

# SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION IN THE HOMETLAND: WO'LAKOTA UNGLU'SU'TAPI.<sup>1</sup> EPAS OR IMPASSE? OPERATIONALIZING ACCREDITATION STANDARD 6.0

## **Richard W. Voss**

West Chester University

## **Albert White Hat, Sr.**

Sinte Gleska University  
Rosebud Sioux Tribe

## **Jim Bates**

Eastern Washington State University  
Yankton Sioux Tribe

## **Margery Richard Lunderman**

Ring Thunder Ti'ospaye  
Oglala Sioux Tribe

## **Alex Lunderman, Jr.**

Ring Thunder Ti'ospaye  
Rosebud Sioux Tribe

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

MY GRANDMOTHER always told me that the White man never listens to anyone, but expects everyone to listen to him. So, we listen! . . . We have survived here because we know how to listen. The White people in the lower forty-eight talk. They are like

the wind, they sweep over everything.  
(Coles, cited in Nabokov, 1991, p. 431)

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

---

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

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

These findings are corroborated by the authors' review of "Tribal College Profiles" (see the Appendix in *Globalization of Tribal Colleges and Universities*, 2000), which included profiles of 18 tribal colleges. The profiles included information about the respective majors offered at the tribal colleges and report on the types of majors their institutions offer. These profiles showed the following: Only two offered the associate of arts degree in social work and the Red Crow Community College in Alberta, Canada was in the process of developing a joint BSW program in concert with the University of Calgary. Most of the colleges offered other related majors which included associate of arts degrees in the following concentrations: human services, community health education, and alcohol and drug abuse studies. The associate of science degrees were also offered and include the following areas: chemical dependency counseling,

social science, public and tribal administration, health information technology, and criminal justice. Sinte Gleska University offered three related bachelor of science degree programs including criminal justice, mental health, and chemical dependency. Oglala Lakota College offered the BS in human services, and Sitting Bull College offered the BS in Native American human services. The Turtle Mountain Community College offered the BS in social work in partnership with the University of North Dakota (*Globalization of Tribal Colleges and Universities*, 2000).

The report *Creating Role Models for Change: A Survey of Tribal College Graduates* (American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Institute for Higher Education Policy, & Sallie May Education Institute, 2000) offers additional information about courses of study at tribal colleges and includes a summary of tribal college graduates' major fields of study. Among its findings, it showed that 19% of the graduates majored in nursing and health care, 13% in computer and office technology, 11% in education/teaching, and 11% in psychology/social work/human services (p. 8). These data document interest in social work among American Indian students<sup>2</sup> attending tribal colleges, despite the

<sup>2</sup> The authors have decided to use the terms "American Indian," "native indigenous people or students," "Indian," or "tribal people" interchangeably when discussing generic issues, concerns, and ideas about the subjects of this essay. The authors are well aware of the historical, social, and political complexity and controversy associated with any terms used to identify culturally distinctive groups of people and note that the term "American Indian" is the legal title of federally recognized tribes holding jurisdiction on reservation lands in the United States. The terms "native

apparent barriers to the BSW. Interestingly, all of the tribal colleges included in the tribal college profiles in *Globalization of Tribal Colleges & Universities* (2000) reported that they had established international partnerships and exchanges as institutional priorities, and many had developed partnerships with sister universities across the United States—so there is interest in inter-institutional partnerships and collaborations here.

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

---

indigenous” and “tribal people” connote the originality of the people’s association with creation, the land, and the Creator, and their natural, extended, familiar relationship bonds which define them. Likewise the term “homeland” is preferred over “reservation” since the later connotes a fenced in place where animals are kept; it connotes a place of containment or restriction whereas the former term better reflects the sense of kinship, a place of safety and origin, and deep-felt affection the Lakota and other traditional people feel for their ancestral homeland.

for a “shadow curriculum” for native indigenous students, a curriculum that would be grounded upon core indigenous values and traditional philosophical assumptions; a curriculum that would more appropriately prepare traditional Indians for social work in their respective tribes within the framework of their own traditional heritage (personal communication, 1999).

