003). *Race and the politics of welfare reform*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Sidell, R. (1998). *Women and children last*. New York: Penguin.
- Thompson, K. (1998). *Moral panics*. New York: Routledge.
- Wagner, D. (1997). *The new temperance*. Boulder, Co: Westview.
- Zukin, S. (1995). *The culture of cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.
-

**Crisis of Faith in Gay Christians:
An Examination Using Transformational Learning Theory
Denise L. Levy, LMSW**

This paper examines the social work practice issue of Christian, homosexual individuals facing a crisis of faith. The phrase crisis of faith, though commonly used in scholarly text and popular culture, is not clearly defined in religious, philosophical, or sociological literature. This paper, therefore, will refer to the Wikipedia (2005) definition:

Crisis of faith is a term commonly applied to periods of intense doubt and internal conflict about one's preconceived beliefs or life decisions. A crisis of faith . . . demands reconciliation or reevaluation before one can continue believing in whichever tenet is in doubt or continuing in whatever life path is in question. (Para 1)

This practice issue will be examined using Mezirow's (1991) transformational learning theory, which is particularly pertinent because it focuses on making new meanings during and after a crisis. There is relatively little scholarly research on this subject, especially from a social work perspective. Furthermore, there is almost no literature analyzing this issue using transformational learning theory.

Review of the Literature

Literature about Gay Christians

Literature is available on how "people of faith understand the intersection between homosexuality and religion" (Hodge, 2005, p. 207). In addition, various churches and denominations publish statements regarding their beliefs and stances on homosexuality. However, literature that is more significant to this practice issue discusses homosexuals' understanding of Christianity. For example, Yip (1998), in his empirical research, found that almost all homosexuals in the study "consider the Church hierarchy . . . to be homophobic" (p. 49). There is also an abundance of literature on how gay Christians have made sense of their sexuality and spirituality (Buchanan et al., 2001; Sears, 1991; Shallenberger, 1996; Webster, 1998; Yip, 1997, 2003). Articles and books cover information about challenges gay Christians face regarding their sexuality and spirituality.

Literature about Transformational Learning Theory

Transformational learning theory is included in almost every text on adult education and adult learning theories (Clark, 1993; Baumgartner, 2001; Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). These books tend to focus on the theory's use in adult education, with specific examples from this

discipline. In addition, many texts have been written specifically about transformational learning theory (Cranton, 1994; Mezirow, 1991; Taylor, 1998) and empirical studies have been completed using this theory as a framework (Courtenay et al., 1998; Kilgore & Bloom, 2002; Taylor, 2001). Finally, descriptive articles provide continued explanation of the theory and its practical applications (Grabove, 1997; Mezirow, 1997).

Statement of the Problem

Many gay individuals face discrimination from Christians who believe that homosexuality is immoral (Buchanan, Dzelme, Harris, & Hecker, 2001). Yip (2003) explained that “the Bible serves as the most powerful and fundamental basis for the Churches’ prohibition of the ‘practice’ of homosexuality” (p. 138). For example, the Bible instructs men in Leviticus 18:22 (New International Version) not to “lie with a man as one lies with a woman; that is detestable”.

But what about homosexuals who grow up as devout Christians? How do they reconcile their sexuality and their spirituality? This struggle often hinders gay Christians from admitting their sexuality to themselves, their friends, and their families. Savin-Williams (1990) explained that “the term ‘coming out’ is frequently used to refer to the process of identifying oneself as gay” (p. 30). This progression includes initial awareness of feeling different, testing and exploring sexuality, accepting sexuality, and integrating sexuality with other aspects of identity (Savin-Williams). In one study, “self-disclosure was highest when there was relatively little attachment to a church” (Savin-Williams, p. 116). Although the coming out process mirrors the development described by transformational learning theory, literature about gay Christians does not make this connection (Buchanan et al., 2001; Savin-Williams, 1990; Shallenberger, 1996; Yip, 1997, 2003).

In coming out, Buchanan et al. (2001) explain that Christian homosexuals either choose between their sexuality and spirituality or find some way to integrate these two parts of themselves. In choosing between the two, gay Christians will either: abstain from homosexual behaviors and “forsake all homosexuality” (Buchanan et al., p. 440) or reject religion and the church. On the other hand, in integration, gay Christians will form new beliefs about their faith that include acceptance of homosexuality. Furthermore, they may find congregations and religious institutions that approve of being gay (Yip, 1997). The process of resolving these issues can be mentally and emotionally difficult. It can last for years, or even “for the rest of their lives” (Yip, p. 105). In addition, “many gay Christians, having internalized the conventional Church teachings that are negative toward homosexuality, experience a great deal of guilt and shame. This form of internalized homophobia is debilitating and painful” (Yip, p. 103). Guilt and shame are illustrated in Shallenberger’s (1996) article through the words of Gerald, who says:

Somewhere down inside me I realized, this is what I am, this is what I want. And that began this struggle. Because all my Christian upbringing told me that because of what I’d just done, I was going to burn in hell forever. If I stayed this way, it was just nothing but death for me. (p. 204)

Summary of the Theory/Model

Transformational learning theory, proposed by Mezirow in 1978, “is about change—dramatic, fundamental change in the way we see ourselves and the world in which we live” (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 318). It includes three steps: critical reflection, discourse, and action. In addition, “the process is most often set in motion by a *disorienting dilemma*” (p. 321). Such “an acute/internal/external personal crisis” (Taylor, 1998, p. 41) sets into motion a process of transformation and change.

Critical Reflection

Critical reflection includes an assessment of prior assumptions about self, others, and the world. Existing assumptions and meanings are usually those created in childhood, and may stem from authority figures and friends. During this phase, “critique and reassessment of the adequacy of prior learning, leading potentially to its negation, are the hallmarks of reflection” (Mezirow, 1991, p. 110). In transformative learning, individuals utilize critical reflection to make new meanings by synthesizing old meanings with new ideas learned through the crisis.

Discourse

After critical reflection, new created meanings are validated using discourse. This step is used “to test whether our new meanings are true or authentic” (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999, p. 322). Through discourse with other people, individuals will analyze, deliberate, and affirm new ideas. Although relationships are an important component to this process, discourse can occur alone. Regardless, at the end of this phase, “understanding is arrived through the weighing of evidence and measuring the insight and strength of supporting arguments” (Taylor, 1998, p. 10). In other words, individuals will be able to precisely identify and defend their new beliefs.

Taking Action

The final step in transformative learning is to take action. This action is prescribed by the disorienting dilemma and the new created meanings. Individuals will somehow transform their lives based on these new meanings. Moreover, “that individual transformation leads to social action and social change” (Cranton, 1994, p. 81).

Use in Social Work

This theory, although primarily used as an adult education theory, has been used in social work as well (Courtenay, Merriam & Reeves, 1998). Because social workers often assist individuals who are currently or have been in crisis, transformational learning theory is particularly useful. In therapy, social workers can assist clients in the meaning making process that will naturally occur after a crisis. Furthermore, therapists can provide a supportive environment in which clients can complete discourse.

