A COMPARISON AND BLENDING OF THE COUNTERCULTURAL PRACTICE MODELS: STRUCTURAL AND NARRATIVE SOCIAL WORK

J. CHRISTOPHER HALL

University of north carolina in Wilmington

The structural and narrative models of social work practice are summarized and compared relative to the social worker's role, the conceptualization of the problem, and the intervention techniques utilized. The two approaches are found to differ significantly in all areas and most specifically in problem conceptualization. This difference is indicative of Kuhn's (1962) observation that different conceptual paradigms are both structured and limited by their theoretical framework. Though both models vary by conceptualization and application, both are determined to be significantly different from the dominant medical model paradigm of "helping" and thus considered countercultural. Finally, it is pointed out that the challenge to the dominant paradigm by these two models allows them to be blended together in social work practice.

Keywords: *structural social work, narrative social work, family therapy in social work practice.*

INTRODUCTION

> *"It is the theory that determines what we can observe."*
> (Albert Einstein)

Arguably, two of the most groundbreaking and influential models in social work have been Minuchin's (1974) structural family and White and Epston's (1990) narrative approach. Each model has contributed uniquely to social work by challenging the status quo to the extent that

new paradigms for viewing and conceptualizing problems have been advanced. In particular, Minuchin, influenced by the works of Bowen (1978) and others (Merton, 1957; Parson, 1951) moved the problem conceptualization from the individual to the family, while White and Epston, influenced strongly by Foucault (1965, 1972, 1975, 1979, 1980, 1992), developed a conceptual and internalized based problem paradigm which places emphasis on viewing the individual, family, and problem in cultural context to the extent that it is often internalized cultural expectations that are considered the problem.

Each theory is representative of a countercultural view. One in which Kuhn (1962) has described as revolutionary in that each offers not an expansion of the dominant paradigm of social work but completely knew paradigms that challenge and de-center the dominant (Derrida, 1978). As Kuhn notes, "the existence of the paradigm sets the problem to be solved" (p. 27), therefore both structural and narrative approaches have changed the perception of the problem; structural, from individual to family; and narrative, from individual or family to cultural. The ripples of these paradigm shifts are being felt today, across disciplines, in both the field of social work and the academic world, as the struggle for the dominant approach to understanding of mental and social ills continues between postmodern and positivist-oriented social work and research methodologies.

This paper will present the structural and the narrative models in the order of their creation and compare and contrast the practices in relation to their view of the social worker's role, the construction of the problem, and the intervention approach. A discussion of how the two approaches can be blended is then presented with case examples. The merging of these approaches is unique to the literature.

STRUCTURAL APPROACH

Salvador Minuchin created the structural family approach while working with the Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic. His approach countered the dominant approach of the period which was behavioral and individualized pathology. Pulling from the intergenerational approach of Bowen (1978) as well from Bateson's (1974) work with schizophrenics

and the double-bind theory, and resting heavily on his Argentinean upbringing, Minuchin began to examine the family as the primary influencing factor of the individual, identifying it as the "matrix of identity" (Minuchin, 1974, p. 12). He conceptualized that what was formerly understood as individual pathology was, in his view, a symptom of a dysfunctional family system. Minuchin defined this dysfunction as a product of unhealthy boundaries between subsystems within the family that restricted the family's ability to adjust both to the developmental needs of a family's individual members as well as to the family's life transitions. Minuchin described the family in developmental terms stating that the family evolves as it progresses through "experiment(s) in living" (Minuchin, 1984, p. 45).

It is important to note that Minuchin's structural approach is both a social work methodology and a theory of family normality (Becvar & Becvar, 2003). In Minuchin's view the healthy family structure is one in which hierarchy is central and the ideal power structure is one in which the parental subsystem is in control. Minuchin has defined three subsystems composing any family; these are the spousal, parental, and sibling subsystems. In addition, the family system may be understood to be of a suprasystem and is influenced through a process of feedback that can either be positive (change inducing) or negative (homeostasis maintaining) (Minuchin, 1984). These subsystems are both connected and separated by boundaries that Minuchin has described as being clear, diffuse, or rigid. Clear boundaries are optimal, allowing for both autonomy and control, while rigid and diffuse boundaries allow for too little adaptability, control and autonomy. Minuchin maintains that the structure of a family is governed by two general constraints, generic, representing a hierarchical structure based on reciprocal and complimentary functions, as well as a second restraint system, the idiosyncratic, which is unique to each family. The latter represent patterns and rules whose origins may have been lost through history but still function in the family (Becvar & Becvar, 2003).

