

**STUDYING SOCIAL WORK: NEOLIBERALISM,
INSTITUTIONAL ETHNOGRAPHY AND A PROGRAM OF
UNDERGRADUATE SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION**

by

Kathleen Piovesan
Bachelor of Arts, University of Victoria, 2002

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

In the
Department of Sociology and Anthropology

© Kathleen Piovesan 2007
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

2007

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Kathleen Piovesan
Degree: Master of Arts
Title of Thesis: Studying Social Work: Neoliberalism, Institutional Ethnography and A Program of Undergraduate Social Work Education

Examining Committee:

Chair:

Dr. Wendy Chan
Associate Professor of Sociology

Dr. Dara Culhane
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor of Anthropology

Dr. Jane Pulkingham
Supervisor
Associate Professor of Sociology

Dr. Dany Lacombe
External Examiner
Associate Professor of Sociology

Date Defended/Approved:

July 16, 2007



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Declaration of Partial Copyright Licence

The author, whose copyright is declared on the title page of this work, has granted to Simon Fraser University the right to lend this thesis, project or extended essay to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users.

The author has further granted permission to Simon Fraser University to keep or make a digital copy for use in its circulating collection (currently available to the public at the "Institutional Repository" link of the SFU Library website <www.lib.sfu.ca> at: <<http://ir.lib.sfu.ca/handle/1892/112>>) and, without changing the content, to translate the thesis/project or extended essays, if technically possible, to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation of the digital work.

The author has further agreed that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by either the author or the Dean of Graduate Studies.

It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without the author's written permission.

Permission for public performance, or limited permission for private scholarly use, of any multimedia materials forming part of this work, may have been granted by the author. This information may be found on the separately catalogued multimedia material and in the signed Partial Copyright Licence.

While licensing SFU to permit the above uses, the author retains copyright in the thesis, project or extended essays, including the right to change the work for subsequent purposes, including editing and publishing the work in whole or in part, and licensing other parties, as the author may desire.

The original Partial Copyright Licence attesting to these terms, and signed by this author, may be found in the original bound copy of this work, retained in the Simon Fraser University Archive.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, BC, Canada



SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
THINKING OF THE WORLD

STATEMENT OF ETHICS APPROVAL

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

(a) Human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics,

or

(b) Advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University;

or has conducted the research

(c) as a co-investigator, in a research project approved in advance,

or

(d) as a member of a course approved in advance for minimal risk human research, by the Office of Research Ethics.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed at the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Bennett Library
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, BC, Canada

ABSTRACT

Starting from the observation that social work students and faculty conceive of social work as an area of thought and activity separate from its practice, this thesis explores the historical and current relationship between social work education and (neo)liberal governance. Drawing on the theoretical developments of Rose (1996a; 1996b) and Fraser (1989), qualitative interviews with students and faculty at a social work program in British Columbia and analyses of program-related texts, I argue that social work education methods fail to interrogate the professional power of social workers associated with credentials, policy and agency mandates. Ultimately, social work education preserves the definition of social work as an activity of social justice without successfully protesting the neoliberal trend toward elimination and reduction of state social welfare provisions current in Canadian social services.

Keywords: Social work; social work education; neoliberalism; social services; professionalism; social justice

Subject Terms: Social Work – History; Social Work Education – British Columbia; Social Work Education – Canada; Neoliberalism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the members of my committee and my program colleagues.
Thank you especially to the many feminist activists whose arguments for women-led and women-run feminist services inspired this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents.....	v
Introduction: Studying Social Work	
Neoliberalism, Institutional Ethnography and a Program of Undergraduate Social Work Education.....	1
Chapter 2: Imagining Social Work	
A Conceptual History of Professional Social Work and Liberal Government	24
Chapter 3: Learning Social Work	
Reflection and Awareness Techniques in Social Work Education.....	46
Chapter 4: Valuing Social Work	
Constructing a Moral/Political Domain of Social Work.....	68
Conclusion: Certifying Social Justice	
Social Justice Aspirations and Professional Social Work Education.....	94
Reference List	102

INTRODUCTION: STUDYING SOCIAL WORK

Neoliberalism, Institutional Ethnography and a Program of Undergraduate Social Work Education

Neoliberal governments, such as those that predominate currently in much of the world, including in Canada, seek to govern through the market. They reconstitute social programs and services in such a way as to undermine the concept of universal entitlement that is one of the key assumptions, if never fully realized, of Keynesian welfare state provisions (Kingfisher 2002:28). Social workers, as the professionals most closely associated with social service delivery (Prior 2004:4), work according to these changes and also put them into effect. In a neoliberal era, their work is primarily determined by the restrictive and restricting mandates of their governmental and sometimes quasi non-governmental service organizations and agencies that manage risk and care (Westhues, et al. 2001). This thesis looks at the relationship between neoliberal restructuring of social services in Canada and the education of social workers in a professional, university-based undergraduate social work program, hereafter referred to as 'an undergraduate program of social work education' or 'the program.'

For those concerned with the neoliberal turn in social service provision in Canada and simultaneously interested in political and economic change beyond the simple provision of social services, we are currently stuck in a contradictory place of advocating for a return of the services that we in the past judged both inadequate and de-politicizing with respect to race, class and gender inequalities.

The choice to pursue research into social work education grew out of my own sense of what Dorothy Smith (2002,1987) calls a split or bifurcation in consciousness. This split occurred between the concrete work I was engaged in within a transition house, answering to the material needs of women living there, and the abstracted social service theory for delivery of service to battered women I encountered at conferences, in meetings with social workers and sometimes in conversation with professionalized transition house staff. My own sense of being divided between my concrete work in a transition house and the abstracted version of transition house work I encountered in other venues made apparent to me a contradiction I had observed between the stated goals of social service delivery and its effect. I observed that in various forms and through various means, women seeking aid from state social services experience that either there is no aid to be had or any that is made available comes with the price of increased monitoring of daily life. Yet, Canada is a nation that describes itself as having a social safety net and most young social work hopefuls I know describe themselves as interested in supporting a socially just organization of society. This contradiction, between the reality of state social service provision and the aspirations of the social work profession has led me to argue that undergraduate social work programs conceive of social work as an activity and system of thought other than its practice.

Social work education in Canada is regulated by the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (CASSW), a non-governmental organization comprised of university faculties, schools and departments offering professional

education in social work at the undergraduate and graduate levels (www.cassw-access.ca). This body accredits programs of social work education across the country. As a non-governmental organization, the CASSW retains some independence from government, the sector that is the largest employer in the field of social services (SWEC 2000). However, curriculum standards set by the CASSW must also accord with the requirements of social service employment in as much as students graduating from professional social work programs in Canada must meet social work employment requirements in order to put their education to effect. Social work education, therefore, both trains students to the ideals of social work practice and prepares students for work in social services.

Students and faculty simultaneously live out two contradictory definitions of social work. On the one hand, they define social work as an abstracted and ideal activity of social justice and on the other recognize that social work is practiced through concrete, bureaucratic methods that are predominantly state-defined. In order to explore this contradiction further, I considered the relations of ruling (Smith 2002, 1987) across sites of governance of social work professional education, including the Canadian Association of Social Workers (CASW), the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (CASSW) and a single undergraduate university-based program of professional social work education. Through interviews with social work students and faculty at the undergraduate level, I consider the relations of ruling that shape and make normal the organization of undergraduate social work education.

While other institutional sites, including provincial ministries, such as the Ministry of Children and Family Development and the Ministry of Health, two of the largest employers of social workers in British Columbia (SWEC 2000:18-20), are important aspects of the broader institution of social service delivery, I have chosen not to include them as additional institutional sites in this study. This decision is partly due to time constraints and is partly an aspect of the nature of social work education. While graduates of an undergraduate program of social work education generally take up work in the social services, program curriculum is designed to teach social work as an activity and theory independent of social service employment. Thus, this study focuses primarily on the internal discourses and logic of the curriculum standards and materials in relation to the experiences of students and faculty even while it implicitly and explicitly assumes that curriculum completion will prepare students for employment in the social services.

Another research decision was to limit this study to a university-based degree program in social work rather than include college-based certificate-level social service worker programs. In the province of British Columbia (BC) in 2005, the last year for which statistics are available, there was 1732 Registered Social Workers (RSW) registered with the Board of Registration for Social Work in BC (www.brsw.bc.ca). This statistic represents the most accurate accounting possible of the number of graduates of any university-based program of social work education currently working in the province of BC. Though it likely under reports the number of Bachelor of Social Work (BSW), Master of Social Work

(MSW) and Doctor of Social Work (DSW) graduates as there is no requirement that qualified social workers register with the provincial body (Finch, et al. 1994:47). If we consider that BC Work Futures reports that 3760 social workers were working in the province in 2001 (www.workfutures.bc.ca), the last year for which statistics are available, and that 11594 community and social service workers working in that additional, but related, occupational category (www.workfutures.bc.ca), we see that the number of people employed in the social services is far greater than the number of those registered with the Board of Registration for Social Workers in BC. The workers reported by BC Work Futures statistics include social workers with university social work degrees, workers with other degrees or no post-secondary education who have been hired into various positions within the social services, and social service workers who have college-level social service worker certificates (SWEC 2000:13).

The distinctions between these categories of 'social workers,' broadly defined are primarily distinctions of wage and position. Degree-level social workers, those with BSW, MSW or DSW certifications, are the only workers in the social service field who can register with the Board of Registration for Social Workers in BC (www.brsw.bc.ca) and therefore have a recognized professional body. Additionally, degree-level social work is the professionalized arm of the social service, requiring the highest level of education and achieving the highest level of pay and position among social work positions in the social services (www.workfutures.bc.ca).

Although, degree-level social work has the most professional authority of all social service workers, in general the profession of social work has historically been unable to fully define and control its professional borders and authority. From Flexner in 1915, who declared social work as an field of knowledge from many professions with no distinct identity of its own (in Leighninger 2000:44), to the current day in which social work is a largely state-based domain of employment where the title social worker is applied to many workers in the social service field (SWEC 2000:15), employers challenge the authority of university-based social work programs to define the practice of social work. Yet, university based social work programs continue to assert their knowledge as central to the practice of social work (SWEC 2000). University-based social work education faces pressure to either accept employer (state) demands to tailor courses to the workplace more explicitly or articulate the authority of university-based social work knowledge to assist clients in various social service fields (SWEC 2000:24-28). The authority of social work professional knowledge is increasingly undermined by neoliberal reorganization of social services. Social work education is itself subject to neoliberal forces that create uncertainty in knowledge, which in turn poses further problems to a profession and professional education that is still trying to assert its authority within its professional domain (Hugman 2001:322; SWEC 2000:v; Parton 1996:11).

However, while social workers do not strictly control the policy and mandates that govern the workplace and are not present in every single social service-worker-client interaction, as the arm of the social service worker group

with a professional body and nationally-accredited degree level credentials, employment in many areas of the social services and greater likelihood of having a managerial role, BSW, MSW and DSW-level social workers are the most clearly authoritative, autonomous and cohesive occupational group within the social service field. For this reason, I believe it is possible to separate university-based social work undergraduate programs from college level social service worker programs, as well as analyze the connection between neoliberalized social services and the organization of the curriculum. This study, therefore, analyzes social work undergraduate curriculum, not as the sum total of practice in the social service field, but as one central institution in the broad domain of the social services.

This thesis draws centrally on the theories of Rose (1996a; 1996b) with respect to governance, both liberal and neoliberal, and Fraser (1989) with respect to the relationship between need and state social services. Rose's (1996b) analysis of (neo)liberalism as a form of governmentality argues that the methods by which and authority to regulate the conduct of individual members of liberal society have become linked to the political apparatus of government (1996b:38). In this analysis, 19th century liberal governments, governing in the interests of morality without appearing to infringe on individual liberty, employed experts in the form of philanthropists, scientists and bureaucrats, among others, to effect rule through institutions linked to the state but drawing also on the expertise of these professionals for their authority (Rose 1996b:39-40). Current day neoliberal governments likewise seek to govern in the interests of stability

and liberty. However, they do so by applying market logic to the relationship between expert authority and autonomous active citizenship. In this form of liberalism, Rose (1996b) argues, each aspect of social life is subject to the logic of consumer demand and choice. The strengths, cultures and pathologies of smaller, delineated segments of population similar in membership to the increasingly specialized target groups of social work intervention, have become the terrain of authoritative expert action, including of social work (Rose 1996a:331).

Fraser (1989), in writing on the politics of need interpretation, argues that the social services depoliticize the needs for which they are intended to provide; the process by which a social service comes to provide for a 'need' necessarily makes of that need an administerable service abstracted from its race, class and gender specificity, but particularized to accommodate the political and economic organization of society (1989:306). Social work students and faculty hope that social workers are particularly poised to fulfil social justice aspirations. Fraser (1989) argues such aspirations are outside of the realm of a social service. Fraser (1989) therefore is helpful in analyzing the contradiction between the social justice aspirations of the profession that are rarely put into practice in the employment setting. This research looks at the constant resolution of this contradiction that preserves both elements of it. Centrally, this research asks three primary questions:

1. What is the historical and current relationship between social work and (neo)liberal governance?

2. In what way does undergraduate social work curriculum prepare students for the decentralized, fragmented, unstable and controlling work regimes of neoliberalized social services?
3. How do social work students and faculty make sense of the contradiction between the moral/political definition of social work as an activity of 'social justice' and the bureaucratized, particularistic and highly regulated setting of a social service agency?

The context in which I am undertaking research into undergraduate social work education includes state intrusion into feminist organizations and greater targeting of programs and services to more narrowly defined 'marginal populations' within the overall neoliberal restructuring of the welfare state. The pressure put on transition houses is a particular example of both the nature of a social service and the increasing intrusion of social service mandates into strategies developed in opposition to oppressive forces. Since the inception between 30 and 40 years ago of feminist services in Canada, including rape crisis centres, women's centres and transition houses for battered women, there has been much debate about the role of the independent women's movement, the constitution of a 'feminist service,' and the proper place of the state vis-à-vis the feminist movement and its services. Over the past 30 to 40 years, state-based social services have in part responded to feminist demands for services for women, but have also acted to contain the independent advocacy work of the feminist movement. Not only does the state establish social service regimes that standardize or otherwise insert themselves into the spaces for women's resistance carved out by feminist theory and action, but also, in doing so, it undermines the authority of the feminist movement accrued to it through 30 or

more years of work. Effectively, the state compels feminist organizations to function not according to their own carefully developed praxis, but according to shifting state mandates for service delivery and funding (Lakeman 2005).

In my work in a transition house, I see the push toward specialized programs for women/children/victims to be increasing and very much in line with the neoliberal desire to rationalize and specialize services to service users, here battered women. This move is antithetical to a movement that depends on the collectivized lived experience of women across race and class lines for its motivations, processes and strategies. The more the spaces of the women's movement are dominated by professional knowledge and government-determined programs, the less likely it is that the movement and the services that build women's equality will exist.

Neoliberal restructuring exacerbates the already present tendency of a social service to both generalize need, making it a broad problem separate from the inequalities that produced it, and particularize need, making it administerable only through institutions that take up and use the already existing inequalities that fundamentally structure political, economic and social relations. In Canada, neoliberalization of the social services has been carried out in large part through the reconstitution of the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) as the Canada Health and Social Transfer (CHST) (Kingfisher 2002; Pulkingham and Ternowetsky 1999). Restructuring has shifted the meaning and responsibility of state involvement in social welfare programs from one of securing minimum standards in health, education and social services to one of supporting market growth and

reducing national debt, resulting in the lowest levels of spending on social programs since the inception of the welfare state in Canada in 1948 (Brodie 1999:37). In British Columbia, cuts to the availability of income assistance, as well as the rates, and to other services have matched if not exceeded the neoliberal restructuring happening in other provinces and federally.

