

NORMALIZATION VS SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZATION: SIMILAR OR DIFFERENT?

Akhilesh Kumar
Rajani Ranjan Singh
University Kota

A.T. Thressiakutty
University, Coimbatore

The radical changes towards services for persons with disabilities were brought by Principle of Normalization, originated in 1969. As a consequence of Normalization, disability as a whole, and intellectual disability in particular, received the attention of the mass and the intelligentsia begun advocating normalization ideologies which became very popular across the globe as 'the right based ideology, which in turn, initiated integration, inclusion, community based rehabilitation and other non-segregating practices. But 'Normalization' came under criticism because of its simplicity resulted in an evolution in thinking which shifted the term 'Normalization' to 'Social Role Valorization' (SRV). Although, Normalization and SRV uplifted the lives of persons with disabilities, a disagreement appeared about their similarity. The present study critically examines the guidelines of these two human services for similarities and differences upon several criteria using cluster analysis and critical analysis. The Jaccard's Similarity Index has been computed to see similarity between documents explaining the concepts. The result revealed poor similarity index between documents explaining the concepts. It was also observed that Normalization and SRV differ from each other in their totality, but are the ways to achieve Social Inclusion.

Introduction

The main contribution from the Nordic countries to the international development of policies and practices in services for people with intellectual disabilities (ID) is no doubt the conceptualization and dissemination of the notion and Principle of Normalization (Tossebro, Bonafills, Teittinen, Tideman, Traustadottir & Vesala, 2012, pp:135). The essence of Normalization and Social Role Valorization lie in their consequences. These two ideologies (sometimes argued that these are not ideologies but rather, guiding principles to human services) initiated major reforms in human services for children with various disabilities. The Principle of Normalization was the precursor of programs emphasizing inclusive approaches. These inclusive services include integration, full inclusion, promoting Self Determination (SD), Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR), and legislation to protect human rights of persons with disabilities and so on. The concept of 'Integration' was first given by Benjt Nirje- the pioneer of

Normalization Principle. Nirje has defined integration as: "to be yourself—to be able and to be allowed to be yourself—among others (Nirje, 1985 pp-67)". Not only Integration, but also empowerment, self-determination, choice, consumer-directed service models, independent living, individual funding, natural support, mentoring, circle of supports or Inclusion, all such practices have their roots in the ideas of Normalization and Social Role Valorization (Caruso and Osburn, 2012; Bank-Mikkelsen, 1969; Nirje, 1969).

There was a period in which the 'Normalization' philosophy became so entrenched in everyday thinking and practice in the intellectual disability field that it was as if no one dared to question it. Despite the far-reaching adoption of practices based on Normalization Principles and the widespread recognition of the many benefits of these for service users, Normalization has become tainted with controversy (Culham & Nind, 2003, pp-68). Immediately after its formulation, Normalization has so widely misunderstood that just after ten years of its formulation, both the pioneers; Nirje & Wolfensberger differed in their thinking of Normalization significantly, even to such an extent that Wolfensberger changed the name from Normalization to Social Role Valorization.

The present study was intended to compare similarities and /or differences between Normalization and Social Role Valorization, and the underlying ideas behind these two. For this purpose content analysis of documents were carried out, to see whether Normalization and Social Role Valorization are similar.

While conducting content analysis at first, two articles from the both principles written by their respective pioneers Benjt Nirje and Wolf Wolfensberger were selected for analyzing their content. Two groups were formed. The classic article of Nirje, published in 1969, initially formulating the first statement of Principle of Normalization namely "Normalization principle and its human management implications" was the first article and the other one was "Setting The Record Straight" written by Burt Perrin & Benjt Nirje formed group one and the other group included two fundamental articles from Wolfensberger, first one was "An overview of Social Role Valorization theory" written by Wolfensberger and Lemay and the second one was "Proposed new term for normalization" written by Wolfensberger. A content analysis was performed using the qualitative data analysis software Word Stat. In order to see the similarity between these four documents under two groups, a Jaccard's correlation coefficient (Jaccard's Similarity Index) was computed on the basis of word similarity between these documents. The computed correlation is as below:

