Preface

Introduction to Social Work: Through the Eyes of Practice Settings was written with the realization that we live in a rapidly changing world, and these changes have dramatically impacted the social work field. Social work is a discipline that touches on virtually every dynamic occurring worldwide that affects people and their surroundings. Social workers provide assistance to people in all dimensions of the client’s life. They interact with individuals, families, and communities within a variety of contexts and on a variety of levels, which means that social workers wear numerous hats and must be aware of a vast amount of information.

Social workers are therapists, case managers, social justice advocates, policy experts, and experts on a range of social problems. What other careers require this level of expertise? Social workers working in refugee resettlement must be aware of patterns of global conflict throughout the world. Social workers working in employment assistance must be aware of economic patterns on a micro and macro level, including the impact of globalization on domestic and international employment. Social workers working with children must be aware of child development theory, child- and family-centered intervention strategies, domestic policy and legislation impacting child welfare on national and local levels, and contemporary social problems impacting children (such as cyberbullying). Social workers must remain abreast of technological advances, including the globalization of communication technologies, which impact their clients in positive and negative ways. Social workers must be aware of contemporary changes in family structures and newer ways of working with families that reflect their changing structures, such as working with blended and same-sex family constellations. These are just a few examples reflecting the breadth of this career.

I have worked in the social services throughout my entire career, and the trajectory of my career has in many respects reflected the changes within the social work field, including evolving from a focus primarily on “domestic” social work on a direct practice level working in traditional practice settings, such as mental health and schools, to a career primarily on a policy and macro level working with international issues, such as conflict and refugees. It is my hope that this book effectively reflects the breadth and complexity of the social work profession, while also reflecting the most recent changes in the world that impact the social work profession.

A CONTEXTUAL AND INTEGRATIVE APPROACH

With regard to the approach and organization of this book, readers will note that I have taken a unique approach to presenting content relevant to the social work profession in that the roles, function, and nature of the work that social workers do is presented contextually
and in an integrative manner so that readers will be better able to understand and envision the nature of this profession by looking “through the eyes of practice settings.”

The first section of this book is designed to provide a foundation for the rest of the book by providing readers with a very general introduction to the social work profession including its purpose, preparation, practice, and theoretical orientations most often used in social work (Chapter 1); exploring the evolution of social welfare policy and the effect on social work practice (Chapter 2); and identifying and exploring many of the generalist skills and intervention strategies used in the social work profession, as well as the nature of social work ethical standards (Chapter 3). Chapters 4 through 12 focus on a range of practice areas addressing social problems existing in the world today that social workers are most likely to encounter in their careers, such as child welfare (Chapter 4); adolescence (Chapter 5); older adults (Chapter 6); mental health and mental illness (Chapter 7); homelessness (Chapter 8); health care and hospice (Chapter 9); schools (Chapter 10); religion and spirituality (Chapter 11); violence and victim advocacy (Chapter 12); and international social work (Chapter 13), which explores global dynamics, including international human rights violations and the international community’s response. Touching the lives of social work students on such a broad scale is an honor, and I hope this book reflects my awareness of the importance of this field—both with regard to its history, its current contributions, and its future.
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Purpose, Preparation, Practice, and Theoretical Orientations

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

• Identify and describe three reasons people may need social work intervention.

• Distinguish between the different helping fields and the associated requirements of each way one can enter the field of social work and the various types of careers within the social work profession.

• Identify the most common degrees and associated licensure level within the social work profession.

• Apply social work foundational theoretical frameworks to client situations experiencing frequently encountered social problems.
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Sara works for a hospice agency, where she spends one hour twice a week with Steve, who has terminal liver cancer and approximately six months to live. He has been estranged from his adult daughter for four years, and Sara is helping him develop a plan for reunification. Sara helps Steve deal with his terminal diagnosis by helping him talk through his feelings of being sick and dying. Steve talks a lot about his fear of being in pain and his overwhelming regret for many of the choices he has made in his life. Sara listens and also helps him develop a plan for saying all the things he needs to say before he dies. During one meeting, she helped him write a list of what he would like to say to his estranged daughter, his ex-wife, and other family members. She is also helping him make important end-of-life decisions, including planning his own funeral. Sara and Steve
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will continue to meet until his death, and if possible, she will be with him and his family when he passes away.

Gary works for a public middle school, where he meets with six seventh graders every Monday to talk about their feelings. He helps them learn better ways to explore feelings of anger and frustration. Sometimes they play a board game where they each take turns picking a self-disclosure card and answering a personal question. Gary uses the game to enter into discussions about healthy ways of coping with feelings, particularly anger. He also uses the game to get to know the students on a personal level, so that they will open up to him more. He dedicates one session per month to discuss their progress in class. The goal for the group is to help the students learn how to better control their anger and to develop prosocial behaviors, such as empathy and respect for others.

Frank works for a county social services agency in the child welfare division, and is working with Lisa, who recently had her three young children removed from her home for physical and emotional neglect. Frank has arranged for Lisa to have parenting classes and individual counseling so that she can learn how to better manage her frustrations with her children. He has also arranged to have her admitted to a drug rehabilitation program to help her with her addictions to alcohol and cocaine. Frank and Lisa meet once a week to talk about her progress. He also monitors her weekly visitation with her children. Frank is required to attend court once per month to update the judge on Lisa’s progress on her parenting plan. Successful completion of this plan will enable Lisa to regain custody of her children. Frank will continue to monitor her progress, as well as the progress of the children, who are in foster care placement.

Allison is currently lobbying several legislators in support of a bill that would increase funding for child abuse prevention and treatment. As the social policy advocate for a local grassroots organization, she is responsible for writing position statements and contacting local lawmakers to educate them on the importance of legislation aimed at reducing child abuse. She also writes grants for federal and private funding of the organization’s various child advocacy programs.

THE NATURE OF SOCIAL WORK AND ITS NEED IN SOCIETY

What do all these professionals have in common? They are all social workers, each possessing a broad range of skills and having a wide range of responsibilities related to their roles in helping people overcome a variety of social problems. Social work is a growing profession (Doelling, 2004), and is expected to grow at 19 percent over the next decade, representing a faster-than-average pace (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014).

Although the responsibilities of social workers can range considerably, the International Federation of Social Workers defines the social work profession as one that promotes social change, problem-solving in human relationships, and the empowerment and liberation of people to enhance well-being. Utilizing theories of human behavior and social systems, social work intervenes at the points where people interact with their environments. Principles of human rights and social justice are fundamental to social work. (Hare, 2004)

Human beings have basic needs, such as the need for food, health, shelter, and safety. People also have social needs, such as the need for interpersonal connection and love,
and psychological needs, such as the need to deal with the trauma of past abuse or the psychological ramifications of disasters such as a hurricane or house fire. People who are fortunate have several ways to get their needs met. For instance, social and psychological needs can be met by family, friends, neighbors, places of employment, and places of worship, and needs related to food, shelter, healthcare, child care, and housing can be met through employment, education, and family.

But some people in society are unable to meet even their most basic needs because they do not have a supportive network—they may not have a supportive family or they may have no family at all. They may have no friends or have friends who are either unsupportive or unable to provide help. They may have no social support network of any kind, having no faith community, and no supportive neighbors, perhaps due to apartment living or the fact that many communities within the United States tend to be far more transient now than in prior generations. They may lack the skills or education to gain sufficient employment; thus, they may not have health insurance or earn a good wage. Perhaps they’ve spent the majority of their lives dealing with an abusive and chaotic childhood and are now suffering from the manifestation of that experience in the form of psychological problems and substance abuse and, thus, cannot focus on meeting their basic needs until they are able to deal with the trauma they endured.

Some people, particularly those who have good support systems, may falsely believe that anyone who cannot meet their most basic needs must be doing something wrong. This belief is incorrect because numerous barriers may exist that keep people from meeting their basic needs, some of which might be related to their own behavior, but more often, the reasons people cannot meet their needs are quite complicated and often lie in dynamics beyond their control. Thus, while some people who are fortunate enough to have great families, have wonderfully supportive friends, have the benefit of a good education, have not experienced racial oppression or marginalization, and have no significant history of abuse or loss may be self-sufficient in meeting their own needs, this does not mean that others who find themselves in situations where they cannot meet their own needs are doing something wrong. Social service agencies come into the picture when people find themselves confronting barriers to getting their basic needs met and their own resources for overcoming these obstacles are insufficient (see Box 1.1).

A tremendous amount of controversy surrounds how best to help people meet their basic needs, and various philosophies exist regarding what types of services truly help those in need. For instance, some philosophies posit that many social welfare programs foster dependence and thus should be stigmatized to discourage liberal use. However, other philosophies posit that a solid social safety net fosters self-sufficiency and what may appear to be dependence is really masked discouragement. Regardless of what philosophy one adopts with regard to social welfare assistance, the primarily goal of social work is to assist people in achieving self-sufficiency and reaching their optimal level of functioning. This means that social workers are committed to helping people develop the necessary skills to become self-sufficient and function at their optimal levels, personally and within society. Thus, although a social service agency may subsidize a family’s rent for a few months when they are in a crisis, social workers will then work with the family
members to remove any barriers that may keep them from meeting their housing needs in the future, such as substance abuse disorders, a lack of education or vocational skills, health problems, mental illness, or lacking self-advocacy skills necessary for combating prejudice and discrimination in the workplace, for instance.

