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CHAPTER 1

Introduction: the social work context

Welcome to Reflective Social Work Practice. This book is designed to locate the process of reflection within the ordinary, day-to-day practice of front-line social workers.

As will be seen, chapters are organized around the kinds of activities social workers undertake. Diary extracts deliberately establish the book as a practical resource, relevant to any practitioner or student social worker undertaking any of the social work activities. As a result, the book an essential companion for social workers, enabling them to make practical links between the use of reflection and their own practice experiences regardless of context. The emphasis on the ‘week in the life’ of a social worker allows the role of reflection to be embedded in the broad range of activities and roles that a social worker may be involved at points within their working week. The additional worth of the book, however, lies in the deconstruction of those activities in terms of reflective and reflexive practice, and in the purposeful attention to the integration of values, emotions and relationship-building within that process. It is very timely as the role of reflection in social work practice now occupies a central place in professional frameworks and narratives. For example, the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) (College of Social Work, 2012) highlights critical reflection as one of its nine domains. There is an emphasis on the importance of critical thinking in the complex world of social work practice and the necessity of it being evident at student, practitioner and management levels. Simply put, reflective practice is at the heart of practice throughout the entirety of a social worker’s career regardless of context or role.

This chapter will also:

• illustrate the current context of social work practice
• consider how policy is translated into actual practice
• highlight the key themes of the book
• introduce the ‘Reflective Social Work Practitioner Model’
• orientate the reader to the content of later chapters.
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Practitioner’s context

Social work practice in any setting is contextualized by a number of key, ‘hard’ features such as legislation, policy, procedure and theory. These elements are defined as ‘hard’ features because they are transparently evident, relatively easily articulated in their application, essential, and part of any robust, well-informed practitioner’s tool box in any social work interaction. Also, in the context of this book, they are defined as ‘hard’ features to differentiate them from the ‘softer’ skills of reflection, awareness of values, emotional acuity and relationship-building which form the focus of this book. The ‘hard’ features might vary from situation to situation, and the reader is encouraged to think about them in relation to their own practice, and to define and understand them specifically in relation to the piece of practice which is the subject of their reflection. It is important to note that they are defined as ‘hard,’ not because they are in any way harsh or dogmatic, but because they are the more tangible, transparent and explicit elements of practice. As such, they contrast with the more implicit, often hidden, ‘soft’ features of values, emotions and the sense a social worker will make of their relationship with the service user. It is also important to be aware that reflective social work practice integrates both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ features, so notions of binary opposites do not apply. Figure 1.1 (p. 14) should make this clear.

In recent years, much attention has been paid to the importance of the ‘hard’ features of practice, in relation to the emerging dominance of a managerialist approach to social work. Managerialism is a concern with the control of workers, involving overt attention to targets and measurements of performance, as well as the reliance on standardized tools and procedures to ensure ‘correct’ practice. As Munro (2011, p. 86) states:

the professional account of social work practice ‘in which relationships play a central role’ appears to have been gradually stifled and replaced by a managerialist account that is fundamentally different. The managerialist approach has been called a ‘rational-technical approach,’ where the emphasis has been on the conscious, cognitive elements of the task of working with children and families, on collecting information and making plans.

The ‘conscious, cognitive elements of the task’ would include the transparent application of legislation, policy, procedure and theory
which is essential but which, as Munro states, may ‘stifle’ or supplant emphasis on relationship-building if it becomes the dominant component of practice. Webb (2006, p. 21) defines rational-technical practice as an approach ‘in which the practical application of knowledge is used to achieve specific, desired ends.’ Once again, the ‘practical application of knowledge’ covers the ‘hard’ features of social work as already mentioned and is not concerned with reflection, values, emotions or relationships. Many writers in social work are in agreement that a ‘rational-technical’ approach has indeed taken hold, and that this paradigm has played out in actual social work practice, as evidenced by risk-averse practice (Fenton, 2013), the valuing of procedural knowledge over casework expertise (Whittaker, 2011), a reliance on actuarial measures of risk (Webb, 2006), an emphasis on ‘measuring’ outcomes in terms of key performance indicators, audit measures and a ‘target driven philosophy’ (Thompson and Thompson, 2008, p. 138). It can also be assumed that within a ‘rational-technical approach’ attention to values, emotions and, ultimately, reflective practice is undervalued.