Correlation between the original formulation of Normalization and Social Role Valorization based on their word similarity:

Table 1. Correlation between the original formulation of Normalization and Social Role Valorization based on their word similarity

Sl No.	Document	Correlations (Jaccard's Coefficient)	
	Code	S1	S2
1.	N1	0.14	0.12
2.	N2	0.21	0.14

The above Table 1 shows a very poor correlation between the original formulation of Normalization and Social Role Valorization which provides enough space to suspect dis-similarity between these two. It may be noted here, that the correlation between the two primary documents within the group i.e. between

the two documents on Normalization and two documents on Social Role Valorization were found relatively high indicating consistency in formulation of both the ideologies/principles.

As observed, the poor correlation indicates no overt similarities between these two guiding principle of human services: Normalization and Social Role Valorization. In order to see the latent differences between Normalization and Social Role Valorization it is interesting to note the criticism of both made by their respective pioneers Nirje and Wolfensberger.

Latent Differences between Normalization and SRV

The comparison of Normalization and SRV are given below:

Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of their emphasis towards social inclusion:

Table 2. Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of their emphasis towards social inclusion

Criteria of comparison 1 : Emphasis

1.	Normalization	The Normalization principle emphasizes that people with handicaps should be given an opportunity to live a life similar to that of other non-disabled persons in the society, having similar rights and responsibilities within certain limits which varies from society to society and culture to culture.
2.	Social Role Valorization	Social Role Valorization theory emphasizes 'normalizing' the lives of deviant people through eliciting, shaping and maintaining normative skills and habits. It calls for certain behaviors must be ascertained by devalued groups or parties before considering their social inclusion.

Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of their intended goals and intended population:

Table 3. Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of their intended goals and intended population

Criteria of comparison 2 : Intended Goals and Intended Population

1.	Normalization	Providing equal opportunities to persons with disabilities similar to their non-disabled peers (Perrin & Nirje, 1985, Kumar & Thresiakutty, 2012) persons with intellectual disabilities in particular and persons with disabilities in general.
----	---------------	--

		Enhancement of social roles of socially devalued groups, persons with disabilities may be part of these groups.
2.	Social Role Valorization	1. Enhancing social images 2. Enhancing personal competencies of devalued group. 3. Analysis of Service systems in conformity with Normalization Goals. All socially devalued persons or groups.

As we see in the above tables (Table 2 & Table 3), Normalization and Social Role Valorization differs from each other in terms of their intended populations as well as their intended goals. Normalization is intended to foster the need of Social Inclusion of persons with disabilities only whereas Social Role Valorization includes all socially devalued groups. First one is clearly intended for persons with disabilities, but the intended population of SRV is vague. Devalued Groups may differ place to place and situation to situation.

Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of opinion of the Pioneers about each other:

Table 4. Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of opinion of the Pioneers about each other:

Criteria of comparison 3 : Opinion of the Pioneers about each other

1.	Normalization: Wolfensberger views it as a misunderstood ideology due to ease of the term. <i>As he mentions "the choice of the term 'normalization' itself clearly been unfortunate, one major reason being that relatively few people have found it possible to separate the different meanings attached to it by various users of the term (Wolfensberger, 1983 pp-235)"</i>
2.	Social Role Valorization: Nirje views <i>"Social Role Valorization is an authoritarian approach which neglects personal preferences, whereas Normalization principle indicates that persons with mental retardation should be encouraged and assisted in expressing their own preferences and making their own choices."</i> (Nirje, 1985 pp-72)

The above Table 4 reveals that the view of Nirje towards, Social Role Valorization was that it is an authoritarian approach which has nothing to do with 'Normalization' as formulated and popularized during 1970's. Wolfensberger views 'Normalization' as a misunderstood and misinterpreted ideology due to ease of term. It can be said here that Normalization was too easy to be interpreted correctly and Social Role Valorization is too complex to be understood properly by the public and professionals both.

Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on their theoretical base:

Table 5. Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on their theoretical base
Criteria of Comparison 4: Theoretical Base

1.	Normalization	Normalization is based on the ideas implemented by Bank Mikkelsen, during deinstitutionalization movement. "The mentally retarded have, along with other human beings, a basic right to receive the most adequate treatment, training, and rehabilitation available, and to be approached in an ethical fashion (Mikkelsen, 1969, pp. 234)".
2.	Social Role Valorization	Social Role Valorization: Social Role Valorization or SRV in short is based on Role Theory of Sociology which describes society on the basis of roles played by its members at different times. As learnt from Wolfensberger, Establishment, Enhancement and defense of social roles of devalued people/parties via the enhancement of their personal competencies and their social roles is Social Role Valorization. As Cocks (2001) explains it, "SRV provides a set of relations in support of the social integration of devalued people in valued participation with valued people in valued activities which take place in valued settings. (Cocks, 2011, pp. 15)

From the above Table 5, it can be observed easily that Normalization and Social Role Valorization differ to a greater extent from each other on the criteria of their theoretical basis. Normalization is based on the simple idea of Human Rights whereas SRV has different base of social roles rooted in sociology.

Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of ease of their understanding:

Table 6. Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of ease of their understanding

Criteria of Comparison 5: Ease of Understanding

1	Normalization	Very simple and easy and due to the ease of term "normalization principle has been widely misunderstood both by many of its advocates as well as by its critics. In some cases it has been misinterpreted so perversely as to produce implications and programs directly opposite to what is intended by the principle." (Nirje, 1985, pp-69)
2	Social Role Valorization	Quite complex, requires a rigorous training on SRV, is a broadened theory with its root in modern sociology developed for a relatively big population (for socially devalued people which include women, minorities, old age persons, divorcees, widows, persons with disabilities and Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), too in specific Indian context.

Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of specification of certain behavioral standards:

Table 7. Comparison of Normalization and Social Role Valorization on the basis of specification of certain behavioral standards

Criteria of Comparison 6 : Specification of Behavioural Standards

1.	Normalization	Principle of Normalization doesn't specify any behavior to be confirmed by persons with disabilities prior to their inclusion in society. i.e. Normalization doesn't require any pre-requisite for social inclusion of persons with disabilities. Bank Mikkelson, father of Normalization explains it in simplest terms as "Normalization means acceptance of the mentally retarded with their handicap offering them the same conditions as are offered to other citizens, inclusive of treatment, education and training needed to provide for optimal development". (Mikkelson, 1976, pp.27-28, Perrin & Nirje, 1985, pp-70)
2.	Social Role Valorization	SRV specifies various behavioral standards a person with Mental Retardation (Devalued Persons) must confirm. It prescribes a persons with disability must confirm certain behaviors so that they may pass undetected in society.

From the above table it is evident that 'Normalization' simply intended to promote 'acceptance of children with disabilities with their handicap and providing them all facilities available to a normal citizen. On contrary, SRV argues that since deviant behaviors lead to social devaluation, therefore, a person with disability must confirm certain behaviors so that perceivers could not detect their 'deviancy'. Not only in name but also in their formulations and interpretation 'Normalization Ideas' were quite simple. Misinterpretation of Normalization due to ease of term is entirely a different issue. Social Role Valorization on the other hand, is quite complex.

As Nirje (1985) mentions:

We wish to clearly indicate that Wolfensberger's Version of 'normalization' deviates in many significant ways from the original concept of the principle, and thus contrary to Wolfensberger's claim cannot be considered as reformulation, refinement, or operationalization of the principle. Rather his Version, with its focus on using normative means and on establishing normative behavior is built upon a fundamentally different value base and conception of people, with quite different implications for how we view and treat handicap people. Nirje, 1985, PP. 73)

This view of the leading person of Normalization Principle is of great importance in Normalization Vs. Social Role Valorization debate. Nirje never accepted Wolfensberger's definition as a reformulation of Normalization Principle. On the other hand, not only Normalization as defined by Wolfensberger, but also, Social Role Valorization, is considered as a 'refinement' or 'expansion' of the Principle of Normalization by Dr. Wolfensberger especially in his writings in 1980's. He argues that due to ease of the word Normalization, it has been misunderstood and never taken seriously by public or professionals. He writes strongly:

....the choice of the term 'normalization' itself clearly been unfortunate, one major reason being that relatively few people have found it possible to separate the different meanings attached to it by various users of the term (Wolfensberger, 1983, pp. 234). Also in part because of its name, people have failed to take the principle of Normalization seriously as a tightly built, intellectually demanding and empirically well-anchored mega theory of human service, and to some degree, relationships.(Wolfensberger, 1983, pp. 234-235, 2011, 435-436).