Conclusions

Examining the Practice Issue from the Theory

For many gay Christians, their crisis of faith is the disorienting dilemma that begins the transformational learning process. It includes the realization that they are, in fact, gay and that homosexuality is considered a sin by their religion. In addition, it creates a dichotomous situation in which many homosexuals believe that they “are asked to choose between their sexual orientation and their religious and spiritual beliefs” (Buchanan et al., 2001, p. 435). In facing this crisis, many will hide their sexuality from others, go through counseling in an attempt to reorient or change their sexuality (Carlton, 2004), reject their religion, or somehow integrate their religion and sexuality.

In the critical reflection phase, gay Christians may begin to question their religious beliefs. Individuals might attempt to find out the origins of Christian views of homosexuality (Webster, 1998) by talking to people in their church, reading books at their local library, or looking online for answers. It is through this reflection that gay Christians will either integrate or choose between their religion and their sexuality (Buchanan et al., 2001). They will most likely reject their old beliefs that homosexuality is a sin. This may lead to new beliefs that their church and/or the Bible is not 100% accurate (Yip, 2003).

In the discourse stage, new meanings will undergo scrutiny and validation. Individuals will need to, in a sense, examine and deliberate these new meanings by themselves and with others in order to affirm them. This can be accomplished individually by journaling one’s thoughts and feelings. However, for those who are in a more supportive environment, this is usually completed with at least one other person. Discourse might be held with a therapist, friend, family member, teacher, pastor, mentor, or even a stranger in an online chat room. Yip (2003) provided an example of a lesbian who describes her new meanings:

I have come a long way. But my sexuality now fits very well with my Christian faith . . . I no longer have any respect for the Church of England . . . It is supposed to be inspired by God. But I think it loses sight of God. (p. 143)

In Shallenberger’s (1996) article, there is another example of new meanings. Beth explains that the way she “grew up [within a Conservative Christian household] left me no place to be as a lesbian (p. 195).

The final step in the transformational learning theory is action. This can include rejecting Christianity totally, and possibly becoming devoted to a new, more tolerant religion. On the other hand, individuals may continue to follow Christianity in a modified way, possibly leaving their church. Another possible action is educating Christians about homosexuality. Individuals might be inspired to create a formal or informal support network for gay Christians in their community (Shallenberger, 1996). Finally, if there is little encouragement and continued discrimination, individuals may be inclined to move out of their community. This was the case for one gay male, who said that “it is easier to be gay in Atlanta than in a small town in South Carolina” (Sears, 1991, p. 44).

Implications for Social Work

There are many implications for social work practice, policy, research, and education. Transformational learning theory can provide a needed framework for examining the crisis of

faith in gay Christians. As knowledge about this subject increases, social workers will increasingly be able to support individuals in the discourse phase. Understanding will only develop with further research. Therefore, researchers are needed to study the natural stages present in the crisis of faith in order to find out if the steps in transformational learning theory are truly similar.

Finally, in an effort to increase interdisciplinary education, professors can make use of transformational learning theory in social work education. This theory, though borrowed from adult education, seems to fit nicely with the values of social work and the types of clients social workers encounter. In particular, as illustrated throughout this paper, transformational learning theory provides a needed framework for examining the crisis of faith in gay Christians.

References

- Barker, K. (Ed.). (1995). *The NIV study Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Baumgartner, L. M. (2001). An update on transformational learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *The new update on adult learning theory* (pp. 15-24). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Buchanan, M., Dzelme, K., Harris, D., & Hecker, L. (2001). Challenges of being simultaneously gay or lesbian and spiritual and/or religious: A narrative perspective. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, 29(5), 435-449.
- Carlton, C. (2004). Sexual reorientation therapy: An orthodox perspective. *Christian Bioethics*, 10(2/3), 137-153.
- Clark, M. C. (1993). Transformational learning. In S. B. Merriam (Ed.), *An update on adult learning theory* (pp. 47-56). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Courtenay, B. C., Merriam, S. B., & Reeves, P. M. (1998). The centrality of meaning-making in transformational learning: How HIV-positive adults make sense of their lives. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48(2), 65-84.
- Cranton, P. (1994). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Grabove, V. (1997). The many facets of transformative learning theory and practice. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, 74, 89-96.
- Hodge, D. R. (2005). Epistemological frameworks, homosexuality, and religion: How people of faith understand the intersection between homosexuality and religion. *Social Work*, 50(3), 207-218.
- Kilgore, D. & Bloom, L. R. (2002). "When I'm down, it takes me a while": Rethinking transformational education through narratives of women in crisis. *Adult Basic Education*, 12(3), 123-133.
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). Transformational learning. In *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed., pp. 318-339). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative dimensions of adult learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Mezirow, J. (1997). Transformative learning: Theory to practice. *New Directions for Adult & Continuing Education*, 74, 5-12.
- Sears, J. T. (1991). *Growing up gay in the South: Race, gender, and journeys of the spirit*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Savin-Williams, R. C. (1990). *Gay and lesbian youth: Expressions of identity*. New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.
- Shallenberger, D. (1996). Reclaiming the spirit: The journeys of gay men and lesbian women toward integration. *Qualitative Sociology*, 19(2), 195-215.
- Taylor, E. W. (1998). *The theory and practice of transformative learning: A critical review*. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education.
- Taylor, E. W. (2001). Transformative learning theory: A neurobiological perspective of the role of emotions and unconscious ways of knowing. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 20(3), 218-236.
- Webster, A. (1998). Queer to be religious: Lesbian adventures beyond the Christian/post-Christian dichotomy. *Theology & Sexuality: The Journal of the Institute for the Study of Christianity & Sexuality*, 8, 27-39.
- Wikipedia: The Free Encyclopedia. (2005). *Crisis of faith*. Retrieved December 4, 2005, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Crisis_of_faith
- Yip, A. K. T. (1997). *Gay male Christian couples: Life stories*. London: Praeger.
- Yip, A. K. T. (1998). Gay male Christians' perceptions of the Christian community in relation to their sexuality. *Theology & Sexuality: The Journal of the Institute for the Study of Christianity & Sexuality*, 8, 40-51.

Yip, A. K. T. (2003). Spirituality and sexuality: An exploration of the religious beliefs of non-heterosexual Christians in Great Britain. *Theology & Sexuality: The Journal of the Institute for the Study of Christianity & Sexuality*, 9(2), 137-154.

Criminal Court Jurisdiction and Juveniles: Who Really Suffers the Punishment? **Joy D. Patton, MA**

With the passing of juvenile crime policies by legislators to help protect society from the juvenile super-predator, the key question that must be raised is, has it made a difference? Juvenile crime policies have a great deal of impact on more than just the juvenile committing the crime. Understanding criminal court jurisdiction for juveniles helps illuminate the impact these policies have on the juveniles and communities in terms of who really suffers the punishment.

Historical Background and Literature Review

Rehabilitation for Juvenile Offenders

The efforts to separate juveniles from the adult court system dates back to the late 1800s in which two prominent individuals, Lucy Flower and Julia Lathrop, worked tirelessly on behalf of incarcerated juveniles in Illinois (Tanenhaus, 2004). The efforts of these two individuals in concert with the American Bar Association as well as prominent attorneys and judges led to the establishment of the first juvenile court in 1899 in Chicago, Illinois (Tanenhaus). According to Small (1997), “the overriding rationale for the juvenile court was rehabilitation...” (p. 119).

