From Wrapped Differences towards Diversity Sensitive Social Work?

An intersectional discourse analysis of the Protective Wraps-model

© EG pictures 2012

Utrecht University
MA-1 Comparative Women's Studies in Culture and Politics

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Gloria Wekker
Second reader: Dr. Eva Midden

Esther Goedendorp
0433306
25-09-2012

Index

My Protective Wraps

I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Gloria Wekker for being my academic Protective Wrap; without her support, inspiring guidance and calmness, I had not been able to finish this thesis at all.

My friends and my aunt, who did not give up on me and have sent me positive thoughts, sunshine and raincoats from Kathmandu, Melbourne, Utrecht and the Merelstraat. Thank you all for travelling by my side..

And last, but not least, I would like to thank my (grand)parents for their financial protection, even though I am 'a disobedient daughter[1]*! ☺*

---

[1] Braidotti, R 'Dimpna en de figuratie van de krijgsheldin' (2007:266)

1. Introduction

1.1 This thesis and me

Travelling makes me happy and feel alive. From the day I left the small white Christian village I grew up, to move to the city, I felt encouraged to move beyond more borders, to explore bigger worlds and to hear different stories. My ideas about society are enriched by my bachelor in Anthropology, my travels, and by my work in Utrecht's multi-ethnic social field, where I coordinated a reading-to-children project ('VoorleesExpress') for migrant families. This thesis brings many parts of me together and confronted me with new limits and borders, like the required academic language to make myself heard as a newcomer in Gender Studies and the necessary reflection on where I come from, academically, socially and personally and what consequences this has for this thesis. I see myself as a connector, someone who wants to bring different worlds, ideas and perspectives together on a small scale, like encounters between white Dutch students and migrant children at the 'VoorleesExpress', or introducing my white Dutch brother to my Moroccan Dutch friend or invite my grandmother from the countryside to go to the theater in the city. I evidently choose topics that touch me personally and evoke personal quests and introspection.

My focus in this thesis is the Protective Wraps-model ('Beschermjassen') that offers transcultural[2] assistance to migrant families. Transcultural system therapist Kitlyn Tjin A Djie developed this model and provides insight into her journey: her own history as a migrant, her professional experiences as a social worker in the Netherlands and her personal experiences as a member of collective family systems are all connected and all contributed to the Protective Wraps-model. The journey I have started by writing this thesis consists of many different aspects as well and I will try to intertwine them into a coherent story of personal experiences and ideas and academic challenges.

The Protective Wraps-model inspires me and teaches me about the strengths and transfer of issues of collective family systems; perspectives still underexposed in Dutch society. This knowledge touches me for several reasons. First, on a social level, because Tjin A Djie speaks up for collective family systems that seem to be ignored in social work institutions, and while their essence remains unrecognized, exclusion and injustice are operative and relate to the mono-cultural white Dutch perspective in society. Tjin A Djie's work affected me personally too, because it made me aware of what the exclusionary mechanisms of social work institutions mean for my family, also related to dominant (white Dutch) values and perspectives. In my extended families, (hyper)sensitivity is at play in both family lines. If you are very sensitive in a society

---

[2] I prefer using the term *intercultural*, instead of *transcultural*, although both terms are used interchangeable in literature and have similar meanings. For the readability I only use *transcultural* if I cite my sources literally.

like the Dutch, that values ratio, achievements and progress and you are not able to keep this pace, this often results in burn-outs, depressions and other psychosocial problems. This is not only my personal experience, but also the experience of two of my aunts, nieces and my dear father. When psychosocial assistance is offered, but focuses on re-socialization and 'fitting in again', this often leads to alienation and more psychosocial difficulties. The qualities of sensitivity become overlooked or misunderstood, while if they were recognized as personal or social strengths and if these specific clients were 'wrapped with protection', they could anchor and empower themselves, instead of being labeled as 'weak, victims or mentally unstable'. These personal experiences and observations made me aware of the risk of disciplining 'clients with psychosocial problems', who can be, viewed in another light, migrants in their liminal stage 'in-between cultures' or very sensitive persons who do not fit in the rational, stress resistance, targets achieving parts of society. In other words, how the dominant discourse in social work reflects the dominant discourse(s) on difference in society and the serious impact on the lives of people who differ from the norms.

'They should learn Dutch'
Before I elaborate on the profession of social work and its objectives, I will share two other stories grounded in my family background, but with another message about assistance and today's Dutch society. My mother works as a nurse and she treats people with skin diseases. Many Turkish Dutch ladies are under her treatment and my mother worries about their recovery. Despite the treatment, their skin does not improve. She wonders whether they understand her instructions and whether the accompanying husbands translate the given information about the treatment correctly. And she concludes: 'They should learn Dutch!'. My sister works as a physiotherapist in Rotterdam and experiences similar difficulties. Her clientele is multi-ethnic and very diverse, related to class, age and gender. When she treats patients who do not belong to the dominant white Dutch community, her biggest frustration is 'that they answer 'yes' to all her questions' and she concludes that 'they do not take her seriously'.
To me it is alarming that my sister, 25 years old, white Dutch and educated in Rotterdam, a city that has had a multi-ethnic environment for years, is not skilled in intercultural competences. The same goes for my mother, while she works in a hospital, the place where all people should get appropriate care. Although I consider them both as skilled and dedicated professionals, I wonder for how long Dutch society will persist its 'they should learn Dutch'-attitude, while forgetting to reflect on its own excluding mechanisms and ethnocentric framework?

I also met many migrant families, who joined the reading-to-children project. I remember many shocking living room conversations with Moroccan, Turkish and Egyptian migrant families, about their difficulties and challenges as migrants in the Netherlands. Their stories about hostile hospitals, 'wrong' or no medication, appointments with GP's 'who did not listen', 'did not take them seriously' or 'did not want to give a prescription, mammography or hospital referral'. Feelings of fear, disappointment, depression, misunderstanding, frustration: many personal stories with similar characteristics.

The gap between the experiences of my mother and sister and the stories of migrant families, points to a structural issue in Dutch multi-ethnic society, namely that not all institutions are adapted to today's multi-ethnic society. The mentioned examples are my personal observations and experiences related to physical and psychosocial health and they fell into place when I read Tjin A Djie's work. I consider physical and psychosocial health both delicate and important topics. However, in this thesis I will focus on psychosocial health and social work professionals, because in my view and personal experiences, problems associated with psychosocial assistance make clients even more vulnerable than problems with physical health. In particular when viewed in the light of Dutch society, where social work methodologies are Western-oriented and are, in the words of Campbell and Essed (1994) 'strongly analytical, rational, verbal and aimed at cause and effect- relations'. This is in contrast to many other philosophies, which construct a more intuitive and comprehensive approach to the world and which produce different subjectivities and 'conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, the awareness of oneself and the way s/he understands his/her relationship with the world' (Wekker 1994:46; Weedon 1987:32).

1.1.1 Migrants & social work

According to the 'Professional Code of Social Workers[3]', the aim of social work is 'to improve the social functioning of persons, both by working with the client herself and her environment and to strengthen the client's social positioning and situation, to let the client discover her own qualities and to 'relearn' how s/he can be part of society' (NVMW 2006:5). Social workers perform many different tasks, such as prevention, intervention, psychosocial counseling, advice, practical services, social research, social reporting and signaling for social policy (NVMW 2012; Holstvoogd 2006). They work at very diverse organizations, institutions and social fields, like hospitals, nursing homes, GGZ[4], schools, youth care, child protection, clinics for addiction care, debt assistance, companies and social work institutions (NVMW 2012; Holstvoogd 2006). So if

---

[3] Beroepsprofiel Maatschappelijk Werk, to be found on the website of the Dutch Association for Social Workers (www.nvmw.nl)

[4] Geestelijke Gezondheidszorg or Mental Health Care

someone asks for (psycho)social assistance, it is very likely that s/he ends up with a social worker. Psychosocial counseling is an important aspect of assistance offered by social workers and this assistance is supposed to be accessible for everyone. These assumptions in combination with the aim of the social work profession 'to make a client part of society again' (NVMW 2012) are important reasons for me to critically reflect on conventional Dutch social work institutions. In particular, when viewed in the light of social power inequalities in Dutch multi-ethnic society with regard to gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality.

Boedjarath and Van Bekkum (1997) edited a book about intercultural assistance[5], which contextualizes the specific life experiences of migrants and the psychosocial problems they struggle with. Bozkir (1997) describes the impact of family reunification, shifted and strained family relationships and absent fathers; Boedjarath (1997) focuses on the perception of sexual problems related to the loss of traditional social networks; Araz (1997) underlines the possible loyalty conflicts within collective family systems related to arranged marriages and migration; and Kasi (1997) elaborates on diagnostic difficulties with Hindi Surinamese people related to 'self-preservation' or 'madness' in the context of mourning and possession. This is not to say that all psychosocial problems of migrants have to do with their history of migration or their possible experience with discrimination and social exclusion, but the impact of migration and the perspective of the (migrant) client should be taken seriously, to be able to offer appropriate assistance and to prevent the reinforcement of exclusion.

The British psychiatrist Suman Fernando points to the relation between the high numbers of black patients diagnosed with schizophrenia in Great-Britain and 'the essentially racist society' and states that 'stereotypes of dangerousness and primitiveness come into play in a context where society tends to turn to psychiatry for social control' (Fernando 1993). Then, how should the 'fact' be interpreted that in Dutch society, schizophrenia is diagnosed *two to six times more* with Moroccan, Surinamese and Antillean young men (15-24 of age) than with white Dutch young men[6]? Diagnoses like this can have far-reaching consequences for the ones labeled schizophrenic and should be understood in the context of a society with a multi-ethnic reality, but with white Dutch mono-cultural institutional foundations. Choenni (1987) points out the difficulties in Dutch society regarding the recognition and acknowledgement of racism, in particular in established institutions.

These topics matter and are related to the discourses on difference, equality and sameness in Dutch multi-ethnic society. Moreover, these topics raise questions on

---

[5] 'Een blik in de transculturele hulpverlening'
[6] page 50 'Migratie en gezondheid: Feiten en cijfers 2011' published by Pharos, Utrecht

inclusion and exclusion, power relations, diversity and the treatment of migrants in social work.

I studied Anthropology and now Gender Studies to work with topics I care about. To observe, analyze, understand, contextualize, speak up against discrimination and exclusion and to work from an intersectional diversity perspective. Luckily, I am allowed to use my sensibility to and frustrations about injustice and inequalities as fuel for my academic knowledge, and hereby I will take this opportunity.

Thesis structure

In this first part of the introductory chapter I have explained why this thesis is about social work and why this topic matters, socially and personally. In the following paragraph I will elaborate on the history of social work in Dutch society and in particular on the movements concerned with gender sensitive and intercultural social work. This historical framework contributes to the contextualization of the Protective Wraps-model within social work developments. In the second chapter I will focus on the theory, methodology and methods I have used in the research process. I will also mention the difficulties I have experienced in the 'liminal' stage between the disciplines of Anthropology and Gender Studies and refer to my research questions. The third chapter is the analytical part of this thesis and consists of my intersectional discourse analysis of the Protective Wraps-model, which offers transcultural assistance to migrant families. In the final chapter, I will come back to my research questions and conclude on my analytical findings.

1.2 History of social work

In this paragraph I will focus on the history of social work in the Netherlands by highlighting the developments that have been influential in the light of gender and ethnicity. For me the importance lies in the understanding of how structural power relations in Dutch society have shaped the history of social work and to work towards a combination of gender sensitive and intercultural social work.

According to Waaldijk (1996:99), Marie Muller-Lulofs (1854-1954) provided important foundations for modern social work in the Netherlands, by her founding of the first school for social work in 1899 in Amsterdam and her articles on 'effective visits to the poor'[7]. Social work at that time was strongly related to Christian morality, concerns with 'the poor', female devotion and the first feminist movement of white Dutch middle-class women (Waaldijk 1996:101;117). As Felten describes, the white middle-class female 'Angel of the house' was allowed to start a 'professional career' as a social worker where she could express her assumed female qualities of care, devotion

---

[7] In Dutch 'doelmatig armbezoek'

and emotions (Felten 2006; Waaldijk 1996). Felten (2006:10-11) refers to the class hierarchies that were operative, where the 'civilized ladies' had a 'moralizing approach' (Nijnenhuis 1997) and often saw the working class 'as a different 'race' (Grever 2000). These power relations, where class ('race') and gender worked together with Christian devotion, characterized the social work paradigm until the 1950s. A professional methodology for social work developed after the Second World War (Felten 2006:11).

In the 1950's, Marie Kamphuis fulfilled an important role in professionalizing social work by introducing the American methodology of social casework (Waaldijk 1996:99). This method focuses on the contact and relationship between client and professional and aims to 'start where the client is' and for 'awareness on your position as social worker' (Boet & Waaldijk 2003:51). Kamphuis' innovative ideas transformed social work as a profession and left the 'white female middle-class devotion, care and servitude' behind (Felten 2006; Waaldijk 1996). Social casework has its roots in social- and behavioral sciences and this turned social work into a 'more gender neutral and objective profession' that shaped the so-called professional relationship between social worker and client (Felten 2006:12-13). Despite the increased attention to this relationship, hierarchical power relations between social worker and client were still at play.

1.2.1 Social work & gender sensitivity

In the professional relationship between social worker and client that developed within social casework, not all Kamphuis' key points were implemented to everyone's satisfaction. Around 1975 the Dutch VHV[8]-movement ('feminist assistance') emerged. This was the first movement that claimed space for a form of diversity in the health discourse in the Netherlands. In the book 'Vrouwenhulpverlening 1975-2000' Van Mens-Verhulst and Waaldijk (2008) describe the impact of the feminist movement in the 1970s on the developments of this VHV-movement and its critical views on health care and social work. The main criticism from the VHV-movement was the lack of attention and sensitivity to the voice of women as clients and patients in medical and psychosocial assistance. With their specific complaints and experiences as women, the movement underlined not only their different physical and psychosocial needs compared to men, but also pointed to their different and unequal positioning as women in society. From the early 1970s on, many women gathered in support or self-help groups to discuss their lives, their dissatisfaction with their positions, roles and opportunities in society. They connected their dissatisfaction and hopelessness with their physical and psychosocial problems as women and by doing so feminist social

---

[8] Vrouwenhulpverlening, freely translated 'feminist assistance'

work developed. Personal experiences from menopausal symptoms to concealed domestic and sexual violence were turned into political claims and women as a group claimed their space and wanted recognition for their needs and gender[9] specific treatments (Van Mens-Verhulst & Waaldijk 2008:15). In the first methodological publication[10] in 1978 on feminist social work (also: 'women's self-help'), the focus was on several principles, like working in peer groups ('lotgenoten') where personal and political aspects intertwined. Also, the symmetrical relation between professionals and clients and mutual recognition and identification were important parts of the 'collective process of awareness'. This was a very different approach for the social workers, educated with a 'neutral' and distant relation with their clients. Another principle was the rejection of separate categories of assistance and to bring social work, educational work and community work together to solve women's problems, instead of distinguishing between personal and structural or individual and social problems (Van Mens-Verhulst 2008:86-87).

As Van Mens-Verhulst and Waaldijk (2008:29) point out, the VHV-aspirations for gender specific care were based on the assumption that they represented all women in the Netherlands. As a collectivity of women they fought for emancipation, recognition for their differences from men and focused on the similarities between women. The 'sameness of being women' was productive in the way that it transformed attitudes in social work, because the women's groups created opportunities to discuss the different positions taken by client and social worker. Awareness was raised and created room for change in the perspective and approach towards female clients. Thus, feminist assistance influenced social work enormously.

However, the women that were represented in the VHV-movement were mainly white Dutch middle-class women, thus their dominant perspective infused the struggle for gender specific care. Despite the presence of black and migrant women within the feminist movement, there was little space and recognition for their different positioning as women of color in Dutch society. As the Surinamese social worker Marlène Babel[11] remark in retrospect on the 1970s Dutch feminist movement: 'Self-determination, self-reliance and learning to set personal boundaries were all concepts related to the individuality of the white Dutch I-culture and not so much to the aspirations of black women who joined the feminist movement' (Naezer 2008:111). Although there existed a plurality of perspectives on psychosocial health under the

---

[9] In the book the term 'sex specific care' is used, but because the unequal positioning of women is acknowledged as an important aspect of this sex specific care and of the VHV-framework, I decided to translate this as gender specific care.