Further discussion of the structural approach will continue when compared with the narrative approach below. The reader's attention is now turned to an introduction to narrative.

NARRATIVE APPROACH

Michael White and David Epston developed the narrative approach during their work as social helpers in Australia and New Zealand. Heavily influenced by the work of Foucault (1965, 1972, 1975, 1979, 1980, 1992), White and Epston took Foucault's work concerning the instruments of power and control in society (i.e. language, discourse, self-subjugation) and developed an approach which aims to help clients liberate themselves from learned oppressive ways of being. For the narrative social worker the problems of clients are linked to discourses into which clients have been overtly and covertly recruited. Discourses are invisible webs of meaning that serve to inhibit self-definition by providing a rigid template of self-understanding and behavior (i.e. gender discourse, heterosexual discourse, racial discourse), as well as ideas or beliefs that masquerade as truth about material things (status representation and power) and science (positivism) (Foucault, 1965). Discourses can originate from multiple sources (i.e. family, region, culture) and are political in that they are almost always a source of control for those who hold power. Foucault (1979) illustrated the concept of self-subjugation as a source of political power through his description of the panopticon, an octagon shaped prison structure in which prisoners do not know when they are being watched and thus regulate their own actions. Foucault compares the panopticon to day-to-day life with discourse serving as the rules of how we should be, society as both the creators of discourse and the enforcers of its authority, and the internalization of discourse serving as the link between power and self-subjugation. If is though this process that Foucault maintains that discourse is political in nature.

For the narrative social worker the goal is to help clients broaden their views of the problem to a cultural or familial context to the extent that clients may begin to see how they are self-subjugating according to discourses' constraints. By exposing self-constraint it is hoped that clients may understand that their story of self, or narrative, has been defined through the problem discourse rather than by themselves. Narratives are events that are linked together in a particular sequence, through time, according to a specific plot (White, 2007). The meaning applied to an

event, and the way it has been perceived, can be affected by the norms and values of the society in which one lives. Having been recruited into accepting cultural ways of understanding, persons are then limited in their perceptions of alternatives. Narrative social work seeks to loosen the grip of the problem story, expose times in the client's life when the problem has been resisted, and to develop a new story of resilience, strength and self-definition. This is achieved through several processes that will be discussed later in the paper, but of particular importance is deconstruction.

Deconstruction is defined as a process of unpacking the taken-for-granted assumptions and ideas underlying social practices that masquerade as truth or reality (Monk, Winslade, Crocket & Epston, 1997). In narrative social work these "taken-for-granted realties" are pulled apart by client and therapist in order to discover their origin and the motives behind their negotiation and construction. The therapist and client act as socio-anthropological detectives in a mutual exploration of cultural beliefs that may have, unknown to the client, influenced the meaning that the client has given to the events in his or her life (Freedman & Combs, 1996). With an initial overview of both models, a comparison of the two will now ensue.

COMPARISON OF THE STRUCTURAL AND NARRATIVE APPROACHES

Comparing the two theories, the major differences lie in the role the social worker is invited to take in the client-social worker relationship. These two differing roles can be understood as either a first- or second-order cybernetic approach. These approaches will now be elaborated.

First-Order Cybernetics. Upon first glance one may assume that all social work approaches describe the ideal role the social worker adopts with a client to be similar, if not the same, but this is not necessarily the case. With all approaches rapport building is paramount and to this end Minuchin espouses joining with the family such that all members feel respected and understood while White and Epston promote establishing a connection or openness with the client. From the initial rapport building the methodologies part.