From Rehabilitation to Punishment

From 1912 to current day, the established legislations surrounding the juvenile justice system are too numerous to list. However, some of the legislative establishments and court rulings that are well known for leading the juvenile justice system to its current standing are noted.

The major policies concerning the treatment of juveniles in relation to their crimes began to emerge around the 1960s with a series of Supreme Court decisions. Two decisions in particular, *Kent v. United States*, (1966) and *In re Gault*, (1967) affected the way in which juvenile courts handled court proceedings (Feld, 2004; Small, 1997). In addition, the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (JJDP) Act of 1974 was instrumental in ensuring the release of youth already in the adult system into a juvenile facility (Juvenile Justice FYI, 2001). These two court cases were instrumental in ensuring juvenile rights as intended by the establishment of the juvenile justice system and show a progression toward rehabilitation.

However, by 1980, the JJDP Act of 1974 was amended to specifically address issues concerning the authorization of each state to decide the age limit in which a juvenile could be tried in juvenile court as well as the sentencing age of juveniles convicted of serious crimes and/or those juveniles considered to be chronic offenders (Juvenile Justice FYI, 2001). After this amendment, Texas juvenile courts, along with nine other states chose to limit their jurisdiction of juveniles to those age 16 and younger (Juvenile Justice FYI). This newly amended Act in 1980 marks the beginning of a more penalizing approach toward juvenile crime (Brink, 2004). Since adult correctional systems are geared more toward punishment than rehabilitation, lowering the

age in which a juvenile is convicted as an adult allows the courts to impose punishment, effectively lessening the chance for rehabilitation of many juveniles.

In 1987, the state of Texas became one of the first states to enact two policies within the Texas Family Code, known as blended sentencing and determinant sentencing. Determinant sentencing for youths allowed the age in which a youth could be tried as an adult to be lowered. Blended sentencing “allow[ed] youth who receive a determinate sentence to serve the first portion of the sentence in TYC [Texas Youth Commission] with the possibility of being transferred to the adult system to complete the sentence” (Texas Youth Commission, 2003, Para 2). These age limits range from age 10 if the juvenile has committed a felony of the first degree and age 14 if the juvenile has committed a felony of the second or third degree (Texas Statutes Family Code, 1987). According to Brink (2004), the adoption of blended and determinant sentencing was another movement toward even greater penalties for juvenile crime. This is so because it allows juveniles to be sentenced as adults and sent to either adult prisons or a combination of juvenile corrections and adult prisons. Brink states “this is a more punitive trend because, in comparison with the juvenile forum, the adult forum makes juveniles liable for longer sentences in harsher environments and makes their convictions a matter of permanent public record” (p. 1563).

Current Status of Juvenile Justice System

Now, in 44 states and the District of Columbia, laws have been passed making it easier for juveniles to be tried in adult criminal courts with minimum transfer ages ranging anywhere from age seven in Oklahoma to age fifteen in New Mexico (Frontline, 2005). It is this current legislation that has effectively returned the juvenile justice system to its beginnings, ignoring the very foundations of rehabilitation and treatment services offered by the juvenile justice system. With the passing of juvenile crime policies by legislators to help protect society from the juvenile super-predator, the question must be raised, has it made a difference?

At first glance, it would be tempting to give a resounding yes to the effectiveness of these policies. Many researchers have reported that from 1994 to 2002, crime rates among juveniles have had a steady decline across the nation (Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, 1999; Frontline, 2005; Office of Juvenile Justice and Prevention, 2003; Snyder, 2003). While reported statistics appear to be encouraging in favor of immediate public safety, there are other issues that need to be examined to present a clearer picture of whether or not these stricter crime policies are really making a difference. Two issues to be examined, that have unintended consequences impacting the effectiveness of stricter crime policies, are recidivism rates and erroneous transfer of juvenile offenders.

Recidivism Rates as an Indicator of Policy Effectiveness

When looking at the success of the stricter juvenile crime policies in terms of recidivism rates, a much different picture emerges in regards to the effectiveness of these policies. Previous studies by Fagan (1996), Podkopacz and Feld (1996) and Myers (1999), provide interesting results of juvenile recidivism rates. The study by Podkopacz and Feld (1996) found higher recidivism rates for juveniles who were transferred to criminal court as compared to non-transferred juveniles. Myers compared the recidivism rates of 557 violent juvenile offenders in the state of Pennsylvania and reports that juveniles who were judicially transferred to criminal

court were rearrested more quickly upon their return to the community when compared to those juveniles who remained in the juvenile system during the same time period. Lastly, a study completed by Fagan reports that, criminal court processing alone may produce higher recidivism rates, regardless of whether or not the juvenile is confined in a juvenile facility or an adult facility.

Additionally, in a report released by the United States Surgeon General in January 2001, it was confirmed that juveniles who are transferred to adult court are more likely to commit crimes when they are released, “juveniles transferred to adult criminal court have significantly higher rates of re-offending and a greater likelihood of committing subsequent felonies than youths who remain in the juvenile justice system” (United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2001, Para 13). This information points to the long-term ineffectiveness of stricter juvenile crime policies. Stricter juvenile crime policies may have an impact in terms of safer communities in the short-term but ultimately, these same juvenile crime policies will have a negative effect on the communities in terms of long-term public safety.

Erroneous Transfer of Juvenile Offenders as an Indicator of Policy Effectiveness

Another issue to reflect on when considering the effectiveness of stricter juvenile crime policies is the category of juvenile offender appearing in criminal court as compared to the intended category of juvenile offender. Interestingly, Juskiewicz (2000) completed a study for the Building Blocks for Youth initiative and found the following:

prosecution in adult court is expected to be reserved for youth charged with the most serious offenses. However, several of the findings in this report suggest that cases brought against youth prosecuted as adults were either not particularly serious or not very strong. ... The findings suggest that the adult criminal court is taking on numerous cases that should be prosecuted in the juvenile justice system (Para 20).

Statistics of Texas juvenile offenders show that there was a 52% increase from 2001 to 2002 in the number of juveniles certified to stand trial as an adult, transferring 141 juveniles in 2001 and 214 juveniles in 2002 (Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, 2003). Furthermore, this erroneous transfer of juvenile offenders to adult criminal courts has placed increasing numbers of juveniles at risk in that,

Youth tried in the adult criminal court face the same penalties as adults...[they also] will receive little or no education, mental health treatment, or rehabilitative programming; will obtain an adult criminal record which may significantly limit their future education and employment opportunities; and are at greater risk of rape, assault and death in adult jails and prisons with adult inmates (Building Blocks for Youth, n.d., Para 3).

Method

Policy Selection

The juvenile justice system in the United States is not a single justice system, but rather there are 51 separate juvenile systems (National Center for Juvenile Justice, 2003). Every state, and the District of Columbia, has its own regulations regarding juvenile delinquency. Because

juvenile justice laws in many states regarding transferring juveniles to adult courts are similar and because Texas is followed closely and reported on often in regards to its justice system in general, the Texas juvenile policy was chosen for analysis.