[10] 'Van binnen uit, vrouwen over welzijnswerk en zelforganisatie' edited by FemSoc writing collective Vlijtig Liesje, published by SARA in Amsterdam in 1978

[11] Social worker at 'DE MAAN' (organization for feminist assistance) in 1988, chapter 'Stichting DE MAAN (1981-1992)' written by Marijke Naezer in Vrouwenhulpverlening 1975-2000 (2008:103-118)

same VHV-umbrella, diversity among women regarding their ethnicity, sexual orientation and age was less recognized and acknowledged within the VHV-movement. Even though the politicized feminist social work groups linked women's problems with their position of social inequality, other Dutch standards as hetero-normativity and whiteness were not deconstructed as influential aspects of specific women's social lives and their identity construction.

1.2.2 Social work & cultural/ethnic[12] sensitivity
The development of intercultural[13] assistance and counseling started in the same time period as the VHV-movement. As psychiatrist Frank Kortmann (2003:9) argues, the mental health industry 'slowly started to realize that it lacked knowledge and skills to treat patients with a different cultural background than the Dutch'. In the WRR[14]-report of 1989, the Dutch government focuses on health institutions and their accessibility for 'allochthons', because every institution should be accessible for all citizens of the Netherlands (Leito & Van Bekkum 1997:26). Leito and Van Bekkum (1997:23) state that between 1980 and 1990 many courses and projects were created for migrant assistance within the AGGZ[15], but structural intercultural changes were not implemented. Interculturalisation is often understood as gathering knowledge about certain cultures or hiring ethnically different (non-white Dutch) professionals. Although these factors matter and contribute to an intercultural approach, structural institutional changes should be made as well. Leito and Van Bekkum (1997:24) exemplify that in the context of structural interculturalisation 'ethnocentrism, the relation between racism and mental health, mono-culturalism and interdisciplinary cooperation' should be taken into account as well. Otherwise, professionals and clients with a background that differs from the dominant white Dutch are not truly included and organizations keep on working from an assimilation perspective. Many Black Migrant and Refugee-women (BMR)[16] have similar experiences as Black Migrant and Refugee-clients and professionals in the former VHV-organizations, where they have struggled for 'structural changes towards multi-culturalisation, in terms of policy, attitude, values, views, working culture and representatives in board and administration' (Naezer 2008:113).

---

[12] In Gender Studies the use of ethnicity is more common than the use of culture. I understand both meanings as interrelated, but consider it important to mention them both in relation to social work. When Dutch society is concerned I choose multi-ethnic, to make sure white Dutch ethnicity is included as well.

[13] Interculturalisation and transculturalisation are both used in literature and have similar meanings. I prefer the term interculturalisation, but will use transcultural(isation) when my sources do.

[14] Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid or Scientific Council for Government Policy

[15] Algemene Geestelijke GezondheidsZorg or General Mental Health Care, later on named 'GGZ' that offers psychosocial assistance as well

[16] Black, Migrant and Refugee women, in Dutch: zwarte, migranten en vluchtelingenvrouwen

Van Dijk and Boedjarath et al (2000:118) point to another key factor in intercultural assistance, namely the relation between professionals and clients and the necessity of 'improving cultural sensitivity and pioneering in professional practice among social workers'. Also, they focus on the improvement of skills and participation of migrant clients, to contribute to their representation and power in Dutch GGZ-institutions. Transcultural system therapist Jessurun (2010:28) mentions 'intercultural skills' for social workers as one of the key aspects of intercultural assistance. She emphasizes the importance of self-reflection for social workers and 'awareness on the role that one's own background, values and views play in (professional) action and thought'. Therefore, Jessurun (2010:28) insists that 'gathering knowledge and gaining insights into one's own ethnicity is just as important as knowledge about the client's culture and mindset' which concerns 'both the (white) Dutch as the migrant therapist[17]'. This reflexivity combined with a focus on dialogue, reciprocity and equality in the client-social worker relationship form the basic principles of intercultural assistance (Jessurun 2010; Felten 2006; Oude Avenhuis 2004; Kortmann 2003).

Van Dijk and Boedjarath et al (2000:115) wrote a manifesto for intercultural mental health ('GGZ') in the 21st century and they make a plea for cultural criticism as inherent part of interculturalisation, because the Dutch GGZ 'embodies the dominant white cultural values' and therefore is no neutral or inclusive institution. As Van Dijk and Boedjarath et al (2000:116) mention in their manifesto, migrants still 'lack political-economic power and cultural representation in the Netherlands'. Unfortunately, there is no strong migrant movement to engage in a debate with the dominant white Dutch majority (Van Dijk and Boedjarath 2000:116). This makes the struggle for interculturalisation and migrant assistance more difficult, because professionals who work intercultural still take up solo-positions and cannot change social work institutions all by themselves. In particular when project-based initiatives are not translated into structural funding and implementation and when intercultural pioneers resign, because they are tired of the everyday fighting to battle with racist stereotyping, prejudices and exclusion (Van Dijk and Boedjarath 2000:118; May 2010). This struggle for recognition and inclusion has similarities with the experiences of the VHV-movement, but differs in the social positionings of her participants, since white Dutch middle-class women still take up a more powerful positioning in Dutch society than women and men with a migrant background and their white allies.

May (2010) criticizes the (white Dutch) conviction within Dutch mental health institutions that 'one protocol or guideline fits all', because this view overlooks gender, class and ethnic differences and health-seeking behavior. However, he focuses mainly

---

[17] Jessurun uses the word therapist. Although the profession of therapist and social worker differ, the skills related to intercultural assistance are similar, so they can be understood interchangeable.

on ethnicity when he states that the lack of inclusion of GGZ-institutions reflects the Dutch social climate, that is dominated by 'fear for 'allochthons' and Islam', in particular after 9/11 and the murder of Theo van Gogh and Pim Fortuyn (May 2010). Therefore, May (2010) disagrees with the division between mainstream institutions for clients from the white Dutch dominant group and specific institutions for 'ethnically different' clients, because this reinforces a social gap between them and suggests that 'being allochthonous is a disease instead of a demographic characteristic'. He makes a plea for intercultural mental care institutions that assist all clients properly and underlines that exclusion, discrimination and misunderstanding are the key problems in intercultural assistance instead of the cultural/ethnic characteristics of the ethnic Other (May 2010).

In this light, Leito and Van Bekkum (1997:29) state that 'in all symptoms and syndromes that migrant clients experience more frequently than dominant white Dutch clients, migration and uprooting-traumas play a role, often related to loss and mourning, but presented by somatic and magical complaints'. These symptoms are often intertwined with complaints related to injury due to discrimination (Leito and Van Bekkum 1997:29). Therefore, the client's history of migration and social position both deserve attention and recognition within (intercultural) mental health assistance and should not be overlooked. However, the impact of gender is usually not viewed in relation to discrimination or social position, nor is there attention for the intertwined relation between gender and ethnicity. This is unfortunate, because gender and ethnicity (and other axes of signification like class and sexuality) shape people's lives simultaneously and impact social positions that relate to social power inequalities.

The insights on gender inequalities and the struggle for the inclusion of feminist perspectives by feminist assistance were major contributions towards the inclusiveness of social work. The same goes for the views and principles of intercultural assistance, which reflect on ethnocentric visions, racism and the exclusion of migrants. Both movements offer more inclusive approaches towards their clients and work towards sensitivity, but do not take both gender and ethnicity into account, even though they co-construct social positionings and it is impossible (and undesirable) to untangle them in practice. The movements do not converge, which is unfortunate, especially because both movements overlook exactly the axis of signification the other advocates for.

In this thesis I will argue for the inclusion of (at least) gender and ethnicity as axes of signification, to strive for a more inclusive perspective regarding difference than the singular focus on either gender or ethnicity at play in the dominant discourses on difference in Dutch society. In my intersectional discourse analysis of Tjin A Djie's

Protective Wraps-model in the third chapter, I will point to the contributions of an intersectional perspective towards the social positionings of social workers and clients.

2. Theory and Methodology

This Methodology chapter is necessary to elaborate on the new flowers and prickly plants that I discovered in the academic Gender Studies garden. First, I will elaborate on where I come from academically and what consequences this has for my research. Then I will lay out the methods that I have used in my analysis of the Protective Wraps-model. The described epistemological assumptions form the basics of this thesis and make it also accessible for people who are not used to the vocabulary of Gender Studies. I will focus on assumptions that are related to Tjin A Djie's work and refer to my self-positioning as a researcher. I will close this chapter with my research questions.

2.1 Old habits (die hard)

The constructivist approach towards concepts like culture, ethnicity and identity that I was socialized into in my studies in Anthropology is a very valuable approach in my view. The rejection of rigid and essentialist concepts and the idea that 'everything is always in the making' contributed to my personal and academic understanding of the world. In the words of Baumann (1999:83), an essentialist approach towards culture focuses on culture as 'reification, a thing one has, a finished object'. This approach 'creates more problems than it resolves' according to Baumann (1999:87), although he simultaneously recognizes the common use of essentialist views in daily life and political strategy. In a constructivist approach, concepts are 'malleable, open to change and new consciousness' and understood as 'processual' and this approach is indispensable for a multicultural analysis (Baumann 1999:84-91). Baumann expresses the double-edged nature of culture, where both fluidity and static are claimed, in which analytical and daily practice of culture both coexist and work together. Constructivism and essentialism are key concepts in the social sciences. In the Humanities the general philosophical assumptions concerning language as social practice and the deconstruction that comes with this starting point, suggest a post-structural (or constructivist) approach to all concepts. This contrasts with my experiences as student in the Gender Studies field, where the common static use of culture and religion was an unpleasant surprise for me. Such as the ideas about Muslim women, headscarves and their emancipation, judged from a liberal white middle-class perspective which considers Muslim women to be 'oppressed by their men and their religion', without granting 'them' any agency or space to formulate their particular perspective. For my Comparative Women's Studies-classmates, the deconstruction of everything else (except from culture or religion) was very natural and logical, while the concepts I wanted to deconstruct, made me 'a relativist'.

Stereotypical white liberal Western and middle-class assumptions were the standard and I experienced little space for plurality here. With white liberal Western middle-class feminism as starting point, different interpretations of feminism are often perceived as deviant, instead of different but equal in value. I felt I had to choose between multiculturalism and feminism, while my aim with the Comparative Women's Studies-master was to make a productive contribution in combining these two interests.

2.2 Anthropology & Gender Studies

According to Marjorie Pryse (2000) disciplinary identities are so persistent that people rather give up their cultural prejudices and attitudes than their disciplinary socialization and methodologies[18]. My disciplinary switch from Anthropology to Gender Studies has been a major challenge for me, too. Several issues are at stake here that I will try to unravel.

First, as an anthropologist I was used to talk about culture[19] and cultural diversity and I focused on this aspect of humanity before taking gender or other axes of signification into account. Secondly, I had learned to reflect on my positioning as a researcher related to ethical behavior towards informants and on my powerful position to in- or exclude data I had gathered, but not on myself as a person who conducts her academic research and takes up a social positioning as well. My focus was mainly on the ethnic Other and her views and experiences, instead of my intentions, life experiences and personal sensitivities. In Gender Studies the Self is included and recognized in knowledge production and taken-for-granted production of knowledge is criticized. Feminist perspectives have been 'Othered' in academic institutions and disciplines and Gender Studies as a discipline struggled for the inclusion of feminist perspectives as equally productive knowledge in academia. In this case, Otherness refers to the exclusion of women's perspectives and to patriarchal gender relations and the associated assumption that 'man' is defined as the norm for knowledge on hu*man*ity, while 'woman' and her perspective deviates and has been excluded from this norm.

I realized during the Comparative Women's Studies-master that ethnicity and/or culture and religion were my first concerns and my classmates focused on gender. This perfectly reflects the dominant discourse to speak about difference, whereby one axis of difference is taken into account, but is not connected to other differences, similar to the developments in gender sensitive and intercultural social work. My classmates and I actually could have worked complementarily. Furthermore, if we all

---

[18] In the chapter 'Disciplinariteit als strijdtoneel: Gloria Anzaldúa en interdisciplinariteit' by Gloria Wekker (2007:66)
[19] Often referred to as 'ethnicity' in Gender Studies

had worked systematically with the intersectional approach, an important method in Gender Studies, we could have deconstructed our supposed priorities and blind spots immediately, because this approach looks at several axes of signification together and how they simultaneously co-construct different social positionings. The four axes of signification that are (at least) taken into account are gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality, but age, religion and health can be included as well.

Although this intersectional approach is an important tool in Gender Studies, there seems to be discomfort to speak about ethnicity, while gender, sexuality and class are more often thought simultaneously. Wekker (1996:58) offers food for thought in her critical reflection on Dutch Women's Studies'[20] theory and practice in relation to ethnicity and underlines that ethnicity concerns both 'the own ethnicity and that of Other women'. In Wekker's analysis of published books in Women's Studies, she concludes that Women's Studies' researchers in the Netherlands have difficulties to situate themselves and to mark and be accountable for their knowledge claims and knowledge production (Wekker 1996:72). This is very problematic, because the core of Gender Studies is exactly this recognition for one's specific positioning and situatedness, instead of a positivistic and neutral idea of knowledge production. As Wekker (1996:73-74) argues, in practice 'the white middle-class woman remains the imaginary Women's Studies' Subject' and this dominant powerful positioning is neither acknowledged nor deconstructed within the Women's Studies' community in the Netherlands.

Wekker (1996:58) connects 'common sense' ideas about ethnicity in Dutch society with the Women's Studies' community in the Netherlands and the representations of reality offered by Women's Studies. They all lack thorough reflection on color- and power evasiveness (Frankenberg 1993), when whiteness is not defined as ethnicity and class and ethnicity seem only relevant as axes of signification 'when it is about Other (refers to non-white here) women' (Wekker 1996:73-75). In this hierarchical relation, where a white dominant Self creates a subordinate colored Other, Wekker (1996:77-78) defines both Anthropology and this aspect of Women's Studies as 'child of the Enlightenment'.

Addressing ethnic discomfort?

In her Master's thesis, Meuwissen (2011) addresses what ideas students, graduates and staff of Women's Studies in Utrecht have about ethnicity (and gender, sexuality, career and relationships) and how ethnicity is integrated in their work or research. She concludes that among the WS-teachers she interviewed (who are defined as being

---

[20] The former name of the Gender Studies discipline, which I will use in my quotes when my sources do.

white, middle-class Dutch nationals) there is one group that always includes ethnicity 'because it is always present' and 'related to gender' (Meuwissen 2011:24). The other group of WS-teachers considers ethnicity 'as just one section of intersectional research' and they do not always address ethnicity in their own research (Meuwissen 2011:24). According to Meuwissen (2011:24), the WS-staff defines ethnicity as 'an important issue for feminist research', but it is 'not everyone's research focus'. The reference of the WS-teachers to 'a colleague whose research mainly deals with ethnicity' is very significant in my view. This colleague must be Gloria Wekker, the only Surinamese Dutch professor of the WS-staff, who works thoroughly intersectionally and thus addresses ethnicity together with gender, sexuality and class. She is the professor who critically reflected on the whiteness of Women's Studies in the nineties and her thoughts on the intertwined relation between (at least) gender and ethnicity are unfortunately still not the common focus among teachers in Women's Studies in Utrecht. Also, Meuwissen's (2011:27) conclusion about WS-students and their 'struggle with discussing ethnicity' is not reassuring in my eyes. The awareness of 'the risks of discrimination and generalization' is useful, but the experienced 'unease or fear to contribute to this (discrimination and generalization) when they speak about ethnicity themselves' results in students who 'prefer not to address ethnicity over speaking about ethnicity' (Meuwissen 2011:26-27). This leaves the color- and power evasiveness intact that Gender Studies aims to deconstruct and underlines that awareness is a first step in taking power inequalities into account, but needs consistent implementation in research practice as well.

