

Valued Social Roles and Empowerment: Two Key Dimensions in Recovery

Presented By

Eric A. Evans

Nebraska Advocacy Services, Inc.

Aurora Consumer Conference

September 24, 2002

- **THE ROOTS OF EXCLUSION AND OPPRESSION: DEVIANCY, DEVALUATION, AND WOUNDING**
- **SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZATION AS A RESPONSE EXCLUSION AND DEVALUATION**
- **EMPOWERMENT AS A RESPONSE TO OPPRESSION**
- **RECOVERY AS A RESPONSE TO EXCLUSION, DEVALUATION, AND OPPRESSION**

**THE ROOTS OF
EXCLUSION
AND DEVALUATION**

THE SOCIAL DEFINITION OF DEVIANCY

A PERSON BECOMES PERCEIVED OR
DEFINED AS *DEVIANT*

- BY BEING DIFFERENT FROM
OTHERS
- IN ONE OR MORE DIMENSIONS
- WHICH ARE PERCEIVED AS
SIGNIFICANT BY A MAJORITY OR
RULING SEGMENT OF A SOCIETY
- WHO VALUE THIS DIFFERENCE
NEGATIVELY

**DIFFERENCES AND DEVIANCY ARE
NOT IDENTICAL-- DEVIANCY IS THE
RESULT OF *SYSTEMATIC* DEVALUA-
TION.**

MINORITY GROUPS WIDELY DEVALUED IN WESTERN SOCIETIES

- **PEOPLE WHO ARE “HANDI-CAPPED” IN SENSES, BODY OR MIND**
- **PEOPLE WHO ARE “DISORDERED” IN CONDUCT OR BEHAVIOR**
- **PEOPLE WHO ARE SOCIALLY REBELLIOUS**
- **PEOPLE WHO ARE POOR**
- **PEOPLE WHO HAVE FEW OR UNWANTED SKILLS**
- **PEOPLE WHO ARE UNASSIMILATED FOR SOME REASON**

MAJOR HISTORICAL ROLE PRECEPTIONS OF PEOPLE WHO ARE DEVALUED

- AS NON-HUMAN
- AS MENACE, EVIL OR OBJECT OF DREAD
- AS WASTE MATERIAL, GARBAGE, DISCARD, OFFAL
- AS TRIVIUM OR OBJECT OF RIDICULE
- AS AN OBJECT OF PITY

- **AS A BURDEN OF CHARITY**
- **AS CHILDLIKE**
- **AS A HOLY INNOCENT**
- **AS A SICK OR DISEASED ORGANISM OR THE DISEASE ITSELF**
- **AS DYING, ALREADY DEAD OR AS GOOD AS DEAD**

THE MOST COMMON WOUNDS OF PEOPLE WHO ARE DEVALUED

- **A PHYSICAL OR MENTAL IMPAIRMENT**
- **A FUNCTIONAL IMPAIRMENT**
- **RELEGATION TO LOW OR DEVIANT SOCIAL STATUS**
- **REJECTION BY FAMILY, FRIENDS, NEIGHBORS, COMMUNITY, SOCIETY, SERVICE WORKERS**
- **CAST INTO MULTIPLE HISTORIC DEVIANCY ROLES**
- **SYMBOLIC STIGMATIZING, “MARKING”, “DEIVANCY-IMAGING”, “BRANDING”**

- **SUSPICION OF MULTIPLE DEVIANCIES**
- **DISTANTIATION—SEGREGATION AND CONGREGATION**
- **LOSS OF CONTROL, AUTONOMY AND FREEDOM**
- **DISCONTINUITY WITH THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT AND OBJECTS**
- **SOCIAL AND RELATIONSHIP DISCONTINUITY AND EVEN ABANDONMENT**
- **LOSS OF NATURAL, FREELY GIVEN RELATIONSHIPS AND SUBSTITUTION OF PAID RELATIONSHIPS**
- **DEINDIVIDUALIZATION**

- **INVOLUNTARY MATERIAL POVERTY**
- **IMPOVERISHMENT OF EXPERIENCE, ESPECIALLY THAT OF THE TYPICAL, VALUED WORLD**
- **EXCLUSION FROM KNOWLEDGE OF AND PARTICIPATION IN HIGHER-ORDER VALUE SYSTEMS THAT GIVE MEANING AND DIRECTION TO LIFE AND PROVIDE COMMUNITY**
- **HAVING ONE'S LIFE "WASTED"**
- **BRUTALIZATION AND EVEN DEATH MAKING**
- **AWARENESS OF BEING A SOURCE OF ANGUISH TO THOSE WHO LOVE ONE**