Procedure

This paper provides an analysis of the Texas Statutes Family Code, Title 3; Juvenile Justice Code, Section 54.02; Waiver of Jurisdiction and Discretionary Transfer to Criminal Court (1987). Selection of a policy analysis model for analyzing policy is contingent upon several factors. However, when taking a closer look at policy analysis models used for evaluating policies, there are obvious emphases within each model. When examining the Texas juvenile policy, the evident emphasis is on social welfare. For this reason, the policy analysis model applied is adapted from Segal and Brzuzy's (1997) social welfare policy model. This model encompasses the following seven parts in which to analyze this policy: (a) the social problem defined, (b) the goal of the policy, (c) the nature and supporters of the policy, (d) implementation of the policy and the results, (e) the population most affected by the policy, (f) the intended impact of the policy and (g) the *actual* impact of the policy.

Application of the Policy Analysis Model

The applied policy analysis model encompasses seven parts for analyzing social welfare policies as previously outlined. The following seven parts reveal the results of the policy analysis.

Part I—Social Problem Defined

The social problem is one of public perception. Society was painted a picture of an inevitable juvenile superpredator emerging if juvenile crime policies were not toughened. The fear that juvenile criminal offenses were spiraling out of control was due, by and large, to a report published by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP) in the 1990s. Later, in February 2000, the OJJDP "acknowledged that the threat of juvenile violence and delinquency was grossly exaggerated" (Juvenile Justice FYI, 2001, Para 13). Unfortunately, the damage had been done and this report resulted in profound changes to the way in which the United States began restructuring its juvenile justice system.

Part II—Goal of the Policy

The general goal of this policy was to hold violent juveniles accountable for their criminal actions. However, as Brink (2004) suggests, this goal to revamp the structure of the juvenile justice system is due partly to the fact that "juvenile crime is perceived by many as more violent and serious than before, and more serious crime has seemed to many to call for more serious punishment (p. 1560). A subgoal of this policy was to make communities safer by removing the most violent, chronic juvenile offenders.

Part III—Nature of the Policy

By 1996, juveniles under the age of 15 accounted for 32% of all juvenile arrests (Bilchick, 1998). It is at this time that federal legislation was established to authorize states to lower the age in which juveniles could be deferred to criminal court (Juvenile Justice FYI, 2001). The portion of the policy under analysis allows juveniles age 10 and older to be tried as an adult, in Texas, if they have committed a felony in the first degree and age 14 and older to be tried as an adult if they have committed a felony in the second or third degree. The objective of this portion of the policy is to require violent juveniles at younger ages to take responsibility for their criminal actions.

Part IV—Implementation of the Policy and Results

The social program implemented as a result of this policy is the blended sentencing piece. This portion of the policy allows for juveniles who have been convicted of a crime as an adult to serve a portion of the sentence within the juvenile system and then be transferred to the adult prison system at the appropriated age. In trying juveniles as adults, the original purpose of the juvenile justice system, which is rehabilitation, has been ignored, thus, making the blended and determinate sentencing ineffective for the purposes of the established juvenile justice system.

Part V—Populations Most Affected by the Policy

By far the most affected population of this policy is the juvenile offender. One bad mistake could take the ability for rehabilitation away from the juvenile. Other populations that are affected by this policy are the communities in which these juveniles live and return to. A report released by the United States Surgeon General in January 2001, confirms that juveniles who are transferred to adult court are more likely to commit crimes when they are released than juveniles who are allowed to stay in the juvenile justice system (Pelley, 2001; United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2001, Para 13).

Part VI—Intended Impact of the Policy

The intended impact of this policy was to try violent, chronic juveniles as adults in an effort to get tough on juvenile offenders and hold them accountable for their criminal actions. In trying violent juveniles as adults, two social problems were supposed to have been changed: (a) public safety and (b) deterring juveniles from violent behavior.

Actual Impact of the Policy

As indicated previously, increasing public safety only happens in the short-term when juveniles are arrested and deferred to criminal court. However, the long-term effects of this policy show the actual impact is one of decreased community safety when these juveniles are released, as they are more likely to commit more crimes. Another result of this policy was supposed to be to deter juveniles from violent behavior by imposing tougher punishment. It is unlikely that juveniles will be deterred from criminal behavior by imposing tougher punishments simply because “juveniles tend to be less competent in discriminating right from wrong and in

being able to regulate successfully their actions in accord with these discriminations” (Brink, 2004, p. 1557).

Conclusion

Current juvenile crime policies simply do not work. These policies are ineffective in deterring juveniles from crime as they, in many instances, provide an environment for juveniles that seem to elicit re-offending once released from the adult justice system. While communities may experience an immediate increase in public safety by sending these juveniles to adult prisons, long-term public safety for communities has been compromised.

In changing juvenile crime policies to reflect more of a preventative system rather than an anecdotal one, social workers, community services centers and community programs could be employed in providing the needed services for juveniles. There is evidence to suggest rehabilitative interventions of young offenders; those younger than age 13, are more likely to be constructive in deflecting them from chronic delinquency (Flores, 2003). In addition, research studies have shown that some intervention programs within the juvenile justice system does reduce future delinquency and “that the use of the least restrictive sanctions, within the limits of public safety, and enhanced reentry assistance, monitoring and support may reduce future delinquency” (Thornberry, Huizinga & Loeber, 2004, p. 13). In reducing the number of juveniles allowed to remain in the juvenile justice systems by sending them to the adult justice system, social service workers and institutions are unable to work effectively in rehabilitating juvenile delinquents and many juvenile delinquents will go without the needed rehabilitative services.

References

- Bilchik, S. (1998). *OJJDP Fact Sheet*. Retrieved July 30, 2005, from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Prevention Web Site: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/fs-9887.pdf>
- Brink, D. O. (2004). Immaturity, normative competence and juvenile transfer: How (not) to punish minors for major crimes. *Texas Law Review*, 82(6), 1555-1586.
- Building Blocks for Youth. (n.d.). *Transfer of youth to the adult criminal justice system*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from <http://www.buildingblocksforyouth.org/issues/jjdp/factsheet.html>
- Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice. (1999). *Juvenile victims and offenders: 1999 national report*. Retrieved April 12, 2005, from Center for Juvenile and Criminal Justice Web Site: <http://www.cjcj.org/pdf/nr99.pdf>
- Fagan, J.A. 1996. The comparative advantage of juvenile versus criminal court sanctions on recidivism among adolescent felony offenders. *Law and Policy* 18 (1 and 2), 77-113.
- Feld, B. C. (2004). Juvenile transfer. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 3(4), 1599-1603.
- Flores, J. R. (2003). *Child delinquency*. Retrieved January 29, 2006, from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Prevention Web Site: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/193410.pdf>
- Frontline. (2005). *State laws on trying juveniles as adults*. Retrieved July 30, 2005, from WGBH Educational Foundation Web Site: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/juvenile/stats>
- Juskiewicz, J. (2000). *Youth crime, adult time: Is justice served?* Retrieved April 12, 2005, from Building Blocks for Youth Web Site: <http://buildingblocksforyouth.org/ycat/ycat.html>
- Juvenile Justice FYI. (2001). *History of America's juvenile justice system*. Retrieved April 15, 2005, from http://www.juvenilejusticefyi.com/history_of_juvenile_justice.html
- Myers, D.L. 1999. Excluding violent youths from juvenile court: The effectiveness of legislative waiver. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland.
- National Center for Juvenile Justice. (2003). *State juvenile justice profiles*. Retrieved July 30, 2005, from National Center for Juvenile Justice Web Site: <http://www.ncjj.org/stateprofiles/>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (August 11, 2003). *Juveniles in court*. Retrieved February 22, 2005, from <http://www.ojjdp.ncjrs.org>