Structural therapy requires the social worker to accept the role of expert in the session. This expert role is considered a first-order approach. Minuchin states that the therapist is to be the bearer of feedback and the subsequent catalyst for change in the family (1998). Upon joining the family the social worker is to analyze the family interaction, create an enactment of the homeostatic cycle and then break this interaction by interjecting positive feedback in some way that will unbalance the system and promote change. First-order cybernetics is defined as a social worker being outside of the system rather than a part of the system. Those who espouse a first-order view generally accept the notion that one can be objective and can subsequently be in a position to offer a well-educated, objective assessment of the problem (Watzlawick, 1978). A narrative approach takes a different view and is built upon second-order cybernetics. *Second-Order Cybernetics.* Deriving from a postmodern paradigm, narrative relies on a second-order cybernetic approach in which client and social worker co-create understanding in the context of the therapeutic relationship (White & Epston, 1990). From this vantage point, language plays a central role and assumptions about people and meanings in families are set aside in exchange for a not knowing attitude in which the therapist relies not on an assessment from an expert position but on the skills of curiosity and relentless optimism to help understand the client as he or she has come to understand him- or herself in different contexts. A multi-universal view is taken in which all participants' views of the problem are respected. As a part of this acceptance, the social worker's view is understood as one perspective but not the authoritative perspective, as all views are rooted in individual experience that is culturally influenced. Self-reflection and transparency are desired skills of the social worker from a second-order perspective (Becvar, Becvar, 2003) and the context of the social worker client relationship is recognized as being relationally influenced. For example, the culture of the agency will impact the social worker, which impacts the client-social worker relationship, which then impacts the client. Context is not separate from relationships and there is no recognition that objectivity exists. With this respect of views and the understanding of a multi, rather than uni, "verse" comes a broadening of the ways the problem can be understood.

Anderson (1995) espouses broadening the view of the problem to include all members of a family and community who actively "language" about the issue. More recently Seikkula, Arnkil and Eriksson (2003) have opened this concept even further by suggesting a solution focused model of therapy in which a team of interviewers discuss, within twenty-four hours of a crisis, solutions to the problem with family and community members. The goal is to create the vision of a solution early and then ask specifically what each individual *would have done* to have contributed to the arrival of this solution. In summary, the social worker from a second-order perspective serves as a facilitator of ideas and of ways of understanding rather than as expert analyzer of an individual, family, problem or situation as indicated by a first-order approach.

INTERVENTION APPROACH

Structural and narrative approaches differ significantly in terms of methodological intervention. The goals in structural are to (1) join with the family and assume leadership; (2) analyze and determine the structure of the family; and (3) change the structure by introducing positive feedback which disrupts homeostasis and causes the structure to reorganize in a more healthy, hierarchical way. This approach is designed to promote conflict within the family system such that structural change must occur for the system to adapt. Minuchin, like Perls (1973), believed that introducing and facing conflictual situations promoted adaptation and healthy change. From a structural view it was precisely in not facing this painful adaptation that the system became stuck, therefore restructuring is paramount for change.

Narrative, on the other hand, promotes (1) an externalization of the problem. The problem is seen as the problem story, which has encompassed a person or family's identity. (2) Upon naming and externalizing this problem it is then traced in the life of the client to determine its effect on the individual, persons, places and contexts, in order to ascertain how the problem relates with the client or family in different settings. (3) The problem is mapped and deconstructed, with a particular eye toward what the problem's motives may be, where the problem originated, and if the problem is in the best interest of the client or family. (4) Upon

deconstruction of the problem story, times in which the individual or family has "protested against" the problem story are discovered and discussed, making them as vivid as possible through the utilization of landscape of action and landscape of meaning questions (White, 1991). Landscape of action questions are questions which bring a "counter-act" (event of protest) to light looking at what happened and how they were able to offset the problem's influence. While landscape of meaning questions highlight what the act of protest meant for them, what does it say about you and your family that you could stand up to the problem in this way? The goal is to expose the problem story, loosen its grip on the paradigm of the individual or family such that they can see alternate ways of being. (5) This will then allow the family to unpack the origin of the problem story and recognize how they have control over it and to consciously take over defining who they or their family are or would like to be in absence of the problem. They create a new story, a new narrative, a new way of being and understanding themselves and others.