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

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

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

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

Parallel to these discussions, a traditional Oglala medicine man<sup>3</sup> and other elders who live in a traditional community on the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation have discussed their concerns about and the need for social work on the reservation, the need for developing a core curriculum for tribal social workers, and the pressing needs of American-Indian people (personal communication, 2000). This medicine man asked for more discussion between traditional tribal educators and elders with mainstream educational institutions (and their respective accrediting bodies) particularly around building a curriculum that could interface with traditional knowledge keepers. He was really calling for a two-way process, one where professional social workers would collaborate with the medicine men and traditional elders, teaching basic or core helping skills, and also where the traditional knowledge-keepers would inform social work practice. He wondered why American social workers were so influenced by "English social work" when there were traditions of social work-like functions among traditional (American-Indian) people.

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

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

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

The question arises, Is it possible to bring these apparently incompatible worldviews into a dialogue? Will the Council on Social Work

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

### **Social Work Education and Post-Colonial Resistance**

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

into a materialistic lifestyle in an institutional (boarding school) setting (Douville, personal communication, 1997; Little Soldier, personal communication, 1997; White Hat, personal communication, 1997; see Standing Bear, 1975, pp. 123–176).

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

“Historical trauma” describes the cumulative cultural wounding across generations as well as present-day effects on one’s current life circumstances (Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999, p. 22) in response to systemic oppression and genocide. For American-Indian people the legacy of genocide includes imposed distortions of one’s tribal identity, devalued

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

Oetting and Beauvais (1991) found that an individual's identification with one culture is independent of their identification with any other culture. Therefore, increasing identification with one culture does not necessarily demand a reciprocal decrease in identification with another culture (Weaver & Yellow Horse Brave Heart, 1999, p. 21). In order to develop a strong identity with the predominant culture,

an individual need not relinquish his or her identity with his or her native culture, which was the faulty assumption of the early boarding school innovators. We now know that individuals may and do identify with more than one culture for a variety of reasons, and that there are multiple sources of strength and support for overcoming even great adversity (Crozier-Hogel & Wilson, 1997).

### **Educational Failure as a Form of Cultural Resistance**

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

Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC), together with the Institute for Higher Education Policy and Sallie May Education Institute (2000), noted that

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

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

interested in addressing the systemic failure in post-secondary performance measures for many American-Indian students today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Higher education continues to be based on a modern, secular, liberal, scientific model of empiricism and interpersonal objectivity, requiring critical, detached scrutiny that assumes the investigator is separate from the subjects studied. This is not the way traditional American Indians see their world; for them the world (earth) and the above (sky) are intimate relatives, so intimate the traditional Lakota Sioux use the personal relational terms

of *Maka* ("mother"), *Unci* ("grandmother"), *Ate* ("father"), and *Tunka'sila* ("grandfather") respectively. For the traditional Lakota and other traditional American Indians these are not metaphors. These are terms of endearment and reflect a way of speaking about a highly personalized environment where everything is intimately related and connected. This conflict creates an epistemological crisis for many American-Indian students whose outlook on life and the understanding of the world is holistic. Lionel Bordeaux, president of Sinte Gleska University noted, "We do have a very holistic outlook. . . . We find it difficult to separate various things within ourselves" (Harriman, 2000, p. 2).

While present-day century social work education would not consciously or overtly ascribe to Colonel Pratt's "kill the Indian, save the man" ideology, social work education is, nonetheless, situated within the broader educational institution historically embedded in the American experience. Within this broader educational context, vestiges and residues of the earlier civilizing pedagogy may be found in the profession's most fundamental values. Consider the profession's emphasis on "intervention" and ethical stance on "client self-determination" and "client confidentiality." Traditional Indian people understand their close ties to all of their relatives and ancestors who respond to their needs when they ask for help. The spirits give many options to the individual in the healing process and are always available to help the individual. The individual seeking help knows that answers are not always immediate, so he or she waits with patience and fortitude (*wo'wacini tanka*) and knows that understanding will come in the space of time. The individual knows that

his or her problems will be dissolved, often in a way that is not expected. Here the spirits (relatives) really challenge one's mind or reasoning power to recognize the solution(s) as it (they) unfold in day to day life. There is great respect for the intelligence of the individual throughout this process.