In addition to a commitment to working with a broad range of populations, including high-needs and disenfranchised populations, and providing them with the necessary resources to get their basic needs met, social workers are also committed to working on a macro or societal level to removing barriers to optimal functioning that affect large groups of people. By advocating for changes in laws and various policies, social workers contribute to making strides in reducing prejudice and discrimination related to one’s race, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status (SES), or any one of a number of other characterizations that might marginalize someone within society.

Social workers continue to work on all social fronts so that all members of society have an equivalent opportunity for optimal functioning and self-sufficiency. The chief goal of social workers is to help individuals as well as communities function at their maximum potential, overcoming personal and social barriers as effectively as possible in the major domains of living.

**SOCIAL WORKERS: EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS**

Each year numerous caring individuals decide to enter the field of social services and embark on the confusing journey of trying to determine what level of education is required for specific employment positions, when and where a license is required, and even what degree is required. There are no easy answers to these questions, because the social services profession is a broad one encompassing many different professions, including human services generalist, mental health counselor, psychologist, social worker, and perhaps even psychiatrist, all of whom are considered social service professionals if they work in a social service agency,
working in some manner with marginalized and disenfranchised populations or other individuals who are in some way experiencing problems related to social or systemic issues within society.

Another area of confusion relates to the educational and licensing requirements needed to work in the social work field. What educational degrees are necessary to become a social worker, what level of education is required, and what professional license is needed depend in large part on variables such as specific state and federal legislation (particularly for highly regulated fields, such as educational and healthcare sectors), industry-specific standards, and even agency preference or need. To make matters even more confusing, these variables can vary dramatically from one state to the next; thus, a job that one is qualified for in one state with an Associate of Arts (AA) degree may require a Master of Social Work (MSW) degree and a clinical license in another state. In addition, many individuals may work in the same capacity at a social service agency, each with different professional degrees. Keeping such variability within specific social services fields in mind, as well as differences among state licensing requirements, a very general breakdown of degrees in the mental health field is shown in Table 1.1, along with their possible corresponding licenses, as well as what careers these professionals might be able to pursue, depending on individual state licensing requirements.

While many professionals working in the social services field engage in comparable work, not all are social workers in the legal sense; thus, when I use the term social worker, I am referring to the legal definition and professional distinction of a licensed social worker, indicating either a Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) or an MSW level of education, and likely some level of professional licensure.

In the early 1900s, many of those who worked in the social services field were called social workers; yet, as the social work field continued to professionalize, the title of social worker eventually became reserved for those professionals who had either an undergraduate or a graduate degree in social work from a program accredited by the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the body responsible for the accreditation of social work educational programs in the United States.

From the 1960s through the 1980s, the majority of social workers had a BSW and could become a licensed social worker. Currently, most states require that social workers have at least a BSW, but the professional standard is an MSW. Most states also require that practicing social workers be licensed, certified, or credentialed by taking a national examination.

Even with the push toward increasing professionalism, the educational and licensing requirements for social workers may range from state to state, or even from community to community (Rittner & Wodarski, 1999). Issues such as the stance of legislators in a particular state, as well as the need for social workers within high-needs communities, may significantly impact educational and licensing requirements. For instance, communities that have a shortage of social workers—such as in high-crime areas, rural communities, and migrant communities in need of bilingual social workers—often require lower levels of education and may not require any licensing (Gumpert & Saltman, 1998).

Other factors that affect educational and licensing requirements for social workers include federal or state governmental licensing requirements pertaining to certain practice settings, such as the healthcare industry (hospitals, hospices, home healthcare), government child welfare agencies, and public schools, that stipulate the requirement for advanced degrees and licensure and/or certain credentials. For instance, in many states,
### Table 1.1  Multiple Discipline Degree Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Academic Area/Major</th>
<th>License/Credential</th>
<th>Possible Careers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>BS-BCP</td>
<td>Caseworker, youth worker, residential counselor, behavioral management aide, case management aide, alcohol counselor, adult day care worker, drug abuse counselor, life skills instructor, social service aide, probation officer, child advocate, gerontology aide, juvenile court liaison, group home worker, child abuse worker, crisis intervention counselor, community organizer, social work assistant, psychological aide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Psychology, Sociology</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Same as above, depends on state requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSW</td>
<td>Social Work (program accredited by CSWE)</td>
<td>Basic licensing (LSW) depends on state</td>
<td>Same as above, depends on state requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>LCP (Licensed Clinical Professional—on graduation)</td>
<td>Private practice, some governmental and social service agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–60 credit hours</td>
<td>LCPC (Licensed Clinical Professional Counselor—~3,000 postgrad supervised hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSW</td>
<td>Social Work (program accredited by CSWE)</td>
<td>LSW (on graduation)</td>
<td>Private practice, all governmental and social service agencies (some requiring licensure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 credit hours</td>
<td>LCSW (Licensed Clinical Social Worker—~3,200 postgrad supervised hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyD 120 credit hours</td>
<td>Doctor of Psychology</td>
<td>PSY# (Licensed Clinical Psychologist—~3,500 postgrad supervised hours)</td>
<td>Private practice, many governmental and social service agencies, teaching in some higher education institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Psychology</td>
<td>Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology</td>
<td>PSY# (~3,500 postgrad supervised hours)</td>
<td>Private practice, many governmental and social service agencies, teaching in higher education institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School social workers must have an MSW degree, a social work license issued by the state, and an educational credential in school social work. Additionally, most states require hospice social workers to be licensed social workers, thus requiring either a BSW or an MSW degree. But in Illinois, for instance, the Hospice Program Licensing Act provides that a hospice agency can also employ bereavement counselors who have a bachelor’s degree in counseling, psychology, or social work with one year of counseling experience. Some states require child welfare workers to be licensed social workers with an MSW, whereas other states require them to have a master’s degree in any related field (i.e., psychology, human services, sociology). In states where there is a significant need for bilingual social workers, such as California, educational requirements may be lowered if the individual is
bilingual and has commensurate counseling and/or case management experience. Insurance reimbursement is also driving educational and licensing requirements, with some third-party payers reimbursing for services provided by only those service providers with graduate-level education and state licensure (Beaucar, 2000).

The Association of Social Work Boards (ASWB) is legally responsible for regulating the social work profession, developing and maintaining licensing exams for all states, as well as serving as a central clearinghouse of information on the legal regulation of social work. The ASWB has identified professional standards for the practice of social work and defines by law the requirements for each level of licensure as a social worker. There are four levels of practice that states can legally regulate, each with increasingly difficult written examinations (see Table 1.1), but as shown in Table 1.2, not all states recognize each level of practice.

The CSWE is responsible for accrediting and monitoring social work educational programs in the United States, through the development of educational standards that social work educational programs must meet. The current Educational and Policy Accreditation Standards (EPAS) has shifted to a competency-based standard, using an outcome performance approach to demonstrate that the curriculum in social work programs illustrates the integration and application of the identified core competencies in practice with individuals, families, groups, organizations, and communities. What this means is that through the use of an integrative learning model (which focuses on the integration of concepts across the entire curriculum), social work students develop competencies in various social work practice behaviors that are deemed important for all social workers to have mastery in (depending on whether they have a bachelor’s or master’s degree). (See Box 1.2.)

Every social work educational program must provide a comprehensive plan for how they have designed their explicit curriculum, which includes the 10 core competencies (with associated practice behaviors), and field education, which according to the CSWE is social work education’s signature pedagogy (see Box 1.2), reflecting the importance of connecting what’s being learned in the classroom with what’s occurring in the real-world practice setting. Social work education programs must also provide comprehensive information on its implicit curriculum, which includes the inner workings of the program, such as the program’s admissions policies and procedures, academic structure, faculty, and commitment to diversity. CSWE’s current EPAS also includes an assessment component, which requires social work educational programs to assess student learning to ensure that its curriculum is meeting the competency standards and thus is successfully preparing social work students for their professional careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.2  ASWB Levels of License Examinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASWB License Level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Exam (formerly called Basic Exam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Exam (formerly called Intermediate Exam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Generalist Organization (formerly called Advanced Exam)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assess your comprehension of “Social Workers: Educational Requirements and Professional Standards” by completing this quiz.
Part One: Foundational Issues in Social Work Policy and Practice

HOW DO SOCIAL WORKERS PRACTICE AND WHAT DO THEY DO?

Since human beings have walked this planet, people have been trying to figure out what makes them *tick*. If we were to construct a historical time line, we would see that each era tends to embrace a particular philosophy regarding the psychological nature of humans. Were we created in the image of God? Are we inherently good? Are personal problems a product of social oppression, or are individuals responsible for their lot in life? Do we have various levels of consciousness with feelings outside our awareness, motivating us to behave in certain ways? What will make us happy? What leads to our emotional demise? These questions are often left to philosophers and more recently to psychologists, but they also relate very much to social work practice because the view of humankind held by social workers will undoubtedly influence how they both view and help their clients.