BLENDING STRUCTURAL AND NARRATIVE APPROACHES: ENGAGING IN GAMES OF TRUTH

In Michelle Foucault's late article *Technologies of the Self* (1988) he discussed games of truth as the process of playfully taking unique and often marginalized looks at the ways in which truth can be understood. This involves playing with, and blending, various perspectives. Postmodernism and poststructuralism both encourage the dissolution of binaries and positioning of opposites (Derrida, 1978). Both Foucault and Derrida's ideas call for the possibility of combining these models as mutually exclusive, yet complimentary ways of working. The thought of blending these approaches may be sacrilegious to some diehard followers of either models but in the spirit of postmodernism the blending will be discussed to see if there is common and useful ground for social work. Structural family therapy and narrative therapy have traditionally been seen as opposing forms of practice, in that structural is described as a first order cybernetic model, rooted in modernism with a direct and often confronting style. Narrative has been described as being a second-order cybernetic model of practice and one in which client

understandings are explored and deconstructed to determine if new ideas of self and the relational context may be better suited to client life goals and identity development. A narrative-structural blend is an eclectic approach premised on respect and collaboration, centered in a second-order cybernetic approach (Becvar & Becvar, 2003) with a particular emphasis on the postmodern notions of meaning in the family (Gergen, 2001; White, 1991) coupled with a structural understanding of how the problem has been created and maintained via systemic interaction (Bowen, 1978; Minuchin, 1974).

The overarching theory is one of post-modern eclecticism based on a mutual agreement between therapist and clients as to how the problem will be understood and, specifically in this blended model, it is how family discourse and structure are to be understood. It is important to note that the adoption of a post-modern practice approach is not based on assumptions *about* the family, but rather springs out of a collaborative process *with* the family. This transparent, non-expert role is stressed because through collaboration the piecemeal theory trap described by (Breunlin, Schwartz, & Mac Kune-Karrer, 1997) as "ecology chopping" in which "the whims of the therapist's perceptions and the parochial preferences for models" drive the selection of methodology (p. 93) is avoided. A narrative-structural hybrid process in social work involve the following steps:

1. Joining with the family and building rapport
2. Assessing the structure of the family using structural family techniques
3. Explore how the existing family structure was negotiated
4. Deconstruct the family's discourse of family structure and roles and determine if all family members are benefiting from the family discourse
5. If all members are not benefiting, discuss other possibilities for the way in which the family could create or accept a new more respectful family discourse
6. Assist the family to create this change

Having established the foundational, post-modern theory of a narrative-structural blend the first step (1) is to join with the family and build rapport through a collaborative approach (Anderson, 1995) in which

language is used that matches the family's language and cultural understandings. Adherence to themes of socially created and negotiated meaning, ways of relating and fitting into the family / marriage system is stressed while also using structural techniques such as noticing patterns of communication and role structure within the family.

The second step, (2) is assessing the family structure. Here the social worker seeks to determine how the family is interacting with one another, what the house rules are, and if all members of the family are benefiting from these rules. Benefiting is understood to mean a space where all members of a family feel respected and understood. House rules, expectations, and punishment should be accepted as coming from a place of fairness for all in the family. With this methodology, a narrative-structural blending explores alliances in the family and parental subsystems, as well as sibling subsystems, in an attempt first, to understand the system and later to realign the family with an effective parental coalition (Minuchin, 1974). Example questions to explore a family structure include: Are there children in the home who are being parented? Are those providing the parenting aligned together and are the rules agreed upon and being shared equally? Do the parents want help aligning together? Do parents have a healthy and happy relationship with one another? Do both partners in the relationship have the same power to negotiate the relationship or is one accommodating the other more? If so is this acceptable for both or are animosities present? Does the couple need assistance in renegotiating their relationship?

The third step (3) is understanding how the family structure was negotiated and created. This is the premise of circular causality (Everett, 2000), a non-linear approach in which the system is explored as to its creation and maintenance of the problem rather than a search for cause-and-effect reasoning. This practice has direct links to Bowen's (1978) concept of undifferentiated ego mass, when family members are not separated emotionally from one another (enmeshed). In these cases the family, and particularly the parents, are assisted in engaging in a conversation concerning their attachment to their family of origin provided that the parent's view the problem in this way. From a systemic perspective the goals in such conversations are to explore triangulation (two people aligned against one), to reflect on a genogram (a graphic representation

of a family's generational structure), and to help them differentiate (separate emotionally from their family of origin). If problems are inter-generational, circular questioning is used to either broaden or narrow the perception of the problem. In most cases the questioning is used to broaden the problem view such that the family can "see" it as generational rather than individually centered. With this new "nonlinear" view a more systemic solution can be explored.