More recently, a myriad of critiques have emerged suggesting that, for social work to be effective, it must move beyond the rational-technical practice agenda to an approach which takes far more cognizance of responsivity, reflective practice and relationship-building. Ferguson (2005, p. 781) was central in turning the rational-technical tide, with his critique of social work’s ‘rational-bureaucratic’ responses to child deaths, characterized by highlighting changes in procedures and processes as the solution to systemic failures. His appraisal of such responses is that they ignore the emotional, psychological aspects of the work, in particular practitioners’ responses to violence and their fears for themselves. He states that, within these responses, lies a view of practice as ‘little more than rule following’ (ibid., p. 783). Ferguson is clear that, as a profession, social work must attend to the feelings and emotions of social workers, must understand the complexities of relationship-building with sometimes very aggressive or confrontational service users, and must create organizational cultures which are reflective in nature. Only through the process of honest reflection can social workers initially identify their feelings and their progress (or lack of) in building relationships with service users. Ferguson also suggests that social work education’s uncritical teaching of values, anti-oppressive practice, warmth and ‘unconditional positive regard’ fails to tackle the complexities in terms of values when
working with families who harm their children or other involuntary service users. Workers need a way to think through properly all of the competing tensions in terms of values to deal with risk and protection, whilst still adhering to the value-base of social work. Reflective practice is the only way to do this.

The ideas in Ferguson’s paper are further developed and promoted in a number of recent key policy initiatives. For example, the Munro Report (Munro, 2011) proposes changes to the child protection system in England and Wales, advocating a move away from a rational-technical system which over-emphasizes bureaucratic procedure-following, recording and targets, to one which is child-centred and characterized by social workers who are allowed to use their professional expertise to respond to case-by-case variations in need. The report highlights relationship-building, including the ability to ask the difficult questions, a reduction in prescriptive practice, more autonomy for social workers and an emphasis on prevention. In effect, the premise of the report is that ‘when the bureaucratic aspects of work become too dominant, the heart of the work is lost’ (ibid., p. 10). Changing Lives: Report of the 21st-Century Social Work Review (Scottish Government, 2006), a wide-ranging review of social work in Scotland, recommended more autonomy for social workers and the loosening of managerial restrictions and prescriptive practice, an emphasis on the core values of social work and building relationships with service users. Reshaping Care for Older People (Scottish Government, 2012), again emphasizes building proper relationships with older service users and adopting a person-centred approach to finding out what the older person values and wants the outcome of any help given to be. The UK Government’s white paper, Caring for Our Future, Reforming care and Support (Department of Health (DoH), 2012), has at its heart a commitment that ‘supporting the transformation of the social work profession, we will ensure that people are confident that they will be able to develop trusting and rewarding relationships with those giving them care and support’ (ibid., p. 49).

The issue noted above of the need for confidence is a crucial one. Mattison (2000) notes that procedurally driven practice is attractive to workers when they feel under pressure to act correctly. Horwath (2007) suggests that even when a social worker feels that their actions are guided by pre-set procedures, individual subjectivities and emotions are at play in terms of choices and decisions. Building a safe, confident future, the Social Work Task Force report
(Department of Children, Schools and Families, 2009) noted the necessary and unavoidable balance between procedures and individual subjectivities, and pointed to the need for high-quality supervision and organizational cultures which permit and facilitate the exploration of the complexities of practice. This includes reflection on the emotional impact of the work and relationships with service users.

What all of these key policy drivers have in common is the necessity for social workers to build positive relationships with service users, whilst remaining fully aware of the complex context within which the relationships are built and sustained. Within a rational-technical framework, the relationship with the service user and engagement with the full circumstances of their life are not essential features, so it is clear that there is an impetus and aspiration in recent policy to move away from rational-technical approaches towards something quite different. In building relationships with service users, of course, attention to emotions and values via reflective practice is central.

**Policy direction into action**

Social work codes of practice and ethics are frameworks inside which aspiration or ‘direction of travel’ can be put into action. What is it that social workers need to do, and is this congruent with moving practice from rational-technical to reflective?

Currently, social work in England is regulated by the Health and Care Professions Council and is underpinned by the Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF) which sets out the required standards of professional social work practice (College of Social Work, 2012). The PCF comprises nine domains, including domain 6, ‘Critical reflection and analysis,’ and gives explicit attention to values, ethical principles, awareness of self and relationship building. Quite clearly, then, the PCF is congruent with the ‘soft’ features of practice and with a shift away from rational-technical practice.

Elsewhere in the UK, other professional bodies regulate social work practice, namely the Northern Ireland Social Care Council (NISSC, 2004), the Scottish Social Services Council (SSSC, 2004), and Cyngor Gofal Cymru/Care Council for Wales (CGC/CCW, 2004). Other than differences in title, the codes of practice issued by the regulatory bodies are the same across all three, having been
developed jointly (Reamer and Shardlow, 2009). In England, the General Social Care Council (GSCC, 2004), also shared the same codes of practice until 2012, when responsibility for the regulation of social work practice was transferred to the Health and Care Professions Council as already mentioned. Consonant with the PCF, the codes of practice frame the standards of practice required from social workers. It might be expected that the ‘softer’ features of practice make an appearance in the codes, in that reflection, values, emotions and relationship-building must be present to move practice in the anti-rational-technical direction espoused by policy. The question is, then, do the codes indeed make reference to the ‘softer’ features of practice?