The degree of Wolfensberger's disappointment with the term Normalization could be understood by his following statement

Ever since 1969, I have attempted to convert the early formulations of Normalization by Bank Mikkelsen (1969) and Nirje in to a scientific theory that is universal, parsimonious, and congruent with social and behavioral science. I have never been satisfied with the term 'Normalization' but have resisted a change in Name for two reasons. a) I was unable to think of a superior choice; alternatives suggested by others seemed to be no improvement and usually even inferior: (Wolfensberger, 1983, pp. 235, 2011, 436). And b) by the early 1970s the term 'normalization' has acquired so much momentum that only a dramatically superior term seemed to warrant the attempt to change it. (Wolfensberger, 1983, pp. 235, 2011, pp. 436)

A dissatisfaction of Nirje and Wolfensberger with the definitions of Normalization given by each other is evident in the contemporary literature on Normalization and Social Role Valorization. Nirje perceived it a clear 'deviance' from the normalization as originally defined what Wolfensberger believed 'refinement'.

It's interesting to see some other critics of Normalization and Social Role Valorization. Culham & Nind (2003) views these two as different models of Normalization. In his definition of Normalization in 1972, Wolfensberger's over emphasis on 'confirming' certain behavior was widely criticized and it lead him to coin a new term instead of Normalization. As Culham & Nind, (2003) describes it:

The requirement to conform was a charge that Wolfensberger also ardently rebuked. In an attempt to allay confusion and controversy, he abandoned the term normalization and adopted instead the term "social role valorization" (SRV) (Wolfensberger, 1983). This, he argued, was intended to separate the controversial moral interpretations of normalization, and to clarify its true intentions, which were about using culturally valued means in "the creation, support, and defense of valued social roles for people who are at risk of social devaluation" (Culham & Nind, 2003, pp. 68).

As pointed out by Wolfensberger, he changed the name to eliminate the moral and controversial interpretation of principle of normalization which was attached to it due to ease of terms. Both the pioneers of Normalization: Nirje and Wolfensberger agree to each other at this point of misinterpretation of Principle of Normalization. Nirje was very sensitive to it and he tried to clarify meaning of normalization by addressing frequent misconceptions about it in his article 'Setting the Record Straight' with Burt Perrin (Perrin & Nirje, 1985).

He pointed out frequent misconceptions as:

1. Normalization means making people normal
2. Special services are inconsistent with the normalization principle
3. Normalization supports dumping people in to the community without support.
4. Normalization is an all or nothing concept
5. Normalization is appropriate only for the mildly retarded.
6. Normalization is a Scandinavian concept inapplicable elsewhere.
7. Normalization is a humanistic concept but idealized and impractical
8. Mentally Handicapped people are best off with their own kind, protected from the rigors of society. (Nirje, 1985)