One of the most common questions social workers are asked in a job interview is about their *theoretical orientation*. I recall a professor in my graduate program cautioning all students to avoid claiming to be eclectic if asked this question in a job interview, because this was a clear indication to any employer that we had no idea what theoretical orientation we embraced. Essentially what this question is addressing is what theoretical orientation social workers operate from as a foundation. In any mental health clinic, one practitioner might counsel from a psychoanalytic perspective, another from a humanistic perspective, and yet another from a cognitive–behavioral perspective. The theoretical orientation of mental health professionals will serve as a sort of lens through which they view their clients. Depending on the theory, a social worker’s theoretical orientation may include certain *underlying assumptions* about human behavior (e.g., what motivates humans to behave in certain ways), *descriptive aspects* (e.g., common experiences of women in middle adulthood), as well as *prescriptive aspects* defining adaptive versus maladaptive behaviors (e.g., is it normal for children to experience separation anxiety in the toddler years? Is adolescent rebellion a normal part of adolescent development?!)
Most theoretical orientations will also extend into the clinical or direct practice realm by outlining ways to help people become emotionally healthy, based on some presumption of what caused them to become emotionally unhealthy in the first place. For instance, if a practitioner embraces a psychoanalytic perspective that holds to the assumption that early childhood experiences influence adult motivation to behave in certain manners, then the counseling will likely focus on the client’s childhood. If the practitioner embraces a cognitive–behavioral approach, the focus of counseling will likely be on how the client frames and interprets the various occurrences in his or her life.

**Theoretical Frameworks Used in Social Work**

When considering all the various theories of human behavior, it is essential to remember that culture and history affect what is considered healthy thinking and behavior. Common criticism of many major psychological theories is that they are often based on mores common in Western cultures in developed countries (often referred to as the Global North) and are not necessarily representative or reflective of individuals living in developing or non-Western cultures (often referred to as the Global South). For instance, is it appropriate to apply Freud’s psychoanalytic theory of human behavior, which was developed from his work with higher society women in the Victorian era, to individuals of the Masai tribe in Africa? Or is it appropriate to use a theory of human behavior developed during peacetime when working with those who grew up in a time of war? Any theory of human behavior one considers using in relation to understanding the behavior of clients should include a framework addressing many systems, such as culture, historical era, ethnicity, and gender, as well as other systems within which the individual operates. In other words, it is imperative that as a part of any evaluation and assessment, social workers consider environmental elements that may be a part of the client’s life.

Social workers are often referred to as generalists, implying that their knowledge base is broad and varied. This does not mean that they do not have areas of specialization; in fact, in the past 100 years, social workers have increasingly ventured into practice areas previously reserved for other helping professionals, such as psychologists and professional counselors (Rullo, 2001), and even in non–social work arenas, such as business, politics, and international relations. But many believe that regardless of developing areas of specialization, to be most effective, social workers must be competent in working with a broad range of individuals and a broad range of issues, using a wide range of interventions. A conceptual framework that is most commonly associated with the social work discipline is one that views clients within the context of their environment, specifically focusing on the transaction or relationship between the two.

Several theories capture this conceptual framework, and virtually all are derived from general systems theory, which is based on the premise that various elements in an environment interact with each other, and this interaction (or transaction) has an impact on all elements involved. This has certain implications for the hard sciences, such as ecology and physics, but when applied to the social environment, its implications involve the dynamic
and interactive relationship between environmental elements, such as one’s family, friends, neighborhood, church, culture, ethnicity, and gender, and individual elements, such as one’s thoughts, attitudes, and behavior. Thus, if someone asked you who you were, you might describe yourself as a female who is a college student, married, with two high school–aged children, who attends church on a regular basis. You might further describe yourself as having come from an Italian family with nine brothers and sisters and as a Catholic.

On further questioning, you might explain that your parents are older and you have been attempting to help them find alternate housing that can help them with their extensive medical needs. You might describe the current problems you’re having with your teenage daughter, who was recently caught ditching school by the truancy officer. Whether you realize it or not, you have shared that you are interacting with the following environments (often called ecosystems): family, friendships, neighborhood, Italian-American culture, church, gender, marriage covenant, adolescence, the medical community, the school system, and the criminal justice system.

Your interaction with each of these systems is influenced by both your expectations of these systems and their expectations of you. For instance, what is expected of you as a college student? What is expected of you as a woman? As a wife? As a Catholic? What about the expectations of you as a married woman who is Catholic? What about the expectations of your family? As you attempt to focus on your academic studies, do these various systems offer stress or support? If you went to counseling, would it be helpful for the practitioner to understand what it means to be one of 10 children from a Catholic, Italian-American family?

This focus on transactional exchange between the individual and social forces is what distinguishes the field of social work from other fields such as psychology and psychiatry, although recently, systems theory has gained increasing attention in these latter disciplines as well. Several theories have been developed to describe the reciprocal relationship between individuals and their environment. The most common are ecological systems theory, person-in-environment (PIE), and eco-systems theory.

**Bronfenbrenner’s Ecological Systems Theory**

Urie Bronfenbrenner (1979) developed the ecological systems, which categorizes an individual’s environment into four expanding spheres, all with increasing levels of intimate interaction with the individual. The microsystem includes the individual and his or her family, the mesosystem (or mezzosystem) includes entities such as one’s neighborhood and school, the exosystem includes entities such as the state government, and the macrosystem includes the culture at large. Figure 1.1 illustrates the various systems and describes the nature of interaction with the individual. Again, it is important to remember that the primary principle of Bronfenbrenner’s theory is that individuals can best be understood when seen in the context of their relationship with the various systems in their lives. Understanding the nature of these reciprocal relationships will aid in understanding individuals and their thoughts, attitudes and behaviors.

**Person-in-Environment**

Another theory that is similar in nature to the ecological systems theory is referred to as the person-in-environment, or PIE. The premise of this theory is quite similar to Bronfenbrenner’s theory, as it encourages seeing individuals within the context of...
their environment, both on micro- (i.e., intra- and interpersonal relationships and family dynamics) and on a macro (or societal) level (i.e., the individual is a recently arrived immigrant, who lives in an urban community with significant cultural oppression).

Eco-Systems Theory

Similar to Bronfenbrenner’s theory, in eco-systems theory, the various environmental systems are represented by overlapping concentric circles indicating the reciprocal exchange between individuals and their environmental systems. Although there is no official recognition of varying levels of systems (from micro to macro), the basic concept is very similar, and most who embrace this theory understand that there are varying levels of systems, all interacting and thus impacting the person in various ways. It is up to the social worker to strive to understand the transactional and reciprocal nature of these various systems (Meyer, 1988).

It is important to note that these theories do not presume that individuals are necessarily aware of the various systems they operate within, even if they are actively interacting with them. In fact, effective social workers will help their clients increase their personal awareness of the existence of these systems and how they are currently operating within them (i.e., nature of reciprocity). It is through this awareness that clients increase their level of empowerment within their environment and consequently in all aspects of their life.

**Case Study 1.1  Evaluating the Environmental Systems**

A woman in her forties is feeling rather depressed. She spends her first counseling session describing her fears of her children being killed. She explains how she is so afraid of bullets coming through her walls that she doesn’t allow her children to watch television in the living room. She never allows her children to play outside and worries incessantly when they are at school. She admits that she has not slept well in weeks, and she has difficulty feeling anything other than sadness and despair.

Would you consider this woman paranoid? Correctly assessing her does not depend solely on her thinking patterns and behavior, but on the cultural context within which her thinking patterns and behavior are situated. If this woman lived in an extremely safe, gate-guarded community where no crimes had been reported in 20 years, then an assessment of some form of paranoia might be appropriate. But what if she lived in a high-crime neighborhood, where drive-by shootings were a daily event? What if you learned that her neighbor’s children were recently shot and killed while watching television in the living room? Her thinking patterns and behavior do not seem as bizarre when considered within the context or systems in which she is operating.
Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

Another effective model for understanding how many people are motivated to get their needs met was developed by Abraham Maslow. Maslow (1954) created a model focusing on needs motivation. As Figure 1.2 illustrates, Maslow believed that people are motivated to get their most basic physiological needs met first (such as the need for food and oxygen) before they attempt to meet their safety needs (such as the security we find in the stability of our relationships with family and friends). According to Maslow, most people would find it difficult to focus on higher-level needs related to self-esteem or self-actualization when their most basic needs are not being met. Consider people you may know who suffer from low self-esteem and then consider how they might react if a war suddenly broke out and their community was under siege. Maslow’s theory suggests that thoughts of low self-esteem would quickly take a backseat as worries about mere survival took hold. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs can assist social workers in helping clients by recognizing a client’s need to prioritize more pressing needs over others.

Summary

This book has been written using an integrative learning model; thus, it supports CSWE’s EPAS approach to social work education by presenting information in such a way that basic concepts and theories are explored within the context of real-world social work practice settings. This approach allows social work students to more easily see how what they are learning in the classroom applies in the field. For instance, the nature of intervention is often dependent on the specific practice setting where the social worker is providing service, particularly since...
social work practice settings most often focus on particular social problems (e.g., domestic violence, homelessness, etc.). Thus, how clients and client systems are helped to improve their personal and social functioning (through the application of concepts and theories) will look very different depending on whether services are provided in a school setting, a hospice, a domestic violence shelter, or a prison, each of which exerts different kinds of influence on clients and client systems.

It would be difficult to present an exhaustive list of practice settings due to the broad and often very general nature of social services, and social service practice settings can be categorized in many different ways, including based on social issues or problems (i.e., domestic violence, homelessness), or by target population (i.e., older adults, the chronically mentally ill, children), or even by the area of specialization (i.e., grief and loss, marriage and family, trauma). Regardless of the manner in which practice settings are categorized, there is bound to be some overlap because one area of practice could conceivably be included within another field, and some practice settings could also be considered areas of specialization. For instance, there are religiously affiliated hospices (medical social work and faith-based practice), some social workers work with both survivors of domestic violence (victim advocacy) and batterers (forensic social work), and adoption is sometimes considered a practice setting unto itself and sometimes it is included under the umbrella of child welfare.