I am motivated to undertake this study in part by my observation that there are few state services available to women and because neoliberalization of social services, and associated social service co-optation of women's movement strategies has adversely affected women. Nevertheless, the subject of this study is neither the lives of women seeking social service aid nor the work of transition houses and other feminist services. Rather this study focuses on the education of social workers as one institutional site through which it is possible to study and analyze the neoliberalization of social services as revealed in social work curriculum.

Institutional Ethnography (IE), a combined theoretical and methodological framework first developed by Dorothy Smith (1987) exploring coordinated activity within and across institutional settings, partially informs my research questions. The methodology of IE intends to provide a way of revealing the ruling relations that exist within and across institutions, but which shape the everyday lived experiences of individuals and groups. In IE, ruling relations are defined as "a complex of organized practices, including government, law, business and financial management, professional organization, educational institutions as well as the discourses in texts that interpenetrate the multiple sites of power" (Smith

1987:3). They link the local settings of “everyday life, organizations and translocal processes of administration and governance” (Devault and McCoy 2002:751).

Smith (1987) describes this analysis of the relations of ruling as apparent in a bifurcation or doubling of consciousness in her own life. In the academic world of sociology, the sociologist “participates in a discourse connecting the individual to others known and unknown in an impersonal organization (of the university and of the extra-local relations of academic discourse)” (Smith 2002:17). By contrast, the work of caring for house and children requires the coordination of “multiple particular details, clues and initiatives, involving relationships with particularized others” (Smith 1990:17). This split between the abstracted forms of knowledge fundamental to the discipline of sociology and the particular forms of knowledge and activity necessary to the care of home and children, in Smith’s (1987) analysis, points to the way in which lived experience is constituted by social relations not wholly visible within that experience itself.

The IE researcher is able to recognize that the relations of ruling are at work when she locates a bifurcation of consciousness, an instance in time and space where consciousness is split between the abstracted forms of the social relations of ruling and the particular forms of everyday work experience. Within my research, it was my analysis of my own split between the concrete work within the transition house answering to the material needs of women living there and the abstracted social service theory for delivery of service to battered women I encountered at conferences, in meetings with social workers and sometimes in

conversation with professionalized transition house staff. Analysis of this split in my daily work, between the concrete realities of a transition house and the abstracted version of transition house work, made apparent to me a contradiction I had observed between the stated goals of social service delivery and its effect. While in the abstract, social work literature on social services described means to maximizing human potential, in practice social service aid to women living in the transition house was ungenerous and punitive. I assumed that my observation of the existence of a contradiction between social work's 'social justice' aspirations, as I later understood them, and its unjust practices would be readily apparent in social work education, where I assumed students would learn both the underlying theory of social service delivery and techniques for working with clients. IE, as a methodology that could incorporate my experience of this split in consciousness as a starting point to explore the contradiction between social work theory and practice, therefore seemed a good point from which to begin the research for this study. Throughout, I have sought to understand how the contradiction between the aspirations of social work and its practice is both made sense of and criticized within undergraduate social work education.

The methodology of IE is founded on several important concepts that are the focal points of the analysis, particularly those of work, institution and discourse. In IE, work is defined broadly as all "that people do that takes some time, that they mean to do, that relies on definite resources, and is organized to coordinate in some way with the work of others similarly defined" (Smith 2002:46). Accounts of people's doings are analyzed together with the meanings

they assign to their work and their particular subject locations. IE fundamentally assumes that the way people talk and write about their work reveals social relations. Researchers employing IE therefore seek the instances of connection between an account of work at one site and that at another as these instances reveal the coordination of work across sites (Smith 2002:31). Texts and interviews are important components of IE research as they reveal these connections, thereby allowing researchers to determine the ways in which activity at a particular site in a particular time is abstracted and coordinated across the many sites of the institutional complex (Smith 2002:38). Discourse coordinates the activities of individuals across contexts of work, but is directly tied to the local and actual activities of individuals. Through discourse, the practices of individuals in one site are coordinated with those at another site and simultaneously made to make sense within the site in which they are performed.

The methodology of IE is meant to be an ongoing process of discovery of the relations of ruling through an exploration of the terrain of the institution, including by conducting interviews that help develop the researcher's analysis of the work performed within the institution and the discourse that coordinates different institutional sites. Initial interviews are meant to lead the researcher both to further interviews and to important coordinating texts within the institution (DeVault and McCoy 2002:758 and 766). While, I originally intended to perform such a study, in the end I was not successful in applying all of the concepts and methods of IE to my research. This is effectively because my research, although instigated by my own sense of being split between the concrete experience and

abstract definitions given to transition house work and the contradiction I therefore observed between social work aspirations and social service reality, began with text-based study of the current context of social service delivery in Canada. From this study, I developed a conceptual understanding of the global process of neoliberalization, namely the devolution of public and state responsibility for social welfare programs onto the privatised care work of women, the overall reduction in state services and emphasis in social service programming on cost accounting and reduction (Kingfisher 2002). Through this analysis, I came to understand the contradiction between the idealized version of social work and its reality in practice as partially the result of neoliberal reductions in social service resources combined with increasingly managerialist orientations in social service policy. This theoretical analysis of neoliberalism later informed my initial interview questions with students and faculty as well as my initial analysis of social work texts.

Between September 2005 and April 2006, I conducted ten interviews with three students and three faculty; all six participants attended or taught at a university level undergraduate program of social work education. I also analyzed texts, including program texts, accreditation standards for Canadian undergraduate programs in social work education and the Canadian social work *Code of Ethics* (CASW 2005). Before beginning this research, I obtained approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics, obtained in August 2005. With the students, I conducted multiple interviews, including three with one student and two with each of the other two students. With each of the

faculty members, I conducted a single interview. For each interview I developed a general guideline of questions, though did not use these questions to structure the interviews precisely. The interviews lasted from 1 hour to 2 ½ hours each. I obtained written consent to the interview, use of the data and tape recording prior to the initial interview and reconfirmed this consent at subsequent interviews. I used a tape recorder to ensure accurate transcription of each interview. I fully transcribed each interview, but removed information that would identify individuals.

Generally, in IE, interviews with research participants are meant to reveal the work processes, institutional relationships and discourse shaping the research site as well as guide the researcher to choose further participants and texts. In my research process, however, I did not rely on initial interviews to determine future research participants. In order to meet ethics requirements for confidentiality and secure a number of research participants from a relatively small group of potential participants, I recruited participants separately over the course of the first four months of research through postings and email requests for participation. While there was much interconnection between research participants, including within the faculty group, within the student group and between the faculty and student groups, this was more the result of the structure of the program than deliberate choices on the part of the researcher. Finally, while interviews did reveal the kinds of work undertaken by students and faculty, these did not become focal points for my analysis as my study drew from my theoretical analysis of the neoliberalization of the social services and attempted

to understand the relationship between the social work curriculum and neoliberalism. It did not try to understand the institutional relationships of the school itself or the work accomplished by students and faculty to perform the tasks of being students and faculty members.

In general, initial interviews did shape the overall direction of future interviews. The initial interviews with students at least, attempted to explore their experiences within the program, and particularly their motivations for entering a program of social work education. These initial interviews gave shape to future interviews with students and faculty by revealing students' primary initial experiences and concepts of social work. Drawing on these experiences and concepts, I was able to develop interview schedules that explored the principles and practices of the social work curriculum and the coordination of this curriculum with curriculum standards as well as the points of interconnection between student and faculty participants.

Interviews revealed a number of points I had not expected given my beginning analysis. The first of these concerns the generalist nature of social work education. Generalist social work education involves instruction in a generalized theory and methodology with little training in concrete skills. Skills, when taught, are chosen on an ad hoc basis and often taught as examples of theory or method in class or are learned in field placements, though these vary significantly between field placements. The only consistently taught skills are interviewing/counselling skills, reflection and awareness (Professor 1:1-2, Student C 1:10). One professor I interviewed was even offended at the

suggestion that training (in skills) be part of university-level social work instruction (Professor 1:14). This was surprising as my analysis described even more bureaucratic and technical social service practice in neoliberal social service bureaucracies than previous social service bureaucracies (Kingfisher 2002:7-8; Peck and Tickell 2002:392). The juxtaposition of a non-technical social work education with a highly technical mode of social work practice was surprising and led me to further questions the curriculum standards and courses taught.

The second concerns the reappearance of values throughout interviews and curriculum texts as well as in curriculum standards. Students and faculty named social work values as central to their choice to pursue social work. They described social work as centred in values and the curriculum as teaching social work values (Professor 2:14; Student A 1:3; Student B 1:1). Values play a central role in instruction in social work (CASSW 2000:1.2). The realization of this led me to incorporate the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Ethical Practice*, which outline the central values of social work, into my analysis.

As I proceeded in the interviews and in reading the curriculum texts, students and faculty most commonly described social work as a practice of social justice. While not all students and faculty were in agreement as to what constitutes social justice or whether social work was achieving its goals of social justice, all agreed that social justice is the proper work of social workers. Beyond this simple definition, I found many contradictions within and between interview transcripts. Students and faculty described different practices, theories and motivations as key to successful social work. Neither students nor faculty was

able to define clearly the role of social workers in society. The kinds of work social workers do seemed endlessly open-ended. The potential for social workers to enact social control was a source of ambivalence. In the face of these contradictory, ambiguous and ambivalent responses from interview participants, I began to look for the source of the definition of social work as an activity of social justice. From these points in the interview transcript, I broadened my research to include texts other than social work curriculum, and specifically began to research the history of social work and social work education.

In the end, four sets of texts were important to this study. Two documents produced by the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (CASSW), *Board of Accreditation Manual: Educational Policy Statements* (CASSW 2000) and *CASSW Standards for Accreditation* (CASSW 2004), describe the general requirements for accredited instruction in social work at the undergraduate level. While the CASSW documents do not set absolute standards for programs of social work education, they do demand that each program provide a group of courses that fulfil the generalized theoretical and methodological requirements of generalist practice (CASSW 2000:2.2).

The particular texts selected within a given undergraduate program of social work education, while chosen by individual social work faculty members, relate directly back to the requirements outlined in the two CASSW documents. Additionally, these course texts come to represent the professional modes of thought and analysis into which students in the social work program are being

trained and which construct the logic and meaning of the world of professional social work.

The Canadian Association of Social Workers (CASW) *Code of Ethics* (2005) and *Guidelines for Ethical Practice* (2005) are also central to the curriculum of undergraduate social work education. These texts direct the professional codes of conduct into which students are trained.

Finally, I was unable to conceptualize all of my findings within my initial analytical framework of neoliberalized social services. This led me to conduct further historical and theoretical research on the topic of social work, social work education, the social services, liberalism and neoliberalism. Drawing particularly on the analysis of Rose (1996a; 1996b) and Fraser (1989), I came to understand that social work and the social services are intimately tied, historically and currently, to liberal governance, which reinterprets the needs of raced, classed and gendered groups as social services administerable through already existing state institutions. It is within this framework that I analyze the contradiction initially observed between the idea of social work as an activity of social justice and its neo(liberalized) practice.

Thus while I initially set out to follow the methodology of IE and did draw somewhat from it, in the end I was unable to map the relations of ruling from my investigation of the terrain of the institution of social work education. My analysis of the history of social work in relation to the analysis of liberalism developed by Rose (1996a; 1996b) and of the social services developed by Fraser (1989) has heavily influenced my interpretation of the interview transcripts and their

relationship to accreditation standards and the values of professional social work. Had I started from a historical analysis of the professionalization of social work and considered only the accreditation standards, social work professional values and course texts, it is possible that I could have reached similar arguments to the ones I have made here.

The primary ethical concern in this study was to protect the confidentiality of research participants, particularly given the relatively small number of undergraduate social work programs in British Columbia (six) and the relatively small size of each school. In order to ensure confidentiality, the name and location of the particular school where I conducted the research is not revealed in this study. Additionally, all of the transcripts have been stripped of personally identifying information at the point of transcription in order to ensure that no identifying details of participants be revealed through the transcripts or this document. Finally, I have assigned pseudonyms to all of the participants in order to facilitate the process of quoting from interview transcripts without revealing the identity of the interviewee. Faculty in the department are referred to as Professor 1, Professor 2 and Professor 3. Students similarly are referred to as Student A, Student B, Student C with multiple interviews being referred to by number. For example, the seventh page of Student A's third interview would be referenced in the text of the thesis as Student A 3:7.

Throughout this document, I will refer to the program as 'an undergraduate program of social work education' or alternately 'the program.' Although each undergraduate program of social work education in Canada teaches a slightly

different curriculum depending on faculty interest, overall, undergraduate programs in social work education in Canada are governed by the standards of accreditation of the CASSW. This accrediting body outlines that every undergraduate social work curriculum shall prepare students to begin practicing according to a generalist practice model (CASSW 2000:2.2). This model, is generalized to provide social work students with a base of social work theory and methodology from which to begin to practice, and is relatively similar in content across social work educational settings. While undergraduate social work education in any one program is influenced by the particularities of that department or school, its geographic location, faculty appointments and student composition, overall each school and department of social work in Canada conforms to the basic principles of theory and method within the framework of generalist social work education (CASSW 2000). Thus, throughout this document, I will be referring to research conducted within one particular undergraduate program of social work education. However, the analysis of that research is an analysis of the coordination of the curriculum between the CASSW standards of accreditation, the CASW *Code of Ethics* and the particular curriculum, rather than an analysis of the curriculum per se.

The analysis deriving from this research is divided into three chapters. In the first of these, I consider the relationship between the historical development of social work and its contemporary practice. Drawing heavily on the analysis of Rose (1996b) and Fraser (1989), this chapter considers the relationship of charity/social work to strategies of liberal governance, both past and present,

arguing that social work performs a governance function in liberal society. In the following chapter, I examine the primary organizing ideas taught in an undergraduate program of social work education in British Columbia. Here I make two arguments. In the first, I argue that the practice of reflection and development of awareness in social work education function primarily to prepare students for the flexibility required of them in neoliberalized social service employment. Secondly, I argue that heavy focus on reflection as an integral practice of socially just social work over-emphasizes the power of the individual social worker at the expense of under revealing the power of the social service policy, and employment contract to shape the social worker-client relationship. In the final chapter, I reveal the relationship between undergraduate social work education, the code of ethics of the professional association and social work employment. Here I argue that the sense making within the program that normalizes disjuncture between a moral/political domain of social work education and its technical practice in the employment setting serves to reinforce the idea that social work is a field of knowledge separate from that which it accomplishes in practice, allowing socially just social work practice to remain undefined, unsubstantiated and likely unachieved.

CHAPTER 2: IMAGINING SOCIAL WORK

A Conceptual History of Professional Social Work and Liberal Government

This research, in part, seeks to understand the relationship between the historical development of professional social work in early liberal society and its current organization within a neoliberalized social and economic order. Liberal society assures the freedom of its members by drawing limits on the legitimate boundaries of state intervention in any non-state sphere of society. However, the liberal state must also govern in such a way as to reinforce its own ability and authority to do so, namely by minimizing the forces of social fragmentation, ensuring that the economy functions and that the family acts to socialize individuals into responsible citizenship (Rose 1996b:47-9). In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the development of a professional class of experts, including charity/social workers, formally attached to the state was one means by which the state was able to exercise its authority over time and space while maintaining the appearance of individual liberty and a free market. Current neoliberal governments rework the liberal formula of rule by centering market logic within their governing institutions, requiring professionals to secure their authority in a marketplace of expertise and governing through the regulated choices of individuals. However, current neoliberal governments, as did past liberal governments, still seek to assure the legitimacy of their rule by creating a society

in which citizens at least perceive that their government preserves stability and individual freedom.