A critical analysis of the codes reveals that there is no mention of reflection: it is not a requirement that social workers in Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland reflect, analyse or critically examine their practice. There are implicit allusions to relationship-building, in that workers must ‘strive to establish and maintain the trust of service users and carers’ by being, amongst other things, honest, trustworthy and reliable, and communicating openly (SSSC, 2004, section 2 etc.). Arguably, however, a social worker could demonstrate all of those qualities without working to build a relationship. There is also no mention in the codes of emotional impact or dealing with emotions. More encouragingly, values are a feature of the codes in that workers must treat people with dignity, respect and attention to diversity. They also must not abuse, discriminate nor misuse power. In regard to this, however, Reamer and Shardlow (2009) point out that the absence of the term ‘ethics’ in the title of the codes diminishes and narrows the translation of values into practice. They state that

use of the term ‘ethics’ suggests that expected behaviour should be consistent with some moral (or values) imperatives and that the notion of morality is the driving force in the determination of acceptable and unacceptable behaviour ... The force of the term ‘code of practice’ is seemingly rather more mundane – it demands adherence as a managerial tool rather than encourages the individual practitioner (Reamer and Shardlow, 2009, np).

Reamer and Shardlow, therefore, are suggesting that, actually, the codes of practice are ‘managerial’ in nature (and therefore more rational-technical). Treating a person with ‘respect’ in a narrow, managerial way, might mean writing ‘Dear Sir’ on a letter, but not engaging, really listening or getting to know the person. The
connection to the ‘morality’ of social work practice is not explicit. In contrast to this, the British Association of Social Workers’ *Code of Ethics for Social Work* (British Association of Social Workers (BASW), 2012), might be expected to articulate clearly the connections between morality or values, reflection and ‘soft’ features of practice. Indeed, this does seem to be the case, as the code states that ‘by outlining the general ethical principles, the aim is to encourage social workers across the UK to reflect on the challenges and dilemmas that face them and make ethically informed decisions about how to act in each particular case in accordance with the values of the profession’ (BASW, 2012, p. 5). The code goes on to outline the ‘values and ethical principles’ which underpin the work (*ibid.*, p. 8), namely, human rights, social justice and professional integrity, then to distil from them, the ‘ethical practice principles’ which enact them (*ibid.*, p. 11). As already discussed, and very hearteningly, the PCF also recognizes critical reflection, the application of values, relationship-building and an endeavour for social justice as core to social work practice.

Rather than a set of managerial ‘rules,’ therefore, the PCF and the BASW code of ethics clearly link expected practice with the overarching values and ethical principles of social work practice. For example, social workers must ‘apply the values and principles … to their practice’ (BASW, 2012, p. 11). They should also develop ‘relationships based on people’s rights to respect, privacy, reliability and confidentiality…’ (*ibid.*, p. 12). Finally, social workers should ‘strive for objectivity and self-awareness in professional practice’ and ‘reflect and critically evaluate their practice and be aware of their impact on others’ (*ibid.*, p. 15). Clearly then, the code of ethics locate the need for reflection and the ‘soft’ features of practice as key elements of any social worker’s responsibility and moral duty. Likewise, the *Statement of Ethical Principles* of the International Federation of Social Work (IFSW, 2013) asserts the centrality of dignity, social justice and professional integrity. In the third category, there are requirements for social workers to act with compassion and care towards the people they are working with (relationship-building), to engage in ethical debate and discussion and make ethically informed decisions (values and reflection), and to care for themselves both in personal terms and professionally (awareness of emotional impact) (*ibid.*). The individual national ethical codes of IFSW member organizations must be congruent with the overarching IFSW code, therefore supporting the argument that there is an internationally consistent requirement for
social workers to be able to engage in the ‘soft’ features of practice. BASW, as well as the other national organizations affiliated to IFSW, are therefore congruent with the policy direction of contemporary social work in its concerted effort to move beyond a rational-technical framework for practice. It can be suggested, however, that this impetus can be somewhat lost in translation between direction and actual practice, governed by the narrower, rule-based approach to, for instance, the codes of practice in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales (Reamer and Shardlow, 2009).