An (white feminist female) anthropologist
For me, the gained insights on whiteness shed a different light on my former anthropology research in Peru on domestic violence against women. Back then, I noticed that my white Dutch skin was lighter compared to my female informants from Indigenous Quechan communities and the dominant Peruvian ethnic community, who I had met at a local grassroots organization, the police station or the court. Now I am more aware of the privileges of my whiteness at that time and how this influenced my research, such as the suggestion that I was rich and influential because I am white (while in Dutch society I am a 'poor' student) and the easy access to formal institutions, while if I had been black (or at least darker than the discriminated Indigenous people) this would have been more difficult. I distinguished my privileged middle-class, white ethnic positioning from the positioning of my informants, instead of taking into account the effects that my positioning inevitably had on them and how this influenced my research. I had thought even less about the impact of my feminist ideas on my academic positioning, while my identification with feminism and gender

equality shaped my research aims at first and were not neutral from the start. I also realized that my 'being white', was something I associated with going abroad instead of being white in the Netherlands. This clearly illustrates my lack of reflection on my own ethnicity, not unlike just described for some WS-teachers and students, and the privileged positioning I have with regard to my white skin color that grants me a place in the dominant white Dutch community.

Several feminist perspectives and methods helped me to reflect on my positioning as a white feminist researcher, such as standpoint feminism (Hill Collins 1990; Harding 1989), situated knowledges (Haraway 1991), the relation between knowledge, power and the subject (Foucault) and intersectionality (Crenshaw 1989). The intersectional approach in particular is a new tool for me to tackle the often suggested contrasts between multiculturalism(s) and feminism(s), while it brings productive anthropological approaches (like constructivism and the focus on culture and/or ethnicity) together with gender and self-reflective approaches. It keeps on giving me insights into inequalities in social power relations, although it remains difficult to always ask the other 'invisible' question. Also, the analysis of discourse and the deconstruction of the politics of representation offered new perspectives that are useful to me in my academic and daily life.

2.3 Methods: Discourse analysis & Intersectionality

The book 'Beschermjassen, transculturele hulp aan families[21]' written by Kitlyn Tjin A Djie and Irene Zwaan will be the focus of my research. This book is about the Protective Wraps-model and its development, principles, contributions and the experiences of social workers who use the Protective Wraps-model in their daily work at Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe[22]. The theoretical foundations I have used in my research are discourse analysis and intersectionality and I will elaborate on the first method in this paragraph. I used literature review as well, to put Tjin A Djie's work and her Protective Wraps-model in a historical social work perspective.

Jørgenson and Phillips (2002:4) point to the intertwined relation between theory and method in discourse analysis 'and the basic philosophical premises that researchers must accept', like the idea that language reflects power. Stuart Hall (1997:5) defines language as 'signifying practice, a practice that produces meaning'. He refers to discourse as 'a formation of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about, forms of knowledge and conduct associated with, a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society' (Hall 1997:6). According to Hall (1997:6),

---

[21] 'Protective Wraps, transcultural help for families' (my translation)

[22] Office for Youth Care (Support for children and their parents when psychological, social or pedagogical problems occur) located in Drenthe, a region in the North East of the Netherlands.

the way knowledge about a particular topic is constructed, defines what knowledge is considered 'true' or useful and what sorts of subjects belong to the discourse.

In Dutch society the dominant discourse regarding difference can be defined as singular, meaning that the focus is on one axis of difference. As I have shown in the history of social work in paragraph 1.2, either gender or ethnicity is the main concern of specific social work movements, but gender and ethnicity are not connected with each other. In Gender Studies, the intertwined relation between gender and ethnicity is one of the principles of the discipline and is reflected in the use of intersectionality. I will elaborate on this method and its contributions in the next paragraph.

In a discursive approach, it is about the effects and consequences that representation has, which works 'as much through what is not shown, as through what is' (Hall 1997:59). Assumptions about norms, identities and appropriate behavior can be grounds to include or exclude particular subjects from a specific discourse.

Foucault's work contributed enormously to the development of discourse analysis as he focused on the relation between knowledge, power and 'truth' in particular historical epochs. As Foucault (1980:131) argues, 'each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth; that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true, the mechanism and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned... the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true'[23]. Foucault's (1980) idea of power as productive laid the foundation for the definition of discourse that Jørgenson and Phillips (2002:65) propose, namely 'an important form of social practice which both reproduces and changes knowledge, identities and social relations including power relations, and at the same time is also shaped by other social practices and structures'.

These social power relations are an important incentive to Tjin A Djie's work, because she points to the exclusionary mechanism practiced by conventional social work institutions that keep up social inequalities by their dominant white Dutch social work standards. She focuses on the serious consequences of this exclusion, namely that migrant children do not get appropriate assistance. I am interested in the language Tjin A Djie uses to work on these delicate topics and to what extent she is able to construct a language that supports her message.

In Gender Studies, critical discourse analysis is used, that aims 'to explore the links between language use and social practice and focuses on the role of discursive practices in the maintenance of the social order and in social change' (Jørgenson & Phillips 2002:70-71). The central question of critical discourse analysis is therefore, whether a specific text (or book, theory etcetera) reproduces or challenges the order

---

[23] In the chapter 'The work of representation' by Stuart Hall (1997:49)

of discourse and what consequences this has for the social practice (Jørgenson & Phillips 2002:71). As the critical discourse analysis is described as focusing on social power relations, it is important to refer explicitly to the specific power relations that are taken into account. Therefore, the discourse analysis that I have used in my analysis can be defined as an intersectional discourse analysis that takes several axes of signification into account. The following paragraph focuses on this intersectionality and its productive contributions.

An important point for consideration is, that Tjin A Djie's book about Protective Wraps is not developed within an academic framework or aimed at academic readers, because her objective was to share learning experiences of social workers trained with the Protective Wraps-model and to inspire others to work with Protective Wraps.

My discourse analysis aims to analyse Tjin A Djie's language and her message and to strengthen her model if possible, and not to criticize her work solely based on (the lack of) academic approaches or the inclusiveness of specific concepts. This brings me to a shortcoming of this research, because I did not conduct interviews with Tjin A Djie herself or participants of her intercultural training, and thus only focused on the written language of the book. If I had used more diverse and complementary research methods, maybe the heart of Tjin A Djie's work could have been more central. I was unable to conduct interviews in the little time there was left to graduate 'in time', taking my low writing speed and 'liminal' academic stage into account. I underestimated the investment of time that the discourse analysis demanded from me, in particular because it was my first discursive analysis of a book. Yet I took the risk to focus on Tjin A Djie's model, because of the thrill I felt when I read her book. This challenge highlights two fields of tension for me: the exclusionary mechanisms of academia, where one needs to speak a certain disciplinary language to be heard and the difficulty of translating the wisdom of one's heart and life expertise into productive academic knowledge.

2.3.1 Intersectionality

The American lawyer Kimberlé Crenshaw was the first who used the term intersectionality, in her aim to move beyond the problem of identity politics (Crenshaw 1989). Back in 1977, the Combahee River Collective in Boston already drew attention to the intertwined systems of oppression that black women experienced in their famous 'A Black Feminist Statement' (Wekker & Lutz 2001:39). These black feminists are important contributors to the development of the intersectional analysis, one of the strengths of feminist thinking and practice nowadays (Smith 1998; Wekker & Lutz 2001).

Intersectionality is a vital aspect of my critical discourse analysis, because it moves beyond the singular focus on difference that pertains to the dominant discourse on difference in Dutch society. The intersectional approach is an important tool to analyze different social positionings and takes power relations into account. According to Wekker and Lutz (2001:40-41), the intersectional approach 'understands gender and ethnicity (and other axes of signification that construct one's social positioning) as dependent, intertwined systems of ideas and practices that are related to differences between people'. According to Verloo (2006:216), the axes of signification, like gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality, work simultaneously, co-construct a specific positioning in society and are all 'social categories strongly connected to inequalities'.

Everyone has a location 'according to (at least) gender and ethnicity and the related power positioning' (Wekker & Lutz 2001:38). Dominant groups are not left 'unmarked' as the implicit norm, but become visible as groups that take up powerful positionings in society, like 'white', 'male', 'middle-class' and 'heterosexual' positions in Dutch multi-ethnic society. As many black feminists have made clear, when the category of 'women' is mentioned, it is about *white* women, while in the category 'people of color', often black *men* are the focus. This mechanism with its focus on one axis of difference excludes black women systematically. Intersectionality works towards their inclusion and brings underlying power inequalities to light. Intersectionality differs from diversity policy in this aspect, because in diversity policy the power inequalities are often overlooked. This occurs because axes of signification are viewed separately, 'difference is taken as focus point' and there is no attention for the relation between various inequalities (Wekker & Lutz 2001:38). When the dominant norm is 'naturalized', critical reflection on dominant positionings is often lacking and disproportional and negative attention goes to groups that deviate from the dominant norms. Wekker and Lutz (2001:41) argue for intersectionality as a more inclusive approach 'that moves beyond thinking in binary hierarchical categories that keep on (re)producing exclusion'.

Intersectionality takes several power inequalities into account and gives a more diversified picture of someone's positioning, which contrasts with the dominant focus on either gender or ethnicity in many dominant diversity perspectives. In relation to the Protective Wraps-model, I will look at the axes of signification that Tjin A Djie uses in her model and her positioning as developer of the Protective Wraps-model and writer of the book. Also, the positionings of social workers and clients are viewed from an intersectional perspective. Another aspect that intersectionality brings to light is who is not represented in the Protective Wraps-model and what implications this has, which is also important to reflect on.

2.4 Epistemological assumptions

There are two critical feminist thinkers I want to mention in relation to Tjin A Djie's work, because their epistemological perspectives and claims are useful to position Tjin A Djie. Donna Haraway understands knowledge as a product that is constructed within a specific moment and a specific location. Therefore, knowledge can never be neutral or 'true', but always relates to the context (Haraway 1991). Moreover, she argues for 'politics and epistemologies of location, positioning, and situating, where partiality and not universality is the condition of being heard to make rational knowledge claims' (Haraway 1991:195). Thus, *feminist* objectivity can be achieved when the 'situatedness' of knowledge claims is acknowledged (Haraway 1991:188-191).

So, in feminist eyes objective and 'better' knowledge can be produced, if knowledge is situated, understood to be partial and produced from a particular standpoint (Haraway 1991). This is exactly Tjin A Djie's aim, as she clearly states how her Self is involved in the development of her Protective Wraps-model with her personal experiences as a migrant, a professional and a member of collective family systems. Moreover, Tjin A Djie takes up a clear position in relation to Dutch social work institutions and their exclusionary mechanisms concerning migrant families, based on her own experiences in social work institutions.

'Outsiders within'

Sandra Harding (1989) argues that some standpoints produce better knowledge and are examples of 'strong objectivity'. As feminist standpoint thinker, Harding (1989) defines standpoint theory as developed from the idea that the standpoints of oppressed and marginalized subjects produce a more critical perspective, because their positions grant more insight in different perspectives and experiences than the perspectives of dominant groups. She defines women researchers as 'outsiders within', who can contribute to (more inclusive) knowledge perspectives, because their perspectives as women are taken into account (Harding 1991:131).

In conventional social work perspectives, Tjin A Djie's positioning[24] as a black Surinamese transcultural system therapist with a migrant history, can be defined as an 'outsider within' because she notices immediately which parts of her being and her perspective are excluded by dominant white views, based on the individual-oriented characteristics of the dominant white Dutch group.

The Gender Studies starting points, such as situated knowledges and standpoint feminism, pose a serious challenge to the dominant positivistic approach to knowledge that defines science as universal and empirically produced knowledge as superior, because of its supposed 'neutrality, rationality and objectivity' (Wekker 2007:67). This

---

[24] Tjin A Djie's positioning defined from my view

positivistic approach does not take underlying power relations into account and detaches knowledge from ideas, feelings and attitudes about this knowledge or the impact of language and representation systems concerning knowledge (Wekker 2007; Sturken & Cartwright 2001). In the words of Brooks and Hesse-Biber (2007:7) 'feminists exposed the dominance of the positivist paradigm as stemming not from its objectivity or its universality, but from its privileged location within a historical, material and social set of patriarchal power relations'. In all research projects the researchers 'carry their particular worldviews, histories, and biographies with them' (McCarl Nielsen 1990[25]).

The conventional relationship between social workers and their clients exemplifies that neutrality and distance are valued more than reflection on one's personal and professional situatedness. The dominant positivistic view on knowledge production has similar characteristics, because neutrality and rationality are valued over the acknowledgement of one's positioning as a researcher or the relation between researcher and their subject(s). In both fields, this neutral and distant angle is defined as professional and as superior to situated knowledges, which creates hierarchal relations. Tjin A Djie's struggle for the recognition and inclusion of migrants and their different perspectives within social work has similarities with the struggle of Gender Studies as a discipline for the inclusion of intersectional feminist perspectives as equally productive knowledge within the academic world. Both work towards institutions (and employees) that reflect on their positions in society and that are critical of hierarchical power relations and exclusionary mechanisms. Thus, both Tjin A Djie and Gender Studies practitioners speak as 'outsiders within' within their institutions and struggle for their inclusion, comparable to my position as Anthropology student in the Gender Studies field.

2.4.1 Self-positioning
As the work of Brooks & Hesse-Biber (2007), Haraway (1991) and Harding (1989) underline, knowledges can never be neutral, but are always political engaged; either for social or personal purposes. The methodologies used in Gender Studies acknowledge this situatedness and the aim to contribute to social justice with academic work.

This corresponds to my personal drive to do research, in combination with broadening my perspectives and opposing social inequalities. I see myself as a standpoint feminist who speaks from a particular positioning, but I identify with post-structuralism as well to avoid the pitfalls of essentialism. This self-positioning is productive for me, because it brings up topics that I encounter in daily life and that make me angry. This is the

---

[25] In the chapter 'An invitation to Feminist Research' by Brooks and Hesse-Biber (2007:13)

fuel for my academic analysis: to put things, situations, and positions in a social perspective, to understand mechanisms of in- and exclusion and since I became involved in Gender Studies, to be more aware of the constructing power of language and the politics of representation. Also, it reflects my idea of creating connections, because the connection between my (academic) work and today's society, in this case the Dutch multi-ethnic society, is a necessity for me. In relation to the Protective Wraps-model, the inappropriate assistance for migrant children made me very angry and I decided to focus on social work perspectives in the Netherlands. I consider the Protective Wraps-model as a contribution to social work perspectives that deserves every social worker's attention. However, my post-structural focus on Tjin A Djie's work brought up some inner conflicts, because she uses essentialist definitions and binary categories in her work, while she aims to offer an inclusive diversity perspective for social workers.

2.5 Research questions

The key question of this thesis is: *In which ways does the Protective Wraps-model deviate from dominant approaches in social work?*

The second question that I have focused on in this research is:
Does the Protective Wraps-model utilize an intersectional approach and if not, how can an intersectional approach strengthen its aims?
To answer this second question, I use four sub questions to indicate the aspects I will look at:
2a How does the Protective Wraps-model perceive the social worker-client relation?
2b How does the Protective Wraps-model define difference, diversity and sameness?
2c What roles do gender and sexuality play in the Protective Wraps-model?
2d How is the migrant constructed in the Protective Wraps-model

I will answer my research questions in the third chapter on the analysis of the Protective Wraps-model and come back to them in my final conclusions in the fourth chapter.

3. Analysis of the Protective Wraps-model

In this chapter a critical description and analysis of the book 'Beschermjassen, transculturele hulp aan families[26]' written by Kitlyn Tjin A Djie and Irene Zwaan will be central. I will analyze the discourse of Protective Wraps from an intersectional perspective, the approach I expanded on in the chapter on theory and methodology. First, I will describe the key approaches of the Protective Wraps-model and give some background on the development of the model and the book. I have changed the given order of the eight chapters in this description, to make a clear distinction in my analysis between Tjin A Djie's theoretical aspects and the more practical tools. After this descriptive part, paragraph 3.2 will follow with an in-depth analysis of the dominant messages of the book regarding the relationship between social worker and client and their positionings in Dutch society.