Social work historically and currently works with the 'marginalized,' or disenfranchised, whose needs social workers interpret as need for social work intervention (Tice 1998:7). In this simplistic correlation, social work effectively answers to the needs of disenfranchised groups. However, drawing from the analysis above, social work also plays a regulating role in liberal government. Need as it is institutionalized in the social service is most commonly interpreted according to already existing liberal and neoliberal social, political and economic institutions (Fraser 1989). In this way, the state social service apparatus is able to create services that take account of these needs without ever challenging the foundational institutions of government. Throughout this chapter, I will consider the development of professional social work from the turn of the 20th century to the turn of the 21st century, arguing that the development of the profession of social work is directly tied to liberal and now neoliberal governance.

In this chapter, I will develop my analysis of the history of social work education in relation to the profession as a whole. Starting from an introductory description of current day Canadian social work and drawing on the theoretical arguments of Rose (1996a; 1996b) and Fraser (1989), I will develop to a conceptual history of social work from the turn of the 20th century onwards. This history will focus primarily on two periods of social work history in particular, social work at the turn of the 20th century and at the turn of the 21st century. Throughout I will seek out the many continuities and discontinuities between

liberalism and neoliberalism, as well as between social work then and social work now. Ultimately, my analysis will argue that social work from its earliest conception to its present day is deeply enmeshed within liberal and neoliberal governance.

The education of social workers in 34 nationally accredited university-based undergraduate programs of social work education in Canada is the result of social work's history of seeking a knowledge base upon which to legitimise its activity and also essential to the credibility and development of the profession of social work today. Currently, there are over 2000 Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) graduates annually in Canada (Westhues, et al. 2001:36) and in British Columbia alone, there are six schools of social work graduating close to 300 BSW students each year (SWECC 2000:vi). The national accreditation body, the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (CASSW), governs all of these programs. Graduates are employed in government social services and private social service organizations. The professional association, the Canadian Association of Social Workers (CASW) (2005), has established a *Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Ethical Practice*, standards that are meant to govern the thousands of social workers employed in the many and varied fields of the profession.

In 1994, social work employment in the province of British Columbia spanned 27 areas of practice. These areas varied across more traditional fields of social work employment, such as hospital work, corrections, family and youth work, but also included newer areas such as social planning and policy

development, crisis intervention and suicide intervention as well as population specific areas such as social work with gays and lesbians, immigrants and refugees, and Aboriginal people (Finch, et al. 1994:31). Additionally, BSW graduates are employed in an array of fields under varying titles such as counsellor, youth worker, alcohol/drug worker and the like (SWEC 2000:15). Studies conducted in British Columbia that predict growth in population groups including the elderly, youth, visible minorities and Aboriginal people, the unemployed and the poor, predict that the profession of social work will grow concurrent with these populations (SWEC 2000: 7-13).

Throughout its history, social work has been associated with marginal or 'needy' populations. The profession has two historical antecedents, one in the Elizabethan Poor Laws of 17th century England (Guest 1997:11) and the charitable work of 'friendly visitors' in the slums of London and other growing industrial cities beginning in the mid-19th century (Kendall 2000:6). Poor Law relief provided for the 'impotent' or deserving poor who were unable to work due to illness, age, or infirmity. 'Friendly visiting' offered 'uplift' of the moral character of its poor recipients. It operated on the belief that poverty was a result of moral defect and not simply a material condition. The poor within 19th century industrial society, of those unable to subsist on waged labour belonged to the 'dependent' classes (Fraser and Gordon 1994:316-8).

'Dependency' was a fundamental problem for liberal government, because it presented a contradiction between the function of the liberal state and its role vis-à-vis the individual. On the one hand, the liberal state is meant to govern in

such a way as to ensure stability and order, while on the other the state must limit its intrusion upon the freedom of citizens (Rose 1996b:39). Liberal government, at the turn of the 20th century, facing the increasing social fragmentation brought about by the industrial revolution, began to employ and authorize experts including charity/social worker who could set out norms for conduct (1996b:39). Early industrial society placed value on 'independent' waged labour, which by contrast made the poor, colonized and enslaved peoples, and women 'dependent' or aberrant vis-à-vis the falsely constructed independence of waged labour and the mostly white men who participated in it (Fraser and Gordon 1994:316-8). Not only did this enforced dependency make these groups less able to exercise the rights and obligations of full liberal citizenship, but it also contributed fundamentally to an industrial capitalist economy. Their 'dependency' made the waged labour of others possible and also provided the contrast against which waged labour could be made to represent independence, even while working class men in reality remained highly dependent on the employing class.

As 'dependents', charity recipients therefore belonged outside the realm of the 'good nature' of the autonomous rights-bearing citizen (Smith 1990:219). By consequence, the poor were treated as though it was by "their own nature that they prevented themselves from participating and allowed marginalization to happen to them" (Smith 1990:222). In liberal society, bad order, as well as good order, was thought to pervade both the "external world of society and the internal world of individuals" (Smith 1990:215). Through this logic, it was possible to

conceive of the characters of charity recipients as something to be known, controlled, managed and bureaucratized in the same way as the external world of science, labour, finance and government. Rose (1996b) argues that it was early professionals and developing social science knowledge that combined with liberal government acted to regulate the poor. Based on the concept of governmentality, or an analysis of the techniques and methods of government, Rose (1996b) argues that liberalism is characterised by a distinct relationship between professionals and government. This relationship arises from government use of knowledge developed in the human sciences including health, sociology, psychology and criminology as expertise important to the management of populations. Emphasising the importance of individual liberty, including centrally the definition of the population as active in their own government, professionals or experts are authorised or licensed by the state to put to use the knowledge developed in the human sciences to help to shape people into human beings who will govern themselves (1996b:45-7). In such an analysis, liberal government has shaped the profession of social work, which in turn has shaped liberal government.

An analysis that views liberal government and social work as fundamentally reinforcing is neither wholly accepted, nor wholly rejected by the students and professors I interviewed for this study. The current curriculum of undergraduate social work in Canada is premised on values of 'social justice' encoded both in the statements of the CASSW (2000) and of the CASW (2005a; 2005b). The arguments of Rose (1996b) on the nature of professions within the

liberal state present a direct challenge to social work's fundamental self-identification with independent professional values of 'social justice.' Instead, Rose (1996b) argues that social work is more likely an activity with some potential for 'social control' or at least the ability to shape the clients of social work according to the needs of liberal government. Several of the professors and students I interviewed as part of this research revealed both a strong belief in the values of social justice and an ambivalence toward their ability to enact these values in practice. In the words of one professor:

social workers are always slightly subversive. We will twist it [deleterious social policies] in such a way as to mute the more negative aspects of it and probably use it in some ways to advance social justice, though it may not always look like that at the front. The fact is that social work is a product of the state and of the status quo. We are not outside of it. Social workers are never revolutionaries really. We are always within the reform tradition at best. We are paid by the state. We used to be closer to being charity. At one time social work was called scientific charity. I always say to students that are we are agents of social control.
(Professor 2:16)

The interplay between the desire to 'be subversive' and do what is best for the client is counter posed to the role social workers play in administering or carrying out the often controlling and deleterious policies of the state.

While students and some social work academics remain ambiguous about the relationship between social work and the state, historians and theoreticians of social work engage the analysis of Rose in explaining the historical development

of the profession. Similar to Rose and drawing on his analysis, Parton (1996) attributes the professionalization of social work to the state's desire to change dependent individuals into productive individuals, while continuing to promote the private sphere of the family as the place in which individuals meet their day-to-day needs. He argues that social work at the turn of the 20th century assisted the state to discipline and survey its population according to knowledge then emerging from the human sciences. Government thereby continued to slough off to the private realm of the family the responsibility for the problems of poverty incurred by industrialization (Parton 1996:6-7).

Some social work historians and theoreticians do not see this, however, as the only or enduring role for social work. Webb (2006) claims a dual role for the profession, describing the 'double alliance' of social work in promoting social solidarity as well as regulating society according to the governance needs of the state (2006:51). Parton (1996), however, describes the social solidarity role for social work during the heyday of the welfare state, as hiding the other role, thereby hiding the ambiguities, tensions and uncertainties at the core of social work (1996:8-9), including the difference between the interests of social work and the aspirations of clients.

Many of these tensions were made apparent in the period of rising political movements of the 1960s through 1980, approximately. In this period, social work was heavily criticized both from outside its borders and from within. In Britain, for example, a social worker organization called Case Con, basing itself on a Marxist analysis of the state, the ruling class and capitalism, published a manifesto

calling for a radicalized social work (Case Con in Bailey and Brake 1975). This manifesto presented a fundamental criticism of welfare state social work as individualizing social problems at the expense of social change. This, they argued, was a result of the professionalizing drive within social work. Case Con called for social work to organize independently of the state in order to achieve collective control over services and resources (Case Con in Bailey and Brake 1975:144-147).

While some departments of social work education changed curriculum to reflect more instruction in sociological analysis than psychoanalysis (Lecomte 1990:35-39; Findlay 1978) during this period, few of the changes advocated by Case Con were enacted in social service agencies. Rather transformations that have taken root in social work in most welfare states since at least 1970 are more neoliberal than redistributive. In Canada, social workers, nationally and provincially, more often work in situations where “legislation, regulations, policy, procedures and standards govern their activities” as well as within service delivery mandates that decrease the amount of aid available while increasing the monitoring of both clients and social workers (Westhues, et al. 2001:42). Recent social policy targets highly selected groups within the population for the delivery of specialized programs, leading to an overall fragmentation of social work into highly particular programs for specific ‘social problems’ and populations and making social workers into population/problem experts (Webb 2006:61). In effect, social work is as state-controlled and regulated as ever.

Fraser (1989), in analyzing the demands made by marginalized people on the state and its social service apparatus, argues that people in receipt of social service aid become “positioned as potential recipients of predefined services rather than as agents involved in interpreting their needs and shaping their life conditions” (Fraser 1989:307). A social service, in Fraser’s (1989) argument is the result of an administrative translation of the original need or demand into the mechanisms of the social service apparatus. In the process of undergoing this translation, the need is:

decontextualized and recontextualized ... [It is] represented in abstraction from its class, race, and gender specificity and from whatever oppositional meanings it may have acquired in the course of its politicization [and is also] cast in terms which tacitly presuppose such entrenched, specific background institutions as (‘primary’ versus ‘secondary’) wage labour, privatized child rearing, and their gender-based separation. (Fraser 1989:306)

Social service recipients, including the groups who originally advocated for state provision, are pushed out of the final round of interpreting need into the state’s social service bureaucracy. Instead, experts and bureaucrats make the need administerable according to already established institutions. Similar to Rose’s (1996b) argument about the fundamental nature of social work within liberalism, Fraser (1989) links social work to primary institutions and philosophies of government. Within neoliberalism, as well as in earlier periods of social work, the profession of social work and its professional domain, the social services, conform to the culture of government rather than to the aspirations of some of its more radical members or the aspirations of its target client groups. Through the next section of this chapter, I will outline a brief history of social work in order to

draw further connections between urbanization, poverty, charity and liberalism from the turn of the 20th century to the current day.

Social work claims two contrasting types of organization as the origin of modern-day social work methods and philosophies. In Settlement Houses, work done by settlement workers provided immediate services to the neighbours of the settlement house, as well as advocated for reforms in local, regional and national laws and services to the neighbourhood. In general, the purpose of settlement houses was to organize inside and outside of the neighbourhoods in which they were located for better treatment of their mostly poor and immigrant residents. Settlement workers were often young men and women from middle class families who moved into, or settled into, the large houses and buildings that were established as settlements throughout the United States, with many also in Britain and a few in Canada (Koerin 2003; Kendall 2000; Guest 1997). Residents generally paid room and board to live in the settlement and their work there was voluntary.

Settlements had many different affiliations. Some were run by religious organizations, others, such as Hull House in Chicago, were established by individuals, many had associations with civic organizations, women's clubs, businessmen's groups and trade unions and in Canada the social gospel movement (Wharf 1990:20). The programs settlement houses offered varied also, including recreational programs, kindergartens, daycares, adult education programs, meeting places for community groups and labour organizations, and various cultural activities such as dances, musical gathering and art exhibitions

(Koerin 2003; Andrews 2001). The reform projects they attempted were equally varied not only within individual settlements, but also between settlements. Some, such as Hull House, run by Jane Addams, pushed for and won significant reforms including the city's first public playground and bathhouse. They initiated a lobby for child labour laws, and safety and health provisions in the workplace, and participated in national campaigns with other settlement houses to fight for national child labour laws, women's suffrage, unemployment insurance and other reforms (Johnson 2004). Settlement house program delivery methods became the forerunners of community development and group social work methods (Andrews 2001), though, at the time of the establishment of settlements, these techniques were not associated with social work, which was, at the turn of the 20th century just beginning to develop into a full profession more commonly associated with individualized casework.

The Charity Organization Society Movement (COS), the other prominent stream in social work history, is most closely associated with the social work method of casework. As charitable organizations and charitable aid proliferated within cities at the turn of the 20th century, a movement of charity organizations led by prominent charity workers, philanthropists, city officials and social scientists grew to prominence. Their goal was to organize charities within cities into larger, more centralized and more bureaucratized organizations in order to develop more systematic methods of charitable service, including by preventing duplicated effort among local charities thereby also cutting down on fraud or 'double dipping' by 'clients' (Guest 1997:39). More prominent in Britain and the

United States, the COS movement also had a lasting effect on the organization of charity in Canada, acting to define and structure 'proper' charitable activity (Leighninger 2000:1). Similar to the work of 'friendly visitors,' material aid was often not the primary object of COS workers as COS movement philosophies considered the cause of poverty to be character-based (Tice 1998:28).

The COS movement was instrumental in initiating 'scientific charity,' a method of charity that investigated charity recipients through use of new and growing social science knowledge of human character and systematic investigation techniques drawn from business and social science. Charity workers learned a set of practical and intellectual techniques for sorting, classifying and tutoring charity recipients. Extensive case records and classification records made direct comparisons between the urban poor and colonized peoples and drew on binary and polarized images of good/bad, virtue/vice in their analysis (Tice 1998:30).

Settlement houses and the Charity Organization Society movement, while not an exhaustive description of early charity efforts nevertheless present two different, and, in many respects, contradictory, philosophies guiding charity at the turn of the 20th century. Settlement houses by-and-large operated with the assumption that poverty had to be addressed by material change in the life conditions of the poor. Houses addressed the material conditions of poverty at both the individual level and at the level of the broader society. Hence, settlement houses provided local programming accessible to neighbourhood residents and advocated singly and in coalition for broader political and economic

changes. Most settlement houses until the 1920s operated mutual aid and self-help programs for neighbourhood residents (Andrews 2001:6). In the COS movement, by contrast, bureaucracy, and expert knowledge and methods were key to the day-to-day work of delivering charity, which was most often addressed through character building advice and only minimal material aid. The philosophies that guided settlement houses were fundamentally opposed to those guiding the COS movement. Eventually, many of the reform-oriented and egalitarian elements of charity, including the settlement houses and mutual aid organizations that had included and relied on the active, intelligent participation of charity recipients, lost credibility to the more 'professional' and liberal assumptions of COS movement methods (Tice 1998:45).

The push for professionalization became more and more apparent throughout all forms of charitable practice in the early decades of the 20th century. This push came predominantly from the COS movement, which was the most prominent form of charitable activity at that time. Organizations such as the Vancouver Friendly Aid Society and the Associated Charities of Winnipeg could be found in almost every major city of Canada in those decades. These organizations were not necessarily affiliated with each other, though members and representatives did meet at regional and national conferences of charity workers, related professionals and concerned, usually wealthy, citizens (Hurl 1983). With the publication in 1917 of *Social Diagnosis*, by Mary Richmond, a highly publicized and widely distributed book describing casework methodology, a unified definition of casework was disseminated throughout the COS

movement as well as in almost every department of social work then in existence (Shoemaker 1998:189).