- Pelley, S. (March 21, 2001). *Adult time*. Retrieved August 8, 2005, from CBS News Web Site: <http://cbsnews.com/stories/2001/02/06/60II/main269725.shtml>
- Podkopacz, M.R., and Feld, B.C. 1996. The end of the line: An empirical study of judicial waiver. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 86, 449-492.
- Segal, E. A., & Brzuzy, S. (1997). *Social welfare policy, programs and practice* (1 ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Small, M. (1997). Juvenile justice: Comments and trends. *Behavioral Science and the Law*, 15, 119-124.
- Snyder, H. N. (2003). Juvenile arrests 2001. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*.
- Tanenhaus, D. S. (2004). *Juvenile justice in the making*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Texas Juvenile Probation Commission. (2003). *The state of juvenile probation activity in Texas*. Retrieved July 30, 05, from Texas Juvenile Probation Commission Web Site: <http://www.tjpc.state.tx.us/publications/reports/RPTSTAT2002.pdf>
- Texas Statutes Family Code. (1987). *54.02 waiver of jurisdiction and discretionary transfer to criminal court*. Retrieved April 18, 2005, from <http://www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/docs/FA/content/htm/fa.003.000054.00.htm>
- Texas Youth Commission. (2003). *A brief history of TYC*. Retrieved February 5, 2005, from Texas Youth Commission Web Site: <http://www.tyc.state.tx.us/about/history2.html>
- Thornberry, T. P., Huizinga, D. & Loeber, R. (2004). The causes and correlates studies: Findings and policy implications. *Juvenile Justice*, 9(1), 3-19.
- United States Department of Health and Public Services (2001). *Youth epidemic not over but effective prevention programs exists.*, *Surgeon General's report findings*. Retrieved August 8, 2005, from www.surgeongeneral.gov/news/pressreleases/pr_sgr_tobacco_use.htm

Causal Role of Marriage Formation in Welfare, Poverty, and Child Well-Being

William D. Cabin, MSW

This article examines whether “marriage formation” policy is an effective singular public policy for reducing welfare and poverty and improving child well-being in the absence of other policy reforms. The article proposes two theses regarding marriage formation policy in the United States:

1. There is no valid and reliable evidence which has determined marriage is a singular, independent variable causing improved child-well-being and reduced welfare and poverty; and
2. There is evidence of multiple resource availability and relationship stability variables as the most valid and reliable predictors of adult and child economic and social well-being.

The article examines the contrasting philosophical positions on marriage formation policy. The perspective which asserts marriage is the single causal variable is examined through recent proposals by the Bush Administration (Office of Child Support Enforcement, 2003; Administration for Children and Families, 2004) and its underlying theoretical and research justifications (Murray, 2001, 1984; Mead, 2001, 1986; Rector, 2001; Fagan, Patterson, & Rector, 2002; Whitehead, 2004). Evidence of the multiple interdependent variable approach comes from a variety of research studies detailed in the article.

Marriage Formation as the Single Cause and Solution

The recent Bush Administration proposals recommend anywhere from \$1.2-\$1.5 billion dollars over the next five years to promote marriage formation as a means to improve the well-being of welfare recipients and children. Marriage formation is the marriage initiative in the

Bush Administration's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Reauthorization proposal (Administration for Children and Families, 2004). The proposal does not propose increases job creation, child care coverage, transportation assistance, housing, health and mental health access and coverage, transitional support programs for welfare to work, or TANF-based time limits, family caps, and sanction policies .

Much of philosophical underpinning of the marriage formation policy derives from Mead (1986) and Murray (1984). Mead asserts work-based welfare reform was necessary to create a more responsible attitude among welfare recipients which would result in more stable families and personal accountability. Murray advocates eliminating welfare altogether, asserting the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) federal welfare policy encouraged single women to choose welfare instead of marriage. Rector and Fagan (1996) extended Murray's logic with Rector going so far as to assert "the sole reason that welfare exists is the collapse of marriage" (Weitzstein, 2001). Ironically, Murray (2001) argues the 1996 work-based welfare reform did not go far enough in eliminating perverse welfare incentives, asserting the reforms had virtually no impact on out-of-wedlock birth, single parenthood, child well-being, and family formation.

Support for this philosophical position relies on two forms of evidence:

1. Secondary research about programs which do not include analysis of multiple variables; do not use statistical techniques such as regression analysis to isolate causal variable impacts and interdependence; and often are applied to middle class married couples; and
2. Research which infers from various macro trend data sources a causal relationship between marriage and child poverty, out-of-wedlock childbearing and welfare dependence, and marriage and educational performance.

Fagan, Patterson, and Rector (2002), for example, cite 29 peer-reviewed social science journal articles, an analysis of 85 studies, a meta-analysis of 16 studies, another meta-analysis of 71 studies, and several individual studies to assert "marriage education and enrichment programs work"(p.1). However, the programs and interventions in the studies were designed to improve relationships and deter divorce in married, predominantly middle class couples, yet they are cited as evidence for a marriage formation policy directed at unmarried low-income, working class, and TANF recipient populations

In another example, Fagan, Rector, Johnson, and Peterson (2002), produce a 48-page chart book asserting the positive effects on marriage and, conversely, the negative effects of non-marriage. Their assertions are based on 29 charts from 17 different sources none of which are subjected to statistical tests of either statistical or clinical significance. Without such measures, it is difficult to evaluate the social scientific validity and reliability of the asserted causal relationship.

Whitehead (2004) similarly asserts, "Overall, the available research evidence persuasively demonstrates the advantages of marriage for children, adults, and the society" (p. 2). She cites twelve different studies and a report to support her position. The report (Institute for American Values, 2002) reviews multiple studies which use different sample sizes, target populations, methodologies, goals, and outcome measures. Many of the studies involve white middle-class populations. However, the report is used by Whitehead and in the President's TANF Reauthorization proposal to support a healthy marriage policy targeted primarily to non-white low-income and TANF populations.

The Constellation of Interdependent Variables

In addition to the paucity of valid and reliable research supporting the singular cause approach to marriage formation policy, there are many researchers who support increased marriage formation and enhancement programs who acknowledge the potential limited impact of such policies unless broader, interdependent causal variables are addressed. Lerman (2002), Director of the Labor and Social Policy Center at the Urban Institute, for example, conducted three studies which he claims support the value of marriage, but he could not support marriage as having a singular or determinative effect on reducing poverty and material hardship and improving child well-being:

The findings strengthen the case for policies that support marriage or at least avoid discouraging marriage. At the same time, the studies do not provide evidence as to whether government programs aimed at promoting healthy marriages will, in fact, increase the number of such marriages and whether the induced marriages will achieve the economic benefits generated by existing marriages. (The Urban Institute, 2002, p. 1)

The Urban Institute further reports, “The analyses of material hardship, Lerman cautions, do not yield conclusions about a causal role for marriage, but they do show strong associations between marriage and reduced hardship” (p.2).