For the purposes of this text, basic concepts and theories will be explored through the application of social work roles and functions within the context of social work within the context of particular social work practice settings general enough to cover as many settings as possible within the field of social work, but narrow enough to be descriptively meaningful. The social work settings and social workers who work in them will be examined by exploring the history of the practice setting and related social problems, the types of clients and client systems most commonly affected, the psychosocial issues most commonly encountered, common modes and types of service delivery, and the most common generalist intervention strategies used within the following practice settings: child welfare, adolescents, older adults, mental health, housing and homelessness, healthcare and hospice, substance abuse, schools, faith-based agencies, violence, victim advocacy and corrections, macropractice, and international social work.
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such social welfare policy and legislation and the current prevailing attitudes toward the poor influence one another.

It would be naïve to assume that any current trends in how the poor are perceived and treated developed in a vacuum; thus, a general understanding of the roots of current social welfare legislation, policy, and attitudinal trends is essential to any practicing social worker. The development of the social welfare system in the United States was very much influenced by England’s social welfare system; therefore, it is important to understand the evolution of how the poor were treated in England to fully understand how social welfare policy has developed within the United States.

Despite popular contention that social welfare policy practice is evidence based, objective, and free of ideological bias, significant evidence exists indicating that both historic and current economic policy practices are solidly interwoven with moral and religious philosophy, reflecting the cultural mores of the times within a given society (Hausman & McPherson, 2006). Essentially, social policy, particularly policy addressing the social welfare of its citizenry, often reflects dominant philosophical movements and themes, including religious and societal moral codes as well as beliefs about the causes of poverty and the various reasons poverty afflicts certain individuals and populations, and why other individuals and populations do not struggle with poverty on a collective basis (see Box 2.1).

The Feudal System of the Middle Ages

A good place to begin this exploration is England’s Middle Ages (around the 11th century), where a system called feudalism prevailed as a social structure that also served as a sort of social welfare system. This system of legal and military customs prevailed as England’s primary manner of caring for the poor. Under this elitist system, privileged and wealthy landowners called lords would parcel off small sections of their land, which would then be farmed by peasants, also called serfs. Many policy experts frame the feudal system as a harsh but effective method for controlling poverty. However, it has also been characterized as a governmentally imposed form of servitude, since individuals became serfs through both racial and economic discrimination and were commonly born into serfdom with little hope of ever escaping. Serfs were considered the legal property of

---

Box 2.1 Understanding the Social Phenomenon of White Privilege

White privilege is a social phenomenon where Caucasian members of society enjoy a distinct advantage over members of other ethnic groups. White privilege is defined as “unearned advantages of being white in a racially stratified society” and an expression of institutionalized power (Pinterits, Poteat, & Spanierman, 2009, p. 417). White privilege is something that most Caucasians do not acknowledge, leading many of those who benefit from this advantage to take personal credit for whatever they gain through their privilege (Neville, Worthington, & Spanierman, 2001). Unfortunately, this also means that many Caucasians may blame those from groups that do not benefit from privilege for not being as successful. Yet, due to various forms of racial discrimination, it has typically been white people who have benefited most from the best that life has to offer—gaining access into the best educational systems (or being the only ones to obtain an education at all), the best jobs, and the best neighborhoods. Even if white privilege were to end, the cumulative benefit of years of advantage would continue well into the future, just as the negative consequences of years of social exclusion will continue to negatively affect groups who have not benefited from white privilege.
their lord; thus, although lords were required to provide for the care and support of serfs in exchange for farming their land, the lords had complete control over their serfs and could sell them or give them away as they deemed fit (Stephenson, 1943; Trattner, 1998).

Despite the seeming harshness of this system, it did provide insurance against many of the social hazards associated with being poor. It was also complemented by the prevailing belief that there was no shame in poverty. In fact, the commonly held societal more during medieval times was that poverty within society was unavoidable, and the poor were a necessary component of society, in that poverty gave an opportunity to the rich to show their grace and goodwill through the giving of alms to those less fortunate than themselves. Thus, caring for the poor was perceived as a noble duty that rested on the shoulders of all those who were able-bodied. Also, the poor were necessary because without them there would be no servants for the ruling class.

Poor Laws of England

Many economic and environmental conditions led to the eventual phasing out of the traditional feudal system in the mid-14th century to the mid-16th century (1350 through 1550), including several natural disasters, such as massive crop failures, the bubonic plague, and mass urbanization spawned by the Industrial Revolution. The increased demand for factory wage labor in the cities ultimately led to droves of individuals moving to the city to work in factories. This trend, coupled with the decline of the feudal system and the diminishing influence of the church with its complex and effective framework of charitable provision, led to the need for a complete overhaul of the social welfare system in England. Thus, although mass urbanization may have led to freedom from serfdom for the poorest members of English society, it also generated a vacuum in how poverty was managed, creating the necessity for the development of England’s earliest poor laws (Trattner, 1998).

Although these social changes were gradual, they led to a dramatic shift not only in how poverty was managed but also how it was perceived. It is always easier to have a gracious attitude and extend a helping hand to someone we know, but such graciousness becomes challenging when the poor are no longer extended family and longtime neighbors, whose personal circumstances are well known; rather they are nameless, faceless strangers living en masse, often from different countries, speaking different languages, and behaving in very different manners (Martin, 2012; Trattner, 1998). The increasingly impersonal nature of caring for the poor, as well as the complexity of life in cities, ultimately led to the belief that the incorporation of punitive measures into relief policy was needed to control begging, vagrancy, and increased crime in the cities. In response, England passed several relief laws during the mid-1500s through the early 1600s, which set forth guidelines for dealing with the poor. England’s Relief Act of 1536 placed responsibility for dealing with the poor at the local level and reflected a complete intolerance of idleness. Local law enforcement scoured the cities in search of beggars and vagrants, and once found, a determination was made as to whether they were true victims of poverty (the worthy poor) or legally defined vagrants (the unworthy poor). Legislative guidelines typically stipulated that only pregnant women, individuals who were extremely ill and unable to work, or any person over the age of 60 were considered justifiably poor; thus, they were treated more leniently, including receiving governmental authorization to beg (typically in the form of a letter of authorization). In some cases, the poor were given
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other forms of sustenance in addition to being allowed to beg. If an able-bodied person was found to be unemployed, they were considered vagrant, and were punished by whippings, naked parading through the streets, being returned to the town of their birth, or incarceration. Repeat offenders were often subjected to having an ear cut off or were even put to death (Beier, 1974; Birtles, 1999).

Clearly, no sympathy was shown to individuals, male or female, who were deemed capable of working but found themselves without a job or any means of support, and little consideration was given to economic difficulties or what is now termed the cycle of poverty. Also, little sympathy was extended to children, particularly adolescents who were found begging, and district officials often took these children into custody, placing them into apprenticeship programs, which were later considered to be little different from child slavery. Thus, vagrancy was handled as a criminal matter, and the local authorities provided sustenance only for those deemed unable to work (Trattner, 1998). The earlier English Poor Laws laid the foundation for the Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1601, which acted as a foundation for U.S. social welfare policy.

The Elizabethan Poor Laws

The Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1601 were an organized merging of England’s earlier, sometimes conflicting and erratic social welfare legislation, which not only brought order and organization to England’s poor laws but also served as the foundation for such legislation in colonial America. Thus, rather than viewing the Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1601 as a single act, it is more appropriate to view it as an evolution of legal acts in a series of previous acts. The Elizabethan Poor Laws of 1601 served to set the stage for poor relief for several centuries and is still considered foundational in contemporary social welfare policy in both England and the United States. This Act established three driving principles as the foundation for social legislation: the belief that the primary responsibility for provision lay with one’s family, that poor relief should be handled at the local level, and finally, that individuals should not be allowed to move to a new community if they were unable to provide for themselves financially. Charity included both indoor and outdoor relief, with the former referring to assistance provided in almshouses and other institutionalized settings and the latter referring to services provided in the home environment of the person in need, including the delivery of food baskets and/or medicines.

It was quite common for community members to bring charges against others if it could be proven that they had moved into the district within the past 40 days and had no means to support themselves. Such individuals would be charged as vagrants by the local officials and returned to their home districts. The underlying notion was that local parishes didn’t mind supporting those individuals who had fallen on hard times after years of paying taxes, but they didn’t want to be forced to support strangers who came to their district for the sole purpose of receiving aid. Elements of these residency requirements can be found among current U.S. welfare policy; in fact, most welfare reform legislative bills today contain residency requirement language.

---

Engage in Policy Practice to Advance Social and Economic Well-Being and to Deliver Effective Social Work Services

Practice Behavior: Analyze, formulate, and advocate for policies that advance social well-being.

Critical Thinking Question: Jane Addams believed that advocacy was most effective when advocates lived within the communities they served. Describe how this philosophy influenced the model of social work that serves as a foundation for the profession to this day and how it enables social workers today to be better advocates for their clients.
English colonization of North America began around the 16th century and continued throughout the 17th century. Life in colonial America not only offered tremendous opportunity but also presented significant hardship related to life on the frontier. Many immigrants were quite poor to begin with, and the long and difficult ocean voyage to the New World often left them unprepared for the rigors of life in the United States. Because there was no existing infrastructure in the original 13 colonies (such as religious monasteries or other social welfare programs), relief for the poor consisted primarily of mutual kindness, family support, and distant help from the motherland. Self-sufficiency was a must, and life was not easy on the frontier. But as the population increased within the colonies, the need arose for a more organized form of relief, and it makes sense that the colonies would rely on the English Poor Laws. The colonies adopted not only the social welfare legislation of England but also much of the perceptions of and attitudes about the poor and indigent as well.