In conclusion, this book is intended to reach beyond rational-technical, managerial and practical ‘doing’ agendas, including the technical application of legislation, policy, procedure and theory, to explore the underpinning ‘soft’ features of practice. Thus, practice, and the reflection that results, is connected to the professional morality expressed within the PCF and the BASW codes of ethics and embodied in recent policy aspiration. We will now briefly touch on the unique key themes of this book.

Key themes

There is a range of key themes that will run through this book and will become familiar touchstones when considering the role of critical reflection in social work practice. This chapter has introduced the important narratives relating to what could be described as the social work landscape. Whist this book focuses on the UK context, the recurrent themes that emerge will have a resonance internationally, as the complexity of the social work task and the need for effective critical reflection are common features of all practice contexts across all boundaries.

The balance between relationship based practice and technicist approaches

Ruch (2009) notes that relationship based models of practice have been developed from psycho-social approaches which focus on the individual within their wider context. The emphasis is on the inter- and intra-personal aspects of practice, with the relationship between practitioner and service user being of central importance. This approach to practice values the complexity that it gives rise to rather than attempting to reduce practice to a purely rational
pursuit. Ward (2010, p. 185) proposes the following conditions required to underpin relationship based practice:

- Placing a premium on working with the experience and process of a helping relationship
- Attending to the emotional as well as cognitive elements for practice
- Maximizing opportunities for helpful communication
- The need for reflection at a deep level
- Focusing on the self of the worker
- An emphasis on personal qualities and values.

The conditions listed above are useful reminders of the purpose of this book. The need for the complexities and uncertainties of practice to be acknowledged and permitted is a crucial driver of the need for social workers to engage in significant reflection about their actions, motivations, emotions, values and responses in their practice.

Hennessey (2011) notes the importance of knowing one’s self and being aware of one’s emotional reactions within a social work relationship. The possession of self-knowledge allows social workers to consider the sources of their actions and reactions, and allows for the examination of the power issues inherent in care control functions of social work. This links well to the emotional awareness and regulation aspects of emotional intelligence (Salovey and Mayer, 1990). Ward (2010) notes that the term ‘self’ is a complex one insofar as it involves one’s beliefs, experiences and values, but is not a fixed entity. By this Ward means that our ‘self’ will change and fluctuate over time and from context to context. This reminds us that a relationship-based approach is contextual and professionally orientated rather than neutral and fixed. Munro (2011) acknowledges the need for practitioners to receive supervision that allows them to consider the emotional content of practice and the way that this stream of information for practitioners interfaces with concrete knowledge and procedures. Simply put, when social work is seen through this lens, then the full richness of practice with all its attendant complexities and unpredictability must be explored and appreciated.

The relationship based conception of social work is often pitted against more procedural and bureaucratic conceptions. If the procedural conception of practice is taken to its extreme, then the process of practice can be reduced to following a set of instructions without any consideration of the aforementioned complexities and
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unpredictability. Ferguson (2005), as already discussed, noted that the reality of practice in relation to child protection was such that workers felt they had no opportunities to explore and articulate the complexities of working in an environment of fear and aggression, and that this was in part due to the rigidity of processes and procedures. If the relationship aspects of social work were removed (or, more likely, repressed) then there would not be a need for this book; social work practice, supervision and outcomes would be containable within a linear and procedural framework. As evidenced earlier in this chapter, this is not supported by the ethical codes, policies and narratives of the profession in the twenty-first century.

A key driver of this book is the acknowledgement that social work as a profession continues to seek clarity about its purpose and place within the wider political and inter-professional landscape. Howe (2008) forcefully advocated that the knowledge and roles that underpin the social work task are only relevant in the context of the skills and relationships that the social worker possesses and develops. Sudberry (2002) concurs with this when she notes that the establishment and maintenance of a positive and trusting relationship with service users is required before any of the more tangible outcomes-based benefits of social work can occur. This is a powerful point in that it shows the dynamic and fluid complexities of relationships as being the catalyst and environment for the rational-technical aspects of practice to emerge, rather than being viewed as a marginalized aspect of practice.

Although relationship-based social work with service users is at the heart of this book, it would be remiss to ignore the other relationships which abound in contemporary, multi-disciplinary social work practice. These relationships are also fundamental to critically reflective practice, characterized as they often are by different viewpoints, different values, different perceptions of status and complex communication strategies. Subsequent chapters deal with these issues and relate them to specific social work contexts.

Emotions and social work practice

Throughout this book, we will refer to the emotional aspects of social work practice and the need for social workers to engage in critical reflection which explores and articulates these aspects. It is important that we clarify what is meant by ‘emotions’ at this stage in the book to make subsequent references to them relevant and useful.
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