In paragraph 3.3 I will focus on difference, sameness and diversity and its implications for who is perceived as Other. In paragraph 3.4 I will turn to the given examples of social workers in the light of difference and I will argue for the importance of an appropriate intersectional contextualization. The deconstruction of 'the' migrant will be central in paragraph 3.5 and my conclusions regarding the approach of Protective Wraps will follow in the final paragraph 3.6.

I consider Tjin A Djie's work very valuable and support the Protective Wraps-model as an important example of a methodology that strives towards equality in difference. By looking from an intersectional angle at this model, I hope to contribute to and strengthen its methodology, which is necessary because the impact of gender and sexuality is overlooked and Tjin a Djie uses a definition of diversity that is too limited.

3.1 Tjin A Djie's Protective Wraps

The model of Protective Wraps was developed by transcultural system therapist Kitlyn Tjin A Djie, and it relates closely to her own history and professional and personal experiences. In the first chapter of her book called 'Kitlyns story[27]', Tjin A Djie describes her Surinamese and Chinese roots, her youth in Paramaribo with her family and her migration to the Netherlands when she was fifteen. All these aspects give insight into her personal journey and position her as an expert on diversity. Tjin A Djie explains the importance of knowledge of one's personal history by telling her own story. This makes Tjin A Djie's position in the book really clear; her personal development is intertwined with the creation of the Protective Wraps-model and cannot and should not be viewed separately. The book does not aim to produce neutral knowledge or information. As such, it is a clear example of the concept of

---

[26] 'Protective Wraps, transcultural help for families' (my translation)

[27] My translation, original title in Dutch 'Kitlyns verhaal' chapter 1 pages 5-12 of the book

'situated knowledges' that Haraway (1991) proposed. This situated location, one's 'particular biography, history and positionality', as Haraway (1991) argues, can offer a unique way of seeing the world, a 'focusing device' that produces one's particular knowledges, insights and understandings (Brooks & Hesse-Biber 2007:13).

As I have explained in the chapter on theory and methodology, in feminist epistemology the researchers are seen as an inherent part of their work and their reflection on their positions and aims are fundamental aspects of their academic practice. Tjin A Djie's vision is articulated from a particular standpoint that is clearly politically motivated and thus fits Harding's (1989) understanding of 'strong objectivity', because Tjin A Djie's knowledge is produced from a minority perspective. Her perspective offers a specific and critical view on the exclusionary mechanisms of the dominant perspective on social work and reflects on underlying power inequalities concerning migrants in Dutch multi-ethnic society. According to Harding (1991:100), strong objectivity can only be reached with strong reflexivity. Tjin A Djie reflects on her personal and professional position, on dominant social work methodologies and on the importance of 'cultural' differences, but she overlooks social power relations that relate to other differences. Thus, her reflexivity could have been stronger, as I will elaborate on in the coming paragraphs.

Personal standpoints & stories

Although Tjin A Djie does not explicitly mention a feminist standpoint perspective, she clearly positions herself as a standpoint thinker, who speaks from a specific location that she knows, acknowledges and situates and where she produces her knowledge from. The subjective knowledge and narrative approach that have been used throughout the book are explicitly mentioned, justified and valued. The narrative approach refers to Kitlyns story and to the experiences of the social workers from Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe. These social workers participated in Tjin A Djie's intercultural training and started working with the Protective Wraps-model. Because of their positive experiences and insights, the idea for the book on Protective Wraps came up. This explains the book's focus on social workers and family therapists[28] in their intercultural work with families and the specific involvement of the social workers of Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe who shared their personal experiences and reflections in the book. To know and to tell one's personal story are Tjin A Djie's starting points in her book and are the first steps for social workers towards intercultural dialogue. In

---

[28] For the readability of this chapter, I will use the term social workers from now on. Although I realize that family therapists have a different profession than social workers, the main messages of the book are geared towards 'professionals who work with migrant families in social work and assistance'.

her view, these steps can make one vulnerable, but they simultaneously create openness and make dialogue more personal.

Tjin A Djie's experience in working with migrant children as a social worker in the Netherlands, contributed to the development of the Protective Wraps-model. In Tjin A Djie's view, Dutch conceptions of psychosocial assistance do not fit the needs of migrant children. The 'white, Western middle-class' knowledge and theories on which Dutch assistance is based do not take the positioning and perspectives of migrant families into account (Tjin A Djie 2003:2).

Migration & (migrant) families

In the third chapter 'The strength of families[29]', Tjin A Djie goes deeper into the perspectives of migrant families. She focuses on significant differences between the Dutch 'Western' family system and the collective 'non-Western' family system many migrants grew up in. She distinguishes between a focus on individuality within 'I-cultures' and the importance of collectivity within 'We-cultures'. Furthermore, Tjin A Djie explains the conflicts that arise when Dutch social workers familiar with and trained within a Western family perspective, work with migrant families and apply their individual-oriented approach. In collective systems, the extended family plays a crucial role with its 'supporting and correcting forces' and resolving capabilities which are present within the family system. The general Dutch ethos of social work is based on the dominant perspective of individual development and autonomy. As a result, the valuable contribution of extended families is completely overlooked. This is why Tjin A Djie insists on the involvement of extended families when migrant families ask for assistance (Tjin A Djie 2003:2-3).

In the chapter 'Impact of migration[30]', Tjin A Djie brings the emotional impact of migration to the reader's attention and her knowledge is clearly rooted in the developments regarding intercultural assistance. Tjin A Djie (2003:7) defines migration as 'a special transition from one stage of life to the next'[31]. In particular, the liminal phase[32] between the departure and the reintegration of migrants is understood as 'a confusing in-between stage in which nothing fits any longer'. In Boedjarath's (1997) words 'the in-between culture' of this liminal phase is considered as a very vulnerable phase for migrants. Tjin A Djie (2008:37) underlines that the feelings of pain and loss related to migration come up with every new transition in life, a similar

---

[29] Chapter 3 'De kracht van families' pages 22-34 of the book.

[30] Chapter 4 'Impact van migratie' pages 35-45 of the book.

[31] Quote from Jessurun (1994) in Etnocentrisme en communicatie in de hulpverlening: interculturele hulpverlening

[32] Term developed by cultural anthropologists Van Bekkum and others (1996) in Handboek Transculturele Psychiatrie en Psychotherapie quoted by Tjin A Djie (2003:7)

effect as trauma has. When problems occur and migrants ask for assistance, the impact of migration and the related migration-pain should be included and recognized in the positioning of their lives as migrants. This impact of migration on emotional and social health is not only a blind spot for social workers, but often for migrants themselves as well (Tjin A Djie & Zwaan 2008:35).

The chapter on 'Protective Wraps[33]' gives insight into the meaning and approach of the model. 'Protective Wraps' means wrapping a person with 'the old and familiar', like a protective shield or a warm and comfortable coat, when s/he is going through a difficult transitional phase. This responds to the needs of migrants in their liminal stage. Social workers can function as 'professional reminders' of trusted memories, stories, familiar food and values by recalling these memories. This familiarity offers safety and connection and helps clients to anchor and reenergize. In French transcultural psychology the word 'enveloppement' is used and described by Yagyahoui (1988) as 'being embedded into the group and the culture' (Tjin A Djie & Zwaan 2008:37). Kitlyn Tjin A Djie discovered the value of this protection in her work as a family counselor in social work institutions.

Diversity & intercultural dialogue

In the chapter 'Diversity in Drenthe[34]', Tjin A Djie highlights the local diversity of this Dutch region. Local diversity is in this case referred to as the local history of villages and cultural characteristics of different white Dutch communities in Drenthe that speak different dialects and used to have different ways of life (farmers, laborers) that created different communities, classes and coping mechanisms. In her approach of Drenthe, Tjin A Djie is able to show that aspects of diversity are everywhere, even between different families, thus they belong to every context. Awareness of this, makes 'the strange Other' less different and exotic and encourages the social worker to reflect on differences in her environment and daily life.

The chapter on 'Intercultural skills[35]' elaborates on intercultural communication and the necessary skills for 'an open dialogue with the strange Other'. Tjin A Djie (2003) draws attention to the personal and professional cultural baggage that every person has. Awareness of this baggage and knowledge on how these convictions, customs, habits and experiences have constructed one's personal and professional views and positionings is fundamental in Tjin A Djie's eyes. Part of this consciousness on where you come from as a social worker is the knowledge of your personal sensitivities that can conflict with the views of your client. Tjin A Djie (2008:51) calls them 'sacred

---

[33] Chapter 7 'Beschermjassen' pages 70-77 of the book.
[34] Chapter 2 'Divers Drenthe' pages 13-21 of the book.
[35] Chapter 5 'Interculturele competenties' pages 47-55 of the book.

cows[36]', and with that concept she refers to ideas, habits, and convictions that somebody considers as his indisputable truth. This personal truth can relate to anything, from hurtful personal experiences to religious ideas or values regarding sexual morality or gender equality that belong to specific ethnic, religious or political groups. Tjin A Djie underlines that social workers need to realize that these topics can be touched upon in an intercultural dialogue. Their job is not to judge their clients and their different perspective, but to be able to facilitate an open dialogue by switching between their own and other perspectives (Tjin A Djie 2008:19).

This approach requires that social workers use their personal stories in the dialogue and engage with the client's perspective, instead of taking up the know-it-all position. Tjin A Djie gives a strong message on the relationship between social worker and client, because she rejects a distant professional relationship. In conventional social work settings, it is considered professional to keep a personal distance between social worker and client and not to bring in one's own person as social worker.

In the chapter that follows 'Tools for intercultural dialogue[37]', she describes models that can be used as starting points for intercultural dialogue, such as a genealogy chart to deepen the knowledge of family relations and the TOPOI-model[38] for communication to build a relationship between client and social worker.

Key messages

The final chapter 'New perspective in social work[39]' places the Protective Wraps-model next to conventional Dutch ideas on assistance and social work. Tjin A Djie brings up the discussion on professionalism in social work and points to the differences in perspective between the dominant discourse and her approach. She considers the relationship between social worker and client as the most important aspect of effective assistance (Clark 2001). Tjin A Djie translates this knowledge by using anecdotes and personal stories to connect with a client instead of maintaining a distant 'professional' relationship. This corresponds with her unconventional vision of a social worker's position; they should work from a 'questioning' position instead of a 'knowing' position and have a facilitating rather than a rescuing role.

Protective Wraps offers six key messages to improve assistance to migrant families in Dutch society: A less hierarchical relationship between social worker and client, the use of one's personal story within social work, the awareness of one's personal and professional cultural baggage as a social worker, taking into account the perspective

---

[36] 'Heilige huisjes' in Dutch

[37] Chapter 6 'Instrumenten voor de interculturele dialoog' pages 56-69 of the book.

[38] TOPOI stands for Taal (language) Ordening (order) Perspectief (perspective) Organisatie (organization) Inzet (commitment), helps to detect misunderstanding in communication and was developed by Hoffman (1996;2002)

[39] Chapter 8 'Nieuw perspectief in hulpverlening' pages 78-88 of the book.

of the client, the history of migration and the extended family system. The Protective Wraps-model offers a different perspective on social work institutions and relationships between clients and social workers. Tjin A Djie reflects critically on exclusionary conventional Dutch social work approaches that pretend that every Dutch citizen is the same and on the impact of this attitude.

It is my aim in this chapter to analyze the discourse of the Protective Wraps-model and corresponding views on difference and equality and to compare this discourse with the dominant discourse on difference and equality in conventional Dutch social work institutions. This analysis raises questions on inclusion and exclusion, power relations, difference and diversity and the treatment of migrants, both within the Protective Wraps-model and in the context of society.

3.2 Relation social worker & client

A fundamental part of effective social work is the relation between social worker and client; hence I will focus in this paragraph on this relationship and its complications.

As Tjin A Djie argues to bring in one's own person and personal story as a social worker to reduce the distance with a client, she simultaneously pleads for awareness of personal and professional cultural baggage that construct one's positioning in society.

This awareness is important, because differences in professional and social positionings between social worker and client impact their relationship and thus the effectiveness of the assistance. In the case of conventional Dutch social work, messages on family structure, relationships, parenting, professionalism, working relationships and successful methodologies are based on white Dutch nuclear families, the dominant ethnic community in the Netherlands. In other words, the dominant white Dutch are positioned as the norm, regardless of contemporary Dutch multi-ethnic reality. This creates hierarchical relations between dominant white Dutch and Other ethnic communities and complicates the inclusion of these 'Others'. As Wekker (1998:41-45) argues, white Dutch are usually not defined as an ethnic group, which confirms whiteness as the 'unmarked category', the powerful position that remains 'naturalized' instead of questioned or deconstructed.

Tjin A Djie's approach, in contrast, points to the blind spots of Dutch social work institutions and criticizes the exclusionary methodologies based on ethnocentric attitudes and the ethnocentric views of social workers. Both consist of ideas about what is normal and important to work on with clients, but do not mention explicitly that they are shaped by the standards of the dominant white Dutch community and only offer appropriate assistance for these white Dutch nuclear families. In other words, the conventional methodologies are normalised and naturalized and *suggest* to

include everyone, while actually underlying power inequalities and exclusionary mechanisms are operative. Tjin A Djie (2008:78) expresses her anger about these exclusionary mechanisms in light of today's multi-ethnic society, because methodologies are not adjusted to the diversity of clients and therefore cannot offer appropriate help to all clients. Tjin A Djie's main concern is the exclusion of migrant families whose collective family systems and internal strengths are overlooked. Thus, if Tjin A Djie mentions the diversity of clients, she translates this diversity in differences between family systems.

The Protective Wraps-model, in contrast with conventional social work, recognises the different migrants' realities and intertwines this recognition with advocating for a less hierarchical relationship between social worker and client. Tjin A Djie relates the existing hierarchical relationship to the way Dutch social workers are socialized in their discipline, namely with the idea that 'social workers know what is best for their clients'. In Tjin A Djie's eyes, this idea is similar to 'the ethnocentric and superior attitude of Dutch society towards migrants'. She objects to the positioning of clients as victims that should be saved. Therefore, Tjin A Djie argues for a 'questioning' attitude towards a client, instead of this 'knowing' position. Moreover, she rejects the rescuing position of social workers and advocates for a more facilitating role, where the client's perspective and the solutions brought up by the collective family, are valued and taken into account. She emphasizes that migrant clients should be reminded of their collective strengths and defines migrants' collective family systems as powerful groups, because of their internal strengths and wisdom.

Now, I want to untangle the two aspects that, according to Tjin A Djie, create power inequalities in the relationship between social worker and client, namely the hierarchical working relationship that refers to professional 'naturalized' power over a client and the superior ethnocentric attitude of Dutch social work institutions towards migrant clients. The separation of these different power inequalities enables me to highlight the various power mechanisms at work in social work institutions and in Dutch multi-ethnic society. Subsequently, I will demonstrate the contribution of an intersectional perspective on the relationship between social worker and client.

3.2.1 Powerful positionings

First I will analyze the power relation concerning professional position, where one person asks for assistance and the other one assists. In this relationship, the client is more vulnerable and 'in need of help' than the social worker, who carries out her daily job. This unequal balance in power between social worker and client is important to consider as a conventional part of a social worker's profession, and after that, should be understood in the perspective of Dutch multi-ethnic society.

Felten (2006) reflects on the relationship between social workers and their clients within social casework and gender sensitive counseling, two paradigms in social work. She uses Foucault's analysis of power, to conclude that in both paradigms 'confessional techniques' are used 'that are aimed at finding the 'inner truth' of a client' (Felten 2006:54). She relates this to the conviction in contemporary Western society that 'expression of one's 'inner truth' will lead to liberation'. As the social worker stimulates the client to find the truth about herself, because 'that will bring freedom', the social worker is positioned as the dominant party, the 'rescuer' in a 'heroic narrative'. This has powerful consequences for the relationship with the client, because an unequal and dependent relationship is created (Felten 2006:54). Tjin A Djie's criticism regarding the superior attitude of social workers reflected in their rescuing and knowing position corresponds to Felten's formulation of this 'heroic' position that a social worker takes up.