McLanahan (2003), another major supporter of the potential positive role of marriage, is also cautious about using marriage formation as an isolated and singular policy to improve particularly fragile family well-being. McLanahan and Sandefur (1994) often are cited as a primary source of research evidence that children do better living with both biological parents and that single parenthood increases the likelihood of increased risks of poor educational, behavioral, and other outcomes (Seefeldt & Smock, 2004). While McLanahan reports from the Fragile Families Study that many unmarried parents were romantically involved and had high hopes of marriage, she also observes:

Despite their “high hopes” for a future together, very few parents in the study had married by the time of their child’s third birthday. Only 21 percent of the cohabiting couples and 11 percent of the “visiting” couples were married. Further, breakup rates were very high; 38 percent of cohabiting couples and 51% of “visiting” couples were no longer together three years after the birth. (p.9)

McLanahan also observes in her analysis that marriage occurred more frequently when fathers were employed and that poverty is a deterrent to marriage. After comparing poverty rates of parents who did and did not marry, McLanahan notes, “This finding is important and suggests that marriage alone cannot eliminate the income gap between married and unmarried parents, although it can take them part of the way”(p.15).

Waller (2001), also drawing on the Fragile Families Study (FFS) data, finds that lower expectations of marriage were not associated with disinterest with marriage, but with substance abuse, physical violence, conflict and mistrust. McLanahan and Garfinkel (2002), also using the FFS database in a separate analysis, conclude, “Our findings underscore the precarious socio-economic circumstances of many unmarried parents, but they also hold out hope” (p.9) and that large gains in marriage promotion “...are unlikely to be achieved without an increase in the capabilities of parents to support a family and a reduction in marriage and cohabitation penalties in our tax and transfer policies” (p.10).

In data from a new FFS longitudinal study, Carlson, et.al. (2004) find, “Net of other factors (including baseline relationship status), women’s education and men’s earnings

encourage marriage. Cultural and interpersonal factors also have strong effects” (p.1). Mincy and Huang (2001) and Gibson, et.al. (2003) also analyze FFS data and conclude the pre-requisite importance of economic and lifestyle security, including cash benefits and fathers’ employment, on marriage formation, not the reverse. Bloom and Michalopoulos (2001), in their respected analysis of 29 welfare reform initiatives also stress the pre-requisite importance of financial resources to marriage or any type of family stability. They observe that “...policymakers who aim to improve outcomes for families and children may need to develop new ways of providing ongoing financial support to low wage workers-an approach that may raise costs-while continuing to test strategies for raising wages through education and training” (p. ES-3).

Other researchers (Parke, 2003; Ooms, 2002; Newman, 1999; Coontz, 1997 & 2000; Taylor, et.al., 1997) support the importance of housing, medical care, and support systems, including multiple extended and other family arrangements, in determining adult and child well-being, often in addition to or in spite of an unstable or non-existent traditional heterosexual marital relationship. Such research is not discussed by the marriage promotion advocates.

Research on child well-being also raises questions about marriage being the singular independent variable responsible for child well-being. Seefeldt and Smock (2004) cite a variety of research which indicates “...that, on average, children fare better when living with their married, biological parents, provided the marriage is a low conflict one” (p.10) and “that marriage in and of itself, without reasonably good economic circumstances supporting the marriage, may not yield substantially improved levels of well-being” (p.11). Wulczyn, Barth, Yuan, Harden, & Landsverk’s (2005) extensive literature and child welfare databases review linking child development to child well-being indicates that marriage is not a significant factor in child well-being, parenting programs have demonstrated limited success with both single and married parents, and that greater government intervention at early child development stages appears to be the most effective policy direction.

Conclusion

The evidence indicates that a constellation of interdependent economic and social variables must be considered in developing research and policy related to reducing poverty and welfare and improving child, and adult, well-being. Focus on marriage formation or any other single variable defies the existing research literature and masks the underlying issue of unequal resource allocation. Marriage formation is only a relevant variable within such a context, contrary to the current policy direction of the Bush Administration’s marriage promotion agenda for TANF reform.

References

- Administration on Children and Families (2004) U.S. *Department of Health and Human Services, Budget in Brief, FY 2005*. Retrieved February 22, 2004, from <http://www.hhs.gov>
- Bloom, D. & Michalopoulos, C. (2001). *How Welfare and Work Policies Affect Employment and Income: A Synthesis of Research*. New York: Manpower Development Research Corp.
- Carlson, M., McLanahan, S., & England, P. (2004). *Union Formation in Fragile Families*. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://crcw.princeton.edu/fragilefamilies>
- Coontz, S. (2002). *The Way we Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap* (2000 ed.). New York: Basic Books.

- Coontz, S. (1997). *The Way We Really Are: Coming to Terms with America's Changing Families*. New York. Basic Books.
- Fagan, P. F., Patterson, R. W., & Rector, R. E. (2002). *Marriage and Welfare Reform: The Overwhelming Evidence That Marriage Education Works*. Backgrounder No. 1606. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.
- Fagan, P., rector, R., Johnson, K., & Peterson, A. (2002). *The Positive Effects of Marriage: A Book of Charts*. Retrieved February 12, 2004 from <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Welfare>
- Gibson, C., Edin, K. & McLanahan, S. (2003). *High Hopes but Even Higher Expectations: The Retreat from Marriage Among low-Income Couples*. Fragile Families Working Paper 2003-06-FF. Retrieved February 11, 2004, <http://crcw.princeton.edu/fragilefamilies>
- Institute for American Values (2002). *Why Marriage Matters: Twenty-One Conclusions from the Social Sciences*. NY: Institute for American Values.
- Lerman, R. I. (2002). *Wedding Bells Ring in Stability and Economic Gains for Mothers and Children*. Press release, The Urban Institute. Retrieved February 24, 2004, <http://www.urban.org/urlprint.cfm?ID=7858>
- McLanahan, S. (2003). *Fragile Families and the Marriage Agenda*. Center for Research on Wellbeing, Working Paper #03-16-FF, December 2003. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://crcw.princeton.edu/fragilefamilies>
- McLanahan, S., & Garfinkel, I. (2002). *Unwed Parents: Myths, Realities, and Policymaking*. Center for Research on Child Wellbeing, Working Paper #02-15-FF, July 2002. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://crcw.princeton.edu/fragilefamilies>
- McLanahan, S. & Sandefur, G. (1994). *Growing Up With a Single Parent*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.
- Mead, L. (2001). The Politics of Conservative Welfare Reform. In R. Blank & R. Haskins (Eds.) *The New World of Welfare* (pp.201-220), Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Mead, L. (1986). *Beyond Entitlement*. New York: The Free Press.
- Mincy, R. B. & Huang, Chien-Chung (2001). "Just Get Me to the Church...": *Assessing Policies to Promote Marriage among Fragile Families*. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://crcw.princeton.edu/fragilefamilies>
- Murray, C. (2001). Family Formation. In R. Blank & R. Haskins (Eds.) *The New World of Welfare* (pp. 137-168), Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Murray, C. (1984). *Losing Ground: American Social Policy, 1950-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- Newman, K. S. (1999). *No Shame In My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*. New York: Random House and Russell Sage Foundation.
- Office of Child Support Enforcement (2003). *Child Support Report*. July 2003, Vol. XXV., No. 7. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
- Ooms, T. (2002). "Marriage Plus." *The American Prospect*, 13:24-29.
- Parke, M. (2003). *Are Married Parents Really Better for Children: What Research Says About the Effects of Family Structure on Child Well Being*. Policy Brief No. 3, Couples and Marriage Series. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.
- Rector, R. (2001). *Using Welfare Reform to Strengthen Marriage*. American Experiment Quarterly, Summer 2001. Retrieved February 12, 2004, from <http://www.heritage.org/research>
- Rector, R. E. & Fagan, P. F. (1996). *How Welfare Harms Kids*. Retrieved February 12, 2004 from <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Welfare/BG1084.cfm>
- Seefeldt, K. S. & Smock, P.J. (2004). *Marriage on the Public Policy Agenda: What Do Policy Makers Need to Know from Research?* National Poverty Center Working Paper Series. Retrieved February 25, 2004, from http://www.npc.umich.edu/publications/working_papers/
- Taylor, R.J., Tucker, M. B., Chatters, L. M. & Jayakody, R. (1997). Recent demographic trends in African American family structure. In R.J. Taylor, J.S. Jackson, & L.M. Chatters, *Family Life in Black America* (pp. 14-62). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- The Urban Institute (2002). *Wedding Bells Ring in Stability and Economic Gains for Mothers and Children*. Press Release. Retrieved February 24, 2004 from <http://www.urban.org/urlprint.cfm?ID=7858>
- Waller, M. (2001). High Hopes: Unwed Parents' Expectations About Marriage. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 23, 457-484.
- Weitzstein, C. (2001). Unwed Mothers Set a Record for Birth (2001, April 18). *The Washington Times*.
- Whitehead, B. D. (2004). *Testimony before the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, Subcommittee on Children and Families, U.S. Senate*, April 28, 2004. Retrieved January 6, 200 from <http://marriage.rutgers.edu/Publications/Print/Print%20Whitehead%20TESTIMONY.htm>