Charity Organization Society Movement in the United States

The Charity Organization Society (COS), often considered the genesis of the social work movement, marked one of the first organized efforts within the United States to provide charity to the poor. The COS movement started in about 1870 in response to frustration with the current welfare system that was less of a system and more of a disorganized and often chaotic practice of almsgiving. The COS movement itself was started by a pastor, Rev. S. Humphreys Gurteen, who believed that it was the duty of good Christians everywhere to provide an organized and systematic way of addressing the plight of the poor. Gurteen and his colleagues strongly believed that the indiscriminate giving of alms by many of the relief agencies of that time encouraged fraud and abuse, which in turn encouraged laziness on the part of those who were beneficiaries of relief.

The COS philosophy was built on the concept of voluntary coordination, in which various charities worked within a larger network-coordinating services delivered to the local community. The first COS was created in New York in 1877, and the concept quickly spread to large cities across the nation. Soon, most large cities had at least one COS serving the community, acting as an umbrella organization for smaller agencies and churches offering charity services to the community. The COS practiced what was called scientific charity, which embraced social Darwinist philosophies of intelligent giving and embraced the notion that charity should work with natural selection, not against it (Gettleman, 1963). A primary motivation of the COS movement was to coordinate charity efforts by serving as an umbrella organization for the myriad of independent and private charities, thus maximizing the best use of material relief (Schlabach, 1969). Outdoor relief, such as cash assistance or indiscriminate giving, was highly discouraged and actually considered evil based on the longstanding belief that such assistance encouraged dependence and laziness, while discouraging self-sufficiency, ultimately leading to increased poverty (Gettleman, 1963; Kusmer, 1973).

In this respect, those involved in the COS movement embraced the concepts of the unworthy versus the worthy poor, and it was their goal to determine which category aid recipients fell into and then prescribe what each recipient actually needed. Material aid was provided for those who would not abuse it and other services for those who would. To accomplish this goal, the COSs employed friendly visitors, an early version of caseworkers, who visited the homes of aid applicants and attempted to diagnose the reason for their poverty and, if possible, develop a case plan to authentically alleviate their suffering (Trattner, 1998).
A social hierarchy was reflected in the philosophical motivation of the COS leaders, often the community’s most wealthy members, who agreed to provide charity to the poor depending on the poor remembering “his place of inferiority” (Gettleman, 1963, p. 319). Yet even the deserving poor did not escape the demands of the Protestant work ethic, which stressed the importance of hard work in order to achieve salvation, or the fatalism of social Darwinism, both of which were deeply imbedded in the COS culture. These philosophical values were clearly reflected in a speech given by Josephine Shaw Lowell, a leader in the COS movement, at a charity conference held in 1895: “Even the widow with little children, if she finds that everything is made easy for her, may lose her energy, may even, by being relieved of anxiety for them, lose her love for the children” (cited in Gettleman, 1963, p. 323). The unworthy poor were often provided with indoor relief only, in the form of placement in an almshouse, and, according to COS leaders, should be allowed to perish according to natural selection. Many in the COS movement argued that to provide charity to those destined to perish was immoral and unkind because it only prolonged their suffering to no good end for either the poor or society (Gettleman, 1963).

Mary Richmond, the general secretary of the Baltimore COS, is often associated with the COS movement because of her passion for social advocacy and social reform. Richmond believed that charities could employ both good economics and compassionate giving at the same time. She became well known for increasing public awareness of the COS movement and for her fund-raising efforts. Her compassion for the poor was the likely result of her own experience with poverty. Orphaned at the age of two and later left by an aunt to fend for herself in New York when she was only 17 years old, she no doubt understood the social components of poverty, and how devastating it could be to one’s life. Richmond is also credited for developing the early conception of casework, having written several books and articles on the service delivery model. As a result, the concept of the friendly visitor grew and the debate about material relief continued. Many argued that the best opportunity to truly effect change in those suffering from poverty was through the services of the friendly visitor who could help identify and address any barriers to self-sufficiency (Kusmer, 1973).

Despite the general success of the COS movement, its philosophy was influenced by the Reformation theology that anyone who worked hard enough would be blessed and could rise from the depths of poverty. The country would later realize that it was naïve to presume that poverty was primarily caused by individual failure and that material relief would lead to moral decline. The very hard lesson came during the Depression era—a lesson learned long ago by immigrants and ethnic minorities—that sometimes conditions exist that are beyond an individual’s control and that create immovable barriers to self-sufficiency, leading to poverty and destitution.

**Jane Addams and the Settlement House Movement**

Not all social welfare movements within the United States reflected these harsh philosophical approaches, though. Jane Addams, an advocate for social reform, was responsible for beginning the U.S. settlement house movement in the late 1800s. Addams’s social action efforts reflected a far more compassionate approach to poverty alleviation and social inequity. She started the Hull House settlement house in Chicago as an alternative to the more religiously oriented charity organizations, which she perceived as “heartless and overly concerned with efficiency and rooting out of fraud” (Schneiderhan, 2008, p. 3). Addams used a relational model of poverty alleviation based on the belief that the problems of poverty and disadvantage resulted from problems within society, not idleness and
moral deficiency (Lundblad, 1995). She advocated for changes within the social structure of society that created barriers to lateral contribution of all members of society, which she viewed as an essential aspect of a democracy (Hamington, 2005; Martin, 2012). In fact, the opening of the first settlement house in the United States was considered the beginning of one of the most significant social movements in U.S. history (Commager, 1961, as cited in Lundblad, 1995).

Addams was born in Cedarville, Illinois, in 1860. She was raised in an upper-class home where higher education and philanthropy were highly valued. Addams greatly admired her father, who encouraged her to pursue an education at a time when women were primarily encouraged to pursue only marriage and motherhood. She graduated from Rockford Female Seminary in 1881, the same year her father died. After her father’s death, Addams entered Woman’s Medical College in Pennsylvania, but dropped out because of chronic illness. She had become quite passionate about the plight of immigrants in the United States, but due to her poor health and the societal limits placed on women during that era, she did not believe that she had a role in social advocacy.

The United States experienced another significant wave of immigration in the 19th and early 20th centuries (between 1860 and 1910), with 23 million people emigrating from Europe, including Eastern Europe. Many of these immigrants were from non-English-speaking countries, such as Italy, Poland, Russia, and Serbia, did not speak English, and were very poor. Unable to obtain work in the skilled labor force, many immigrants were forced to live in subhuman conditions, crammed together with several other families in deplorable tenements in large urban areas. For instance, New York’s Lower East Side had 330,000 inhabitants per square mile (Trattner, 1998). With no labor laws for protection, racial discrimination and a variety of employment abuses were common, including extremely low wages, unsafe working conditions, and child labor. Poor families, particularly non-English-speaking families, had little recourse, and their mere survival depended on their coerced cooperation.

Addams was aware of these conditions because of her father’s political involvement, but she was not sure how to respond. Despondent after her father’s death and her failure in medical school, as well as over her chronic medical problems, Addams took an extended trip with friends to Europe, where among other activities, she visited Toynbee Hall, England’s response to poverty and other social problems. Toynbee Hall was a settlement house, which was essentially a neighborhood welfare institution in an urban slum area, where trained workers endeavored to improve social conditions, particularly by providing community services and promoting neighborly cooperation.

This concept was revolutionary, in that in its attempt to improve conditions through the promotion of social and economic reform, it actually called for the settlement house workers to reside in the home alongside the immigrant families they helped. In addition to providing a safe, clean home, settlement houses also provided comprehensive care, such as assistance with food, healthcare, English language lessons, child care, and general advocacy. The settlement house movement was different from the traditional charity organizations, in that it had as its goal the mission of no longer distinguishing between the worthy and unworthy poor.

Jane Addams is considered the ‘mother of social work’ due to her tireless advocacy work.
Addams returned home convinced that it was her duty to do something similar in the United States, and with the donation of a building in Chicago, Hull House became the United States’s first settlement house in 1889.

Addams and her colleagues lived in the settlement house, in the middle of what was considered a bad neighborhood in Chicago, offering services targeting the underlying causes of poverty such as unfair labor practices, the exploitation of non-English-speaking immigrants, and child labor. Services ranged from child care to education classes. Hull House became the social center for all activities in the neighborhood and even offered residents an opportunity to socialize in the residents’ café.

Addams’s influence on American social policy was significant, in that it represented a shift away from the fatalistic and metaphysical philosophies of social Darwinism, marking recognition of the need for social change within society to remove barriers to upward mobility and optimal functioning (Martin, 2012). Addams and her counterparts were committed to viewing all individuals equally, to be treated with respect and dignity. She clearly saw societal conditions and the hardship of immigration as the primary cause of poverty, not necessarily one’s own moral failing. Focus was placed on making changes in the community, and social inequality was perceived as the manifestation of exploitation, with social egalitarianism perceived as not just desirable but also achievable (Lundblad, 1995; Martin, 2012).

The settlement house movement radically transformed not only how the poor were cared for but also how they were perceived by the majority population. Now, immigrants had a safe place to live, a voice to advocate for them, and a way to better integrate into American society, so that their dream of obtaining a better life for themselves and their children could actually be realized. Addams also lobbied tirelessly for the passage of child labor laws and other legislation that would protect the working-class poor, who were often exploited in factories with sweatshop conditions. She also worked alongside Ida B. Wells, an African American reformer, confronting racial inequality in the United States, such as the extrajudicial lynching of black men.