- **AWARENESS OF BEING AN “ALIEN”
IN THE VALUED WORLD**
- **PERSONAL INSECURITY, PERHAPS
DISLIKE OF ONESELF OR RAGE**
- **RESENTMENT/HATRED OF
PRIVILEGED CITIZENS**

CONSEQUENCES OF DEVALUED SOCIAL ROLES

- **PEOPLE WHO ARE DEVALUED
HAVE VERY DIFFERENT LIFE
EXPERIENCES THAN THOSE WHO
HAVE VALUED SOCIAL ROLES**
- **IT IS ALMOST CERTAIN THAT THEY
WILL BE TREATED BADLY—
REJECTED, PERSECUTED, TREATED
IN WAYS THAT TEND TO DIMINISH
THEIR DIGNITY, ADJUSTMENT,
GROWTH, COMPETENCE,
HEALTH, WEALTH, AND
LIFESPAN**
- **THE BAD TREATMENT GIVEN TO
PEOPLE WHO ARE DEVALUED
LARGELY EXPRESSES AND
REFLECTS THE DEVALUED ROLES
WHICH THEY ARE ACCORDED**

- **HOW A PERSON IS PERCEIVED AND TREATED BY OTHERS WILL DETERMINE STRONGLY HOW THAT PERSON SUBSEQUENTLY BEHAVES—THE MORE CONSISTENTLY A PERSON IS PERCEIVED AND TREATED AS BEING IN A NEGATIVE ROLE, THE MORE LIKELY HE/SHE WILL CONFORM TO THAT EXPECTATION AND ACTUALLY BEHAVE IN WAYS THAT ARE NOT VALUED BY SOCIETY**

LANGUAGE OF US/THEM

BY MEYER SHEVIN

WE LIKE THINGS

THEY FIXATE ON OBJECTS

WE TRY TO MAKE FRIENDS

THEY DISPLAY ATTENTION SEEKING BEHAVIOR

WE TAKE BREAKS

THEY DISPLAY OFF TASK BEHAVIORS

WE STAND UP FOR OURSELVES

THEY ARE NON-COMPLIANT

WE HAVE HOBBIES

THEY SELF-STIM

WE CHOOSE OUR FRIENDS WISELY

THEY DISPLAY POOR PEER SOCIALIZATION

WE PERSEVERE

THEY PERSEVERATE

WE LOVE PEOPLE

THEY HAVE DEPENDENCIES ON PEOPLE

WE GO FOR A WALK

THEY RUN AWAY

WE INSIST

THEY TANTRUM

WE CHANGE OUR MINDS

*THEY ARE DIORIENTED AND HAVE SHORT
ATTENTION SPANS*

WE HAVE TALENTS

THEY HAVE SPLINTER SKILLS

WE ARE HUMAN

THEY ARE....?

**SOCIAL ROLE
VALORIZATION AS A
RESPONSE TO
DEVALUATION AND
WOUNDING**

SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZATION

- STARTED OUT AS THE *PRINCIPLE OF NORMALIZATION* (1969), BUT THIS WAS WIDELY MISUNDERSTOOD
- MOST EXPLICIT AND HIGHEST GOAL OF *NORMALIZATION* IS THE CREATION, SUPPORT AND DEFENSE OF ***VALUED SOCIAL ROLES*** FOR PEOPLE WHO ARE AT RISK OF DEVALUATION
- ASSUMPTION IS THAT IF A PERSON'S SOCIAL ROLE IS VALUED, THEN OTHER DESIRABLE THINGS WILL BE ACCORDED TO THAT PERSON AUTOMATICALLY, AT LEAST WITHIN THE RESOURCES AND NOMRS OF HIS/HER SOCIETY

- **THUS, ATTRIBUTES THAT MIGHT COME TO BE VIEW NEGATIVELY MIGHT COME TO BE VIEWED POSITIVELY**
- **TWO BASIC CLASSES OF THINGS WHICH CAN BE DONE TO ATTAIN THE GOALS OF SOCIALLY VALUED ROLES AND LIFE CONDITIONS**
- **FIRST, ENHANCEMENT OF PEOPLE'S SOCIAL IMAGE, OR PERCEIVED VALUE IN THE EYES OF OTHERS**
- **SECOND, ENHANCEMENT OF PEOPLE'S COMPETENCIES**
- **THESE ARE RECIPROCALLY REINFORCING—A PERSON WHO IS COMPETENCY-IMPAIRED IS AT HIGH RISK OF BECOMING SEEN AND INTERPRETED AS OF LOW VALUE (IMPAIRMENT OF SOCIAL IMAGE) AND A PERSON WHO IS IMPAIRED IN**