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

Traditional Lakota culture resonates more with social work approaches that use pragmatic, community-based, prevention-oriented, risk reduction strategies that are holistic and

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

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

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

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

any kind of meaningful dialogue. The Council on Social Work Education (2001) accreditation standard 6.0, however, extends such an opportunity for bicultural social work educational transformation.

### **Role of Tribal Colleges in Native Indigenous Homelands**

In order to address the lack of access to higher education, and fueled by the American Indian self-determination movement that coalesced in the 1960s, 33 tribal colleges and universities were established in the United States and Canada to help increase access to higher education by American Indians who live on remote tribal lands (AIHEC et al., 2000, p. 1). Located on homelands (reservations) and administered by American-Indian staff, the tribal colleges and universities are a unique resource in bridging traditional American-Indian knowledge, understandings, and cultural practices to the academic disciplines (Red Bird & Mohatt, 1976). The development of these colleges was further supported by the developing "theory of Indian-controlled schools" (Clifford, 1974), which rejected the assimilation process in education and asserted the new Indian ideologies and belief systems that looked to the "internal forces in the Indian community," demanding local control of Indian education that could promote social change from within the reservation. Clifford identified five critical elements of Indian-controlled schools. First of all, there would be an immediacy of contact between young and old; second, it would promote rootedness in the local environment and encourage exploration of traditional wisdom through modern technology; third, it would provide a forum for cultural expansion and

creativity; fourth, it would provide employment at the local level; and finally, it would establish control of federal monies to better leverage and promote Indian development and capital. So the shifts in traditional Indian views toward formal education have a long history of Indian intellectual resistance and tribal commitment to the preservation of cultural prerogatives. The authors argue these components are relevant to social work education, particularly in light of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) (2001) accreditation standard 6.0, Nondiscrimination and Human Diversity.

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

#### **Accreditation Standard 6.0, Nondiscrimination and Human Diversity**

The CSWE (2001) EPAS accreditation standard 6.0 mandates that "specific, continuous

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

To what extent do we see CSWE-accredited programs located near traditional homelands (reservations) incorporating American Indians in these areas? Alex Little Soldier, former chairman of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe viewed tribal sovereignty (see Pevar, 1992, p. 79) as a critical issue in the restoration of tribal identity for his people (Lunderman/Little Soldier, 1992). This issue was also raised by Paul Boyer in his discussion about the critical role of tribal colleges in educating both tribal leadership, native students, and the larger community about sovereignty as a reality for Indian people and not just rhetoric (Boyer, 2004). How does

accreditation standard 6.0 incorporate tribal sovereignty into its diversity standard? To what extent are CSWE-accredited programs actively engaged in dialogue with tribal governments and colleges and jointly developing social work curricula that can respond to the realities of our native indigenous homelands (reservations), integrating shamanism and tribalism (Voss et al., 1999b) in substantive ways where the "diversity" standard actually supports tribal sovereignty and cultural integrity? How can accredited social work programs serving native indigenous (American-Indian) students living in their native homelands provide a "nondiscriminatory learning environment" without literally having one (programmatic) foot in the student's homeland (reservation)? Recall the respondent in Weaver's (2000) study who noted, "if [I] hadn't been staying at [a nearby tribal college] the first year I went to [a] social work program. . . I don't think I would have made it" (p. 424). Clearly, the tribal college was part of this student's survival strategy in completing the program, and by extension is a natural resource for CSWE programs seeking cultural proficiency in serving Indian people.

### **Integrating the "Shadow Curriculum" Into the Academy**

The route for the effective integration of the shadow curriculum (traditional Indian way) into the institutionalized curriculum (dominant master script) begins by building familial and community connections between the social work program (and respective host university institution) and the student's extended family and respective tribe, including both formal and informal tribal leaders that reflect the student's primary support system.

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

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

First of all, social work programs serving traditional Indian homelands should examine the biases in their theoretical orientations and

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

Second, social work programs that are situated near native indigenous homelands can explore ways to work together to advance mutual goals and interests; recognized tribal elders may be invited to participate as consultants and advisors or cultural guides to assist university personnel in navigating the cultural differences and issues that will often surface in

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

For collaborating institutions the options for ensuring cultural proficiency are endless. They can develop cross-listed courses, distance learning/tele-courses, Blackboard chats around

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

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

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

curricula and practice with Indian people in the homelands. The CSWE (2001) accreditation standard 6.0 is really a mandate for such innovation.