The fourth step (4) is to deconstruct the discourses that envelop the family and explore whether these ideas are of benefit for all family members. For example, a family may have a traditional belief that the husband is the one who makes all the important decisions in the family. Deconstructing questions include: Where did this idea come from? Who benefits from this idea? Who doesn't benefit? Is this a fair idea for all in the family? Are there other ways to think about family? Would any of these other ideas be more egalitarian? Would the family want to adopt some new ideas about how to interact as a family? The main focus of these questions is to unearth and make visible ideas that may have been taken for granted about family. Talking about these ideas affords the family the ability to decide openly about family beliefs that affect the structure of the family.

The fifth step (5) is to openly discuss with the family if the current family discourse is benefiting all in the family. This is not to be mistaken as a space for adolescents to claim that all rules are bad, or that they demand absolute freedom, but rather is a conversation in which current ideas of parenting are explored. Are rules fair and are they age appropriate? At what age does the family see the children as adults? Do the children know this? Are the parents parenting in a way that helps the kids become successful adults? With regard to the spousal or romantic relationship between adults, do they have shared ideas about the future when the children leave? Do they have a shared vision of the future? What are their ideas about their relationship when their children are gone and how can they begin to build that relationship now.

The final step (6) is to help the family to make changes appropriate to the decisions they have made about the family discourse. This can happen very naturally provided that all members of the family are on board with the changes. A shared family vision is extremely important

and changing the beliefs in the family will lead to easier behavioral and structural changes. In the case where one member may not wish the change to occur, ongoing family support with a focus on this family member can help.

CASE EXAMPLE 1: BLENDED FAMILY AND PARENTING

To facilitate this discussion it may be helpful to discuss an actual case as an example. I was working with a blended family in which the mother (36 years old) and biological son (14 years old) were at odds and this was spilling over into the relationship between the mother and her new husband (40 years old). Over the course of two visits with the family I built rapport, assessed the family structure, and recognized that it was still being formed because of the newness of their relationship. The new husband had moved in with the family only two months prior to calling me. When speaking with the mother it became clear that she wanted her new husband to assist with the parenting or her son. From a narrative perspective the discourse of parenting was explored with the family by asking the three of them where their ideas of parenting came from. The mother talked about how she came from a close two-parent family and wanted to emulate that for her son. The new husband had come from a family in which his father was very close to him and was concerned because he did not want to replace his new stepson's father. He stated, "I would never want another man to replace my father". Upon hearing this, the son began to cry and shared that he missed his biological father very much and had resentment for his new stepfather.

Finding the source of the disagreement and the family discourses involved in the current family relationship, we talked about new ways that the family could come together. It became clear that the mother wanted to co-parent with the new husband and that the son was open to "having a stepfather but not a new father". With approval from the son, structural family therapy was used to help clarify and solidify how the two parents would accommodate and negotiate their parenting and narrative was used to discuss openly their conceptualization of their new

family. In the case example the use of each step of the narrative-structural approach was utilized and the result was that the new husband stepped into a father role, the stress came off of the mother, and the son got to know the stepfather a bit more and relaxed about having a second fatherly figure in his life.

CASE EXAMPLE 2: THE MEANING MAKING OF RELATIONSHIPS

 Both narrative and structural have a long history of addressing relationship issues and as discussed previously there is overlap, and though they are different in their approaches they can be used together. One specific way is through the concept of individuation. Minuchin maintains that in order for a person to enter into a relationship that is balanced each individual in the relationship should be individuated from their family of origin (Minuchin, 1974). White and Epston (1990) hold that each person develops a narrative, or story of self, and that there can be multiple ways of understanding ourselves in relationships. Both agree, however, that relationships are collaborations with narrative describing this as co-construction, and Minuchin describing it as negotiated and accommodation. Both of these concepts are applied in the following case.

I worked with an unmarried couple with a seven-year old biological child. The couple described themselves not as boyfriend and girlfriend but as "friends with benefits". This is a new relationship style that is indicative of a postmodern understanding of relationship in that members are free to construct themselves in ways that are most fulfilling for them regardless of traditional relationship ideals.