Casework was particularly important to the professionalizing drive of social workers because it provided a unified set of systematic techniques for workers who worked in such varied fields as church-run sports programs, settlement house kindergartens, schools, hospitals, child welfare departments, and many others. Its method provided a unified method for assessment and intervention as well as a clear description of the social work to other professions and the public (Parton 1996:9). Additionally, its methodology, premised on 'scientific charity' (Tice 1998) made casework a methodology that logically connected poverty, charity, and character-study classification to the foundational philosophy of liberal government. Casework 'made sense' in liberal society.

Overall, COS movement methods altered charitable activity throughout Britain, the United States and Canada, and they became the dominant methods of charitable service in each country. However, casework methodology had the negative impact of structuring professional processes toward individualizing client problems and solutions in opposition to more group-centred, self help and mutual aid models practiced in the reform-oriented settlement houses. By the decade of the 1920s, settlement house workers faced with the professionalizing push in social work and with political and economic changes to a much more conservative society, also sought to legitimize their 'social work' by adopting casework methods (Koerin 2003:55; Andrews 2001:48). Casework was certainly a staple in the curriculum of social work programs. The University of Toronto

was home to the first school of social work in Canada, founded in 1914. By the early 1930s when the University of British Columbia opened the third program of social work in Canada, casework methods and case studies formed the bulk of both curricula (Scott 2004:67-8; Hurl 1983).¹

Prior to moving my analysis of the relationship between social work and neoliberalism, the current formation of liberal government, I will turn briefly to a description of social work in the heyday of the welfare state. The end of the Second World War marks a second phase in the development of social work and social work education. Characterized by major changes in the economy brought about by the Depression of the 1930s and the war, social work post-1945 was even more directly tied to the new welfare state. In England, the Beveridge Report, published in 1942, recommended a new concept of social minima in health care, income and employment (Guest 1997:108). These concepts were drawn from Keynesian economics that proposed an economy in which the state intervened to ensure financial security, full employment and some redistribution of resources (Webb 2006:50). In Canada, these themes were part of the Marsh Report that recommended a national employment program, a federal social insurance system and provincial worker's compensation, old age and permanent disability or death insurance plans, a universal system of health insurance, and a universal system of family allowances (Guest 1997:112). While government did not immediately implement these measures following the end of the Second World War, they were for the most part slowly adopted over the next two

¹ Little information is available about the founding of the second school of social work at McGill University. Therefore, I have not included it here.

decades. The advent of the welfare state added to the professionalizing drive of social work.

The assumptions underlying the services of the welfare state posited social work as the profession that would administer welfare, a state program that would redistribute power and wealth across society (Hopkins 1996:28). Benefits were believed to maximize social welfare. They were seen to be benevolent, ameliorative and redistributive. The state was believed to provide for social progress through further development of social science knowledge, which was then important to the rationale employed by social workers who guided individuals to make progress in their lives (Parton 1996:8).

Broadly, in the early years of the welfare state, social workers began to incorporate psychoanalytic and therapy-oriented casework methods in social work interventions (Jones 1996; Lecomte 1990; Findlay 1978). While the curriculum of social work schools in the immediate post-war period did still draw from sociology, this was primarily from sociological analysis of the family. The larger society continued to see poverty as a personal or familial failing, rather than one fundamental to the economic system. This placed considerable pressure on social workers to understand, describe and fix the personal and familial 'problems' of the poor (Jones 1996:195). During the decades of 1950 and 1960, psychoanalysis began to replace sociology in social work curriculum. Psychoanalysis provided a new and more scientific unifying knowledge that also matched the general societal belief that through personal change, anyone could achieve success (Jones 1996:195). However, the increasingly direct link

between social work and the welfare state during this period also began to shape the profession in ways not fully determined by social workers. Jones (1996) describes that in Britain, just as social workers finally centralized their services under a social work state agency, the state began to make fiscal changes, thereby increasing caseloads and reducing services (1996:197).

During the late 1960s, political movements then gaining ground were, as part of a broad critique of capitalist economies, patriarchal social organization, and the imperial state, highly critical of the individualist and internal focus of most social work methods. In the mid-1970s, some social work students and educators in Britain, Canada and the United States, influenced by these critiques, began to seek to restructure social work education to include an analysis of the social system as the origin of individual problems (Lecomte 1990:35-39; Findlay 1978). However, this trend occurred just as governments in the Western world were entering what of Peck and Tickell (2002) call the first phase of neoliberalism. In this phase, then manifesting macroeconomic conditions were blamed on “Keynesian financial regulation, unions, corporatist planning, state ownership, and ‘overregulated’ labour markets” (Peck and Tickell 2002:388). Governments adopted neoliberal policies and began to dismantle the Keynesian welfare state. Beginning in the 1980s, states increasingly withdrew from social welfare projects, deregulating and marketizing the provision of social welfare.

Beginning in the 1990s, we entered the second phase of neoliberalization. Engendered by crises internal to the neoliberal project, governments pushed for a new form of governance, including stimulating the economy, and creating new

kinds of regulatory institutions and new technologies of governance. Neoliberal governance detaches experts from the institutions of the state and governs, not through society, but through the regulated choices of individuals (Rose 1996b:41). Employing a definition of personhood that names possessive individualism as “descriptive of human nature per se” (Kingfisher 2002:49) and centres the ‘free market’ as both a natural phenomenon and as the primary governing philosophy, neoliberalism alters the liberal formula of rule (Rose 1996b:41).

Peck and Tickell (2002) argue that “roll-out” neoliberalism is characterized by “a striking coexistence of technocratic economic management and invasive social policies” (Peck and Tickell 2002:389). In this phase the often indirect extensions of state power through programs of devolution, localization and policy transfer, serve further to naturalize the appearance of the market and of market participation within (neo)liberal society. State institutions are de-governmentalized, and instead are governed through contracts, performance measures and evaluation while citizens are reconstructed as clients whose citizenship is actively recreated by their choices and allegiances (Rose 1996b:57). Those who do not or cannot fulfil their responsibilities to an active citizenship are subject to programs to recreate them as active citizens (Rose 1996b:60).

Current neoliberal economic and governmental restructuring in Canada is shifting the meaning and responsibility of state involvement in social welfare programs from one of securing minimum standards in health, education and

social services to one of supporting market growth and reducing national debt (Brodie 1999:37). In particular, the shift from the Canada Assistance Plan to the Canadian Health and Social Transfer has meant more power but less money for the provinces, fewer national standards in health and social welfare, fewer mechanisms to enforce national standards, and less security in funding for health, education and poverty-related assistance (Kingfisher 2002; Pulkingham and Ternowetsky 1999). The reconstitution of social programs as a cost cutting measure has been justified on the assumption that Keynesian welfare state provisions are expensive and inefficient. Salient is the idea that universal entitlement provides equally to the wealthy as well as to the poor and is therefore both a waste of money and a bureaucratic inefficiency.

Concretely, Parton (1996) notes that social work in neoliberalism no longer makes use of therapeutic techniques or casework methods (1996:11). Rather social workers in Britain require skills necessary to managing or coordinating the care of their clients. These skills include the ability to assess need and risk, to manage cost and keep budgets, to monitor and evaluate progress and outcome, and to work with other agencies in multi-disciplinary care plans (Parton 1996:11). Overall, social work is more fragmentary and social workers specialize in particular kinds of clients with particular kinds of problems (Webb 2006:61; Parton 1996:11). Both Parton (1996) and Hugman (2001) note that the profession is now more often characterised by uncertainty in knowledge and practice. Narrative and relativist analysis predominate and consequently professional authority cannot be assumed (Hugman 2001:323; Parton 1996:11).

Daily work as well as overall career planning requires flexibility. Para-professionals provide many of the direct services with social workers acting in supervisory roles (Hugman 2001:325; Parton 1996:11).

A study of Canadian social workers conducted by Westhues, et al (2001) finds similar changes in Canadian social work practice. Social workers overall are providing a wider range of services with fewer resources. While neoliberal political and economic changes have reduced the overall provision for social services, the number of social workers employed has increased and social workers are more likely to work in situations where they are more highly governed by legislation, regulation, policy, procedures and standards (Westhues, et al 2001:42). Services are increasingly fragmented and social workers have to negotiate with other professional, such as nurses, for professional recognition. At the same time as the social services are being decentralized, social work as a profession is being destabilized (Westhues, et al 2001:43).

Currently, social workers work through methods and philosophies most compatible with neoliberal shifts in social and economic policy. This is not surprising given that the majority of social workers work either directly or indirectly within state social services, even though there have been overall reductions in funding to the social services. However, it is also important to note that prior to the institutionalization of social services within the state governing apparatus, social work methods were aligned with dominant governing philosophies. In a society that has a long history of locating poverty in moral degeneracy and dependent character, social work as one of the professions that

is most closely associated with administering to poverty is logically tied to dominance beliefs in the causes of poverty. Particularly, when the profession succeeds over the course of 100 years to grow in number and become institutionalized within the government. Although neoliberalism currently 'de-institutionalizes' social work from direct work within government bureaucracy, this is the distancing of bureaucracy from government rather than of government from social work. Social work still operates primarily through the philosophies and methods of government.

In conclusion, in this chapter, I have outlined a brief history of social work that draws links between liberal governance and social work from the turn of the 20th century through to social work as it is practiced now at the turn of the 21st century. Based on the theoretical developments of Rose (1996a; 1996b), I describe the relationship between social work and the (neo)liberal state as one in which social work, among other professions, makes the liberal formula of rule operable; social work assists in maintaining the stability of the society and the appearance of liberty by enforcing proper individual conduct in citizens otherwise aberrant vis-à-vis the demands of (neo)liberal social or market citizenship. 'Dependent' groups are generally the same groups that are subordinated with respect to the dominant social, political and economic institutions of (neo)liberal society. Social services, by making administerable services of the politicized demands of these groups, serve to reposition need in terms of (neo)liberal rule. Ultimately, social workers, the primary administrators of social services, work through the primary institutions of neoliberal governance.

CHAPTER 3: LEARNING SOCIAL WORK

Reflection and Awareness Techniques in Social Work Education

Two documents published by the Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (CASSW), the *Educational Policy Statements* (2000) and *CASSW Standards for Accreditation* (2004), govern social work education in Canada. These documents outline generalist social work practice, a practice framework containing the professional theories and methodologies that enable the beginning social worker to take up work in any social work context with any social work client. Students educated in generalist social work practice are taught to intervene with individual clients through counselling and/or into the 'social environment' in which the client is located through social action arising out of the social worker's theoretical understanding and awareness of oppression. Reflection is an integral skill for the practice of generalist social work and for developing awareness. It is taught in various areas of the curriculum. For example, students reflect on the social justice or anti-oppressive curriculum together with the social worker's own experience of oppression/privilege to develop awareness of oppression and privilege. In another, students are taught to practice reflection to integrate awareness of social justice theory with social work intervention practices as a means of creating and evaluating a socially just social work intervention.

Reflection is taught within the context of neoliberalization of the social services. Neoliberal governments, including those in Canada and British Columbia, are currently restructuring social welfare programs by re-allocating the responsibility of the welfare state to the individual/familial private realm or by applying market principles to social programs (Kingfisher 2002:9; Brodie 2002:97). By contrast, undergraduate social work education teaches that social work, the profession that is most closely associated with the delivery of social welfare programs and services, enacts social justice by confronting oppression. Social work employment and education arenas appear to assign two contradictory meanings to the profession. The employment arena appears to say that social workers have the role of enforcing individual responsibility for welfare by means of establishing contractual relationships between clients and governments (Parton 1996:11). The education arena seems to say that social workers have the responsibility of working toward a social analysis and social response based in ending relations of domination and subordination (Mullaly 2002). In my arguments below, I will show that dominant curriculum and teaching methods that promote reflection toward awareness within the context of a highly flexible generalist social work curriculum are one way that social work rationalizes its social justice aspirations with neoliberal restrictions on social service delivery. I will argue, however, that techniques of reflection and awareness, rather than preparing students for socially just social work practice, ultimately prepare students to take up work in the decentralized, fragmented and unstable work regimes of neoliberalized social services.

I will begin the analysis in this chapter by describing generalist social work method, anti-oppressive and social justice social work theory, and reflection as taught and used by faculty and students in the program. Drawing on the theoretical developments of Ixer (1999), I will analyze reflection and awareness as techniques of 'social justice' social work that teach social work students to meet the work requirements of neoliberalized social work bureaucracies.

The Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (CASSW) has outlined the skills of a generalist practitioner of social work. Competence in generalist social work, or social work in any setting with any client or client group, is demonstrated when a student has achieved the ability to "arrive at professional judgements and actions, based on an integration of theory and practice within the context of professional values and the relevant social work code of ethics" (CASSW 2000:2.3). Practically, this will include the ability to "analyze situations, to establish accountable relationships and to intervene appropriately with clients and related systems and to evaluate one's social work interventions" (CASSW 2000:3.4.5). Additionally, students should achieve: "beginning level analysis and practice skills pertaining to the origins and manifestations of social injustices in Canada, and the multiple and intersecting bases of oppression, domination and exploitation" (CASSW 2004:5.10.4); and "awareness of self in terms of values, beliefs and experiences as these impact upon social work practice" (CASSW 2004: 5.10.9).

The requirements of the CASSW are supported by the lessons given in texts on the topic of generalist social work practice, including one in particular

that outlines that teaching generalist social work practice involves instruction in a generalized six-step method (Kirst-Ashman and Hull 1993:25-37) and its integration with a theoretical analysis of systems and social contexts. This text additionally states that the prepared generalist practitioner has an eclectic theoretical base combined with a variety of intervention techniques that may have been studied in the undergraduate program of social work education or may have been learned through employment training (Kirst-Ashman and Hull 1993:6).

The theoretical analysis taught in social work programs is an integral component of the methodology, giving shape and sense to a vague and highly adaptable method. To paraphrase the words of one faculty member, social justice social work operates through a process of weaving together, into a single but broad practice framework, theories of social, political and economic inequality, along with a methodology of intervention with any client or group of clients, including the social structure itself toward the goal of creating social justice (Professor 2:4).

Currently, social work theory is in a transition period, shifting from older to newer frameworks. Systems theory/ ecological perspective and structural social work analysis, which arose with generalist practice in the decade of the 1970s, are the older frameworks while anti-oppressive practice theory, which arose predominantly in the 1990s, is the newer (SWEC 2000:31-2). Systems theory/ecological perspective is a perspective that employs a view of individuals as located within systems, such as the family, or within 'social environments' (Kirst-Ashman and Hull 1993:14). Structural social work analysis draws on a

Marxist analysis of class or other 'structural' elements of society to explain how human experience is shaped (Lecomte 1990). Anti-oppressive practice theory assumes that inequalities or 'differences' of ability, age, class, gender, race and sexuality are shaping the social context in which are located the origins of clients' problems. Ideologically, anti-oppressive practice theory is what links social work to social justice most explicitly because it is the dominant practice theory, or the framework that guides social workers to locate individual problems within social conditions as a means to professional action. Anti-oppressive practice theory tells social workers in what way their interactions with clients should develop to shift the social conditions toward social justice.

Two examples of social work writing on the topic of anti-oppressive practice theory used in the instruction of students are those of Campbell (2003a) and Mullaly (2002). Brief summaries here will provide a further basis from which to analyze the most important theoretical concepts contained within anti-oppressive social work practice theory. Campbell (2003a) defines anti-oppressive practice as a mode of practice that necessitates the analysis of difference (ability, age, class, gender, and sexual orientation), the acceptance of contradiction and uncertainty, a challenge to expert knowledge and the belief in multiple and varying truths. It "accounts for the impact of structural factors, personal uniqueness, and community differences in interpreting and assessing the thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of individuals" (Campbell 2003a:123) and insists that "interventions always be understood in the light of larger societal constructs" (Campbell 2003a:123).