Although there are no working settlement houses today, the prevailing concept espoused by this model involves recognition of the need for a holistic approach to poverty alleviation that encompasses challenges to social structures, and not just a focus on individual behavioral management. Elements of this concept can still be seen in the current U.S. social welfare system, as well as the current mental healthcare system, yet unfortunately there would be far more future challenges to any philosophical approach to poverty alleviation that considers social inequality as a core reason for poverty, rather than personal moral failing. Thus, despite the overall success of the settlement house movement and the particular success of Addams with regard to achieving social reform in a variety of arenas, the influences of Calvinism, particularly the Protestant work ethic and social Darwinism remained strong, experiencing cyclical decline only during difficult economic times or civil unrest (as experienced in the 1960s).

The New Deal and the Social Security Act of 1935

In 1929 the stock market crashed, leading to a series of economic crises that the United States had never before experienced. For the first time in modern U.S. history, large segments of the middle-class population were unemployed, and within a very short time, thousands of people who had once enjoyed secure lives were without jobs, homes, and
even food. This served as a wake-up call for social reformers, many of whom had abandoned their earlier commitment to social activism. In response, many within the social service and advocacy fields started pushing President Hoover to develop the country’s first federal system of social welfare.

Hoover was resistant, though, fearing that federal social welfare programs would create dependency and displace private and local charities. He wanted to allow time for democracy and capitalism to self-correct before intervening with broad entitlement programs. But much of the country’s population, including many who were literally starving, apparently did not agree, and in 1933, Hoover lost his bid for reelection, and Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected as president.

Roosevelt immediately set about to create dramatic changes in federal policy with regard to social welfare, promising a New Deal to the country, where a minimum standard of living was seen as a right, not a privilege. Within his first 100 days in office, Roosevelt passed 13 Acts, including the Civil Works Administration (sometimes referred to as the CWA), which provided over a million temporary jobs to the unemployed; the Federal Emergency Relief Act, which provided direct aid and food to the unemployed; and the Civilian Conservation Core (CCC), which put thousands of young men aged 18 to 25 to work in reforestation and other conservation programs. Yet, as progressive as Roosevelt was, and as compassionate as the country had become due to the realization that poverty could strike anyone, racism was still rampant, as illustrated by Roosevelt placing a 10 percent limit on the enrollment of black men in the CCC program (Trattner, 1998).

By far the most famous of all programs in the New Deal and Great Society programs were those created in response to the Social Security Act of 1935, which, among other things, created old-age pensions for workers, unemployment compensation, and Aid to Dependent Mothers, Children, and the Blind and Disabled. In total, Roosevelt created 15 federal programs as a part of the New Deal, some of which remain and some of which were dismantled once the crisis of the Great Depression subsided. Although some claim that the New Deal was not good for the country in the long run, it did pull the country out of the Depression, and it provided relief for millions of Americans who may have literally starved had the federal government not stepped in when it did. Programs such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), which provided insurance for bank deposits, helped to instill a sense of confidence in the banking system once again, and the development of the Securities and Exchange Committee (SEC), which regulates the stock market, helped to ensure that a crash similar to the one in 1929 would be unlikely to occur again. In later times, though, the dismantling of some post-Depression financial regulations would contribute to yet another devastating economic downturn—perhaps not as severe as the Great Depression, but more serious and long-lasting than any other recession experienced in the U.S. post–Depression era, particularly because of its global consequences.

**INFLUENCES OF AFRICAN AMERICAN SOCIAL WORKERS**

A review of the historical elements influencing the development of the social work field would be remiss if the influences of African Americans reformers, particularly African American women in the last part of the 19th century, weren’t explored. Black activists had a significant influence on the development of social justice and social work, particularly
in the South, filling the vacuum left by a racist society that often created barriers to service in the black community in earlier eras.

Ida B. Wells was an African American reformer and social activist whose campaign against racial oppression and inequity laid the foundation for the civil rights movement of the 1960s. Wells was born in 1862 to parents who were slaves in rural Mississippi, and although her parents were ultimately freed, Wells’s life was never free from the crushing effects of severe racial prejudice and discrimination. She was orphaned at the age of 16, and went on to raise her five younger siblings. This experience not only forced her to grow up quickly but also seemed to serve as a springboard for her subsequent advocacy against racial injustice. In Wells’s early advocacy career, she was the owner of a black newspaper (the only one of its kind) called Free Speech, where she consistently wrote about matters of racial oppression and inequity, including the vast amount of socially sanctioned crimes committed against blacks (Hamington, 2005).

The indiscriminate lynching of black men was prevalent in the South during Wells’s lifetime, and was an issue that Wells became quite passionate about. Black men were commonly perceived as a threat on many levels, and there was virtually no protection of their personal, political, or social rights. The black man’s reputation as an angry rapist was endemic in white society, and many speeches were given and articles written by white community members (including clergy) about this “allegedly growing problem”. For example, an article published in the mainstream newspaper in the South, the Commercial, entitled “More Rapes More Lynchings,” cites the black man’s alleged penchant for raping white women, stating:

The generation of Negroes which have grown up since the war have lost in large measure the traditional and wholesome awe of the white race which kept the Negro in subjection . . . There is no longer a restraint upon the brute passion of the Negro . . . The facts of the crime appear to appeal more to the Negro’s lustful imagination than the facts of the punishment do to his fears. He sets aside all fear of death in any form when opportunity is found for the gratification of his bestial desires. (Davidson, 2008, p. 154)

Wells wrote extensively on the subject of the “myth of the angry black man,” and the myth that all black men raped white women (a common excuse used to justify the lynching of black men) (Hamington, 2005). She challenged the growing sentiment in white communities that black men, as a race, were growing more aggressive and ‘lustful’ of white women, which she believed was prompted in part by the increasing number of biracial couples. The response to Wells’s articles was swift and harsh. A group of white men surrounded her newspaper building with the intention of lynching her, but when they could not find her, they burned down her business instead (Davidson, 2008).

Although this act of revenge essentially stopped her newspaper career, what it really did was motivate Wells even further. After the burning down of her business, Wells left the South and moved to Chicago, where she continued to wage a fierce anti-lynching campaign, often coordinating efforts with Jane Addams. She wrote numerous books and articles on racial inequality, challenging
socially entrenched notions that all black men were angry and violent sexual predators (Hamington, 2005). Wells and Addams worked as colleagues, coordinating their social justice advocacy efforts fighting for civil rights. Together, they ran the Chicago Association for the Advancement of Colored People and worked collectively on a variety of projects, including fighting against racial segregation in schools (Martin, 2012).

Many other key African American social welfare reformers made significant advances in the social work field, particularly with regard to confronting the disenfranchisement and marginalization of African Americans within U.S. society. In the absence of mainstream social work within this population, African American social welfare reformers operated as a tight community, developing close relationships with each other, even though many of them were spread across the United States. Because racism excluded African Americans from receiving many services, including educational opportunities and health services, many early social welfare reformers focused on these two areas, developing ‘Negro schools’ and healthcare facilities. One such reformer was Modjeska Simkins, who developed healthcare programs for the black community focusing on everything from infant mortality to tuberculosis. Another creative example of social work in the face of extreme opposition was the work of the black sorority Alpha Kappa Alpha, whose members were determined to provide health care services to sharecroppers in Mississippi. When the white community refused to rent them office space, they offered the health care services from cars (Gordon, 1991).

Other black women who significantly influenced social welfare reform include Anna Cooper, who pushed for increased educational opportunities for blacks, and Jane Hunter, who formed the first black Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) (Gordon, 1991). Although often unreported and undervalued, African American social welfare reformers not only assisted their own communities but helped the broader community as well by modeling the power of networking and relentlessly pursuing social justice for all, particularly for those who are the subject of social oppression and discrimination.

**GAY RIGHTS: FROM MARRIAGE EQUALITY TO “DON’T ASK, DON’T TELL” REPEAL**

Ethnic minorities, women, and immigrants are not the only groups in U.S. society to be used as scapegoats, oppressed and marginalized. The gay community, typically referred to as the LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and questioning and/or queer), has long been a marginalized group in the United States (as well as in most countries in the world). Members of the LGBTQ community are often victims of hate crimes, often solely because of their sexual orientation. For years this community has been excluded from many of the social welfare laws designed to protect disenfranchised and socially excluded groups. Yet, in the past three decades, several LGBTQ advocacy organizations, such as the Gay & Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD), have become increasingly vocal about the right of the LGBTQ community to live openly and enjoy the same rights and protections as heterosexuals without fear of reprisal. The specific issues GLAAD has advocated for include the right to be included as a specially protected group in hate crimes legislation, the right of same-sex
partners to legally marry (often referred to as marriage equality), and the right to serve openly in the military.

Despite strong opposition from social conservative groups, the LGBTQ community has experienced recent success in response to their efforts. In 2009 President Obama signed into law the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which expanded existing hate crime legislation to include crimes committed against individuals based on perceived gender, sexual orientation, and gender identity. Marriage equality is currently a battle fought on both the federal and state levels. In 1996 the Defense of Marriage Act was passed, which defined marriage on a federal level as a union between one man and one woman. Yet many states have now passed laws legalizing same-sex marriage.