One of the goals of counseling at this point was not to have them solidify their relationship in marriage, but to meet them where they are in how they choose to construct their relationship. The issue they came in to discuss was how they would parent their child as "friends with benefits". He found himself frustrated in the relationship because he wanted more time with his child. From a narrative perspective we discussed how they were both effected by conflict. How did the conflict begin? What exactly is the conflict about? Instead of focusing on fixing the conflict

we focused on the effects of the conflict on all of the family members. We externalized and personified this conflict and it turns out that conflict keeps them separated and hurts their relationship. It works to confuse how they wish to interact. They both decided that they wanted to work against conflict and one way they wanted to do it was to clarify their relationship with one another. At this point it made sense to shift to structural family therapy to help in this clarification.

They both wished more structure and struggled to come up with a way that was beneficial to them both because each had come from families who were chaotic and they had no model of how to be together, how to parent. I asked them if they would be willing to hear one way of coming together and explained structurally how they were in two different relationships: a "spousal relationship" and a "parental relationship". This conversation turned out to be pivotal in their change. They both strongly embraced the idea of having two relationships and began to work to keep their parenting separate from their own issues in their relationship with one another. This immediately served to reduce the anxiety in their child, and also served narratively to gain an edge on the conflict that had been externalized.

As the parental relationship began to flourish over several weeks, this brought them close together and it came out that she was frustrated by his lack of commitment to her and she felt he was a "player, and once a player he will always be a player". He found her to be controlling "like all women are". As I listened, my narrative ear picked up that both were operating under the influence of gender discourse.

He had a belief that real men didn't commit to one woman but played the field, while she had a belief that women were to find one man and change him from the "player" lifestyle. I explored both relationship discourses simultaneously from a narrative perspective, deconstructing these discourses. I also utilized the theory of individuation from a structural perspective, asking myself were they both individuated from their family of origins and did they have enough independence to think for themselves or were they caught in the rut of past roles.

Using both narrative and structural together we collaboratively determined that he had escaped a very impoverished past where he

did not have a father and survived by adopting a discourse of masculinity described as "the thug life". He also grew up in the absence of a father and felt like he had to be the father to his younger siblings and "never wanted to do that again". Narratively he was self-subjugating to a discourse, while structurally he lacked individuation from his family and was reacting extremely to that situation rather than to the current situation with his partner.

The wife grew up with a father who also participated in "the thug life" and she swore growing up that she would never live that way. From a narrative perspective she adopted a belief that she had to protect and control men, while structurally it could be understood that she did not individuate but, instead, replicated past relationship patterns in her current relationships.

In our discussions we explored the "thug life discourse" and deconstructed it for both, then discussed the structural concept of individuation from the patterns and thoughts of past family of origin experiences, this allowed them enough space to use structural to accommodate and negotiate a new relationship, while disconnecting themselves from the thug life discourse.

CONCLUSION

Both structural and narrative models are countercultural in that they challenge the dominant individual, pathologizing paradigm of the medical model. The structural approach was greatly beneficial in the broadening of the definition of "the problem" by focusing attention on its systemic nature as family functional and relational. Minuchin pointed out that every system is perfectly designed to achieve the problematic symptom unique to that family. While the structural model broadened the problem focus from individual to family, it did so from a first-order perspective. Social workers were still seen as expert, apart from the family, analyzing and directing to assist. To utilize family therapy lexicon, Minuchin introduced a first-order change into the therapeutic modality. Narrative represents a second-order change in that it changes the therapeutic paradigm by recognizing that the therapist is as much a part of

the system as the family within the therapeutic context. Further, both therapist and family are in the soup together. As part of the same society and, often, same culture, all individuals in the therapeutic context are influenced by the dominant discourses prevalent in that society. With this realization comes the opening of definitional space in that therapist and client(s) are co-creating problem definitions in context. Hare-Mustin (1994) points this out brilliantly when she states that any therapeutic relationship which does not recognize and discuss discourse is one of oppression and social control.