Mullaly (2002), also writing on the topic of anti-oppressive social work practice, reminds social workers that:

there are no quick and easy strategies for eliminating oppression.... Almost everyone occupies at least one position of dominance and, therefore, benefits in some way... from the present system. 'In other words, nearly all people are now part of the problem, regardless of personal philosophy'...[and] personal or self-transformation is part of the larger task of social transformation. (Mullaly 2002:206)

Integral steps to be taken by social workers when applying anti-oppressive theory to the methods of social work include changing the language used by social workers, seeking the social causes of a client's problems, giving service-users access to their files, co-authoring records, being self-reflexive, discovering how identities are largely determined by the dominant ideology, focusing on analyzing the social worker's role as an oppressor and gathering together with other anti-oppressive social workers to discuss the difficulties of implementing anti-oppressive methods in agencies or organizations (Mullaly 2002).

It is possible to see from these brief descriptions of anti-oppressive social work practice that its methods are a miscellany of both analytical approaches to and theoretical descriptions of social change, expert knowledge and power. This practice theory directs the social worker both in how to work with her client and in how to relate to herself. As in the articulations of anti-oppressive theory by Campbell (2003a) and Mullaly (2002), the practice of anti-oppression in social work relies on a rejection of the social worker's expertise and authority as a professional attached to a professional association and located within a position of employment that requires professional credentials. To this end, she should

reject her 'expert knowledge,' accept multiple and varying truths, as well as contradiction and uncertainty and consider that 'difference' is the primary organizing force at play in the interaction between herself and the client, as well as between the client and society. At the same time, the tenets of anti-oppressive theory instruct the social worker to turn her gaze on herself to examine the sources of her own authority and assumptions as an individual with her own values and who is herself implicated in the dominant ideology and the organization of difference. However, within the context of the social work encounter, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the social worker is also governed by such institutional relationships as her employment contract, agency or organization mandate including service delivery and records keeping methods, government social service policies, her professional association and credentials.

As mentioned above, anti-oppressive practice theory is a relatively new and still emerging theory for practice. As such, not all undergraduate programs of social work in Canada have fully adopted anti-oppressive practice theory. There are even debates within social work education as to the usefulness of such a practice theory for social work (see Campbell 2003a; 2003b and Tester 2003a; 2003b). Some professors and students see value in the anti-oppressive approach, describing their own approach as anti-oppressive (Professor 2:1 and Student A 2:14). Other students and professors recognize the salience of this practice theory in the program, though they themselves either do not teach it or do not choose to accept it as a useful method of social work practice (Professor 3:5 and Student B 2:21). Nevertheless, programs in several universities across

Canada have adopted anti-oppressive social work as the primary practice theory (see particularly the program of the University of Victoria) and there is a growing body of literature on the topic of anti-oppressive social work (see Campbell 2003a, 2003b; Shera, ed. 2003; Dominelli 2002; Mullaly 2002). While not fully eclipsing other practice theories within social work, including Marxist or structural social work theory and systems theory/ecological approach, anti-oppressive theory is the newest attempt in social work to develop a comprehensive sociological explanation of domination and subordination toward socially just social work practice. Additionally, anti-oppressive theory coordinates closely with other curriculum elements.

Specifically, the exhortation of the curriculum standards and teaching methods to reflection mirrors the exhortation in anti-oppressive social work theory to introspection. Reflection is an assigned aspect in almost every course in the program. Interviews with each student revealed that faculty assign reflection papers at the end of each theory or practice module as a way of demonstrating to faculty the students' ability to learn and incorporate theoretical and methodological instruction into their practicum placements and other course work. According to one student, these papers are meant to make students be more thoughtful of themselves and more aware of themselves (Student B 2:12). They are marked according to whether or not a student meets the criteria for reflection papers, namely a discussion of strengths and limitations (Student A 3:20), use of appropriate language (Student C 1:4), and integration of theory, practice methodology and practice experience.

According to the students I interviewed, reflection, particularly on the topic of practice theory in combination with the social worker's own experience of oppressions and privileges (Student C 2:12) or biases and stereotypes (Student B 1:12) assists students to develop the key generalist social work competency of self-awareness (CASSW 2004:5.10.9). This self-awareness in turn enables the social worker to know others (Student A 1:7), to help the student to explore her assumptions in relation to readings and practical experiences as well as in relation to the authority of the social worker (Student A 3:23; Student B 2:12). Students are taught, particularly in courses relating to the field component of the curriculum, to keep a daily reflection journal in order to aid them in developing awareness of self and clients through which they can analyze what assumptions, knowledge and therefore power each person is bringing to the social worker-client interaction (Students A 3:22).

A second function of reflection in undergraduate social work education is to aid the student to integrate theoretical with methodological knowledge and therefore to create, perform and evaluate the social work intervention. In particular, reflection and awareness help students to interact with program curriculum. One professor in the program defines reflection as a significant component of measuring competent social work practice. Skills of reflection and awareness are part of each aspect of the steps of the generalist approach to social work. The ability to reflect on one's practice and be aware is important, particularly in relation to the student/social worker's values, ethics and experiences. Additionally, a social worker's awareness of herself improves her

ability to communicate and connect with clients and leads to successful assessment of the client's situation. Through becoming aware, it is possible for the social worker to combine theory and method in the social work intervention to create and carry out the intervention. Finally, the social worker must reflect back on the intervention to evaluate success (Professor 2:6-7). With the exception of counselling and interview skills, reflection and awareness, techniques and skills are taught on an ad hoc basis. Some professors choose to teach advocacy skills while others teach therapy techniques and still others teach 'of the moment' techniques, such as strengths-based practice methods (Professor 1:19 ; Professor 3:21; Graybeal 2001). While past generations of social work education programs have included specific training in technique, for example, casework methods (Tice 1998) or psychoanalysis (Lecomte 1990), this is no longer the case.

The first point of my analysis in the use of reflection and awareness in undergraduate social work curriculum is the ambiguity surrounding the definition of successful reflection. In one student's analysis of the use of reflection in the program, she finds that "reflection is reified [by professors and students] in that we think it will solve all problems; that [through reflection] we can have self-awareness and be able to engage with our clients. There is a real dominance to the idea of reflection as an integral skill to be learned in social work" (Student C 1:10). Yet, when she began to write her reflection papers as part of course requirements, she found she could not comprehend the requirements themselves. She had neither received any instruction in the method by which

she should go about reflecting nor direction as to what practices or theories exactly she should choose for reflection. Instead, she found that students could not perform one of the main functions of reflection, namely an integration of theory and practice toward a successful social work intervention, because:

...they [students] did not know what they [faculty] wanted and I realized they [faculty] really wanted this cookie cutter approach. For example, take ecological systems theory and apply it to a case....So the students would talk about what happened in the week of practicum and people were going through intense experiences and I felt these socialization pressures. I cannot explain it any other way. Professors were saying, "Dear Whoever, it's great to see you coming along. I can see that you've come so far since where you were last year and that this is a place for you to bring together these ideas." It was as if [the professor] was rewarding people based on a point system I did not know. She would congratulate students for using a kind of word or a kind of language. (Student C 1:4-5)

In a review of the social work literature on reflection, D'Cruz, et al. (2007) found that reflection has two primary aims in social work education. Similarly to the program here, it is meant to teach a mode of thinking that prepares the individual to respond to her situation, particularly in circumstances of rapid change or 'risk' (D'Cruz, et al. 2007:76). It is also meant to reveal the relationship between power and knowledge production toward understanding what and how we know (D'Cruz, et al. 2007:78). Ixer (1999), in writing on the uses of reflection in British social work education finds that while reflection is a

practice used generally in professional education, it is used to greatest extent in social work education. He notes that British social work education requirements, as in the experience of the student above, fails to define what constitutes successful reflection (1999:514). In Ixer's (1999) analysis, techniques for reflection and the development of (self-)awareness are meant to provide the social worker with a means of thinking in action to enhance 'knowing for doing' (1999:514). Reflection, in particular, "claims to unlock the shackles of theory so that the learner can engage actively with praxis (theory in practice)" (Ixer 1999:515).

However, he notes that reflection is also a social process happening in place and time as well as within the individual social work student. In particular, reflection arises as an important component of professional education at the same time as professional education and indeed the broader society increasingly requires the individual (social worker) to manage uncertainties, 'risks' and highly complex relationships (Ixer 1999:519). In social work in particular, the pressure to work quickly within a set of often conflicting demands and in ever changing funding and policy circumstances, places social workers in a position of needing to consider, evaluate, judge and act quickly.

Hugman (2001) characterises the knowledge characteristic of social workers in such a context as plural, participatory and performative with a new relationship to power. In short, social work in the current context entails the recognition of difference and the ability to make meaning in context, rather than through the authority of professional expertise. Professional knowledge is no

longer able to claim an expertise or a truth and instead must be constantly evaluated according to its output (2001:322). Hugman (2001) links these conditions of post-modern knowledge production to neoliberal shifts in social service policy and regulation (2001:323). The uncertainties and complexity that increasingly characterise social service policy and hence social work require further policy and regulation to direct and regulate social service bureaucracies.

In the second point of analysis of the use of reflection in undergraduate social work curriculum, reflection is being used in Britain to legitimate pedagogy in the field so that work-based learning can be accorded equal status to classroom-based education. This transfers the control over social work education to the employer while also meeting neoliberal financial and policy demands (Ixer 1999:523). While this is not entirely the case in Canadian undergraduate social work education, the university-based social work programs are experiencing increasing pressure to include ministry-specific training and a higher degree of specialization in their curricula (SWEC 2000:vii). While generalist education, which employs a broad practice approach, appears to provide a challenge to the individualizing pressures of neoliberalism, there is also the potential that undergraduate social work education, in preparing students to conform readily to any social work context, is accommodating, rather than challenging, the highly particularized and shifting modes of social service delivery in neoliberalism.

Generalist social work practice and later anti-oppressive social work theory arose out of a number of shifts within both social work education and

social service policy that began in the decade of the 1970s and continue until today. In some respects, it is possible to say that social work education in Canada and elsewhere underwent a crisis of legitimacy in the 1970s and 1980s that led in part to the reformulation of curriculum standards, including by adopting education in class, race and gender hierarchies (Lecomte 1990; Wharf, ed. 1990). In particular, political movements critical of social work's individualizing, psychoanalytic methods and neoliberal governments critical of both bureaucratic inefficiencies and Keynesian universalist welfare policies, simultaneously effected a reshaping of welfare state services and undergraduate social work education. The outcome of this reshaping has been a broad-based methodology that can accommodate the many policy and service delivery shifts resulting from neoliberal restructuring of social welfare programs, a theoretical analysis that encourages uncertainty and adaptability, and a redefinition of social workers as workers for social justice.

At the same time as social work students and faculty were using political movement criticisms to challenge therapy and psychoanalytic methods of social work, the neoliberalizing state was reducing state resources available to the social services as well as the kind and amount of social service aid available to individuals (Jones 1996: 201; Lecomte 1990:33-35). In one example from Britain, as social work departments and schools were challenging the legitimacy of therapy as a model for social work intervention, government policy changed to emphasize managerialism, entailing the precise accounting of outcomes and

effectiveness, as the new organizing structure of social service delivery (Jones 1996:199).

I have argued in an earlier chapter that social work today is primarily a profession that is at the mercy of the employment opportunities provided to it by the state. This is particularly evident when half of all social workers in British Columbia work for the provincial government (SWEC 2000:22) and a greater proportion of social workers now work in situations where they are governed by legislation, regulation, policy and community governance structures put in place to implement government policy in community-based social service agencies (Westhues, et al: 2001:42). As neoliberal governance policies and programs have fluctuated, so too has the work available to and done by social workers. In hyper-flexible, neoliberal social work, according to Hugman (2001), social workers more often act as supervisors of other paraprofessional deliverers of social services. Additionally, they work in more specified and task-defined roles, and more often use outcomes measurement tools. Social work employment is more often contract or casual (2001:326).

Current social programs target highly selected groups within the population for the delivery of specialized programs to 'marginalized' people and communities. In British Columbia alone, the categories of social service programs available have both grown in number and decreased in scope, now representing highly specific target population groups (Finch, et al. 1994:31). While the number of programs for targeted, specialized groups proliferate, social service delivery overall falls further short of fulfilling Keynesian philosophy of

universal entitlement to the welfare state and its resources (Webb 2006: 44).

This trend leads to an overall fragmentation of social work into highly particular programs for specific 'social problems' and 'problem' populations, making social workers into population/problem experts, but also experts in managing the ongoing shifts and changes in types and kinds of programs delivered. Westhues, et al (2001) note that in response, social workers are now required to employ a wide knowledge base to accommodate a wide range of potential and actual workplace settings and fields of practice creating a lack of certainty and a lack of unifying knowledge while requiring a high degree of adaptability on the part of individual social workers (2001:40).

Generalist social work methodology and anti-oppressive theoretical analysis are themselves broad enough to encompass diverse work settings and all forms of social service policy, contract or mandate. Generalist practice methodology provides a wide knowledge base while, together with anti-oppressive social work theory, it prepares students to deal with uncertainty, non-unified knowledge and requirements to adaptability. Encoding uncertainty and adaptability as an expectation and requirement of current day social workers within its very definition, generalist social work prepares students to take up any kind of social work with any kind of client (Kirst-Ashman and Hull 1993:4-6). Anti-oppressive practice theory in turn is a broad, 'catch-all' approach to political analysis. Effectively, anti-oppressive practice theory, with its call to multiple truths, uncertainty and hyper self-awareness, is both a single meta-theory of

practice that will allow a social worker to recognize and confront any form of oppression anywhere drawing on this single approach and a theory that neatly meets the needs of infinite flexibility required in neoliberal social service practice.

In addition to helping to prepare social workers for the complexity of the work environment in which they will find themselves, generalist anti-oppressive social work practice teaching also serves to individualize social work students. In this third analysis of the uses of reflection in undergraduate social work curriculum, reflection guides the student of social work to see her connection to her client as a matter of her own personal awareness, rather than always also and predominantly a matter of the contract for provision governing the relationship. Uses of reflection, whether toward greater self-awareness or toward developing and evaluating a social work intervention, proscribe a process in which the individual social worker within the context of the single social worker-client relationship will of her own accord mitigate the forces at play outside of the relationship, which also shape the social worker-client interaction. In particular, when students are asked to reflect on oppression, privilege, theory, method and the social worker-client relationship, students are guided to see that their individual choices with regard to the social worker-client relationship effect social justice and that social justice is something that can be created within the context of the social worker-client relationship.

As revealed earlier, both generalist practice methodology and anti-oppressive practice theory incorporate reflection as a key element of the learning and doing process. Reflection is meant to aid the social worker to develop her

self-awareness and her awareness of others, to explore her assumptions in relation to readings and experiences, oppressions and privileges, and to consider her authority as a social worker. One student describes the purpose of awareness within the social-worker client relationship as realization that the power relationship between the social worker and the client is one in which the social worker has power over the client. The aware social worker will try to balance that relationship through, for example, client empowerment strategies or use of strengths-based social work practices which allow the client to make some of the decisions about the interaction between client and social worker (Student A 3:3-4).

A social worker's own conception of herself as specifically located by her professional status and position is a potentially influential awareness within the context of her interaction with clients. However, the interaction between the social worker and her client is also highly influenced by such governance structures as the social work professional body, the credentials of social work education and, in the moment of meeting a client face to face in the social service agency, the service contract, policy or mandate.