SOCIAL IMAGE IS LIKELY TO BE RESPONDED TO IN WAYS THAT IMPAIR OR REDUCE HIS/HER COMPETENCY

- **THE REVERSE HOLDS TRUE AS WELL—A PERSON WHOSE SOCIAL IMAGE IS POSITIVELY VALUED IS LIKELY TO BE PROVIDED WITH LIFE EXPERIENCES, EXPECTANCIES, AND CONDITIONS THAT WILL GENERALLY INCREASE HIS/HER COMPETENCIES AND A PERSON WHO IS PERCEIVED AS HIGHLY COMPETENT IS MORE LIKELY TO BE IMAGED POSITIVELY**

**EMPOWERMENT AS A
RESPONSE TO
OPPRESSION**

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF EMPOWERMENT

JOHN DEWEY (1927):

A FOURTH MARK OF THE PUBLIC IS INDICATED BY THE IDEA THAT CHILDREN AND OTHER DEPENDENTS (SUCH AS THE INSANE, THE PERMANENTLY HELPLESS) ARE PECULIARLY ITS WARDS. WHEN THE PARTIES INVOLVED IN ANY TRANSACTION ARE ***UNEQUAL IN STATUS***, THE RELATIONSHIP IS LIKELY TO BE ONE-SIDED, AND THE INTERESTS OF ONE PARTY TO SUFFER. IF THE CONSEQUENCES APPEAR SERIOUS, ESPECIALLY IF THEY SEEM TO BE IRRETRIEVABLE, THE PUBLIC BRINGS TO BEAR A WEIGHT THAT WILL EQUALIZE CONDITIONS.

FRATERNITY, LIBERTY AND EQUALITY ISOLATED FROM COMMUNAL LIFE ARE HOPELESS ABSTRACTIONS...IN ITS JUST CONNECTION WITH COMMUNAL EXPERIENCE, FRATERNITY IS ANOTHER NAME FOR THE CONSCIOUSLY APPRECIATED GOODS WHICH ACCRUE FROM AN ASSOCIATION WHICH ALL SHARE, AND WHICH GIVE DIRECTION TO THE CONDUCT OF EACH. LIBERTY IS THAT SECURE RELEASE AND FULFILLMENT OF PERSONAL POTENTIALITIES WHICH TAKE PLACE ONLY IN RICH AND MANIFOLD ASSOCIATION WITH OTHERS: *THE POWER TO BE AN INDIVIDUALIZED SELF MAKING A DISTINCTIVE CONTRIBUTION AND ENJOYING IN ITS OWN WAY THE FRUITS OF ASSOCIATION.* EQUALITY DENOTES THE UNHAMPERED SHARE WHICH EACH INDIVIDUAL MEMBER OF THE COMMUNITY HAS IN THE CONSEQUENCES OF ASSOCIATED ACTION.

SAUL ALINSKY (1969):

IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO OVEREMPHASIZE THE ENORMOUS IMPORTANCE OF PEOPLE'S DOING THINGS FOR THEMSELVES. IT IS THE MOST COMMON HUMAN REACTION THAT SUCCESSFUL ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES IS MUCH MORE MEANINGFUL TO PEOPLE WHO HAVE ACHIEVED THE OBJECTIVES THROUGH THEIR OWN EFFORTS. THE OBJECTIVE IS NEVER AN END IN ITSELF. THE EFFORTS THAT ARE EXERTED IN THE ACTUAL EARNING OF THE OBJECTIVE ARE PART AND PARCEL OF THE ACHIEVEMENT ITSELF...WHAT YOU GET BY YOUR OWN EFFORTS IS REALLY YOURS. IT IS A PART OF YOU, BOUND AND KNIT TO YOU THROUGH THE EXPERIENCES YOU HAVE UNDERGONE IN SECURING IT.

ALFRED KAHN (1971):

MOBILIZATION IS THE ACTIVE EXPRESSION OF OUR FAITH IN THE DIGNITY AND WORTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL. TO DENY EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION, INCLUDING THE OPPORTUNITY TO CHOOSE, TO BE HEARD, TO DISCUSS, TO CRITICIZE, TO PROTEST, AND TO CHALLENGE DECISIONS REGARDING THE MOST FUNDAMENTAL CONDITIONS OF EXISTENCE IS TO DENY THE INDIVIDUAL'S OWN WORTH AND TO CONFIRM HIS IMPOTENCE AND SUBSERVIENCE.