In gender sensitive counseling the masculine perspective of social work is criticized and a new perspective is developed with awareness of how unequal gender relations affect the relationship between social worker and client (Felten 2006; Van Mens-Verhulst & Waaldijk 2008). Unfortunately, as Felten (2006:55) points out, this new gender sensitive perspective was not intertwined with the deconstruction of the 'heroic' position of social workers, nor was it related to power inequalities between the dominant white ethnic community and ethnic minority groups in Dutch society. Felten (2006:55) argues for an intersectional approach towards social work and mentions the potential fusion of gender sensitive counseling and intercultural counseling.

Power- and color evasiveness
To analyze the relation between social workers and their clients in the Netherlands, Felten (2006:46) proposes Ruth Frankenberg's (1993) concepts of 'color evasiveness' and 'power evasiveness'. The evasion of color is defined as form of racism 'that evades the topic of 'race' altogether' (Frankenberg 1993:14). According to Essed, 'race' in Dutch society is replaced by 'a concern with culture and ethnicity', which evades color, but leaves the racist connotations intact (Essed 1989:3). Frankenberg (1993:156) defines 'power evasiveness' as 'selective attention paid to difference' and when only 'those differences that make the speaker feel good' are referred to.

This power evasiveness works together with color evasiveness, when hierarchical power relations between different ethnic groups remain unacknowledged and an idea of 'sameness' is suggested. This results in the racist attitude, as Frankenberg (1993:14) argues, that 'any failure to achieve is (therefore) the fault of people of color themselves'. In the words of Ann Phoenix (2001:10) the problems ethnic minorities

face are attributed to them being 'different', which suggests that the power inequalities are not the problem, but their victims are.

In the case of a social worker with a dominant white Dutch background who perceives and treats a migrant client as 'abnormal' in a power- and color evasive way, s/he possibly aggravates the client's situation and her feeling of disqualification in society, instead of offering assistance that improves her situation. Thus, differences in skin color, culture and/or ethnicity between social workers and clients should be acknowledged by social workers, instead of being silenced, in order to avoid color evasiveness. This recognition contributes to intercultural dialogue, mutual exchange and a productive and symmetrical relationship between social worker and client, in particular when a 'questioning' attitude is taken up by the social worker.

Although Tjin A Djie does not speak about color- or power evasiveness in her book, she formulates her criticism in terms of Dutch ethnocentrism and 'cultural' superiority related to the focus on 'I-culture' and individual family systems being the norm of the dominant ethnic group. She mentions 'black' and 'white' occasionally, but in an implicit way that does not clearly refer to the cultural baggage of (white Dutch) social workers. A missed opportunity in my view, because it could have raised awareness among white Dutch social workers on the evasiveness of color at work in Dutch society. I will come back to this 'color blindness' in paragraph 3.4 about social workers and their views on difference.

Recognition of (social) power relations
The deconstruction of both hierarchical color and power relations starts with the recognition of different positionings in society. For social workers this means that they should acknowledge their powerful ('heroic') professional position and reflect on this position, because it matters in the working relationship with a client. As I pointed out before, Tjin A Djie makes a plea for the inclusion of client perspectives, the use of personal stories and the involvement of one's own person as a social worker, to reduce this inequality in power towards clients, without however paying explicit attention to a dominant discourse that is centered around power- and color evasiveness.

I argue that the ethnic identities of both social worker and client should be taken into account, because ethnicity plays an important role in social power relations but is often taken to refer to the non-white skin color of the Other. In Protective Wraps, the focus is on the recognition of differences between individual and collective family systems and corresponding values, which refers to power inequality but underexposes the connection with color evasiveness and underlying racism. It is important to name

all positionings, also the dominant white Dutch ethnicity in this case, to make powerful 'unmarked' positions visible.

Moreover, in a thoroughly intersectional analysis of the relationship between social worker and client, there should be attention for more than just ethnicity as diversity aspect, because (at least) gender, class and sexuality are also tend to give rise to exclusion and power inequalities. All these axes of signification affect each other and co-construct one's positioning in society, thus all should be taken into account. It is necessary to include all positionings and to reflect both on ethnic, class, gender and sexual minorities as well as on dominant ethnic, class, gender and sexual positions, to avoid that dominant positions are taken for granted and remain invisible. The recognition of power in social and professional positionings hopefully averts the unconscious perpetuation of power and color inequalities in the relationship between social worker and client, and works towards more appropriate and intersectional assistance.

3.2.2 Dutch rigidity

In this paragraph, I want to elaborate on one of Tjin A Djie's statements and the typical Dutch comments coming from the field of social work. Tjin A Djie (2003:10) argues that the interculturalisation of the therapeutic context is crucial for good results. She invalidates the frequently used argument that 'if social workers interact with their clients in an open and honest manner, this will ensure adequate assistance, irrespective of the backgrounds of the clients'. I am convinced that this injunction exemplifies exactly the ethnocentric attitude that exists in Dutch society in general. Although the idea of honest and open interaction is important, the cultural meaning of 'honesty' and 'openness' is clearly underestimated in this context. If a social worker is not aware of possible differences in positioning in society, family constructions or communication, how much safe space is there for a client to be 'open and honest' if her own contextualization is not even acknowledged or taken into account? If a white Dutch social worker is 'open and honest', maybe s/he is very direct and confrontational in the communication, while this is hard to respond to for a client familiar with an indirect way of communication. Furthermore, the lack of recognition of differences in (ethnic) background makes the distance in communication rather bigger than smaller, instead of contributing to a safe or open dialogue between client and social worker.

I think the criticized statement articulates exactly the rigid Dutch attitude towards integration, migrants and Others, based on the conviction that it is not necessary to change the Dutch approach, because the newcomers have to adjust to the Dutch society and its working methods and not the other way around ('*They* have to learn

Dutch'). This ethnocentric vision is one of the reasons why intercultural health and psychosocial care are still not institutionalized in the Netherlands. The assumption that Dutch ('western') views are 'better', excludes not only other views on health and assistance, but simultaneously refuses to recognize that there are different pictures (of) and perspectives on the world, and on physical and psychosocial health. Van Mens-Verhulst (2003:25) argues that to take diversity into account in social services, a new theoretical framework is necessary, that is not solely based on uniformity. If no space is granted for the cultural recognition of Others and the responsibility for effective integration or assistance is always on the plate of the Other, this mechanism of uniformity is hard to deconstruct. I agree with Ghorashi (2006) when she states that a multi-ethnic society starts with space for difference and for a diversity of identities. Ghorashi argues that 'the Dutch identity does not allow diversity which makes it impossible for migrants to connect to this Dutch identity[40]'. She refers to the unrealistic expectations of the white Dutch community that migrants should completely assimilate to Dutch cultural and linguistic standards. Ghorashi (2006) argues for a new definition of Dutchness that includes today's cultural diversity. Prins points to the paradoxical message related to the matter of whiteness in Dutch society, namely that 'white' (the dominant group) addresses to 'black' (the minorities): 'If you want to be equal to me, I don't want to hear anything about differences; if you are different from me, then you are not equal[41]' (Prins 2000:23; Essed 1989). In other words, there seems to be no chance for equality if you are non-white, which contrasts with the principles of a multi-ethnic society.

Room for difference?

However, when a migrant feels anchored, welcomed and recognised in a society, s/he might feel safe enough to let parts of past traditions go and to combine various cultural perspectives and to connect with aspects of the Dutch identity. This will contribute to integration, because it grants real space for difference, the first requirement for a multi-ethnic society. Ghorashi mentions several steps that contribute to the Dutch 'culture of democracy' that needs some activation in her eyes. This 'culture of democracy' is necessary as the common ground of Dutch democracy and includes the democratic characteristic of plurality (Ghorashi 2006:21). To leave some space for migrants is not enough in Ghorashi's view and runs the risk to turn into indifference. Instead, space for migrants should be created by stepping *aside* and actively make room for them. This creates a common space where migrants are

---

[40] My translation, Quote of Ghorashi in 'Beschermjassen' by Tjin A Djie & Zwaan 2008:45

[41] In Dutch:'Als je aan mij gelijk(waardig) wilt zijn, wil ik van geen verschillen weten; als je verschilt van mij, ben je niet aan mij gelijk(waardig)'

allowed and can feel safe and this space should be guarded carefully (Ghorashi (2006:45-48).

This connects to Tjin A Djie's message in the book regarding social workers who should create space for differences in perspective and also literally step aside to grant space to several generations of a collective family system and their authority figures. Moreover, it fits with the offering of a protective wrap, that helps migrants to anchor and feel save in their new surroundings. This safety can be empowering and contributes to the creation of space for one's own identity, integrated within the Dutch multi-ethnic society.

An integral part of this integration is the reflection on dominant Dutch standards, in this case in social work offered to migrant families. Tjin A Djie brings the resolving capacities of collective families to the fore, which I understand as knowledge from an unconventional perspective that really offers a new angle in Dutch assistance towards the approach of migrant families.

3.3. Diversity, difference and sameness

Diversity and difference are key concepts in the Protective Wraps-model and they relate to many academic debates in Gender Studies. Therefore, in this paragraph I will analyze how diversity, difference and sameness are defined and used in the Protective Wraps-book. If I take a look at how Tjin A Djie speaks about diversity, I realize that she does not give a very clear definition of diversity in the book. She does describe what diversity means for her: 'To take diversity into account is to pay attention to existing differences. To be sensitive to diversity means attention for sex[42], religion, ethnicity, age, condition of health and more. Also to have attention for culture, family, ideas and history' (Tjin A Djie 2008:19). The situation at Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe with its 'attitude of sameness' and 'a similar approach to everyone' is the opposite of 'acknowledging that differences do exist' according to Tjin A Djie. Difference as a theoretical concept in itself is not mentioned in the book, but is always related to diversity.

In her intercultural training, Tjin A Djie works on diversity awareness by expressing diversity as part of social workers' daily lives. She uses the context of Drenthe to emphasize that every region has its local diversity, simply because of the local history and the cultural characteristics (Tjin A Djie 2008:13). In this case 'cultural' refers to traditional values and ways of life in Drenthe, like the historical existence of large families in small villages and characteristics as neighborliness and introversion. Local diversity is reflected in the variety in languages (dialects), but Tjin A Djie (2008:14-16) also defines differences between families and their historical coping strategies and

---

[42] In Dutch she uses 'sekse' which refers to 'biological' differences between men and women.

beliefs as local diversity. What I find interesting in this approach is Tjin A Djie's ability to show that differences between people are inherent aspects of life and human interaction. If differences are everywhere, the 'strange Others' must be everywhere too, also among white Dutch neighbors in Drenthe. This assumption helps social workers to reflect on their own beliefs and their views on Otherness in their everyday life and in relation to their clients. It turns concepts like integration, adaptation and intercultural exchange into concepts that become applicable in every context and they do not specifically relate to migrants anymore (Tjin A Djie 2008:21). Thus, in relation to her intercultural training, Tjin A Djie uses a broad description of diversity that can be found everywhere and is referred to as an important principle.

3.3.1. Critical notes

Now I want to focus on the theoretical description of diversity that Tjin A Djie uses in her Protective Wraps-model. There are two elements in her description that are remarkable in my opinion. First, as a Gender Studies practitioner, it strikes me that Tjin A Djie does not refer to gender or sexuality in her list of theoretical aspects of diversity. She mentions 'sex' to speak about differences in communication between men and women, and occasionally refers to matriarchal and patriarchal family systems, but never expands on the impact of gender or patriarchy on someone's positioning or life. There is no relation with the concept of gender as, in Wekker's (2010) words, 'the constructing principle of personal, social and symbolic meanings of femininity and masculinity in a specific society'. Wekker (2010) adds here that 'sex' is often understood as a socially constructed concept too, to move beyond the idea that only two different biological bodies do exist. She even defines gender 'as most influential structuring mechanism of sex' (Wekker 2010; Butler 2004). In other words, Tjin A Djie's lack of attention for gender as diversity aspect is unfortunate and a limitation of her view on diversity.

The same goes for sexuality, which influences one's position in society just as much as other aspects of diversity. Pilcher and Whelehan (2004) point to the difference in definitions between homosexuality and heterosexuality. As homosexuality is primarily defined in terms of 'sexual identification and a set of sexual practices or preferences expressed by a clearly defined group', heterosexuality, in contrast, is simply related to 'normality' and makes sexuality 'incidental'. Homosexuality is defined in terms of deviance, 'as if an individual's life is defined by their sexuality' (Pilcher & Whelehan 2004:68-69). The centrality of 'hetero-reality', also known as 'hetero-normativity' (Pilcher & Whelehan 2004) reinforces the social exclusion of specific groups, namely lesbians, gays, bisexuals, trans and queer people, based on their sexual identity. As

Swart (2008:123) states in her chapter on 'Lesbian specific assistance[43]' in the Netherlands, hetero-normative perspectives of many social workers in Dutch society perpetuate the social invisibility of lesbian women.

In my analysis[44] of the underlying messages on differences in the examples and quotes given in the book, I will elaborate on the absence of sexuality and gender as axes of difference. So far, I conclude that some important axes of intersectionality are missing in Tjin a Djie's model of diversity, namely gender and sexuality. Although Tjin A Djie mentions 'ethnicity' in her description of diversity, she does not deal with ethnicity in her examples, or with class. In fact, she does not engage with any of the axes of signification that are operative in an intersectional perspective, but is mainly concerned with 'I'- and 'We'-cultures in families.

3.3.2. Conceptual disagreements

The next aspect in Tjin A Djie's perspective is the addition of culture, family, ideas and history as diversity aspects. I agree with Tjin A Djie that culture, family, ideas and history show diversity among people and need to be discussed within an intercultural dialogue between social workers and clients. However, I do not share her use and definitions of these concepts.

When Tjin A Djie refers to culture in the book, she uses the concept in various contexts and with different meanings. In some cases she speaks about Dutch culture and refers to the Dutch nation, in others she mentions the diversity of Dutch cultures and concentrates on regional white Dutch cultures with cultural characteristics like various dialects and traditional practices. This fits the idea of culture as a set of ideas, beliefs and ways of behaving of a particular group or society. When Tjin A Djie refers to the 'culture of mono-thinking' in the Netherlands, culture is used as a substitute for approach. If Tjin A Djie discusses We-culture and I-culture and their cultural practices, she in fact focuses on collective family systems and the related 'family culture' that consists of specific family traditions, values, attitudes and family relations. Then, Tjin A Djie defines the knowledge of one's own cultural baggage as knowledge of one's country, history, the culture, norms and values and the history and structure of one's family. This cultural baggage covers many diversity aspects (including 'culture') and here she combines national and ethnic identity with someone's personal family history.

In other words, the concept of culture that Tjin A Djie uses in her book may imply ethnic difference or family structure, family traditions and the way children are raised, national, regional, group or class identity and sometimes an accumulation of these

aspects. This makes 'culture' so general and applicable in so many ways that the concept loses its meaning. It would have been better if Tjin A Djie had given one definition of culture and had made clear how this concept of culture relates to ethnicity, because these two concepts play an important role in discourses on difference in the Netherlands. Such as Baumann (1999) and the processual 'double discursive understanding of culture' he proposes, where he intertwines 'people's everyday necessity of crosscutting identifications' together with 'claims of reified identities to reach specific goals' to understand multicultural realities (Baumann 1999:137-139). Baumann expresses the double-edged nature of culture and claims both its essentialist and constructivist use, in which analytical and daily practice of culture both coexist and work together.

3.3.3. Family matters

Now I want to take a look at family as an aspect of diversity. Firstly, I agree with Tjin A Djie in her vision that social workers should be able to detect their own family messages, personal views on family relations and upbringing and put these into perspective. Therefore, I understand Tjin A Djie's emphasis that social workers should collect knowledge on a client's family; in this case aspects like family structure, family relations and history of migration are important matters in their conversations. In particular when different family constructions than the dominant I-oriented nuclear families are at stake, attention to their inclusion is necessary.