As in the research conducted by Westhues, et al (2001), social workers are more highly governed now than in the past (2001:42), and, according to Finch, et al. (1999) more likely to work in more highly specified areas of social service delivery than ever before (1999:31). This set of circumstances constrains social workers more than in past policy eras, and makes future program funding and employment contracts less stable. These working conditions together with

over-emphasis on reflection toward awareness as a tool of effecting social justice truly create the individualization of the social worker. Social work students often reflect on themselves, in isolation, toward their own awareness of anti-oppressive social work, which teaches social workers to reject the idea that they are attached as professional authorities to professional associations and located within a position of employment that requires professional credentials. While social work students and social workers might individually reject government policy, professional association principles or agency practices, when social work students are taught to individualize their analysis, they are also being told that the social worker-client relationship is as much about their personal ideas and ideals as about policy, contract, and mandated practices. Rather than assisting the social worker to come to an analysis of the institutional power in the contract between herself and her client, the organizations, agencies, associations and policies disappear from the analysis of power in this form of reflection.

The intent of generalist social work education is to prepare students to assess and intervene in the social environment, both generally to make it more socially just and specifically to ameliorate the life conditions of her client or group of clients. However, within the curriculum itself, the practice of social action is reduced to reflection to develop an awareness of self in relation, largely, to oneself, though also to the individual client. The undergraduate social work student's experience of 'social justice' is already individualized as it is displaced to a largely internal process that, while deeply social, is I have argued above,

only one element of the relations governing the interaction between the social worker and her client.

In the above analysis of anti-oppressive generalist practice applied through reflection, the curriculum guides the social work student to see that her allegiance to 'social justice' is what connects her to other social workers, the profession and her future clients over and above her professional credentials. This formulation of professional relationships, however, ignores both the fact that professional authority always obtains within all relationships within the scope of the profession, particularly here within the social worker-client relationship, and that social justice requires a 'social' realm, which cannot be reduced to the relationship between an ethically committed social worker and her client. Awareness of self and others is always disciplined by its context. Awareness of self and others in undergraduate social work education neglects to interrogate the professional authority through which the social worker acts and upon which are built her ideals of socially just social work practice. It also, therefore, denies the power of social workers vis-à-vis their clients. It is as though it is possible for the social worker to exist in two separate, simultaneous, and often contradictory, relationships with a single client. In one, she is an individual member of society who chooses her relationship with her client, another individual in the same society, based on integral principles and values to which she personally ascribes. In the other, she is a professional who relates to her client through the mandate and authority granted her by her position as a social worker.

The reflective, self-aware social work student is accomplishing many tasks and roles in undergraduate social work education. She is incorporating and learning the theory and methodology of generalist social work practice, accomplishing curriculum requirements, accomplishing the tasks necessary to achieve certification as a social worker and learning to produce a key practice of social work. She is also accomplishing herself as the atomized, self-aware, reflective worker for social justice. Neoliberalized social services require that social workers perform within work environments that are frequently changing in scope and purpose. The proliferation of kinds and areas of social work requires that undergraduate programs of social work education prepare students generally and broadly. Flexibility, eclecticism and on-the-job training are requirements of employment in neoliberal social services (Webb 2006:121). Reflection and awareness contribute to the ability of the social worker to undertake work in this form.

As critiques of individualizing social service practices combined with neoliberal shifts in state allocation of resources to the social services, social work moved toward a 'social justice' approach that combines analysis of ability, age, class, gender, race and sexuality 'difference' within its approach to social problem solving. As political movements have become less visible and less influential, social work has begun to incorporate the foundational ideas of these movements reworked as a politics of difference toward a revolution of the self. This self includes the social worker, but also extends outward to the client. In addition, to helping to prepare social workers for the complexity of the work

environment in which they will find themselves, and individualizing social work students. In particular, reflection has the effect of guiding the student of social work to see her connection to her client as a matter of her own personal awareness based in reflection, rather than always also and predominantly a matter of the contract for provision governing the relationship.

In conclusion, in this chapter, I have argued that the uses of reflection in undergraduate social work curriculum individualize and socialize social work students who are thereby encouraged to develop self-awareness to know others, to explore assumptions, and to understand their power within the social worker-client relationship. Certainly a social worker's own conception of herself as specifically located within the world in which she lives will influence how she interacts with her clients. However, the social worker-client interaction is governed not by the convictions of the individual social worker, but by the social work professional body, the credentials of undergraduate social work education and particularly in the moment of meeting a client face to face in the social service agency, the service contract, policy or mandate. It is through these forms of professional governance that the social worker acts.

CHAPTER 4: VALUING SOCIAL WORK

Constructing a Moral/Political Domain of Social Work

Prior (2004) argues that social work is a technical, political and moral activity increasingly dominated by managerialism, technicism and anti-intellectualism (2004:4). Undergraduate education in social work removes the technical aspects of the profession by displacing technical instruction to the domain of employment and, in so doing, establishes itself as the political/moral domain of social work separate from and in opposition to the technical domain of agencies and organizations. This division between the technical and moral/political realms of social work has effect in each location in which they dominate: schools are the primary locus of theoretical social work grounded in a code of ethics while employment is the locus of technical social work grounded in the demands of the social service bureaucracy. However, this division also acts to construct a false opposition between two domains of a single institution, namely the political, moral and technical institution of social service delivery in which social work is the dominant profession. In this chapter, I argue that the discursive separation in opposition of the education and employment domains performs two important functions within undergraduate social work education. The first is to establish a generalist education framework that is primarily theoretical, methodological and values-based, and which assumes that social work is a field of thought and activity separate from the work it accomplishes in

agencies and organizations. The second is to discursively resolve the contradiction between a de-politicized social service (Fraser 1989) and a 'politicized' social service professional education such that the discourse of social work as a political/moral social justice activity remains intact even while punitive and controlling bureaucracies increasingly direct the actions of social workers in the social service field.

I have defined the dominant institutional/professional discourse of social work education as being contained within the concepts of self-awareness, reflection and social justice; these are the 'common sense' ideas of social work governing undergraduate programs of social work education. Faculty and students in a Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) program hope that individual social workers in work settings will use political and moral arguments for social work that effect social change toward greater social justice. While social justice is not necessarily synonymous with social change, social work students and faculty regularly made links between these two concepts when describing the intended outcomes of social work practice. While some definitions of social justice are individualist and passive, such as describing social justice as critical thinking (Student A 1:19; Professor 1:4), as helping clients to make individual change (Professor 1:4), or as deconstructing unfair power dynamics between the social worker and client (Student A 3:8), others describe a fundamental interest with social change. These include fighting capitalism and taking political action toward one's vision of a more inclusive society through social work (Student A 3:9). Socially just social work practice also advocates for just laws, respect for

human rights and equitable access to resources (Professor 3:2). The CASSW (2000) *Educational Policy Statements* reflect some of these definitions of social justice by outlining that social justice teaching should instruct students in “professional action to remove obstacles to human and social development and to challenge oppression (2000:1.2). The CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics* describes social justice as a set of responsibilities social workers have to society, including: engaging in social and/or political action to ensure equitable access to resources; advocating for change in policy and legislation; and advocating for the prevention and elimination of domination or exploitation (2005:24). Many participants expressed frustration that social workers and social work education are not accomplishing these ideals (Student A 2:17, Student B 2:8, Student C 1:29, Professor 3:7). Several participants described social justice as what is possible when social workers join watchdog organizations (Student C 2:30) or when they act collectively through the professional association to protest injustice (Student A 3:9; Professor 1:7).

However, largely, faculty and students reveal a worry that social work employment is predominantly an arena of social control where the possibility for enacting social justice is squeezed out by policy mandates that also often conflict with social work values. Values are intimately tied to the concept of social justice: socially just social work works from the values encoded in the code of ethics. Through an analysis of the construction of a political/moral domain of social work separate from and in opposition to its doing, and the challenge brought to this discourse by the students’ experiences of practicing social work in

their practicum placements, I will examine conflicts between the theory and doing of social work that leave intact the idea that social work is a theory and methodology of social justice even while the practice of social work, as a highly bureaucratized and technicized field of work, is reinforced by neoliberal restructuring.

Within Prior's (2004) analysis of academic writing about social work, she argues that the profession is often conceived of as a technical, a political or a moral activity. The technical, or technicist, aspects of social work are the technical methods of the work, such as the filling of forms and the keeping of files, as well as the following of operational policies and 'best practices' requirements (Prior 2004:5). The political aspect of social work refers both to the state in the form of ministry policies and mandates that arise and change with different political times, and to oppositional politics that attempt to influence social workers to accept or oppose these mandates (Prior 2004:5-6). The moral aspect of social work incorporates both the goals of early charity workers who sought to 're-moralize' the poor (Prior 2004:6) and ethical codes of conduct, such as the *Code of Ethics* of the Canadian Association of Social Workers (CASW 2005a), which are meant to act as a moral code fundamentally guiding the actions of social workers. There is obviously considerable overlap between these three aspects of social work, particularly between the technical and the political aspects and between the political and moral aspects. Nevertheless, interview transcripts reveal that faculty and program curriculum accept and use the distinctions between a moral, a political and a technical domain of social work as

a way of distancing the bureaucratic and controlling aspects of the profession in practice from social work education. At the same time, they posit a single entity called social work that by definition incorporates activity that promotes social justice throughout all aspects of its work.

One of the means of constructing the distinctions between the technical, political and moral aspects of social work is to displace the technical and technicist modes of social work practice to the employing agency and related bodies. One faculty member stated simply that undergraduate social work education happens at the liberal arts university and teaches the ability to think critically or theoretically as a way of providing a framework for the later learning and application of techniques (Professor 1:14). By contrast, training in the technical aspects of the work of social work is offered through institutions outside of the university that, for example:

receive contracts...from the Ministry for Children and Family Development (MCFD) to do post-BSW training for child welfare. They have a number of training programs. For example, students who graduate and take a position at MCFD, take courses on child welfare here, which are primarily theoretically focused. However, the minute they walk out of here and are hired by the Ministry, they go for six weeks at the Justice Institute for a training program..., which is much more detailed. Here they learn about Kemp's overview of the child abuse work that came out in 1979. That is the theory of child abuse. When they go to the Justice Institute and learn investigative interviewing, they know the theoretical backdrop from their education in the

program. There is not a lot of theory in that training program. (Professor 1:14)

This conception of the relationship between undergraduate education in social work and training in social work is one of the theoretical to the practical, general to the specific and it implies that the contrasting halves of these relationships can be separated into distinct areas of learning. While the theory and methodology are a fundamental aspect of any practice technique, here it is also a separate field of knowledge and study. Since the training teaches the practical methods of working with the recipients of social service, it is strongly implied that this is a needed field of knowledge for performing social work in addition to theory. Yet, also implied is that without the theoretical and methodological training, the technical training could suffice in imparting the knowledge necessary to performing the duties of a social worker. Thus, the liberal arts education of an undergraduate program in social work is potentially made meaningless in relation to social work as it is performed in the employment context.

In order to manage the problem posed by division between the technical domain of social work employment and its theoretical domain in undergraduate education, university programs in social work construct a definition of competent social work that stands in opposition to the technical and technicist demands of social work in practice. In displacing the technical aspect of social work outside of the school and shaping the education of social workers to conform to a more general liberal arts education, undergraduate social work education is able to

take up a 'critical' stance vis-à-vis the profession in practice. This critical stance is formed through the combination of theoretical, methodological and values-based education.

Generalist practice is both the foundation of undergraduate social work education (CASSW 2000) and a model of practice that incorporates the theories of social work together with the values of the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics*. One faculty member explained that the theoretical education of social workers teaches an analysis of the world as "organized in subtle and complex ways so that certain people get some advantages and others don't based on [inequalities of] class, race, gender, ability and sexual orientation" (Professor 2:9).

Methodology, like theory and values, is shaped outside of the context of practice itself. The generalist framework in which students are taught has the distinct characteristic of being applicable in any social work setting with any client because it makes use of a general model of intervention with few specialized techniques outside of reflection, awareness and counselling/interviewing skills (Kirst-Ashman & Hull 1993:9-40). In effect, it acts more like a theory, or a set of general principles independent of the practice of social work, though meant to frame the overall doing of social work. As such it is intended to articulate fundamentally with the theory of undergraduate education and the values of the profession as a measure of the competence of students in undergraduate programs of social work education (CASSW 2000:2.3). The practice theory of social work comes into being through application of the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Ethical Practice* to lessons in theory and methodology.

These documents outline the values, principles and responsibilities that should guide social workers throughout their work.

Together theory, methodology and values define what one faculty member calls the fundamental perspective of social work (Professor 1:13), namely the articulation of the one with the others as a foundation for interpreting “theory using models or approaches, such that what comes out of your mouth is grounded in a theoretical perspective” (Professor 1:2). This behaviour is fundamental to separating social workers educated in the undergraduate social work program from social workers trained only by the employer; social workers trained in the university can articulate the relationship between theory and practice, while social workers trained by the employer are mere technicians. In turn, this concept of an integrated theory, methodology and values comes to define the political/moral aspect of social work both separate from and in opposition to the technical elements of the profession, even while undergraduate social work students will eventually take up and work in the technical modes of social work.

In particular, though, values are the central concept that underlies all socially just social work. The CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Ethical Practice* outline the six core values in social work. They are: respect for inherent dignity and worth of persons; pursuit of social justice; service to humanity; integrity of professional practice; confidentiality in professional practice; and competence in professional practice (CASW 2005a). These principles or standards of behaviour are to be upheld by social workers in all

practice situations through the “social worker’s individual commitment to engage in ethical practice” (CASW 2005a:2).

Values as enumerated in the *Code of Ethics* coordinate with the theoretical and methodological training of social work students. Through the process of integration, students and faculty link values to almost every aspect of social work practice and theory, including the personal values and lifestyles of social workers, the social worker-client relationship, the equitable distribution of services, practice theory and overall good social work. Values, therefore, not only appear within the *Code of Ethics*, but also become integrated components of social work student and faculty conception of social work analysis, social work methods and social work itself. Values have:

...a huge impact... Those values of client self-determination and respect for individuals and differences are key principles to which we expect students to ascribe. However, they interpret those in relation to their own values and own experiences and those things mean different things to different students. Students tend not to pursue on into 3rd and 4th year a social work education unless they do ascribe to those [social work] values.... There is coherence to the students’ values to some extent, though not to say that there are no differences. ... It has to be that their values and experiences come into it [social work relationships] because if they did not, they would not be being genuine in their relationships. And the absolute, I mean to me, the active ingredient in social work is the relationship. ... I think that if people are very conflicted in their values in relation to certain people, then they should question and reflect upon that as

well as about whether they should be working with those clients. If it is really a significant thing, I think they should be questioning whether they should be in social work at all, because we need to be able to offer our services equitably to people. ...I would say overall, students are highly motivated by the values. The values that we are trying to teach in social work are not a secret. I mean one of the big attractions of social work is that you are going get to work on these social justice issues and they are going to pay you.
(Professor 2:14)

Indeed this is true for students considering their motivations for entering the program. One student sees that “for a lot of people the world is really black and white. There is one solution and I think especially social work education in multiculturalism or anti-oppressive practice talks about many solutions, many possibilities. There is not one right answer. [In that way] the program is something that meets up with my values” (Student A 1:3). For Student B, social work is “not just a job to me, it’s like something I know. It becomes a lifestyle to carry with you the values that you learn” (Student B 1:1).

The term ‘values’ in social work is highly meaningful and is also the nexus for the construction in many ways of a social work identity. Values oblige the social worker to take certain actions, such as to “promote the self-determination and autonomy of clients” (CASSW 2005b:1.3.1). According to the above quotations, they are a measurable expectation the faculty have for the students, but they also encourage social work students to be self-analytical. They mark the students of social work as a group. They motivate students. When students

genuinely incorporate the values of social work, or when the values of social work motivate them, they build genuine and stronger relationships with their clients. The values of social work alert people interested in social justice that social work is the profession suited to them. For students themselves, the values are part of them, a lifestyle and an identity.