Arguments for same-sex marriage are typically based on rights of equality (see Box 2.2). Arguments against same-sex marriages are often based on conservative or religious values that hold same-sex partnerships as sinful and unnatural, and define traditional marriage as being between a man and a woman. There also appears to be a general fear that the normalization of same-sex marriage will lead to the lowering of moral standards in a variety of respects throughout society. Yet advocates of same-sex marriage confront religious arguments by citing research that disputes allegation that same-sex marriage will somehow dilute traditional marriage or harm children. They also cite the increasing acceptance among U.S. citizens of same-sex marriage and of same-sex partnerships in general. For instance, according to a series of Gallup polls, in 2009, 63 percent of the U.S. population surveyed stated that they believed that same-sex couples should be able to marry or have a legal civil union, compared to 55 percent in 2004.

Another area of success for the LGBTQ population involves the right to serve in the U.S. military openly. Historically, gays and lesbians were systematically discharged from the military if their sexual orientation was discovered. In December 1993, in response to mounting pressure to change this policy, the Clinton administration compromised by implementing Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell (DADT), an official policy of the U.S. government

---

**Box 2.2 **In Defense of Marriage Equality

The GLAAD website lists several protections that marriage offers that are currently unavailable to the LGBTQ population in same-sex partnerships.

- automatic inheritance
- child custody/parenting/adoption rights
- hospital visitation
- medical decision-making power
- standing to sue for wrongful death of a spouse
- divorce protections
- spousal/child support
- access to family insurance policies
- exemption from property tax upon death of a spouse
- immunity from being forced to testify against one’s spouse
- domestic violence protections, and more.

(GLAAD, 2010, p. 7)

---

Reprinted by permission from GLAAD. GLAAD Media Reference Guide - In Focus: Marriage, Copyright 2014
that prohibited the military from discriminating against gay and lesbian military personnel as long as they kept their sexual orientation a secret. In other words, military personnel could no longer investigate the sexual orientation of those serving in the military, but if a member of the military admitted to being a gay or lesbian, he or she could legally be discharged from the military. DADT was repealed by Congress in December 2010 pending review by military leadership who were to determine the effect on military readiness, but in July 2011, a federal court of appeals ruling barred further enforcement of the policy, and it was officially repealed by President Obama in September 2011. In May 2012 President Obama officially declared his support for marriage equality, citing his daughters' friends with same-sex parents, and his recognition that he could not defend a position that would prohibit them from having the same right to legally marry as heterosexual parents. Achievements by the LGBTQ population seem to illustrate a movement toward greater acceptance of what some call *alternative lifestyles*, yet there remains considerable resistance to the inclusion of same-sex partnerships into mainstream United States, particularly among social conservatives.

**WELFARE REFORM AND THE EMERGENCE OF NEOLIBERAL ECONOMIC POLICIES**

A resurgence of earlier negative sentiments toward the poor and their plight began in the mid-1970s, peaking in the 1990s, perhaps in response to increased economic prosperity within mainstream United States. This increased negative attitude toward the poor is reflected in several studies and national public opinion surveys that reflected the general belief that the poor were to blame for their situation. For instance, a national survey conducted in 1975 found that the majority of those living in the United States attributed poverty to personal failures, such as having a poor work ethic, poor money management skills, a lack of any special talent that might translate into a positive contribution to society, and low personal moral values. Those questioned ranked social forces, such as racism, poor schools, and the lack of sufficient employment, the lowest of all possible causes of poverty (Feagin, 1975).

Ronald Reagan capitalized on this negative sentiment toward the poor during the 1976 presidential campaign when he based his platform in large part on welfare reform. In several of Reagan's speeches, he cited the story of a woman from the South Side of Chicago who was arrested for committing egregious welfare fraud. While Reagan never mentioned the woman's race, the context of the story as well as the reference to the South Side of Chicago (a primarily black community) made it clear that he was referring to an African American woman on welfare—thus matching the common stereotype of welfare users (and abusers) (Krugman, 2007). And with that, the enduring myth of the *welfare queen* was born.

Journalist David Zucchino attempted to debunk the myth of the welfare queen in his exposé on the reality of being a mother on welfare, but later stated in his book, *The Myth of the Welfare Queen*, that the image of the African American woman who drove a Cadillac while collecting welfare illegally was so imbedded in American culture that
it was impossible to debunk the myth, even though the facts do not back up the myth (Zucchino, 1999). Krugman (2007) also cites how politicians have used the myth of the welfare queen to reduce sympathy for the poor and gain public support for welfare cuts ever since, arguing that while covert, such images clearly play on negative racial stereotypes. They also play on the common belief in the United States that those who receive welfare benefits are poor due to immoral behavior and a lack of motivation to work.

More recent surveys conducted in the mid-1990s revealed an increase in the tendency to blame the poor for their poverty (Weaver, Shapiro, & Jacobs, 1995), even though a considerable body of research points to social and structural issues as the primary cause of poverty, such as shortages in affordable housing, recent shifts to a technologically based society requiring a significant increase in educational requirements, longstanding institutionalized oppression and discrimination against certain racial and ethnic groups, and a general increase in the complexity of life (Martin, 2012; Wright, 2000). The general public’s perception of social welfare programs seems to be based in large part on this negative bias against the poor, and the misguided belief that the poor are lazy, immoral, and dependent. In several studies during the 1980s and 1990s, those surveyed claimed support for the general idea of helping the poor, but when asked about specific programs or policies, most became critical of governmental policies, specific welfare programs, and welfare recipients in general. In fact, a 1987 national study found that 74 percent of those surveyed believed that most welfare recipients were dishonest and collected more benefits than they deserved (Kluegal, 1987).

During this same time period a new conservative political movement was born at least in part out of this increasingly negative attitude toward the poor and social programs designed to alleviate poverty. Welfare reform rooted in the Reagan administration in the 1980s ultimately lead to both Republican and Democratic support for drastic welfare reform in 1996. Focus once again shifted from social and structural causes of poverty to personal ones with a renewal of punitive social welfare policies reflecting the paternalistic ideologies of the past (Schram, Fordingy, & Sossz, 2008).

Political discourse in the mid-1990s reflected what is often referred to as economic neoliberal philosophies, a political movement embraced by most political conservatives, espousing a belief that capitalism and the free market economy were far better solutions to many social conditions, including poverty, than government programs. Advocates of neoliberalism pushed for social programs to be privatized based on the belief that getting social welfare out of the hands of government and into the hands of private enterprise, where market forces could work their magic, would increase efficiency and lower costs. Yet research has consistently revealed that social welfare services do not lend themselves well to free market theory due to the complexity of client issues, as well as unknown outcomes, lack of competition among social service providers, and other dynamics that makes social welfare services so unique (Nelson, 1992; Van Slyke, 2003).

In 1994, during the U.S. congressional campaign, the Republican Party released a document entitled The New Contract with America, which represented “a plan that would reform welfare and, along with it, the behavior of the poor” (Hudson & Coukos, 2005, p. 2). The document, introduced just a few weeks before the 1994 congressional election, President Clinton’s mid-term election, was signed by all but two of the Republican members of the House of Representatives, as well as all of the party’s congressional
candidates. In addition to a renewed commitment to smaller government and lower taxes, the contract also pledged a complete overhaul of the welfare system to root out fraud and increase the poor’s commitment to employment and self-sufficiency.

Hudson and Coukos (2005) note the similarities between this political movement in the mid-1990s and the one just 100 years before, arguing that the Protestant work ethic served as the driving force behind both. Take, for instance, the common arguments for welfare reform (policies that reduce and restrict social welfare programs and services), which have often been predicated upon the beliefs that

1. hardship is often the result of laziness;
2. providing assistance will increase laziness (and thus dependence), hence increasing hardship, not decreasing it; and
3. those in need often receive services at the expense of the working population

In an article in Time Magazine entitled “100 Days of Attitude,” Stacks (1995) captured this “us versus them” dynamic fostered in the debate on welfare reform in the mid-1990s. Stacks described how the country was “up-in-arms” over public assistance programs, and this outrage spread quickly through the country. The House held hearings on the state of public welfare in the country in response to the uproar. One of the most inflammatory speeches heard on the House floor was when the U.S. Representative for Florida’s 7th congressional district, John Mica compared public assistance users to alligators, arguing that “if you treat the alligator like a pet or a child, it will become dependent.” Such perspectives negate the complexity of economic disadvantage often experienced by vulnerable and marginalized populations, and categorize the poor as a homogenous group that is in some significant way different with regard to character from mainstream working society.

The debate about public welfare also reflects the genderized and racialized nature of welfare contributing to institutionalized gender bias and racism. Whether veiled or overt negative bias bestowed upon female public welfare recipients of color negates the disparity in social problems experienced by African American women, including increased incidences of poverty, violence, and untreated child sexual victimization, and their associated psychological and social problems (El-Bassel, Caldeira, Ruglass, & Gilbert, 2009; Martin, 2012; Siegel & Williams, 2003).