However, Tjin A Djie works with a distinction between collective and individual family systems. This creates two different groups that supposedly completely differ in terms of identity construction, worldviews, communication and values. I consider this distinction a very rough and simplified reification, especially when I compare Tjin A Djie's understanding of family systems to a 'family culture'. In my understanding, such a culture is not a fixed thing, but changeable, always 'under construction' and depending on the context (Baumann 1999). Moreover, the conceptual borders of each system are defined by who is outside and excluded from this 'group culture', a mechanism similar to the construction of concepts as identity and ethnicity. Tjin A Djie's approach opposes both family systems in a dichotomous manner and creates a hierarchical relationship between them, because she clearly values the collective family system over the individual one. Her binary focus on difference neither leaves space for internal differences among family members, nor shows possibilities for change. From Tjin A Djie's point of view, family fits Verloo's (2006) framing of social categories that relate to unequal social positions, because of her division of family in two positions. Collective family structure then functions as a cause for discrimination, while individual family structure is perceived as the norm and the dominant part of the

binary. However, it becomes difficult to intertwine 'family' as a *group* with gender, class, ethnicity and sexuality to create a positioning in society. In particular, because a family has many different members, who belong to various generations and have different genders, educations, localities, sexualities and possible also different ethnicities (related to marriage and adoption). Therefore, I understand family as comparable with the concept of identity, which is constructed from various aspects that create different positions in society. As Verloo (2006) mentions gender, 'race'/ethnicity, sexual orientation and class as social categories, someone's identity is a co-construct of all these different categories, and maybe more, but no social category *in itself*. Thus, family in itself does not create one's positioning in society, but is shaped by ethnicity, class, gender relations, ideas on sexual orientation, religion and historical forces. The same goes for 'history' and 'ideas'; the concepts are too general to use as social categories. Although it is understandable that Tjin A Djie mentions these concepts as aspects of intercultural dialogue, they do not contribute to or strengthen her description of diversity.

Nevertheless, Tjin A Djie's argument that knowledge about differences in family structure is important in social work, remains intact, to avoid that collective family systems are ignored*. Although her strategic focus on binary family systems is comprehensible, it inadvertently brings her back to the 'Us' and 'Them' categories that she left behind when she approached local differences in Drenthe from a non-hierarchical and contextualizing perspective.

3.3.4. Difference and sameness
In Tjin A Djie's view on diversity, the recognition of difference between people is fundamental. In the case of Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe, Tjin A Djie (2008:19) criticizes their vision and approach that 'everybody is the same' and therefore deserves a similar treatment. This erasing of difference creates serious problems and is noticeable in many parts of today's Dutch society, as I pointed out in my elaboration on color- and power evasiveness in paragraph 3.2.1. Because the norm for appropriate assistance is based upon the dominant white Dutch community, their standards regarding color (white), ethnicity (Dutch), religion (Christian), sexuality (heterosexuality) and identity (individual) are perceived as normal. This creates many Others who are not included in this picture and who are defined as abnormal and deviant. In situations where physical and psychosocial health is at stake, this exclusion of Others and their different perspectives can have far-reaching consequences for them.

Tjin A Djie argues that differences should be taken into account in institutions for social work and in particular at Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe. This starts with taking the

client's perspective seriously, the involvement of the extended family system and recognizing the possible history of migration. Tjin A Djie advocates that different treatment for 'differently structured'[45] migrant families, will lead to more effective assistance. The recognition that migrant families have different needs is translated in a different approach to assistance. Not a similar treatment, but an equal treatment for every client will make Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe an inclusive organization that works in a way that is sensitive to diversity. This is in line with Charles Taylor's (1992) view on the politics of recognition. In his eyes, recognition (of difference[46]) is essential to the happiness of human beings and he defines 'the withholding of recognition or misrecognition as a form of oppression' (Taylor 1994:53-54). When Taylor (1992) reflects on equality in multicultural societies, he distinguishes between equal dignity and equal respect. Equal dignity starts from what people have in common, like their humanity or citizenship, that 'applies to all members in a relatively uniform way' according to Taylor (1992). Equal respect on the other hand, has to do with 'an understanding that difference is also important in conceptualizing and institutionalizing equal relations between individuals'. Taylor (1992) refers to the group identities that individuals have and the existence of hierarchical relations between different groups in society that not only affect equal respect but also damage equal dignity.

In the case of equal dignity in social work, every inhabitant of the Netherlands has the right to appropriate assistance, but with a similar treatment for all, equal respect is not granted to everyone. Precisely because differences in perspective, related to ethnic, religious, gender, sexual and class identity, are not acknowledged.

One size (un)fits all?

Iris Marion Young criticizes what she defines as 'the liberal assimilationist ideal of treating everyone equally according to the same 'neutral' principles, rules and standards'. Because public rules represent the norms of the dominant group, they can never be neutral, instead they 'mark marginalized groups as deviant or Other' (Young 1990:163-164). She argues for the politics of difference in multicultural states, that 'promotes equality among socially and culturally different groups and advocates group autonomy to empower such groups to develop their own voice' (Young 1990:163). According to Young, the focus on 'equality and liberation' of the assimilationist ideal has oppressive consequences, such as the 'perpetuation of cultural imperialism' by the dominant group, because of their unawareness of their privileged positions and their understanding of their norms as universal (Young 1990:164). This idea of equality is based on a 'one size fits all' mentality, while Young (1990) advocates for equality that

---

[45] Meaning in this context differently structured than the dominant Dutch individual family structure.

[46] My addition, interpreted from Taylor's text.

does not (dis)advantage the different parties in the sense that 'the rules speak to and for all the parties'. Tariq Modood's (2007) understanding of multiculturalism contains the fundamental aspects mentioned by Taylor and Young. Modood (2007:48) defines multiculturalism as 'two-way process of integration but, additionally, it is taken to work differently for different groups'. The social realities of groups are recognized in Modood's perspective, which is exactly what Tjin A Djie advocates in her Protective Wraps-model. Moreover, Modood concludes that the 'multi' in multiculturalism should refer to 'specific policies, complexes of policies and multicultural institutional arrangements (that) have to be customized to meet diverse (as well as common) vulnerabilities, needs and priorities' (Modood 2007:46). In other words, instead of the elimination or denial of differences, such as in the sameness-politics of Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe, evident differences should be recognized (Modood 2007:39).

Anne Phillips (1992:20) contributes to the 'equality/difference' debate that the focus should be on a plurality of many differences, 'so that equality becomes compatible with diversity'. This perspective moves beyond the binary that opposes 'difference' and 'sameness' (Pilcher & Whelehan 2004:29). To relate this to conventional social work and the Protective Wraps-model; if equality is understood as sameness, like at Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe, the dominant approach is the norm and applies to everyone, regardless of someone's positioning and assistance will not be appropriate for everyone. If difference is recognized and taken into account, as Tjin A Djie's approach works towards, the perspectives of migrants are appreciated, taken seriously and thus included in social work approaches. Moreover, I argue to understand 'difference' as plural. As Tjin A Djie focuses on one aspect of difference, namely the existence of collective family structure, this brings her back to a binary that opposes 'collective' and 'individual' systems and suggests a hierarchical relation.

Instead, if the recognition of difference is at stake and is understood as plural, more axes of signification are included, like ethnicity, gender, class and sexuality. This means more attention for a diversity of differences which gives a social worker more opportunities to be sensitive to these differences, offer appropriate assistance and to prevent the perpetuation of hierarchical power relations. This intersectional approach gives insight in the intertwined relations between various axes and helps to discuss the possible different positionings of social workers and their clients. The fruitfulness of this intersectional diversity approach for Tjin A Djie's model is that it brings underlying power relation to light and deconstructs them, because it moves beyond the discussion that favors individual or collective family structures and focuses instead on the inclusion of more aspects of diversity.

Thus, I conclude that Tjin A Djie's limited definition of difference in her plea for a more inclusive social work perspective conflicts with the principle of diversity that she

advocated in her intercultural dialogue with the social workers. A move towards intersectional diversity is important, if not fundamental, to avoid the dichotomy of sameness and difference and to deconstruct underlying power relations in Dutch society. Tjin A Djie's Protective Wraps needs more focus on color- and power evasiveness, instead of diversity formulated as oppositional collective and individual family structures. More appropriate assistance can be reached when diversity aspects, like gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality are all taken into account.

3.4 The social workers as 'case-studies': how different are they?

In this paragraph I will analyze how Tjin A Djie approaches difference and diversity in practice in her focus on intercultural communication and the social workers at Bureau Jeugdzorg Drenthe. I wonder whether my former conclusions about the absence of gender and sexuality in Tjin A Djie's diversity approach and the reduction of diversity to binary differences between family structures, will be confirmed or invalidated. Also, I will have attention for power- and color evasiveness and their possible deconstruction.

To gain insight into Tjin A Djie's practical implementation of diversity, I will look at the given examples and quotes of the social workers who work with the Protective Wraps-model. Their examples form a powerful aspect of the book, because their experiences with intercultural work are a reflexive example for the reader. The openness about mistakes they made, like their misinterpretations, the underestimation of a client's perspective or their difficulties with personal sensitivities or judgments, connect to Tjin A Djie's value of showing one's vulnerable and personal aspects. Simultaneously, the impact of these quotes lies in the underlying messages on difference that are given by the social workers. I will address the following questions: How diverse are the social workers that are represented? What positionings do they take up in society when looked at from the angles of ethnicity, gender, class and sexuality? What kind of examples do these social workers bring to light when they refer to 'different' clients?

When Tjin A Djie works on intercultural communication with social workers, she focuses on their 'cultural baggage' and its structuring impact on one's personal and professional beliefs and positioning in society. Her first step in creating awareness on this baggage is to explore family messages, attitudes and values and understand how they construct one's identity and world view. The examples used in the book, were given by the social workers during Tjin A Djie's training in intercultural communication. It remains unclear what exact assignment Tjin A Djie gave them, but she chose to include the descriptions and did not analyze them critically, which makes me conclude that she goes along with them. Tjin A Djie positions herself as a diversity expert and refers to her roots within multiple ethnic communities with specific

patriarchal and matriarchal systems, religious traditions (Jewish, Protestant, Catholic) and her migration experience. The axes of gender, sexuality, nation and class are left out in her positioning, which suggests that these diversity aspects did not contribute to her positioning nor affected her personal and professional views.

If I take a closer look at the given examples of the social workers and how they reflect on diversity in their environment, ethnicity and related family matters are mentioned very often. Either because they have a partner with an Indonesian or Antillean background, or have Moluccan, Indonesian, Surinamese or Armenian roots themselves. Important here, is the fact that the white Dutch ethnicity is not explicitly mentioned, as if white Dutch social workers do not belong to an ethnic group. Two social workers refer to diversity in language among them, because of dialects in Drenthe and a grandchild that is raised bilingually in Swedish and Dutch. One social worker draws attention to her working-class background and her experience of 'living in between (class) cultures' during her student life.

So if these social workers reflect on their positionings, ethnicity is the key aspect of difference, but only for social workers who (or whose partner) do not fit the white Dutch picture. In other words, ethnicity is marked when it pertains to the Other and not when a social worker has a white Dutch background. This suggests that being white Dutch is the norm for social workers in Dutch society and this confirms whiteness as 'unmarked category' (Wekker 1998). Both gender relations and the impact of sexuality are not mentioned in relation to diversity in their own environment or in the contact with their clients.

Ethnic clients & transparent social workers?
When I analyze the examples that the social workers give about their clients, I draw the same conclusion. In all the examples, the ethnic background of clients is explicitly mentioned and related to differences in the way children are raised or to their history as migrants or refugees. Differences and the difficulties of the clients are 'explained' by their non-Dutch ethnicity and not connected with aspects like gender, class or sexuality, while these are influential aspects in the construction of positionings and identities. There is only one example (2008:54) where gender and ethnicity intersect, namely when a (white?) male social worker describes the impact of bringing his female Surinamese colleague with him to an appointment with a Moroccan family. She works as intercultural employee and changed the dialogue with the family by focusing on their perspective. The mother of the family suddenly spoke and the male social worker realised that both the gendered and ethnic positioning of his colleague influenced the situation. But when he reflects on the situation, he explains her success by the fact that she works from an intercultural perspective, instead of recognizing his

own positioning as white Dutch male social worker and being aware of how this positioning simultaneously affected the dialogue. In this case, the white male social worker naturalized his own position and was unaware of the impact of his male gender on both the mother and father of the family and their mutual communication. The possible hierarchical relation between his position as white and part of the dominant Dutch group and the Moroccan parents, who belong to an ethnic minority group in the Netherlands, could have reinforced the unequal (social) power relations as well.

This example is the only situation that engages with both gender and ethnicity and shows the possible impact on the intercultural dialogue. Also, this example sheds light on the difficulties for social workers of the dominant Dutch community of becoming aware of their own privileged positions in society and the underlying power relations that are always at play. Thus, the ways in which the social workers reflect on their positionings privilege ethnicity as it pertains to the Other, in isolation from other axes of signification, and they do not reflect on their own ethnicity, nor gender or sexual positioning.

In the given descriptions of social workers, only their specific function at Bureau Jeugdzorg and their name is mentioned. Some names, like 'Gré' or 'Henke' could be both female and male names, which was confusing in my opinion. The social workers, who are ethnically different than white Dutch, are explicitly described as such, while the social workers who fit the dominant white Dutch community are not positioned in this way. This creates a hierarchical relation between white Dutch social workers and social workers who are ethnically different, because the dominant group is positioned as normal. Every reader is expected to understand that if someone's ethnic identity is not mentioned, s/he must be white Dutch, while Other social workers are expected to explain 'where they come from'. Obviously, the dominant Dutch occupy a powerful position here, exactly because their position remains unquestioned. As Wekker and Lutz (2001:32) underline, this is exactly how unmarked categories work: 'They do not need to identify, because their representation speaks for itself'. To question the privileged position of white Dutch is important, just as mentioning everyone's ethnic background, and working towards the deconstruction of whiteness as the unmarked category. Botman and Jouwe (2001:16-17) argue that 'whites should name, historicize and problematize their positioning and are then able to change it'. In Prins' (2000:107) words, 'deconstructions of whiteness bring to light a group that has been invisible as a group up to now, and is privileged because of this invisibility'. This deconstruction of whiteness in relation to hierarchical power relations in Dutch society is an important element of intercultural dialogue. For this reason, Tjin A Djie should give this 'color- and power evasiveness' (Frankenberg 1993) a more central place

when she works with the cultural baggage of the social workers and refers to dominant perspectives in Dutch society.

More details about the contextualisation of the social workers could have been useful for the reader as illustration of (possible) cultural baggage and the age of the social workers is also something that would have interested me. The little information about the social workers slightly contrasts with the thorough description of the clients, while they are equally important in the dialogue even though they fulfil different roles.

3.4.1. What about Chantal?

I would like to take one example from the book and look at it from an intersectional angle, to demonstrate the contributions of this perspective. In the example of Chantal[47], who works as youth protector[48], she speaks about the intercultural skills she used in her work with an African family. To what ethnic group Chantal belongs or how old she is, remains unmentioned. Only her name and her job position are given. From her name, I assume she is a woman, but she could also be male or female transgender. Chantal defines the aggressive behavior of the mother as the family's problem and views this aggressiveness as intolerable behavior in 'the Dutch culture'. This defines the African background of the mother as the problem, as if her ethnicity explains her aggressiveness. In my view, 'African' does not even give enough information about the mother's ethnic background, her skin color or the country she came from. She can be a white woman from South Africa who speaks Afrikaans or a black woman from DR Congo who speaks Swahili and a bit of French. Both these possibilities create very different positionings within Dutch society, according to in– and excluding mechanisms based on color, ethnicity and Dutch language skills.