Values also belong to the educational domain of social work as a set of ideas that act as a central focus for theorizing about the nature and methodology of social work as a practice of social justice. As such, they become a kind of self-referential social work authority: the values of social work are the values of social justice, and social justice is the practice mode of social work. This definition neatly omits the technical field of social work as it is practiced in agencies and organizations while creating an authority for undergraduate social work education that claims to articulate the fundamental perspective of social work as a field of knowledge and practice.

Social workers in the field, however, often find themselves in what Westhues, et al. (2001) refer to as a “values conflict” (2001:40) wherein social workers must negotiate between social control and social change action because of the “tendency [of social workers] to be caught up in the bureaucracy as an agent of the employer” (2001:40). In a national survey of social workers, Westhues, et al. (2001) found that the ‘values conflict,’ or the conflict between the stated goals of social work and the demands of the bureaucracies in which social workers are employed, erodes professional autonomy and the possibility of

enacting social work values (2001:40). In the employment setting, the bureaucratic demands overtake the demands of social work values.

A division does in fact exist between the aspirations of the moral/political domain of social work and its technical practice. Not only is there a division, but this division is a conflicted one with the moral/political demands of social work often requiring that social workers undermine, ignore or refuse the technician and controlling demands of the bureaucracies in which they work. One could argue that the social work professional body, a body independent of the government and non-governmental employers of social workers, strategically creates this division as a means of articulating a professional code of ethical practice for social justice in critique of or in opposition to the socially unjust practices of the neoliberal bureaucracies in which social workers work. However, drawing on Smith's (1987) argument, I argue that this division is a strategy of another kind.

According to Smith (1987), professional knowledge is transmitted as 'ideological packages,' whose internal consistency provides a way to subsume the actual individual and particular work going on in institutional sites under the guise of professional discourse (1987:162). The ideological package of professional knowledge brings the institution into being by enacting a commonly held set of understandings about what it is that professionals do and the outcomes this doing will produce. The institutions in which professionals of various kinds work require a range of actions that may or may not be contained within the commonly held set of understandings of the profession. The ideological package of professional knowledge that names the purposes of a

profession makes some actions observable-reportable, while others become invisible and uncounted (Smith 1987:162).

Here, I wish to argue that theory, methodology and the CASW (2005a) *Code of Ethics* together form an 'ideological package' that provides a way to subsume the work processes of individuals under a professional discourse of social justice, which makes certain social work actions observable-reportable, and others not. Specifically, the circular definition of social work as "a profession [that] is dedicated to the welfare and self-realization of all people...and the achievement of social justice for all" (CASW 2005a:3) precludes other interpretations of social work as an inherently state-defined and technical field of work that serves a ruling function within liberal society.

In the survey conducted by Westhues, et al. (2001), social work as it is actually practiced is largely defined by the demands of the neoliberal bureaucracies in which social workers are employed. Therefore, it is possible to argue that the actions of social workers in those locations construct the professional field of social work over and above the contrary aspirations of the independent professional body. This argument is supported by the findings of the study conducted by Westhues, et al. (2001) that not only are social workers increasingly describing themselves as enacting social control, but that the profession is currently undergoing an 'identity crisis' in which it is "unable to articulate the contributions of social workers in promoting the well-being of society" (2001:46). Social workers themselves are finding it difficult to match the overall practice of social work to its stated purposes in a clear and articulated

manner and bring that articulation into force in the practice situation. Likely, this is because the values and social justice-based definition of social work do not hold true in the practice situation.

However, rather than seeing this as simply the opposition between a true and good profession called social work and its negative uses by a political economic system called neoliberalism, I see this lack of fit between goals and practice in social work as inherent in the professional domain of a social service. In a neoliberal era, social and economic policies that heighten individualization and control exacerbate rather than create the contradiction between a profession that has a moral/political purpose, but which works through highly bureaucratized methods. The abstraction that neoliberal bureaucracies produce from the classed, raced and gendered experience of need is only a particular strain of that produced generally by social service administration (Fraser 1989:306). Needs articulated through social services have already been translated out of their oppositionally politicized race, class and gender contexts into the context in which they can be administered through a bureaucracy that mimics or encodes race, class and gender hierarchy. These bureaucracies take up and administer need through the relations of ruling (Smith 1987), recontextualizing the need as something that can be answered through the classed, raced and gendered relations in which that need was created. Social work, in enacting social welfare provision through always already depoliticized social services, mistakes social service for social change.

Overall, social work undergraduate faculty members argue that social work is by definition an exercise of social justice in opposition to the social control aspects of social service bureaucracies because the values of the code of ethics of social work obtain in each encounter between a social worker and her client or client group (Professor 1:5; Professor 2:14; Professor 3:6). This despite the fact that social workers themselves recognize that the bureaucracies in which they work have historically had purposes and practices that conflicted with social work values, and that neoliberalism now exacerbates these (Professor 2:16, Professor 3:7 and also see Westhues, et al. 2001:46). Part of the sense making behind the conviction that social work is an activity of social justice is in the separation between the technical aspects of the employment domain and the *Code of Ethics* which acts to make only those actions that are 'socially just' observable-reportable as social work. This sense making process can best be demonstrated through an analysis of the relationship of the field placement stage of undergraduate social work education and its integration into the classroom-based curriculum of the program. In this process, the very instance of integration of field and classroom learning becomes a point in which the technical and moral/political domains of social work are separated anew and, additionally, normalized as distinct from each other to preserve the notion that social work is an activity of social justice.

Every program of undergraduate social work education in Canada must have a field education component embedded within the core curriculum as a means of providing an opportunity for students to undertake supervised social

work and gain practical experience of the profession (CASSW 2000:3.5). The field practice component of the BSW consists of 700 unpaid practice hours in government and/or private non-profit organizations or agencies per year of the 2-year BSW program (CASSW 2004:10). During the field placement students are expected to carry direct responsibility for social work practice, apply the knowledge, values and skills they have learned and evaluate their practice performance and professional development (CASSW 2004:6.2). The practicum locations range from hospitals and government ministries, to neighbourhood houses, immigration services and other non-governmental agencies or organizations (Professor 1:4; Professor 2:8).

Part of the field education component of the program is an 'integration seminar,' a class dedicated to integrating practice experience with theoretical and methodological knowledge gained in lessons. The intent of this class is to reveal and analyze the connections between the work of the social worker in the employment setting and the practice theories and methodologies taught in the BSW program. Discussing experiences, particularly difficult ones, of the practicum with classmates in a structured course environment is the activity of the integration seminar class, through which students develop "peer consultative skills" (Professor 1:1).

Here, too, the values encoded in the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics* are a significant component of the consideration or framing given to the students' field placement experiences. Two assumptions guide the integration seminar class. The first assumption is that students need to learn how to act in the manner of

professional social workers, defined by one faculty member as the application of course instruction to the practice setting. The practicum, or more specifically, the integration seminar, is the location where students learn to use “course theory in a different way. They begin to see that [when they are at work] they are not in a social relationship. They are in a professional relationship. They learn to use a supervisor relationship to help them learn and grow, and to conduct themselves appropriately around difficult issues” (Professor 1:5). In the integration seminar students commonly reveal the experiences, and particularly the problems or ‘ethical issues,’ they encounter in the integration seminar for case consultation with their co-students.

The second assumption is that in the process of applying course theory and values to the practice situation, social work students will encounter areas of non-fit or what I have termed ‘ethical dilemmas,’ and several students have referred to as “ethical issues” and “dilemmas” (Student A 2:8) or “ethical problems” (Student B 2:15). Ethical dilemmas are conflicts between the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics* and the demands of employment, or moments where social workers have difficulty bringing the central values of the profession to bear on the practice setting. The demands of employment, whether these are made by a supervisor, an agency policy, a funding body or other demand or situation faced by the social worker, may be in direct contradiction with the values or principles for practice outlined in the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics*. When social workers face such a contradiction, they are in what I am calling an ‘ethical dilemma’ or what the CASW (2005) refers to as a conflict between the social

worker's ethical obligations and the agency policies, or other relevant laws or regulations (2005:3). Case consultation in the integration seminar, therefore, generally involves students asking their student colleagues to offer them analysis, help to resolve the dilemma and other types of feedback drawn from the program courses (Student A 2:14; Student B 2:25).

Faculty and students broadly acknowledge that social workers are often faced with working within policy mandates that either contradict the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics* or have deleterious effects on clients (Student A 3:13; Student B 2:3; Professor 3:19). While not all professors and students would frame the problems of social work that conflicts with aspirations of 'social justice' in terms of the code of ethics, the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics* is the document that most clearly spells out the framework for ethical and 'just' social work. As per the requirements of the CASSW (2004) *Standards for Accreditation*, undergraduate programs of social work education must teach an "understanding of and ability to apply social work values and ethics in order to make professional judgements consistent with a commitment to address inequality and the eradication of oppressive social conditions (CASSW 2004:5.10.8). It is from this perspective that the curriculum asks students through the integration seminar to consider their experiences in practicum placements and evaluate the demands placed upon them in relation to the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics*.

The relationship of the practicum to the integration seminar class is an interesting one given the analysis I have developed above concerning the implicit and explicit division between a moral/political domain of social work education

centred on the values of the *Code of Ethics* and a technical domain that is displaced to the employment setting and related training institutes. Although it would seem here that the integration class connects the two domains, I argue instead that it acts to maintain rather than undermine the separation in opposition of the professional education of social work from its professional practice. As the seminar's intent is to integrate theory, methodology, values and experience of practice, it is implied and, I would argue, clearly demonstrated in the seminar that this integration is not achieved in practice. In particular, the integration seminar reveals that, even within the very first social work experiences of many students, students are unable to integrate the central values of the profession with the practice of it. Students are led, through the integration seminar, to accept the division between the domains of social work rather than to seek greater integration of them. In framing the experience of conflict between values and practice as an 'ethical dilemma,' the experience of not being able to put into effect the values that underlie the very meaning of social work, the separation between the moral/political definition of social work and its technical practice, is normalized.

However, discussion of 'ethical issues' frequently bypasses the theoretical and methodological models taught in the program and focuses on "the individual point of view. That would be the view accepted and then we'd start to look for a solution instead of considering other ways to look at it [the ethical dilemma]" (Student A 2:14). Students facing ethical issues and presenting these in the

classroom are often met with individualized solutions that do not incorporate a unified social work moral/political response. Student A described that:

...in the practicum class, one student talked about how in her practicum she was told that she had to [encourage service users to create promotional materials for the service's for-profit financial sponsor.] She was looking for ideas of how to get the participants to do that because they did not want to. I said that they should not be forced to do something to get these services. For me, that was going against the *Code of Ethics* by using the clients to benefit you and because these participants were being forced to do something that may not have been right for them. What if they hate the service? What about confidentiality?... I was surprised that the teacher said to the class 'Ok, what do you think?' Everyone started giving out ideas about how to encourage these participants, but nothing was questioned. Situations kept coming up in which things were not critiqued or they were not analyzed. The idea was just to give a solution. (Student A 2:24)

In this example, it is clear, at least to this student, that the situation in which another student was caught required her to do something unethical if read against the *Code of Ethics*. However, within the moment of bringing the 'ethical dilemma' to the seminar for case consultation, students and faculty reduced this conflict to a question of how to encourage the service recipients to participate in the funding body's demands. The group put its efforts toward determining the action that this single student should take in this particular situation. The CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics* frame the problem as an 'ethical dilemma,' a problem of

how to follow the ethical code of the profession in the face of competing employment demands. In the integration seminar, though, the problem is framed as a problem of practice, or perhaps a procedural problem due to inexperience. The responses offered by the majority of students in the class continue to locate the problem as a problem of practice or correct procedure.

The competing interests and claims that require social workers to employ the *Code of Ethics*, according to the *Code of Ethics* itself, come from the conflict between an agency's policies, or laws and regulations and the ethical guidelines of social work (CASW 2005a:3). This conflict constructs the separation between the moral/political domain and the technical domain, constructing the idea that a social worker as a social worker, or a worker whose purpose is to enact values of social justice, will be pulled between the demands of ethical conduct and the demands of the work. The situation of the ethical dilemma becomes the normal situation of social work, but also reveals the internal contradiction within a profession that contains separate moral/political and technical domains, or a moral/political aspiration that does not come into force in the technical practice of the profession.

The assumption that almost every social work student will meet situations where she cannot put these values into practice, even within her first social work practice experiences, highlights the direct confrontation between social work's self-conception and the definition given to social work by employers. This contradiction reveals that social work is highly determined by the technical work of administering social services within social service bureaucracies. Social

justice and its values in effect disappear when confronted with the demands of the practice of social work in neoliberal social services. The enactment of the social justice values of social work would seem to depend entirely on the individual social worker's ability or conviction, rather than on the moral/political aspirations of social work per se (see also Plant in Prior 2004:16). In essence, moral/political social work:

...depends on whether you have guts. It depends on whether you are willing to go up against the system. It depends on what attitudes, values and judgments you make in exercising your authority and different people will do it differently. You know social work is very much about values and some people are caught up in defending the profession and playing by the rules.... Being a professional social worker and following everything to the letter of the law. Somebody might have looked at the letter of the law and said you know I do not give a damn what the letter of the law says, my interest is in social justice and this is not just.
(Professor 3:19)

For most professors, confronting the effects of colonialism or racism and their relationship to social work is up to the individual social worker. That is, a student's willingness to 'take on the system' has to do with that student's personality (Professor 3:7). Some students "want to fit in, want to be secure...other students don't have such a terrible need for security" (Professor 3:7-8). Some students can take a critical perspective and integrate it into their work because they are "highly aware of the issues of colonialism and racism and oppression generally. [They] realize that the people that we are involved with

often are people who are hurt by various forms of systemic oppression and try to address that, ...but it's a complicated thing" (Professor 2:4). That is, "when students look at the reality of jobs, what are they going to do, eat or change the status quo" (Professor 1:7)?

The critique of social work presented above is not a critique of the aspirations of the profession. The political/moral domain of social work I have defined in this chapter, the aspect of social work that would like the profession to enact social justice, including changing the social, political and economic context that creates and sustains inequalities of race, class and gender, is a valid aspiration for any group of people. My critique is of the dissociation social work permits itself to engage in between its aspiration and its practice. When social work readily accepts that 'ethical dilemma' will be 'standard operating procedure,' social workers are saying by-and-large that they refuse the power they have by virtue of the position they hold vis-à-vis clients and within government to make their values have real effect in practice situations. This refusal is, of course, a result of social work's employment within government, and is a reflection that its professional standing depends in large part on its association with government employment.

Socially just social work in the sense of individual kindness toward clients, generosity with the resources available and help with personal problems is certainly possible for many social workers working inside and outside of government. However, social justice social work that creates social change is neither possible when social workers do not control the work situation, as they do

not in government, nor is it likely when social workers ignore the fundamental contradiction between a profession that is controlled by the state and a group of activists with social change aspirations.

In performing the critique of the technical domain of social work, social work undergraduate education establishes a theoretical, methodological and values-based realm of education called generalist education that presupposes that social work is an activity and thought separate from its doing in the practice setting. This construction, however, ignores the level of control of the definition and practices of social work that rests with the employer thereby falsely constructing the idea that a separate moral/political education in social work will equip students newly entering the field to contest and challenge the demands of their employers in the neoliberalized social service environment. In order for social work to effect social justice in the practice setting, the profession would have to oppose some of its most common practices. This, however, would put social work in direct confrontation with its primarily governmental employer, something that would negatively affect the professional standing of social work.