JULIAN RAPPAPORT (1981):

...WE ARE WITNESSING THE RISE OF THE IDEA OF RIGHTS OVER NEEDS. THE PARADOX FOR THE REMAINING YEARS OF THIS CENTURY WILL BE ENCAPSULATED IN A STRUGGLE BETWEEN OPPOSING VIEWS OF THE POOR, THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED, THE MENTAL PATIENT, THE RETARDED PERSON, THE JUVENILE, THE ELDERLY AND SO ON, AS DEPENDENT PERSONS TO BE HELPED OR AS CITIZENS TO BE ASSURED OF RIGHTS AND CHOICES. SYMBOLS AND IMAGERY WILL BE VERY IMPORTANT IN THIS STRUGGLE. IT MAKES A GREAT DEAL OF DIFFERENCE IF YOU ARE VIEWED AS A CHILD OR AS A CITIZEN SINCE IF YOU BELIEVE IT YOU ARE QUITE LIKELY TO ACT THE PART (SNYDER & SWANN, 1978; SWANN AND SNYDER, 1980), AND IF THOSE IN POWER BELIEVE IT THEY ARE LIKELY TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS, PLANS AND STRUCTURES THAT WILL HELP YOU BELIEVE IT.

JULIAN RAPPAPORT (1988):

THE CONCEPT SUGGESTS BOTH INDIVIDUAL DETERMINATION OVER ONE'S OWN LIFE, AND DEMOCRATIC PARTICIPATION IN THE LIFE OF ONE'S COMMUNITY, OFTEN THROUGH MEDIATING STRUCTURES SUCH AS SCHOOLS, NEIGHBORHOODS, CHURCHES, AND OTHER VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS. EMPOWERMENT CONVEYS BOTH A PSYCHOLOGICAL SENSE OF PERSONAL CONTROL OR INFLUENCE, AND A CONCERN WITH ACTUAL SOCIAL INFLUENCE, POLITICAL POWER, AND LEGAL RIGHTS. IT IS A MULTILEVEL CONCEPT APPLICABLE TO INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS AS WELL AS TO ORGANIZATIONS AND NEIGHBORHOODS; IT SUGGESTS THE STUDY OF PEOPLE IN CONTEXT.

EMPOWERMENT: SEEING PEOPLE AS COMPLETE HUMAN BEINGS

- CONFLICT BETWEEN “RIGHTS” AND “NEEDS” MODELS FOR VIEWING PEOPLE IN TROUBLE CREATES A PARADOX
- RECOGNIZES THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DIALECTIC
- EMPHASIZES DIVERGENT REASONING (MANY SOLUTIONS) OVER CONVERGENT REASONING (A SINGLE SOLUTION)
- SEES SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY INSTITUTIONS AS HAVING BECOME “ONE-SIDED” AND CREATING MORE PROBLEMS THAN THEY SOLVE

- **THIS IS THE RESULT OF USING CONVERGENT REASONING TO THINK ABOUT DIVERGENT PROBLEMS, LEADING TO AN INABILITY TO THINK DIALECTICALLY**
- **BUT, IN ACCEPTING THE NOTION THAT ADVOCATING FOR LEGAL RIGHTS IS A SOLUTION TO PROBLEMS IN LIVING WE SETTLE FOR A ONE-SIDED SOLUTION THAT MISSES THE DIALECTAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RIGHTS AND NEEDS**
- **WHAT GOOD IS A “RIGHT TO TREATMENT” IF TREATMENT IS NEITHER AVAILABLE NOR GOOD? WHAT GOOD IS A “RIGHT TO BE IN THE COMMUNITY” WITH NO ROLE, NO RESPECT AND NO RESOURCES?**
- **THE REALITY IS THAT SOME PEOPLE BENEFIT FROM A “NEEDS” ORIENTED HUMAN SERVICE SYSTEM, WHILE**

OTHERS BENEFIT FROM “RIGHTS ORIENTED CONTROLS” ON THAT SYSTEM, BUT A GREAT MANY PEOPLE WILL REQUIRE BOTH RIGHTS AND NEEDS

- **THUS, EMPOWERMENT HAS AS ITS AIM ENHANCING THE POSSIBILITIES FOR PEOPLE TO CONTROL THEIR OWN LIVES**
- **EMPOWERMENT SEES PEOPLE AS FULL HUMAN BEINGS WHO HAVE BOTH NEEDS AND RIGHTS**
- **EMPOWERMENT CONVEYS BOTH A PSYCHOLOGICAL SENSE OF PERSONAL CONTROL OR INFLUENCE AND A CONCERN WITH ACTUAL SOCIAL INFLUENCE, POLITICAL POWER, AND LEGAL RIGHTS**