The only information related to their home country is that the mother and her daughter suffer from their traumatic experience of war. In the given example, it remains unclear if the mother is a single parent, married or that she lost her partner. Some more information about the impact of gender in her life is useful here, because it affects her behavior too. What is expected behavior for a (single) mother, a woman or a partner in her eyes and what gender relations are normal according to her? The mother's behavior is not related to her class position either, while for example financial problems or a change in class position can cause suffering as well. Also the mother's religion, sexuality and age influence her positioning in the Dutch society. Maybe it is difficult for her to connect to fellow Muslims because she is a single mother or is she excluded from a Christian church because she is married to a woman or she is discriminated and not taken seriously at Dutch institutions for social assistance,

---

[47] To be found at page 52 of the book.
[48] My translation of the Dutch word 'jeugdbeschermer'

because she is very young compared to white Dutch mothers. All these aspects influence the others, construct the mother's position in society and give information about the difficulties she might face. In her relation with Chantal, all these aspects matter as well. If Chantal is a young black Moluccan-Dutch woman, maybe the mother identifies more easily with her, than with an old white Dutch male social worker, but this depends on her positioning regarding possible skin color and ethnic, gender, sexual, class and religious identity.

Intersectional benefits
All these aspects are important to contextualize this African mother and to avoid the pitfall of explaining problems and difficulties by someone's ethnicity. If Tjin A Djie had given more information about Chantal's positioning, this could have created more awareness of possible power inequalities at stake in the relation between Chantal and her client. Also, to bring in (at least) the dimensions of gender, class and sexuality offers a more thorough description of the African mother and her positioning, both in relation to Chantal and to Dutch society in general. Then the reader gets a more detailed understanding of how cultural baggage and dominant norms (like whiteness) impact the relationship between social worker and client and shape their intercultural dialogue. The aim of the Protective Wraps-model to offer an intercultural perspective in social work will become stronger if there is attention for more aspects of diversity than just ethnicity, as it only applies to the ethnic Other. Moreover, when an intersectional perspective is used in the Protective Wraps-model the underlying power relations and excluding mechanisms in Dutch society will become more apparent.

In contrast, if someone's difficulties are solely explained by her ethnic identity, a negative essentialist image is created of a specific ethnic group and internal differences within the group are overlooked. This negative stereotype reinforces hierarchical relations between the dominant ethnic community and the other ethnic communities. I do not suggest here that Tjin A Djie creates negative essentialist images of migrants or specific ethnic groups, but more in general I wanted to point to the possible consequences of explaining problems solely by ethnicity, especially in the case of dialogues in intercultural social work.

In short, I argue that Tjin A Djie should have more attention for the mentioned diversity aspects to move beyond the risk of reinforcing ethnic dichotomies and to be able to make hierarchical power relations (more) visible. A fundamental aspect here is the reflection on the Self, one of Tjin A Djie's main messages throughout the book, which unfortunately remains underexposed in the described experiences of social workers and their clients. When a client's positioning is discussed, but the positioning of a social worker is taken for granted, their relationship is still hierarchical; the

opposite of Tjin A Djie's aim. The Protective Wraps-model can contribute more to awareness on existing unequal power relations and dominant white Dutch convictions when the descriptions and examples in the book are used as opportunities to highlight and deconstruct these hierarchies and dominant standards.

3.5 Who is the migrant?

In this paragraph I critically consider the concept of 'migrants'. Who is this migrant and how is s/he constructed in the Protective Wraps-model? When Tjin A Djie speaks about migrants, she focuses on two characteristics. First, the migrant has a history of migration, either because s/he migrated to the Netherlands, or the parents or grandparents did. Secondly, the migrant grew up within a different ethnic group than the white Dutch community; although this group can live in the Netherlands (depending on the generation of migration) there are a few important differences to take into account. It starts with the roots of the family that lie within a collective family system, while the Dutch family system is defined as individual. This connects to the idea of group culture(s) and individual culture(s) that are constructed differently and have different priorities. The migrant in this case has an extended family that involves about three or four generations, while the white Dutch person has a nuclear family that includes parents and their children.

This description of migrants is problematic for several reasons. First of all, Tjin A Djie's description has similarities with the official CBS definition[49] of 'allochthon'; namely 'a person with at least one parent who was born abroad, with a distinction between allochthons of the first (born abroad) and second generation (born in the Netherlands) and between 'western' and 'non-western' allochthons'. The 'non-western' allochthon[50] comes from Africa, Latin America, Turkey or Asia with the exception of Indonesia or Japan, based on their socioeconomic (!) and socio-cultural (!) position, as this mainly concerns persons who were born in the former Dutch East Indies and employees of Japanese companies with their families'. As these definitions show, the connotation of 'allochthon' is very hierarchical in respect to autochthon and is loaded with excluding meanings on who belongs and is welcomed to the Dutch society ('rich, western, Christian and white') and who is excluded based on ethnic/cultural and class identity ('poor, non-western (Eastern), Islamic and colored'). Wekker and Lutz (2001:28) define the apparently 'innocent' terminology of the allochthonous/ autochthonous dichotomy as 'arbitrary, inconsistent, hypocritical and racist, because of its construction and reinforcement of racial difference'. Despite these negative connotations the concept is still frequently used. At first sight, Tjin A Djie seems to

---

[49] http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/dossiers/allochtonen/methoden/begrippen/default.htm?ConceptID=37

[50] http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/dossiers/allochtonen/methoden/begrippen/default.htm?ConceptID=1013

move beyond this terminology. However, when looked closer, her description of who belongs to the migrants and who does not consists of the same problematic binaries and hierarchies, but are formulated in terms of collective and individual family systems. Although she favors migrants over non-migrants, instead of the dominant 'autochthons' as starting point and 'allochthons' as deviant and not-belonging, she remains caught in the same binary. By speaking about 'the' migrant and 'the' white Dutch as two rigid constructions of identity that will never change, she uses opposing stereotypes that leave no space for internal diversity within a specific group or categorization. This contrasts with Tjin A Djie's previous demonstration of diversity that is to be found everywhere, even in local communities in Drenthe. Also, this essentialist approach does not correspond to Tjin A Djie's description of different generations within migrant families, their possibly different stages of integration and relations to Dutch identity and diversity in positionings they take up in society. These inconsistencies and the use of binary concepts are problematic for Tjin A Djie's valuable message that migrants should be approached from an empowering, supportive and appreciating perspective, while they reinforce hierarchical relations and stereotypical pictures instead of deconstructing them.

Who belongs where?
The second issue with Tjin A Djie's description of migrants is that she does not refer to specific ethnic groups when she uses this concept throughout her book. She only remarks: 'Many migrants in the Netherlands are raised in We-systems and we mainly think of those groups when we talk about the We-system' (Tjin A Djie 2008:24). This leaves so much space for interpretation that the reader probably holds on to her (stereotypical?) assumptions regarding migrants, related to specific ethnic groups in Dutch society that are negatively represented in media and politics. In the case of Poles, Moroccans and Somalis for example, very different issues are at play, but how they are positioned in Tjin A Djie's approach, remains unclear. Tjin A Djie mentions some of the history of migrants and their relation to colonization in their home countries. In this context she refers to Moroccan, Turkish, Surinamese and Antillean people living in the Netherlands (Tjin A Djie 2008:40). In the examples in the book, the clients with a migrant background are Moroccan, Surinamese, Rwandese, 'African', Iranian and Croatian. Nevertheless, it remains unsure if all those ethnic communities have a collective family system and if these examples include all migrant groups in the Netherlands that should be taken into account. In some cases Tjin A Djie uses the Western and non-Western-binary as substitute for the I-system and We-system, but still it is unclear who is included. It would have been useful if Tjin A Djie had given a

clear definition instead of a broad description in order to avoid misunderstandings and stereotypical representation.

The final aspect of Tjin A Djie's use of the migrant concept has to do with intersectionality. In the positioning of social workers and their ethnic background, only the Moluccan social worker refers explicitly to his father and the Moluccan community in the Netherlands and their history of migration. The other social workers, with Indonesian and Surinamese roots or with partners with an Antillean or Indonesian background, are not referred to as migrants. This suggests that the clients are positioned as migrants, while the social workers position themselves by their (non-white) ethnic identity, but not by their migration history. This connects to Tjin A Djie's statement that the impact of migration is often overlooked, also by migrants themselves. This applies also to Tjin A Djie herself, because she does not refer to these social workers as migrants either, while she does position herself as migrant. At stake here is the intersection of class and ethnicity: once one is educated, like the social workers, one is removed from ethnicity, in the sense as it is usually understood in the Netherlands, pertaining to the Other, the client in this case. The social worker occupies an unmarked, powerful position because of his profession and education, this moves him beyond his migrant identity. The underlying binary and hierarchical relationship is clearly underlined here, as if one is either educated or migrant, based on an unequal power relation.

Except for class and ethnicity, no other axes of signification are taken into account in relation to migrant positionings. Unfortunately, this leaves the migrants in this book without gender or sexuality, just as the social workers. In the next paragraph I will elaborate on the consequences of this gender 'neutral' migrant construction.

3.5.1 Gendered Others

In the previous paragraphs, I have elaborated on the contribution of the intersectional approach regarding the positioning of social workers and clients. I have concluded that by taking into account more aspects of diversity, a more specific picture of their positioning is provided. In other words, more information is gathered about the living conditions and the related power relations between client and social worker, without reinforcing rigid hierarchical oppositions like 'the' migrant and 'the' white Dutch ('non-migrant') or 'the' We-culture and 'the' I-culture.

Tjin A Djie does not reflect on different gender positions related to migrants, while she simultaneously gives a few examples on migrant women that should not be taken so lightly in my view. What might have happened here, is that my 'sacred cows' are touched, because my feminist eyes cannot ignore these following examples. Tjin A Djie (2008:37) refers in a few lines to the number of migrant women who lose their

Dutch language when they are giving birth and who die during labor, and to the importance of female virginity and arranged marriages for the continuity of the migrant family within specific (ethnic) groups. In my eyes, these examples deserve more attention and contextualization than just two sentences, because the different gendered expectations that are at stake here affect the life chances of differently gendered subjects. For this reason I assume this affects the social work context and its accompanying relations too. Expected gender roles can vary enormously between different ethnic communities and are related with class positions, locations of origin (like a city or a rural area, intertwined with access to education), accepted sexual behavior and religious communities.

'Colonial feminism'

In relation to multiculturalism, differences in gender roles between various ethnic and religious communities are a frequently discussed topic in the Netherlands. In this debate, the focus is mainly on Muslims who are constructed in stereotypical pictures, like 'the oppressed Muslim woman' and 'the aggressive Muslim man' (Prins 2000). The dominant white Dutch ethnic community is represented by 'liberal white feminists' and 'rational, enlightened, white Christian men' who try to save the oppressed or backward Other women from their religion or their culture. As such, it is a clear example of Leila Ahmed's 'colonial feminism' (1992), that legitimizes this saving of Others in a colonial rhetoric, but is actually a selective concern with these women and a way to perpetuate Western cultural superiority (Prins 2000). Asma Barlas (2009) criticizes the used imperialist approach as well. She points to the unfortunate categorization of Muslim women, because this makes them highly visible as Muslim women, but simultaneously invisible as members of Dutch society (Barlas 2009:53). In the words of Modood (2007:45), anti-Muslim racism is 'the most important cultural racism today, at least in Western Europe' and I agree with this.

Tjin A Djie does not get trapped in the binary opposition of Muslims ('migrants') and the 'rest'. On the other hand, when she gives examples about migrant women, there is a lack of analysis and contextualization of their positionings. It is important to be aware of possible differences, sensitivities and stereotypes in the gendered context of social work and the gendered relations between client and social worker. Furthermore, because it is important to take the underlying power relations in Dutch society into account, and to make sure that social workers are aware of the difference between assistance and 'forced liberation' with respect to their female clients. Mahmood makes an important point on the normative and progressive assumptions about 'freedom' and 'agency', as she defines them as concepts that are not universally applicable and should be viewed in their context and should not only be judged from a progressive

point of view (Mahmood 2001:211-212). Tjin A Djie (2008:51) formulates a similar message in her book by focusing on attention for the perspective of clients, their family systems and positionings as migrants in Dutch society: aspects that (possibly) differ from dominant Dutch 'autonomous' perspectives. However, because Tjin A Djie looks mainly at the 'migrant' and 'non-migrant' distinction in her approach, the implications of differently gendered positionings remain underexposed. The same goes for the axes of class, sexuality and ethnicity, but I focused in particular on gender in this paragraph, because Tjin A Djie used a few small examples about migrant women.

3.6 Conclusion

The Protective Wraps-model offers a critical perspective towards conventional Dutch social work principles and the dominant individual family system in Dutch society. Tjin A Djie argues for the inclusion of migrants' perspectives, their extended family systems and their history of migration in social work approaches, to be able to offer different but more appropriate assistance to migrant families. She proposes several key points to social workers to improve their assistance to migrant families and focuses on their self-reflection: The awareness of one's personal and professional cultural baggage as a social worker, a less hierarchical relationship with their clients and the use of one's personal story within their work to reduce the distance with their clients. These are very productive and valuable contributions to today's social work institutions in Dutch society that should be recognized and implemented in conventional social work methodologies.

However, there are two aspects of the Protective Wraps-model that can be strengthened. Firstly, Tjin A Djie wraps her message in binary concepts and oppositions. This is unfortunate and makes her model less strong, because she perpetuates oppositions that are hierarchically related to each other, like collective and individual family structures and We- and I-cultures. In doing so, Tjin A Djie cannot contribute to the deconstruction of power hierarchies, while her theoretical ideas of diversity aim to do so. Instead, she inadvertently brings back the 'Us' and 'Them' dichotomy that dominates the Dutch debate on multiculturalism only in an obverse form, by assigning a dominant position to the Other and her cultural practices. If Tjin A Djie would apply her own idea that diversity can be found everywhere, even among white Dutch communities in Drenthe, she is able to move beyond the reduction of difference into family structures and the sameness/difference dichotomy.

This brings me to the second point for consideration, namely the intersectional approach towards diversity that works towards the deconstruction of underlying power relations in society. I am convinced that if Tjin A Djie would focus more explicitly on

color- and power evasiveness in her intercultural training, this would contribute to the deconstruction of the underlying power relations in Dutch society. In fact, it seems that she is going along and underwriting this powerful aspect of Dutch dominant discourse in the field of 'racial'/ethnic difference. Therefore, she needs an intersectional approach towards diversity that makes 'naturalized' power inequalities visible between the dominant white Dutch community and other ethnic communities. In the case of the Protective Wraps-model, this consists of (at least) taking into account gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality as diversity aspects. Moreover, it is vital to consider these diversity aspects for both social worker and client, to be able to be sensitive towards the power inequalities between both positionings and to offer appropriate and inclusive assistance to every client in Dutch society.

Thus, if Tjin A Djie focuses on more diversity aspects in an intersectional way, this will contribute to the inclusiveness of the Protective Wraps-model and give social workers more insight in existing unequal power relations and dominant white Dutch standards in Dutch multi-ethnic society. The descriptions and examples in the book are perfect opportunities to highlight and deconstruct these hierarchies and dominant standards. Altogether, the Protective Wraps-model is a powerful plea for more inclusive social work institutions and self-reflexive social workers to improve assistance for everyone.

4. Final Conclusion

In this thesis I have dealt with two important questions regarding the Protective Wraps-model. My key question was: In which ways does the Protective Wraps-model deviate from dominant approaches in social work? The second question I concentrated on in this thesis relates to intersectionality, namely: Does the Protective Wraps-model utilize an intersectional approach and if not, how can an intersectional approach strengthen its aims? Several sub questions helped me to answer these questions and focused on the approach of the Protective Wraps-model regarding its social worker and client-relation, its definitions of difference, diversity and sameness, the roles gender and sexuality play in the model and how 'the' migrant is constructed. I approached the Protective Wraps-model with an intersectional discourse analysis to find my answers and to gain more insight into the model. The historical framework of social work gave me insight in two movements that are important for the contextualization of this thesis, namely the ideas and contributions of gender and intercultural social work. The separateness of these movements turned out to be characteristic for the discourse on difference in Dutch society, in its focus on one axis of difference in isolation from other differences, as gender sensitive social work focuses on gender and intercultural social work concentrates on culture/ethnicity. This singular focus on difference is not only applied in various social work approaches, but also visible within academic disciplines, as I have experienced in my academic journey from Anthropology to Gender Studies.