Although welfare reform was initiated by a Republican Congress, it was passed by the Democratic Clinton administration, in the form of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA) of 1996, illustrating wide support not only for welfare reform but also for the underlying philosophical beliefs about the causes of poverty and effective poverty alleviation methods. PRWORA of 1996 reflects a marked shift away from its predecessor, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), an entitlement program created under the New Deal. Many social welfare advocates believe that the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), is punitive in nature, with its strict time limits for lifetime benefits (ranging between three and five years depending on the state), stringent work requirements (often regardless of circumstances), and other measures designed to control the behavior of recipients. Supporters of welfare reform and the passage of PRWORA relied on old arguments citing the need to control welfare fraud and welfare dependency, among a host of other behaviors exhibited by welfare recipients, such as sexual promiscuity and having children out of wedlock (Hudson & Coukos, 2005).
The Christian Right

A powerful voice within the Republican Party that was a big backer of welfare reform is often called the Christian Right—a group of individuals, often Evangelical Christians, who espouse what they consider conservative family values. Conservative Christian organizations, such as the Christian Coalition, the Eagle Forum, and Focus on the Family, have wielded considerable influence within the Republican Party beginning in the 1980s, becoming a fringe core of the party in the 1990s (Green, Rozell, & Wilcox, 2003; Guth & Green, 1986; Knuckey, 2005). These groups were instrumental in the call for welfare reform, voicing significant concerns about moral decline in society and citing the need to defend and uphold traditional family values (Reese, 2007; Uluorta, 2008).

Uluorta (2008) points out that far too often “morality within the United States is a highly circumscribed concept that often confines itself to select individual behaviors such as those pertaining to sex and sexuality (e.g., abortion, abstinence), marriage (e.g., gay marriage) and social standing (e.g., welfare reform)” (pp. 253–254). Many within the Christian Right were fervent supporters of welfare reform, and specifically the PRWOA of 1996, because of its focus on behavioral reform, including the promotion of marriage and sexual abstinence (Reese, 2007).

The ability of the conservative Christian movement to mobilize its members into political action is notable. For instance, Uluorta (2008) points out the political lobbying success of Focus on the Family, a conservative Evangelical Christian organization that broadcasts its messages on over 1,600 radio stations and 16 television stations nationwide, has a frequently used website, and disseminates newsletters and political action alerts via email and physical mail to millions of members who are often asked to strongly advocate for the organization’s policy positions reflecting its socially conservative values. This level and type of mobilization is of concern to some within the social work fields and others who advocate for a more compassionate approach to helping the poor and disadvantaged, and who recognize the wide range of ways to frame social problems (and their causes), rather than focusing solely on perceived behavioral patterns of those who are struggling. The Christian Right and other socially conservative groups often frame their arguments in terms of tradition, yet their version of American tradition and patriotism often reflects the experiences of the majority population, many of whom have had the cumulative benefit of white privilege (Martin, 2012).

The Tea Party Movement

Another conservative social movement, which appears to overlap at least to some extent with the Christian Right, is the American Tea Party Movement, a social movement and a part of the Republican base that advocates for smaller government, lower taxes (the name of the group is a reference to the Boston Tea Party), state rights, and the literal interpretation of the U.S. Constitution. The Tea Party Movement has quickly gained a reputation for advocating on behalf of conservative policies, similar in many ways to the Christian Right agenda. For instance, Michele Bachmann, a Tea Party member, Minnesota congresswoman, and 2012 presidential candidate, has been criticized for her position on social issues, many of which are based on her conservative Christian values. For example, in a 2006 speech to a Christian youth group, Bachmann asserted that religion was supposed to be a part of government and that the notion of separation of church and state (contained in the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution) was a myth (Turley, 2011).
Allegations have also been made against some members of the Tea Party Movement for their stance on immigration and racial issues in general. The media has consistently highlighted the racially charged tone at some Tea Party political rallies, pointing out racial slurs on posters, many of which are directed at President Obama’s ethnic background, although proponents of the Tea Party complain that the media is exaggerating racist elements at the protests and rallies by seeking out and overfocusing on the more extremist elements of the movement. Although “tea partiers” often deny racist or homophobic values, a recent study showed that about 60 percent of tea party opponents believed that the movement had strong racist and homophobic overtones (Gardner & Thompson, 2010).

Currently the Tea Party is considered a part of the Republican base, but its existence appears to be creating some controversy within the party, particularly among the more moderate GOP base. Whether the Tea Party remains a part of the Republican Party or branches off to its own party will depend on many factors, including whether it can maintain its current momentum and increase the number of supporters.

**A TIME FOR CHANGE: THE ELECTION OF THE FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN PRESIDENT**

The 2008 presidential election was unprecedented in many respects. The United States had its first African American presidential candidate and its first female presidential candidate of a major party. Many people who have historically been relatively apathetic about politics were suddenly passionate about this election for a variety of reasons. Growing discontentment with the leadership in the preceding eight years coupled with a lengthy war in the Persian Gulf region and a struggling economy created a climate where significant social change could take root. Barack Obama’s campaign slogans based on hope and change (e.g., “Yes We Can!” and “Change We Can Believe In”) seemed to capture this growing discontent.

The fledgling economy of 2007 evolved into an economic meltdown toward the end of the Bush presidency, extending into the Obama administration, evidenced by a plummeting stock market, the near-collapse of the banking industry, and the real estate bubble at a level not experienced since the Great Depression (Geithner, 2009). Some social reformers and economists have advocated for policies that strive to achieve balance between free market forces, which can stimulate the economy by creating a spirit of competition, and a strong nation-state that provides a safety net for all of its constituents.

President Obama and the 111th Congress responded to the economic crisis with several policy and legislative actions, including the passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (often referred to as the Stimulus bill [Pub. L. No. 111-5]). This economic stimulus package, worth over $787 billion, included a combination of federal tax cuts, various social welfare provisions, and increases in domestic spending, designed to stimulate the economy and assist Americans who were suffering economically. It will be some time before economists and the American public come to a consensus on whether the stimulus package was successful in turning the economy around, but early indications appear to suggest that the stimulus package was at least somewhat successful.
In the meantime, the lead-up to the 2012 presidential elections revealed the same debate about the causes of poverty and effective poverty alleviation strategies. After a brief display of compassion toward the poor at the height of the 2008 economic crisis, harsh sentiments reflecting historic stigmatization of the poor were strongly espoused, particularly among potential Republican primary candidates who continued their campaign against 'big government', social welfare programs, and civil liberties in general. The 2012 Republican presidential candidate, Newt Gingrich, even went so far as to challenge current child labor laws, calling them “stupid.” In a campaign speech in Iowa in the fall of 2011, Gingrich characterized poor ethnically diverse children living in poor neighborhoods as lazy and having no work ethic. In two different speeches (his initial speech and a subsequent speech where he was asked to clarify his earlier comments), Gingrich suggested that poor children in poor neighborhoods could start work early, perhaps as janitorial staff in their own schools. Describing most poor children in economically challenged neighborhoods, Gingrich stated that these children have

no habits of working and nobody around them who works . . . they have no habit of showing up on Monday and staying all day or the concept of “I do this and you give me cash,” unless it’s illegal.

In his follow-up statements, he clarified his earlier comments by stating:

You have a very poor neighborhood. You have students that are required to go to school. They have no money, no habit of work. . . . What if you paid them in the afternoon to work in the clerical office or as the assistant librarian? And let me get into the janitor thing. What if they became assistant janitors, and their job was to mop the floor and clean the bathroom?

Framing his comments in religious terms, Gingrich concluded by stating:

If we are all endowed by our creator with the right to pursue happiness, that has to apply to the poorest neighborhoods in the poorest counties, and I am prepared to find something that works, that breaks us out of the cycles we have now to find a way for poor children to work and earn honest money. (Dover, 2011, para 3–5)

Gingrich’s sentiments presume a level playing field in society, negating current and historic social forces, such as racial oppression and white privilege that have consistently given one group an unfair advantage for centuries.

Perhaps one of the most significant federal laws to be passed in years is the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010 (ACA) signed into law by President Obama in March 2010 after a fierce public relations war waged by many Republicans and health insurance companies designed to prevent its passage. The ACA, which took effect incrementally from 2010 to 2014, is a comprehensive healthcare reform bill. Overall this legislation is designed to make it easier for individuals and families to obtain quality lower-cost health insurance by applying through a central exchange, making it more difficult for health insurance companies to deny coverage. It also expands Medicare in a variety of ways, including bolstering community and home-based healthcare services, and provides incentives for preventative, holistic, and wellness care. With respect to behavioral and mental healthcare, the ACA provides increased incentives for coordinated care and school-based care including mental health care and substance abuse treatment. It also includes provisions that will require the inclusion of mental health and substance abuse
coverage in benefits packages, including prescription drug coverage, and wellness and prevention services. Although the government healthcare marketplace website initially experienced problems making it difficult for people to sign up, according to an April 2014 White House press release, an estimated 8 million people have signed up for private health insurance through the Health Insurance Marketplace (formerly called the exchange).

Assess your comprehension of “A Time for Change: The Election of the First African American President” by completing this quiz.

Summary

As often happens in broad-based economic downturns, the 2007 recession seemed to have led to a softening of antipoverty rhetoric and a political discourse that recognizes the importance of an effective social welfare system for all Americans, yet that empathy appears to be waning, reflected in an increase in discussions of class warfare among politicians in the 2012 presidential election cycle. Discussions of the need for universal healthcare, a federal living wage, and other policies designed to address the economic inequality in the United States will no doubt be ongoing. The debate regarding how capitalism and a free market economy can be balanced with a social safety net for all members of U.S. society continues among politicians (and the public) and shows no signs of abating. Only time will tell where U.S. society ultimately will fall in the philosophical spectrum of individual responsibility and social equity.

Social movements appear to be on the rise, with passionate supporters of both liberal causes, such as marriage equality, and more conservative social movements, such as demands for smaller government and increased restrictions on social welfare programs. Social workers can positively engage in a variety of social movements by advocating for social equality in productive ways that do not contribute to existing polarization.

Recall what you learned in this chapter by completing the Chapter Review.