No such literature were found where Wolfensberger tried to deal with such frequent misconceptions rather he was of interest to replace the word 'Normalization'. Here the question arises why Wolfensberger deviated (as pointed out by Nirje) from the originally defined 'Principle of Normalization'. Jackson (1994) traces the root of Wolfensberger's deviation from the original 'Normalization' to 'Social Role Valorization' in his early life in Germany. As he writes "*born and brought up in Nazi Germany Wolfensberger cannot have been unaffected by the knowledge of horrendous and dehumanizing treatment accorded by the Nazis to the members of all minorities groups or any group regarded as deviant. In the circumstances it is hardly surprising that Wolfensberger should feel highly hostile to any kind of authoritarian social system large or small and suspicious of the motives of anyone who worked in such a system. Wolfensberger's knowledge of what had happened in Nazi Germany and his intense shock at discovering the extent and degree of maltreatment and dehumanization of the residents in mental handicap hospitals of his adopted country must have contributed significantly to the subsequent shaping of his attitudes, values, and beliefs (Jackson, 1994, pp. 175)*". It cannot be denied that Wolfensberger's past experience of Nazi Germany have had an influence on his thought, attitude and beliefs due to which he laid over emphasis on 'devalued groups' which later became a central point of his formulation of 'Social Role Valorization'.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the cluster analysis of original writings from Nirje and Wolfensberger, and a critical analysis of summaries of ideas of Nirje and Wolfensberger suggested that both the ideologies, if not entirely different, differ from each other to a greater extent. Similar was observed after a careful closer look on available literature through various critics of Normalization and Social Role Valorization. Thus unified result of various analysis and interpretation of data favors Nirje's opinion that Wolfensberger was deviated from the original formulation of 'Normalization Principle' (Nirje, 1985) and these two guiding principles 'Normalization' and 'Social Role Valorization' differs from each other not totally but significantly in their totality.

References

- Bank-Mikkelson, N. E. (1976). 'Denmark' In R. Kugel, & A. Shearer (Eds.), *Changing pattern i residential services for the mentally retarded*, (pp. 51-70). Washington DC.
- Bank-Mikkelson, N. E. (1980). 'Denmark' In R. J. Flynn, & K. E. Nitsch (Eds.), *Normalization, social integration, and community services* (pp. 51-70). Baltimore: University Park Press.
- Bank-Mikkelson, N. E. (1969). Changing patterns of residential services for the Mentally Retarded. In President Committee on Mental Retardation. Wahington DC.
- Caruso, G. A., & Osburn, J. A. (2011). The Origins of "Best Practices" in the Principle of Normalization and Social Role Valorization. *Journal of Policy and Practices in Inteleectual Disability Research* , 8 (3), 191-196.
- Cocks, E. (2001) Normalisation and social role valorisation: Guidance for human service development, *East Asian Archives of Psychiatry*, 11(1), 12-16, The Hong Kong College of Psychiatrists.
- Culham, A., & Nind, M. (2003). Deconstructing normalization: Clearing the way of inclusion. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities* , 28 (1), 65-78.
- Jackson, R. (1994). Jackson R (1994) The Normalisation Principle: Back to Basics? *British Journal of Developmental Disabilities*; 40(2), 175-179.
- Lemay, R. A. (1995). Normalization and Social Role Valorization. In A. E. Orto, & R. P. Marineli (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Disability and Rehabilitation* (pp. 515-521). Simon & Schuster and Prentice Hall International.
- Nirje, B. (1976). The normalization principle and its human management implications. In R. B. Kugel, & A. Shearer (Eds.), *Changing Pattern in Residential Services for the Mentally Retarded* (pp. 231-252). Washington DC, USA: President's Committe on Mental Retardation.
- Nirje, B. (1985). The basis and logic of normalization principle. *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Developmental Disabilities* , 11, 65-68.
- Perrin, B., & Nirje, B. (1985). Setting the record straight: a critique of some frequent misconceptions of the normalization principle. *Australia & New Zealand Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, 11, 69-74.
- Tossebro, J., Bonfils, I. S., Teitinen, A., Tideman, M., Traustadottir, R., & Vesala, H. T. (2012). Normalization Fifty Years Beyond-Current Trends in the nordic Countries. *Journal of Policy and Practices in Intellectual Disabilities* ,9 (2) 134-146.
- Wolfensberger, W. (1983). Social Role Valorization: A Proposed New Term for the Principle of Normalization. *Mental Retardation*, 21, 1983: 234-39.
- Wolfensberger, W. (1985). Social Role Valorization: a new insight, and a new term, for normalization, *Australian Association for the Mentally Retarded Journal*, 9(1), 4-11.
- Wolfensberger, W. (2011). Social Role Valorization: A Proposed New Term for the Principle of Normalization. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities: December 2011*, 49(6) 435-440.