Tjin A Djie's Protective Wraps-model can be framed in the movement of intercultural social work that criticizes Dutch social work institutions for their mono-culturalism and ethnocentrism. The Protective Wraps-model deviates from dominant white Dutch social work approaches in its specific focus on migrant families and the aim for the recognition and inclusion of migrants' perspectives in social work methodologies. An important aspect of this inclusion is a different and more symmetrical relation between social worker and client. Tjin A Djie proposes several key points to social workers to improve their assistance to migrant families and focuses on their self-reflection: The awareness of one's personal and professional cultural baggage as a social worker, a less hierarchical relationship with their clients and the use of one's personal story within their work to reduce the distance with their clients. All these aspects propose a more effective and symmetrical relation between social worker and client. I consider Tjin A Djie's key points as very productive and valuable contributions to today's social work institutions in Dutch society that should be recognized and implemented in conventional social work methodologies.

The key points of the Protective Wraps-model have many similarities with the principles of the intercultural movement, but differ on one important point: the reference to whiteness. Tjin A Djie does not connect her focus on Dutch I-culture(s) or individual family systems to the whiteness of Dutch conventional institutions or Dutch social workers. Although Tjin A Djie urges for self-reflection in her intercultural training and she reminds social workers that diversity is everywhere, whiteness remains unquestioned in her book. If Tjin A Djie would focus more explicitly on the evasiveness of color, she could make this mechanism more visible and contribute to the deconstruction of the underlying power inequalities regarding color and ethnicity in Dutch society. It is unfortunate that Tjin A Djie does not point to whiteness as one of her concerns, because this is one of the key issues of intercultural assistance which forms an important critique of the dominant color blindness in Dutch society.

Intersectional diversity?

My second aim in the analysis of the Protective Wraps-model was to focus on intersectionality. In Tjin A Djie's description of diversity, she understands diversity as inherent part of daily life to be found everywhere, even between white Dutch neighbors in Drenthe. However, when Tjin A Djie refers to diversity aspects in her book or uses examples of social workers from her training, diversity is translated into differences between collective and individual family systems. Her focus on family systems inadvertently creates hierarchical oppositions between collective and individual family systems, because she uses them as binary concepts. This brings her back to the 'Us' and 'Them' dichotomy that dominates the Dutch debate on multiculturalism only in an obverse form, by assigning a dominant position to the Other and her cultural practices. Although the Other is granted a more powerful position by Tjin A Djie, a strategic move in my understanding, the binary relations are not rejected or moved beyond. This approach fits the dominant Dutch thinking on difference, where the dichotomy of difference and sameness is operative. Diversity is translated into a singular focus on difference, related to ethnicity in this case, instead of understanding difference as plural.

An intersectional perspective takes (at least) gender, ethnicity, sexuality and class into account as axes of signification. In Tjin A Djie's approach gender and sexuality are not referred to as diversity aspects, while ethnicity and class are mentioned occasionally, but none of these four differences is consistently included in her work. As a consequence, the social positionings of migrant clients and social workers in the Protective Wraps-model remain unclear, because their gender, ethnicity, class and/or sexuality are not or only partly included and not linked with the other axes. This makes it impossible to critically reflect on social power relations. Therefore, my

conclusion is that the Protective Wraps-model does not utilize an intersectional approach.

Towards a more inclusive social work perspective

However, I am convinced that the Protective Wraps-model can be strengthened by an intersectional approach, as I have elaborated in the paragraphs on the relation between social worker and client (3.2) and the social workers as case-studies (3.4). The intersectional approach makes 'naturalized' power inequalities visible between the dominant white Dutch community and other ethnic communities by looking at the intertwined relation between gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality. In the case of social worker and client, it is important to be sensitive towards the power inequalities between both their positionings and to offer appropriate and inclusive assistance to every client in Dutch society. Thus, the named aspects of diversity should be taken into account for both social worker and client and not, as seems to occur in the Protective Wraps-model, only in relation to the (ethnically Other) client. If the Protective Wraps-model would work from an intersectional perspective this would transcend the focus on difference as singular, which dominates the dominant discourse on difference in Dutch society. Then the achievements of both gender sensitive and intercultural social work will be included and their forces will be joined, to work not only towards the inclusion of both gender and ethnicity in social work methodologies, but preferably towards a plurality of many differences, so that equality will be compatible with diversity. Thus, Tjin A Djie's work will be more able to challenge the order of the dominant discourse, if she approaches diversity from an intersectional perspective.

Nevertheless, Tjin A Djie's aim to contribute to a more inclusive perspective in social work and to raise awareness among social workers regarding their self-reflection and more symmetrical relations with clients, succeeded. She brings up different knowledges, strengths and perspectives related to social work and she reflects on exclusionary white Dutch social work approaches. This makes her book still very necessary and contributing in today's multi-ethnic society, even though it will be more inclusive when diversity is applied to gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality in an intersectional way and works towards plurality and inclusion of all these differences within social work methodologies.

To struggle for inclusion, to become heard and recognized as different, but equal, can be of vital importance. Such as for the women involved in the VHV-movement, who fought for their inclusion in health and psychosocial care and for the pioneers in intercultural assistance, who approach migrants as equal citizens with a different background, who need appropriate assistance like every Other person. To move

beyond the dominant exclusionary standards is not easy and requires courage and perseverance. In my eyes, Kitlyn Tjin A Djie is one of these important people who challenge the status quo with their different knowledges, standpoints and experiences and offer food for thought regarding the excluding mechanisms and ethnocentrism in Dutch society. I want to conclude this thesis with an emphasis on the importance of these contributions, like the Protective Wraps-model, even if the used language seems not as inclusive as the message from the heart.

5. Bibliography

Ahmed, L (1992) <u>Women and Gender in Islam: Historical roots of a Modern Debate</u> New Haven, Yale University Press

Barlas, A (2009) 'Interview with Asma Barlas' in <u>Opzij</u> Vol.37, No.9 (pp.50-53)

Baumann, G (1999) <u>The multicultural riddle: Rethinking National, Ethnic and Religious Identities</u> New York, Routledge

Bekkum, D and others (1996) 'Migratie als transitie' in Jong, J de and Berg, M van de (ed) <u>Handboek Transculturele Psychiatrie en Psychotherapie</u> Lisse, Harcourt

Boedjarath, I and Van Bekkum, D (1997) <u>Een blik in de transculturele hulpverlening</u> Utrecht, Uitgeverij Jan van Arkel

Boet, A and Waaldijk, B (2003) 'Start were the client is, Marie Kamphuis and the professionalisation of Dutch Social Work' in Hering, S and Waaldijk, B (ed) <u>History of social work in Europe, Female Pioneers and their influence on the Development of International Social Organizations</u> Opladen, Leske + Budrich

Botman, M and Jouwe, N and Wekker, G (2001) <u>Caleidoscopische visies</u> Amsterdam, KIT

Buikema, R and Van der Tuin, I (2007) <u>Gender in media, kunst en cultuur</u> Bussum, Uitgeverij Coutinho

Butler, J (2004) <u>Undoing Gender</u> London, Routledge

Campbell, H and Essed, L (1994) 'Interculturele benadering in de hulpverlening' in Hoogsteder, J (ed) <u>Etnocentrisme en communicatie in de hulpverlening: interculturele hulpverlening</u> Utrecht, Stichting Landelijke Federatie van Welzijnsorganisaties voor Surinamers

Choenni, C and Zwan, T van der (1987) <u>Psychologische tests en allochtonen</u> Utrecht, LBR- Landelijk Bureau ter bestrijding van Rassendiscriminatie

Dijk, R van and Boedjarath, I et al (2000) 'Interculturele gezondheidszorg in de XXIe eeuw. Een manifest' in <u>Geestelijke Volksgezondheid</u> Vol.55 (pp.115-121)

Essed, P (1991) <u>Inzicht in alledaags racisme</u> Utrecht, Het Spectrum

Felten, H (2006) 'Of Angels and Heroes' Universiteit Utrecht (MA-thesis)

Fernando, S and Cortes, D (1993) 'Mental health, Race and Culture' in <u>American Journal of Sociology</u> Vol.98 No.5 (pp. 1211-1213)

Foucault, M (1980) <u>Power/Knowledge</u> Brighton, Harvester

Frankenberg, R (1993) <u>White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness</u> London, Routledge

Ghorashi, H (2006) 'Paradoxen van culturele erkenning' in Tijdschrift voor Genderstudies No.4 (pp.42-53)

Grever, M (2000) 'Moral purity and Whiteness, feminist visions of a nation of the Dutch Women's exhibition in 1898' in <u>Thamyris</u> Vol.6, No.1 & 2

Hall, S (1997) <u>Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices</u> London, SAGE Publications

Haraway, D (1991) <u>Simians, Cyborgs, and Women</u> New York, Routledge

Harding, S (1991) <u>Whose science? Whose Knowledge?</u> Ithaca New York, Cornell University Press

Hesse-Biber, S and Leavy, P (2007) <u>Feminist Research Practice: A Primer</u> Thousand Oaks, SAGE Publications

Holstvoogd, R (2006) <u>Maatschappelijk werk in kerntaken: Een nieuw profiel van de beroepspraktijk</u> Houten, Bohn Stafleu van Loghum

Hoogsteder, J (1994) <u>Etnocentrisme en communicatie in de hulpverlening: interculturele hulpverlening</u> Utrecht, Stichting Landelijke Federatie van Welzijnsorganisaties voor Surinamers

Jessurun, N (2010) <u>Transculturele vaardigheden voor therapeuten</u> Bussum, Uitgeverij Coutinho

Jessurun, N (1994) 'Genogrammen en Etniciteit' in Hoogsteder, J (ed) <u>Etnocentrisme en communicatie in de hulpverlening: interculturele hulpverlening</u> Utrecht, Stichting Landelijke Federatie Welzijnsorganisaties voor Surinamers.

Jørgenson, M and Phillips, L (2002) <u>Discourse analysis as Theory and Method</u> London, SAGE Publications

Kortman, F (2003) <u>Interculturele geestelijke gezondheidszorg in Nederland</u> Rotterdam, Mikado en GGZ Nederland

Leito, A and Bekkum, D van (1997) 'Visie en uitgangspunten van transculturele hulpverlening' in Boedjarath, I and Bekkum, D van (ed) <u>Een blik in de transculturele hulpverlening</u> Utrecht, Uitgeverij Jan van Arkel

Mahmood, S (2001) 'Feminist Theory, Embodiment, and the Docile Agent: Some reflections on the Egyptian Islamic revival' in <u>Cultural Anthropology</u> Vol.16, No.2 (pp.202-236)

May, R (2010) 'Allochtoon zijn is geen ziekte' in <u>Psy GGZ Nederland Online</u> 12-07-'10

Mens-Verhulst, J van and Waaldijk, B (2008) <u>Vrouwenhulpverlening 1975-2000</u> Houten, Bohn Stafleu van Loghum

Mens-Verhulst, J van (2003) 'Diversiteit als sleutel tot vraagsturing in een gevarieerde samenleving' in <u>Sociale Interventie</u> No.3 (pp.25-34)

Meuwissen, M (2011) 'The Impact of Women's Studies' Universiteit Utrecht (MA-thesis)

Modood, T (2007) <u>Multiculturalism: A Civic idea</u> Cambridge, Polity Press

Nijnenhuis, H (1997) <u>De lerende professie, hoofdlijnen van het maatschappelijk werk</u> Utrecht, Uitgeverij SWP

Oude Avenhuis, A (2004) 'Wisselende perspectieven: een goede behandeling is én seksespecifiek en intercultureel' in <u>Cultuur, Migratie en Gezondheid</u> Utrecht, Stichting Pharos

Pharos (2011) <u>Migratie en gezondheid: Feiten en cijfers 2011</u> Utrecht, Stichting Pharos

Phillips, A (1992) 'Universal Pretensions in Political Thought' in Barrett, M and Phillips, A (ed) <u>Destabilizing theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates</u> California, Stanford University Press

Phoenix, A (2001) 'Voorwoord' in Botman, M and Jouwe, N and Wekker, G (ed.) <u>Caleidoscopische visies</u> Amsterdam, KIT

Pilcher, J and Whelehan, I (2004) <u>Fifty Key Concepts in Gender Studies</u> London, SAGE Publications

Prins, B (2000) <u>Voorbij de Onschuld</u> Amsterdam, Uitgeverij Van Gennep

Seodu Herr, R (2008) 'Politics of Difference and Nationalism: On Iris Young's Global Vision' in <u>Hypatia</u> Vol.23, No.3 (pp.39-59)

Swart, A (2008) 'Lesbisch specifieke hulpverlening: Dit is de vrouw met wie ik probeerde te praten' in Mens-Verhulst, J van and Waaldijk, B (ed.) <u>Vrouwenhulpverlening 1975-2000</u> Houten, Bohn Stafleu van Loghum

Taylor, C (1994) <u>Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition</u> New Jersey, Princeton University Press

Taylor, C (1992) <u>Multiculturalism and 'The politics of Recognition': An Essay with Commentary</u> New Jersey, Princeton University Press

Tjin A Djie, K and Zwaan, I (2008) <u>Beschermjassen, transculturele hulp aan families</u> Assen, Van Gorcum

Tjin A Djie, K (2003) 'Protective Wraps' in <u>Systems Therapy</u> Vol.15, No.1 (pp.17-39)

Verloo, M (2006) 'Multiple Inequalities, Intersectionality and the European Union' in <u>European Journal of Women's Studies</u> Vol.13, No.3 (pp.211-228)

Waaldijk, B (1996) <u>Het Amerika der vrouw: Sekse en geschiedenis van maatschappelijk werk in Nederland en de Verenigde Staten</u> Groningen, Wolters-Noordhoff

Wekker, G (2010) 'Gammacanon 44: Gender' in <u>De Volkskrant</u>, 30-10-'10

Wekker, G (2007) 'Disciplinairiteit als strijdtoneel: Gloria Anzaldúa en interdisciplinariteit' in Buikema, R and Van der Tuin, I (ed.) <u>Gender in media, kunst en cultuur</u> Bussum, Uitgeverij Coutinho

Wekker, G and Lutz, H (2001) 'Een hoogvlakte met koude winden. De geschiedenis van het gender- en etniciteitsdenken in Nederland' in Botman, M and Jouwe, N and Wekker, G (ed.) <u>Caleidoscopische visies</u> Amsterdam, KIT

Wekker, G and Braidotti, R (1996) <u>Praten in het donker: Multiculturalisme en anti-racisme in feministisch perspectief</u> Kampen, Kok Agora

Wekker, G (1994) 'Eindelijk kom ik tot mezelf' in Hoogsteder, J (ed) <u>Etnocentrisme en communicatie in de hulpverlening: interculturele hulpverlening</u> Utrecht, Stichting Landelijke Federatie van Welzijnsorganisaties voor Surinamers

Wekker, G (1988) 'Gender, identiteitsvorming en multiculturalisme; notities over de Nederlandse multiculturele samenleving' in Geuijen, C H M (ed.) <u>Multiculturalisme</u> Utrecht, Lemma

Willie, C, Kramer, B and Brown, B (1977) <u>Racism and Mental Health: Essays</u> Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press

Young, I (1990) <u>Justice and the Politics of difference</u> New Jersey, Princeton University Press

Websites

Central Bureau of Statistics Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor Statistiek) for official
definitions of 'allochthon' and 'non-Western allochthon'
www.cbs.nl

Dutch Association for Social Workers (Nederlandse Vereniging van Maatschappelijk Werkers)
www.nvmw.nl

Kitlyn Tjin A Djie's website about the Protective Wraps-model
www.beschermjassen.nl

Professional Code of Social Workers (Beroepsprofiel Maatschappelijk Werk)
www.nvmw.nl/professionals/beroepsprofiel-inzien.html