In conclusion, the structural approach changed the focus of therapy from the individual to the family system. Narrative moves from the family to the society through the exposure and exploration of discourse and self-subjugation, ushering in a new paradigm for therapy. Using post-modern theory and Foucault's games of truth, both models can be blended by social workers to great effect.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, H. (1995). Collaborative language systems: Toward a postmo-dern therapy. In R. H. Mikesell, D. D. Lusterman, & S. H. McDaniels (eds.), *Integrating family therapy: Handbook of family psychology and systems theory*. Washington, DC: APA, p. 27–44.
2. Bateson, G. (1974). Double bind. In S. Brand (Ed.), *II cybernetic frontiers*. New York: Random House, p. 9–33.
3. Becvar, D. S., & Becvar, R. J. (2003). *Family therapy: A systemic integration* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
4. Bowen, M. (1978). *Family therapy in clinical practice.* New York: Aronson.
5. Breunlin, D. C., Scwartz, R. C., & Mac Kune-Karrer, B. (1997). *Metaframeworks: Transcending the models of family therapy* (rev. ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
6. Derrida, J. (1978). *Writing and difference*. University of Chicago Press.
7. Everett, C. A. (Ed.). (2000). *Family therapy glossary.* Washington, DC: AAMFT.
8. Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization: A history of insanity in the age of reason.* New York: Vintage.
9. Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge.* New York: Vintage.
10. Foucault, M. (1975). *The birth of a clinic: An archaeology of medical perception.* New York: Vintage.

11. Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of a prison.* New York: Vintage.

12. Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–77.* New York: Pantheon.

13. Foucault, M. (1992). *Death and the labyrinth: The world of Raymond Roussel.* New York: Doubleday.

14. Foucault, M., Martin, L. H., Gutman, H., & Hutton, P. H. (1988). *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. Univ of Massachusetts Press.

15. Freedman, J., & Combs, G. (1996). *Narrative therapy*. New York: Norton.

16. Gergen, K. J. (2001). The saturated self. New York: Basic Books.

17. Hare-Mustin, R. (1994). Discourses in the mirrored room: A postmodern analysis of therapy. *Family Process*, 33, p. 19–35.

18. Kuhn, T. S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

19. Merton, R. (1957). *Social Theory and Social Structure*, revised and enlarged. London: The Free Press of Glencoe.

20. Minuchin, S. (1974). *Families and family therapy.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

21. Minuchin, S. (1984). *Family kaleidoscope.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

22. Minuchin, S. (1998). Where is the family in narrative family therapy? *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 24 (4), p. 397–403.

23. Monk, G., Winslade, J., Crocket, K., & Epston, D. (1997). *Narrative therapy in practice: The archaeology of hope*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

24. Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Routledge, London.

25. Perls, F. (1973). *The gestalt approach and eye witness to therapy.* Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavioral Books.

26. Seikkula, J., Arnkil, T. A, & Eriksson, E. (2003). Social networks in post-modern society: Open and anticipation dialogues in network meetings. *Family Process*, 42 (2), p. 14–31.

27. Watzlawick, P. (1978). *The language of change.* New York: W. W. Norton.

28. White, M. (1991). Deconstruction and therapy. *Dulwich Center Newsletter*, 3, p. 21–40.

29. White, M. (2007). *Maps of narrative practice*. WW Norton & Company.

30. White, M., & Epston, D. (1990). *Narrative means to therapeutic ends.* New York: W. W. Norton.

J. CHRISTOPHER HALL

KULTŪRIŠKAI PRIEŠINGŲ PRAKTIKOS MODELIŲ LYGINIMAS IR SUSILIEJIMAS: STRUKTŪRINIS IR NARATYVU GRĮSTAS SOCIALINIS DARBAS

SANTRAUKA

Struktūrinis ir naratyvu grįstas socialinio darbo praktikos modeliai yra apibendrinami ir palyginami analizuojant socialinio darbuotojo vaidmenį, problemos apibrėžimą ir naudojamas intervencijas. Visais analizuotais aspektais nustatyti pastebimi skirtumai tarp šių dviejų modelių. Ypač skiriasi problemos konceptualizavimas. Šie skirtumai paaiškinami Kuno (1962) pastebėjimais, kad skirtingas konceptualias paradigmas struktūruoja, apriboja jų teorinis pagrindas. Nors abu modeliai skirtingai konceptualizuojami ir taikomi, jie pastebimai skiriasi nuo dominuojančio medicininio „pagalbos" modelio ir yra svarstomi kaip kultūriškai priešingi arba neigiantys dominuojančią „pagalbos" kultūrą. Taigi struktūrinio ir naratyvu grįsto socialinio darbo modeliai praktikoje susilieja, keldami iššūkių dominuojančiai socialinio darbo paradigmai.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: struktūrinis socialinis darbas, naratyvu grįstas socialinis darbas, šeimos terapija socialinio darbo praktikoje.