IMPLICATIONS OF AN EMPOWERMENT MODEL FOR HUMAN SERVICES

- LOOKS AT MANY DIVERSE LOCAL SETTINGS WHERE PEOPLE ARE ALREADY HANDLING THEIR OWN PROBLEMS IN LIVING, IN ORDER TO LEARN HOW THEY DO IT (DIVERGENT REASONING)
- DEMANDS FINDING WAYS TO TAKE WHAT WE LEARN FROM THESE DIVERSE SETTINGS AND SOLUTIONS AND MAKE IT MORE PUBLIC—TO HELP FOSTER POLICIES THAT MAKE IT MORE LIKELY THAT OTHERS NOT NOW HANDLING THEIR PROBLEMS IN LIVING, OR WHO ARE SHUT OUT FROM CURRENT SOLUTIONS, GAIN CONTROL OVER THEIR OWN LIVES

- **CHANGES ROLE OF PROFESSIONALS FROM THAT OF “EXPERT” TO THAT OF “COLLABORATOR”**
- **MANY COMPETENCIES ARE SEEN AS BEING ALREADY PRESENT OR AT LEAST POSSIBLE, GIVEN NICHEs AND OPPORTUNITIES**
- **POOR FUNCTIONING IS SEEN AS A RESULT OF SOCIAL STRUCTURE AND LACK OF RESOURCES WHICH MAKE IT IMPOSSIBLE FOR EXISTING COMPETENCIES TO OPERATE**
- **WHEN NEW COMPETENCIES NEED TO BE LEARNED, THEY ARE BEST LEARNED IN THE CONTEXT OF LIVING LIFE RATHER THAN IN ARTIFICIAL PROGRAMS WHERE THE EXPERT IS IN CHARGE**

- **LENDING ITSELF TO A VARIETY OF LOCALLY RATHER THAN CENTRALLY CONTROLLED SOLUTIONS, WHICH FOSTERS SOLUTIONS BASED ON DIFFERENT ASSUMPTIONS IN DIFFERENT PLACES, SETTINGS AND NEIGHBORHOODS**
- **POLICY DEVELOPMENT CHANGES FROM A TOP-DOWN OR FORWARD MAPPING PROCESS TO A BOTTOM UP OR *BACKWARD MAPPING* PROCESS THAT STARTS WITH PEOPLE AND WORKS BACKWARDS TO TELL OFFICIALS WHAT SOCIAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS ARE NECESSARY (DIVERSITY OVER HOMOGENEITY OF FORM)**

**RECOVERY AS A
RESPONSE TO
EXCLUSION,
DEVALUATION
AND OPPRESSION**

- **RECOVERY REFERS TO THE LIVED OR REAL LIFE EXPERIENCE OF PERSONS AS THEY ACCEPT AND OVERCOME THE CHALLENGE OF THE DISABILITY—IT IS A WAY OF LIFE, AN ATTITUDE AND A WAY OF APPROACHING THE DAY’S CHALLENGES**
- **RECOVERY DEMANDS THAT PEOPLE WITH PSYCHIATRIC DISABILITIES CARRY A NEW MESSAGE OF HOPE, OF HEALING BACK INTO THE COMMUNITY WHERE PEOPLE LIVE, LOVE, WORK AND WORSHIP**
- **RESPONDING TO THIS DEMAND ITSELF IS A VALUED SOCIAL ROLE—BEING IN RECOVERY IS VALUED**
- **THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT IS HELPING TO REMOVE MANY OF THE BARRIERS THAT HAVE**

**HISTORICALLY PREVENTED
PEOPLE WITH PSYCHIATRIC
DISABILITIES FROM ACHIEVING
VALUED ROLES IN OUR SOCIETY**

- **BEING IN RECOVERY MEANS THAT ONE KNOWS ONE HAS CERTAIN LIMITATION—THERE ARE THINGS THAT ONE CANNOT DO**
- **BUT, THESE LIMITATIONS MUST NOT BE CAUSE FOR DESPAIR AND GIVING UP—LEARNING WHAT ONE CANNOT DO OPENS UP THE POSSIBILITIES OF WHAT ONE CAN DO**
- **RECOVERY MEANS BECOMING POLITICIZED AND DEVELOPING A COLLECTIVE AWARENESS OF SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND HUMAN INJUSTICES (THE ROOTS OF EXCLUSION AND DEVALUATION)**

- **RECOVERY MEANS FINDING A COLLECTIVE VOICE FOR PEOPLE WITH PSYCHIATRIC DISABILITIES, DEVELOPING A COLLECTIVE PRIDE AND USING COLLECTIVE POWER TO CHALLENGE AND CHANGE INJUSTICE (SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZATION AND EMPOWERMENT)**