Bookworm's Corner

Book Review

Maguire, Lambert. (2002). *Clinical Social Work: Beyond Generalist Practice with Individuals, Groups, and Families*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Reviewed by Carol Grace Hurst, PhD (ABD)

In *Clinical Social Work: Beyond Generalist Practice with Individuals, Groups, and Families*, Lambert Maguire (2002) takes the pulse of the clinical social work profession as a whole. He finds a field changing rapidly in order to try to keep pace with a culture that is “more result oriented and impatient” (p. 279). He argues that contemporary people expect change to happen quickly. People accustomed to accessing desires with the quick click of the computer mouse on the internet don't need clinical social workers who take a long time to help them. Managed care has also impacted the way clinical social workers must practice. It is no longer enough to state that the effective clinician is part scientist, part artist. The effective clinician must now also be part business person.

The need for evidence of outcomes drives clinical social work to a new place. Research, rather than ideology, gives the measure of the most efficient and effective interventions. And briefer treatment is better if it still works. Maguire conceptualizes clinical social work practice as an advanced form of social work practice. A broad generalist orientation, including a variety of systems and ecologically based intervention frameworks for individuals, families and groups forms a basic social work knowledge base. But this is not enough. Maguire contends that advanced practitioners are now required to apply very advanced techniques and therefore need an eclectic skill box. Knowing that research has validated cognitive approaches for treatment of depression and behavioral approaches for treatment of phobias, tics, and bedwetting, allows the advanced practitioner to pull out the right tool for the right client problem.

Lambert Maguire states in the preface that he set out to write an advanced social work practice text grounded in empirical research, pertinent to different client groups, and clear in its description of advanced practice techniques. He largely succeeds. He says his clinical social work practice text covers “the empirically validated, widely practiced major methods currently used in advanced social work” (Maguire, 2002, p. xvii). Theoretically, the “major” perspectives chosen include systems, psychodynamic, behavioral, and cognitive approaches. Four chapters are devoted to systems' approaches for use with individuals, groups, and families, as well as in case management. Separate chapters delineate methods for social work practice with individuals from psychodynamic, behavioral, and cognitive frames. Innovatively, Maguire adds a separate chapter on brief interventions from eclectic theoretical standpoints. He ends with a practical chapter summarizing documentation of clinical intervention from assessment to treatment planning in systems, psychodynamic, behavioral, and cognitive frames.

Maguire writes in a strong, clear voice. While many practice texts include a bewildering array of practice theory choices, Maguire has narrowed the theoretical playing field to a starting line-up. This strategy allows him to give his chosen theories more comprehensive treatment. Students using the text thereby receive a resource offering both depth of perspective and more than one way of approaching clinical decision-making. Maguire, himself an advanced practitioner and researcher, brings social work practice to life with inclusion of some accounts of

his own personal professional experiences. The text is interspersed with case examples, historical anecdotes, and lists of therapy techniques. This makes the text readable, accessible, and useful.

There are aspects of advanced social work practice that are left out of this book. Maguire's theoretical starting line-up keeps some major players on the bench. Postmodernism gets only a page and a half description. Constructivism is subsumed as a variant cognitive theory in the cognitive approaches chapter. Feminism wins a paragraph mention within the two and a half page discussion of constructivism. While the importance of inclusive assessment is noted, only bio-psycho-social assessment is recommended. The word spiritual doesn't even make the index. While Maguire's major player choices inevitably leave some things out completely, he does find bit roles for some other theories. Empowerment, the Strengths perspective, and social work's attention to special populations are treated as systems' interventions. The task-centered approach is presented in the brief intervention chapter.

While I appreciated the author's clear writing style, one thing began to rankle me as I made my way through the text. He is *too* sure. As he himself identifies in his one paragraph on feminism, feminist practice social workers are concerned "that empirical objectivists, who are typically male, put themselves into the position of defining reality in their own authoritative way" (Maguire, 2002, p. 254). While, I believe Maguire definitely holds the credentials to be an authoritative expert on both practice and research, what is missing for me in his presentation of clinical practice is an articulation of the experience of tentativeness in clinical thinking.

Advanced social work practitioners need an understanding of their own processes of reflexivity. Social workers need to know answers. But we also need to know when we don't know. Social Workers need to be experts. But we also need to be tentative enough to allow clients to be the experts on their own experience. In the intimacy of professional helping moments practitioners need awareness of their inner processing. How does a practitioner bridge from their intuitive hunches to a working hypothesis confirmed with the client and back to the research knowledge base? Maguire's work could be enhanced with content on professional reflexivity processes discussed in the work of Schon (1991) and furthered in social work by Klein and Bloom (1995), Parton (2000), and Sheppard, Newstead, Di Caccavo, and Ryan (2000). Instructors who choose this text may wish to add supplemental reading on the processes of reflexive practice.

All in all, I would recommend this text as a very useful resource for social work practice courses. The advanced practitioner looking for a book to read as a primer for polishing technique vocabulary and updating knowledge of empirically substantiated theory will also find Maguire's book a practical choice.

References

- Klein, W. & Bloom, M. (1995). Practice wisdom. *Social Work, 40*(6), 799-807.
- Maguire, L. (2002). *Clinical social work: Beyond generalist practice with individuals, groups, and families*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Parton, N. (2000). Some thoughts on the relationship between theory and practice in and for social work. *British Journal of Social Work, 30*(4), 449-463.
- Schon, D. (1991) *The Reflective Practitioner*, 2nd ed. Aldershot: Arena.
- Sheppard, M.; Newstead, S.; Di Caccavo, A.; & Ryan, K. (2000). Reflexivity and the development of process knowledge in social work: A classification and empirical study. *British Journal of Social Work, 30*(4), 465-488.