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

The authors recognize there are countless pressures and pulls from multiple constituencies on all CSWE-accredited social work programs, and that the last thing our colleagues often need is yet another demand for accountability from yet another constituency. The purpose of this article is not to ask the impossible of our social work programs and require ever-greater expenditures with ever-decreasing resources in the ever-increasingly competitive educational environment. What the authors are asserting is that when CSWE-accredited universities partner with or otherwise collaborate with tribal colleges, a new synergy can actually be generated and valuable resources shared among both educational partners, with potential benefits to faculty, students, and administration. Such transformative activities can also have a ripple effect in the way we view the mission, scope, and very identity of the social work profession. We are suggesting that partnerships between CSWE-accredited university programs located near federally recognized American-Indian reservations present a potential cost benefit to both partners. The authors are concerned that social work education is not being incorporated in tribal colleges and that the perception that human services and other counseling degree programs are more workable for Indian stu-

dents may limit tribal access to professional social work, further alienating the profession from tribal relevance (see above discussion by Klein and Clifford). Accreditation standard 6.0 provides an opportunity for re-engagement by the profession with the federally recognized tribes. It's not too late. Maybe some fresh ideas are needed to activate action.

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

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

in China, including increasing calls for greater indigenization in social work education and pedagogy through the 21st century (Cheung, Sharon, & Liu, 2004; Jinchao, 1995; Voss, 2004; Xia & Guo 2002).

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

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

authors assert are also relevant to social work education in our native homelands.

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

man potential, and the mobilization of human resources to solve problems" (p. 28).

Second, Yuen-Tsang and Wang (2002) also noticed the pragmatic role that developing *partnerships with government in educational and service development* played in Chinese social work programs. The fact that most social work graduates are employed by the government drew a close connection between social work education and a "heavy emphasis on knowledge and skills pertaining to working with the government bureaucracy" (p. 384). Similarly, most graduates of tribal colleges, for example, from Sinte Gleska University, the tribal college affiliated with the Rosebud Sioux Tribe are recruited for tribal service, often as tribal police, health-care providers, and in support of other tribal services, e.g., human services, drug and alcohol treatment, and tribal administration (White Hat, personal communication, 2004). So, social work education in the homelands needs to teach and relate to tribal law, customs, and procedures on a priority basis—not the other way around, i.e., learning non-Indian law, practices, and procedures and only afterward learning the indigenous bureaucracy.

Finally, Yuen-Tsang and Wang (2002, citing Wang) noted in their analysis "a commitment to the *indigenization of theory and practice in social work in the Chinese context*" (p. 384). Here, "indigenization" was defined as the need to "consider the traditional Chinese culture, the impact of the market economy on people's livelihood, as well as the impact of collectivism and welfarism on the mentality of the people." (p. 384). Curricula at tribal colleges are committed to the indigenization and integration of traditional knowledge, values, and prerogatives throughout the curriculum. Social work education needs to actively engage in this discovery process, not with a rigidly

prescribed *a priori* set of standards, but with the capacity to transform its core knowledge, values, and skills within the tribal context in which it is to function. The process needs to be dynamic and interactive versus static and reactive.

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

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

## References

- Ambler, M. (2004). The rights and responsibilities of sovereignty. *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 16(1), 8–9.
- American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Institute for Higher Education Policy, & Sallie May Education Institute. (2000, May). *Creating role models for change: A survey of tribal college graduates* [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 24, 2005, from <http://new.aihec.org/research.html>
- Boyer, P. (2004). Sovereignty: The rhetoric v. the reality. *Tribal College Journal of American Indian Higher Education*, 16(1), 10–13.
- Chamberlain, E. R. (1991). The Beijing seminar: Social work education in Asia and the Pacific. *International Social Work*, 34, 27–35.
- Cheung, M., Sharon, B., & Liu, M. (2004). The self-concept of Chinese women and the indigenization of social work in China. *International Social Work*, 47, 109–128.
- Clifford, G. M. (1974). *The theory of Indian controlled schools*. Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Office of Indian Education.
- Cross, T., Bazron, B. J., Dennis, K. W., & Isaacs, M. R. (1989). *Towards a culturally competent system of care: A monograph on effective services for minority children who are severely disturbed* (vol. 1). Washington, DC: CASSP Technical Assistance Center, Georgetown University Child Development Center.
- Crozier-Hogle, L., & Wilson, D. B. (Compilers). (1997). *Surviving in two worlds: Contemporary Native American voices*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Enoch, J. (2001). Resisting the script of Indian education: Zitkala Ša and the Carlisle Indian School. *College English*, 65(November), 117–141.