Book Review

Berns, Nancy S. (2004). *Framing the Victim: Domestic Violence, Media and Social Problems*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Reviewed by Sherry Sheffield, LCSW

Nancy Berns presents a compelling argument for how the popular media influences public opinion about domestic violence and other social problems. Her book is the result of her research of the popular media portrayal of domestic violence. Berns' defines popular media as television, radio, newspaper, movies, internet, books, and magazines. She argues that the general public uses the media as their only resource for information about social problems. Berns' presents four main points about the problem of domestic violence and how the phenomenon is portrayed in the mainstream media. First, she maintains that the media frame domestic violence as a private matter warranting intervention only in extreme cases. Second, she argues that the media's focus on the victim holds the victim responsible for ending the violence. Third, the media's portrayal of the perpetrator emphasizes external factors for the abuse and negates personal responsibility. Finally, the media ignores social and cultural norms that foster abuse. These points are then considered in light of how they construct a common set of beliefs about domestic violence that influences public policy.

Bern argues that stories of domestic violence often are sensationalized and designed to sell books, movies, or magazines, as well as to entice viewers to watch popular news or talk shows. Berns contends that media stories affect the public perception of the problem, especially for those individuals who have not experienced domestic violence. She maintains that the general public begins to adopt the media experience as their own experience, their own reality of domestic violence. Hence, the public's perception of the problem is distorted by what the popular media is selling. Moreover, this false perception of the problem filters into and influences public policy. In addition, current research is not promoted to the general public and therefore has little effect on the public's response to domestic violence.

Berns uses the word "frame" in the title of her book for a two-fold purpose. First, she uses the analogy of a photographer framing a landscape in the lens of her camera, snapping a picture that captures the view she wants to present to the audience. However, she maintains that the media are biased photographers, more concerned about selling pictures than capturing reality. Berns contends that the landscape of domestic violence has many levels which are not realistically portrayed in the picture. What the audience does not see is the cultural and structural landscapes of gender role socialization, male dominance, and norms that support different forms of violence or oppression. Also, the institutional landscape continues to view domestic violence as a personal issue and criminalization as the only solution. Finally, the individual landscape concentrates on the victim's responsibility to stop the violence, with minimal focus on the perpetrator.

Another way in which Berns uses the word "frame" is to represent how the victim is blamed or held accountable for the violence. Berns argues that the media is driven by a cultural obsession to entertain and that social problems are transformed to sell product. She conducted a qualitative research study of popular women's, men's, and political magazines. She interviewed editors from several publications to determine their criteria for publishing. The women's magazines Berns' included in her research were *Essence*, *Glamour*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Ladies Home Journal*, *Mademoiselle*, *McCall's*, *Redbook*, *Seventeen*, *Teen* and *Vogue*. She discovered that women's magazines defined domestic violence as male violence against females and

enclosed the concept in a frame of empowerment. Although the empowerment frame implies a power shift toward the victim, this paradigm continues to focus on the victim's responsibility for the abuse. Berns found that the primary goals of the women's magazines she studied were to keep stories personal and uplifting. The editors looked for stories that were inspirational and portrayed women who were empowered to overcome the abuse. Furthermore, Berns found that the stories were selected based upon the type of victim. The victim must be deserving of empathy, acceptable, responsible, and easily empowered. Stories about helpless victims, such as the elderly and children, were considered too depressing to print.

The popular men's magazines Berns' researched included *Playboy* and *Penthouse*. These publications utilized an anti-feminist frame, countering the feminist and battered women's movements of the 1970s. This anti-feminist frame put more emphasis on violence overall, claiming that men and women are equally violent. The anti-feminist perspective posits that females are responsible for their own victimization and may even enjoy abuse. Berns found that men's publications were more like to publish stories about female perpetrators and to criticize society's tolerance of women's violence. Furthermore, men's publications protested violence legislation as discriminatory toward men and blamed feminist advocates for propagating bias against men. Berns states that these popular men's magazines are more confrontational, and she infers that they use sexually explicit pictures to subsidize their political views. Berns posits that the men's publications she evaluated were more focused on countering the feminist movement than on furthering any understanding of the problem of domestic violence.

Berns examined some of the liberal political publications such as *The Nation* and *The Progressive*, as well as conservative political publications like *National Review*, *Reason*, and *The New Republic*. She concludes that these publications are more likely to frame domestic violence from a social justice perspective. The author states that the social justice perspective actively resists blaming the victim and focuses on promoting justice through social change. Berns maintains that this perspective is hard to find in the mass media. These political publications were more likely to target social and cultural issues that foster violence. However, these magazines also viewed domestic violence as male abuse of female victims, with no consideration for abuse in same-sex relationships or abuse perpetrated against children and the elderly. These publications also presented domestic violence from a male point of view, showing reluctance to consider the perpetrator's responsibility. Furthermore, Berns reports that political publications were more likely to present domestic violence as the pathos of female victims.

Berns concludes the book with suggestions for new ways of framing domestic violence. She proposes a frame which condemns violence as a means of conflict resolution, a frame that disapproves of the abuser versus shaming the victim, and one that recognizes ways in which violence is culturally and socially supported. She suggests more research examining domestic violence in depth, identifying cultural messages that support rigid gender roles, and exposing cultural attitudes that normalize violence. Finally, Berns encourages the reader to critically evaluate media coverage and to cultivate a broader perspective on the problem of domestic violence and potential solutions to the problem.

In summary, Nancy Berns provides an interesting analysis of the media's portrayal of domestic violence and the public's perception of the same. The writing is redundant in some chapters and the use of the frame analogy becomes burdensome later in the text. Eventually the frames become confusing and too numerous to separate. Never-the-less, the overall argument that the media present a sensationalized view of social problems and how this view affects policy is reasonable. However, the writer does not discuss policy issues in any meaningful way.

Furthermore, there is no mention of any research, or lack there of, on the actual effects the media's portrayal of domestic violence has had on policy. On the other hand, Berns provides a persuasive line of reasoning with regard to the media's influence on the public and the shift from investigative reporting to what she calls "infotainment." Overall, Berns provides interesting food for thought and encourages those who are inclined to read her book to look beyond the façade of domestic violence that is portrayed by mainstream media.

Guidelines for Submission

In order to be considered for publication in *Perspectives on Social Work*, all submissions must meet the following criteria:

- The author must be a currently enrolled doctoral social work student.
- Only original work will be considered. It is acceptable to submit a piece that has been published elsewhere or is currently under consideration as long as it is that student's original work.
- Only electronic submissions are accepted. Submissions should be e-mailed as a Microsoft Word attachment to the following e-mail address: journal@sw.uh.edu
- Submissions for the featured articles should be 5 – 7 pages in length with not less than one-inch margins and 12-point font. Submissions for book reviews may be 2-4 double-spaced pages. Submissions must be double-spaced.
- Submissions must meet APA guidelines (5th Edition) for text, tables, and references.

Feedback Guidelines

The editorial staff encourages thoughtful responses from readers focusing on scholarly debate and dialogue. Please send feedback to Journal@sw.uh.edu