- Fisher, D. (1979). *American Indian stories*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Fulcher, L. C. (2003). The working definition of social work doesn't work very well in China and Malaysia. *Research on Social Work Practice, 13*, 376-387.
- Globalization of Tribal Colleges & Universities: Proceedings and Reference Guide [Electronic version]. (2000, August). Washington, DC: United States Agency for International Development and the United States Department of Agriculture. Retrieved February 24, 2005, from [www.aihec.org/AIHEC%20Documents/PDFS/proceedings.pdf](http://www.aihec.org/AIHEC%20Documents/PDFS/proceedings.pdf)
- Harriman, P. (2000, March). Indian Series. Brain power and the native dream: SD universities, tribal colleges partner to bridge educational gaps [Electronic version]. Retrieved February 24, 2005, from [http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p\\_action=doc&p\\_docid=0F6ABA5711427](http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=doc&p_docid=0F6ABA5711427)
- Healy, K. (2001). Participatory action research and social work. *International Social Work, 44*(1), 93-105.
- Holler, C. (1995). *Black Elk's religion: The Sun Dance and Lakota Catholicism*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Jinchao, Y. (1995). The developing models of social work education in China. *International Social Work, 38*, 27-38.
- Johnson, T. W., & Reed, R. F. (Eds.). (2002). *Historical documents in American education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Lame Deer, A. F., & Erdoes, R., (1992). *Gift of power: The life and teachings of a Lakota medicine man*. Santa Fe, NM: Bear & Company.
- Lunderman, A. (aka Little Soldier). (1992). *Federal policy and social disparity on Indian reservations: Problems and solutions for the 1990s*. Unpublished manuscript. Mission, SD: Sinte Gleska University.
- McFee, M. (1968). The 150% man, a product of Blackfeet acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 70*, 1096-1103.
- Nabokov, P. (Ed.). (1991). *Native American testimony: A chronical of Indian-White relations from prophecy to the present*. New York: Penguin.
- Ng, H-Y. (2003). The 'social' in social work practice: Shamans and social workers. *International Social Work, 46*, 289-301.
- Nimmagadda, J., & Cowger, C. (1999). Cross-cultural practice: Social worker ingenuity in the indigenization of practice knowledge. *International Social Work, 42*, 261-276.
- Oetting, E. R., & Beauvais, F. (1991). Orthogonal cultural identification theory: The cultural identification of minority adolescents. *International Journal of the Addictions, 25*(5A and 6A), 655-685.
- Pevar, S. L. (1992). *The rights of Indians and tribes: The Basic ACLU guide to Indian and tribal rights* (2nd ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Pratt, R. D. (1973). Official Report of the Nineteenth Annual Conference of Charities and Corrections. In R. H. Pratt (Ed.), *The advantages of mingling Indians with Whites: Americanizing American Indians: Writings by the "friends of the Indian" 1880-1900* (pp. 260-271). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1892).
- Red Bird, S., & Mohatt, G. (1976). *Identity through traditional Lakota methods, detailed report*. Rosebud, SD: Sinte Gleska University Archives.
- Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians [Web site]. Retrieved July 26, 2004, from <http://www.kstrom.net/isk/maps/mn/redlake.htm>

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

Accepted: 10/04

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

Address correspondence to Richard W. Voss, West Chester University, Undergraduate Department of Social Work, 114 Rosedale Ave., West Chester, PA 19383; e-mail: rvoss@wcupa.edu.

Copyright of Journal of Social Work Education is the property of Council on Social Work Education and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.