In reality, the practice of 'social justice' as a fundamental practice of social work comes down to the individual convictions of the individual social worker. At the same time as individual social workers may well be taking individual responsibility for their own (moral, political) action in the face of social services that are de-politicized with respect to the inequalities of race, class and gender, they are abdicating responsibility for the actions (and morality, politic) of the profession as a whole. Accepting individual responsibility or individual capacity

via political conviction, but abdicating responsibility for the collectivity pretends that individual social workers can shape policy mandates absent a strong collective social work body.

In conclusion, while the BSW program takes the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics* as a key element of curriculum, some students, by the end of their first year of study have realized that contradictions between the values enumerated in the code and the actuality of practice abound. This realization is clear within the program itself as social work faculty do not implement the core values of social work in their own classrooms (Student A 2:13) and few if any employment positions in social work will reward students convinced of the need for social change with the opportunity to enact their convictions (Student C 1:17). While in university, social work students are trained to appreciate social justice and social change 'values,' in the world, they will be employed by, primarily government social service agencies that will determine the conditions and practices of their employment. The professional body and the program explain the contradiction between the two domains of the single profession as a problem of an 'ethical dilemma.' As students confront the reality of social work employment in their practicum experiences, they sometimes begin to see the fundamental conflict between their work experience and the values they have been taught as part of their social justice education. Overall, however, the actions of students and faculty in the field placement and in the classroom reinforce the acceptability of a professional value set that is inconsistent with the practice of the profession even

while the actions of social workers in the social service field are increasingly directed by punitive and controlling bureaucracies.

CONCLUSION: CERTIFYING SOCIAL JUSTICE

Social Justice Aspirations and Professional Social Work Education

In this thesis, I have argued from the theories of Rose (1996a; 1996b) that social work arose as a function of liberal government, enabling the liberal state to maintain the appearance of limited state intrusion in the lives of individuals while ensuring the practice of moral and responsible citizenship. Mediating between the individual and the state, depending on the expert knowledge of the professions of law, psychiatry and medicine and creating knowledge through case file documentation of the individuals in receipt of social services, social workers acted to ensure the welfare of society by intervening in the lives of individuals and families (Parton 1996:8). Within neoliberalism, social work is similarly seen to 'secure the security' of society "by enjoining the responsibilities of citizenship upon individuals, incapable or aberrant members of society" (Rose 1996b:49). From the early beginnings of social work as charitable service, to its early institutionalized form during the era of the Charity Organization Society Movement, to its present dispersed, fragmented and specialized form under neoliberalism, social work has functioned as one of the foundational professions of (neo)liberal government.

Social services, the professional domain of social work, historically and currently target their services toward marginalized people. The social services

developed to attend to the needs of people who have few privatized resources, including within the family or through the market economy. However, these services de-politicize needs vis-à-vis their gendered, raced and classed origins, and re-politicize them according to the relations of (neo)liberal ruling (Fraser 1989:306). Subordinated people, whose needs or demands are the topic of the struggle to achieve social service provision, are often pushed out of the final contest for interpretation and establishment of the state service as they do not control the mechanisms of government that create service, its policy or delivery methods (Fraser 1989:305).

While practices of monitoring and surveillance are not new to people who receive social assistance, neoliberal practices of monitoring specifically undermine the Keynesian welfare state concept of universal entitlement, shifting social service delivery to selected provision on the basis of need (Kingfisher 2002). In neoliberalism, citizens should be autonomous and self-responsible by participating in and meeting their needs within the market economy; neoliberal citizens hold full responsibility for their own economic and social well-being and meet this responsibility by enacting their potential for market involvement, both as workers and consumers. The ideological package of neoliberalism contains arguments, including that welfare creates dependency and that need is a form of moral and psychological dysfunction (Fraser and Gordon 1994).

The welfare state, based on neoliberal philosophy, is being dismantled and rebuilt. Overall welfare provisions have been reduced while state social service provisions are more highly targeted and specialized to less and less

universal population groups (Webb 2006). State practices and techniques for monitoring recipients of social services are more developed and readily applied (Peck and Tickell 2002). Thus, even while social service provision is reduced, there are overall increases in the number of practicing social workers nationally, growth in the diversity of areas of social work practice and range of target populations (SWEC 2000:16). Social work is more fragmented, delivering highly particular programs for specific 'social problems' and populations, separating the 'marginal' from each other and making social workers into population/problem experts (Webb 2006).

Within the context of reduced service, but increased employment of social workers, social work professional education programs exist in 34 schools at the university level in Canada, with over 2000 Bachelor of Social Work (BSW) graduates annually (Westhues, et al. 2001:36). The Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work (CASSW) governs social work education in Canada, outlining that generalist practice, encompassing theory of social justice or anti-oppressive social work practice and a generalized methodology for social work intervention, is the foundational method of undergraduate level social work practice. Generalist social work practice methodology is a vague and highly adaptable method that requires social work practice theory to give it shape and direction. Anti-oppressive social work practice theory is currently replacing older practice theories. It instructs social work students in the means by which their interactions with clients should develop in order to create social justice. The

primary skills taught in generalist social work curriculum are interview/counselling skills, reflection and awareness.

Anti-oppressive practice theory and generalist methodology are compatible with neoliberalization of the social services. The anti-oppressive social worker must reject her expert knowledge, accept multiple and varying truths and turn her gaze on herself to examine the sources of her own authority and assumptions as an individual (Campbell 2003; Mullaly 2002). Ignored in this formula for social justice social work practice is the social worker's position as a professional governed by the authority of the social service policy or agency practices. Effectively, over-emphasis within the program on reflection as a key skill of social work directs student to see the power difference in the relationship between themselves and their future clients as a matter of their personal awareness, choices and actions. Social work students are taught that they individually can effect 'social justice' within the context of the social worker-client relationship by being reflectively anti-oppressive.

Interviews with students and faculty in an undergraduate program of social work education reveal that reflection is meant to assist students to develop the key generalist social work competency of awareness (Student C 2:12; Student B 1:12). However, even though reflection is a regular course requirement, students find that faculty and curriculum standards inadequately define, explain and measure reflection (Student C 1:4-5). In attempting to make sense of this apparent contradiction, Ixer (1999) argues that reflection is a political ideology that allows the reflective social worker to incorporate the increasing complexity of

demands of undergraduate social work education and learn to meet the highly particularized needs of neoliberalized social service agencies (1999:523).

Dominant curriculum and teaching methods that promote reflection toward awareness within the context of a highly flexible generalist social work curriculum, prepare students to take up work in the decentralized, fragmented, and unstable work regimes of neoliberalized social services. When, flexibility, eclecticism and on-the-job training are requirements of employment (Westhues, et al. 2000:42).

Nevertheless, social work curriculum in Canada promotes social work as an activity of social justice. This idea of social work is carried through each aspect of the curriculum. It is made to make sense within social work undergraduate curriculum through separation of the moral/political domain of social work education from its technical practice in the employment setting. Social work education is primarily theoretical, while training in the skills of social work practice is relegated to the employer or separate training institutes. The training teaches the practical methods of working with the recipients of social services, and it is therefore a needed field of knowledge for performing social work, in addition to the theory taught within undergraduate programs of social work education. Also implied, however, is that without the theoretical and methodological training, the technical training could suffice to impart the skills necessary for performing the duties required of a social worker.

As the practice of social work in the field is determined by the primarily governmental employers, undergraduate social work curriculum would be hard

pressed to keep up with the range of practices or shifts in practice methods employed by agencies without direct involvement of the employer in shaping the curriculum. Social work education instead takes up a separate theoretical moral/political definition of social work as social justice and incorporates this into its curriculum. By not training social work students to the technical aspect of social work and shaping the education of social workers to conform to a more general liberal arts education, undergraduate social work education is able to take up a 'critical' stance vis-à-vis the profession in practice.

Theory, methodology and, centrally, the values of social work, encoded in the CASW (2005) *Code of Ethics and Guidelines for Ethical Practice*, outline the fundamental ideal of social work, namely social justice. This goal is achieved through integration between the theory, methodology and the values of social work. Integration sets social workers educated in the undergraduate social work program apart from social workers simply trained by the employer. In turn, this concept of integrated theory, methodology and values becomes the definition of the political/moral domain of social work both separate from and in opposition to the technical elements of the profession, even while undergraduate social work students will eventually take up and work in the technical employment fields of social work.

Rather than seeing the opposition between the desire for social justice expressed in social work curriculum and the effect of social control produced by social workers in the field as an opposition between the true practice of social work and its negative uses within neoliberalized social services, I have argued

that this lack of fit between goals and practice in social work is inherent in the professional domain of a social service. Taking us back to the original conception posed about the historical nature of social work, liberalism and the current function of the social services in neoliberal society, I argue that it is in the nature of a social service to reposition politicized demands made by subordinated groups as state services that function through the organized practices of ruling, here of neoliberalism. Needs articulated through social services have already been translated out of their oppositionally politicized race, class and gender contexts into the context in which they can be administered through a bureaucracy that encodes the race, class and gender hierarchy of neoliberal society (Fraser 1989:306).

Competing interests and claims require social workers to employ the *Code of Ethics*. According to the *Code of Ethics* itself, these competing interests arise in the conflict between an agency's policies and the ethical guidelines of social work (CASW 2005a:3). This conflict constructs the separation between the moral/political domain and the technical domain; it says that a social worker, as a social worker, will be pulled between the demands of ethical professional conduct and the demands of employment. An 'ethical dilemma,' therefore, is the normal situation of social work, but also reveals the internal contradiction within a profession that aspires to a moral/political practice that is not borne out in reality. The assumption within undergraduate social work education that almost every social work student will meet situations where these values cannot be fulfilled, even within their first social work practice experiences, highlights the direct

confrontation between social work's self-conception and the definition given to social work by employers. Instead, social work is revealed to be highly determined by the technical work of administering social services within social service bureaucracies. Social justice and its values in effect disappear when confronted with the demands of the practice of social work in neoliberalized social services. The enactment of the social justice values of social work, while perhaps possible given an individual social worker's beliefs or convictions, is not a matter of the profession's moral/political aspirations for social work per se. This is made particularly evident when practices of social work that conflict with the profession's social work values are normalized as 'ethical dilemmas' rather than challenged as fundamentally at odds with the profession's desires for socially just practice. Rather than a naïve conception of what kind of work enacts social justice, social work education in social justice social work seems more likely a matter of keeping professional credentials and status by refusing to challenge the very social injustice built into social service policies.

REFERENCE LIST

- Andrews, Janice. 2001. "Group Work's Place in Social Work: A Historical Perspective." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. 28(4): 45-66.
- Bakker, Isabella. 1994. "Introduction: Engendering Macro-Economic Policy Reform in the Era of Global Restructuring and Adjustment." In Isabella Bakker, ed., The Strategic Silence: Gender and Economic Policy. London: Zed Books.
- Barry, Andrew, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose. 1996. "Introduction." In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, eds., Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government. London: University College Press, 1-16.
- Brodie, Janine. 1999. "The Politics of Social Policy in the Twenty-first Century." In Dave Broad and Wayne Antony, eds., Citizens or Consumers? Social Policy in a Market Society. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing: 22-36.
- Campbell, C. 2003a. "Anti-Opressive theory and Practice as the Organizing Theme for Social Work Education: The Case in Favour." Canadian Social Work Review. 20(1): 121-125.
- Campbell, C. 2003b. "Rebuttal: Working Within Contradiction and Ambiguity." Canadian Social Work Review. 20(1): 133-135.
- Campbell, Marie. 2003. "Dorothy Smith and Knowing the World We Live In." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. 30(1):3-22.
- Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work. 2004. Standards for Accreditation.
- Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work. 2000. Board of Accreditation Manual: Educational Policy Statements.
- Canadian Association of Social Work. 2005a. Code of Ethics.
- Canadian Association of Social Work. 2005b. Guidelines for Ethical Practice.
- Case Con. 1975. "Case Con Manifesto." In R. Bailey and M. Brake, eds., Radical Social Work. New York: Random House 144-147.
- Cruikshank, Barbara. 1996. "Revolutions from Within: Self-Government and Self-Esteem" In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, eds., Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government. London: University College Press, 231-251.

- D'Cruz, Heather, P. Gillingham and Sebastian Melendez. 2007. "Reflexivity, Its Meanings and Relevance for Social Work: A Critical Review of the Literature." British Journal of Social Work 37:73-90.
- DeVault, M. and L. McCoy. 2002. "Institutional Ethnography: Using Interview to Investigate Ruling Relations." In Jaber Gubrium and James Holstein, eds., Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method. Thousand Oaks: Sage 751-775.
- Dominelli, Lena. 2002. "Introducing Anti-Oppressive Theories for Practice." In L. Dominelli, ed., Anti-Oppressive Social Theory and Practice. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan 7-36.
- Ferguson, James and Akhil Gupta. 2002. "Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality." American Ethnologist. 29(4):981-1002.
- Finch, J. et al. 1994. Social Work Personnel in British Columbia: Defining the Population and Describing Deployment Patterns in 1993. Vancouver: Health and Human Resources Unit, UBC
- Findlay, Peter. 1978. "Critical Theory and Social Work Practice." Catalyst. 3: 53-68.
- Fine, Michelle, L. Weis, S. Weseen and L. Wong. 2000. "For Whom? Qualitative Research, Representations and Social Responsibilities." In N. K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, eds., The Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage 133-155.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1989. "Talking about Needs: Interpretive Contests as Political Conflicts in Welfare-State Societies." Ethics 99 (2):291-313.
- Fraser, Nancy and Linda Gordon. 1994. "A Genealogy of *Dependency*: Tracing a Keyword of the U.S. Welfare State." Signs 19(2): 309-335.
- Graybeal, Clay. 2001. "Strengths-Based Social Work Assessment: Transforming the Dominant Paradigm." In Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Human Services. 82(3): 233-241.
- Guest, Dennis. 1997. The Emergence of Social Security in Canada. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hopkins, Jeff. 1996. "Social Work Through the Looking Glass." In N. Parton, ed., Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work. London: Routledge, 19-35.
- Howe, David. 1996. "Surface and Depth in Social Work Practice." In N. Parton, ed., Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work. London: Routledge, 77-97.

- Hugman, Richard. 2001. "Post-Welfare Social Work? Reconsidering Post-Modernism, Post-Fordism and Social Work Education." Social Work Education. 20(3): 321-335.
- Hurl, Lorna F. 1983. Building a Profession: The Origin and Development of the Department of Social Service in the University of Toronto 1914-1928. Toronto: Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto.
- Ixer, Graham. 1999. "There's No Such Thing as Reflection." British Journal of Social Work. 29:513-527.
- Jones, Chris. 1996. "Anti-Intellectualism and the Peculiarities of British Social Work." In Nigel Parton, ed., Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work London: Routledge, 190-210.
- Kendall, Katherine A. 2000. Social Work Education: Its Origins in Europe. Virginia: Council on Social Work Education.
- Kingfisher, Catherine. 2002. Western Welfare in Decline: Globalization and Women's Poverty. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kingfisher, Catherine. 1998. "How Providers Make Policy: An Analysis of Everyday Conversation in a Welfare Office." Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology 8:119-136.
- Kingfisher, Catherine and Michael Goldsmith. 2001. "Reforming Women in the United States and Aotearoa/New Zealand: A Comparative Ethnography of Welfare Reform in Global Context." American Anthropologist 103(3):714-732.
- Kirst-Ashman, Karen K. and Grafton H. Hull, Jr. 1993. Understanding Generalist Practice. Chicago: Nelson Hall, Inc.
- Kissane, Rebecca. 2003. "What's Need Got to Do with It? Barriers to Use of Non-profit Social Services." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. 30(2): 127-148.
- Koerin, Beverly. 2003. "The Settlement House Tradition: Current Trends and Future Concerns." Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare. 30(2): 53-70.
- Kondrat, Mary Ellen. 1999. "Who Is the 'Self' in Self-Aware: Professional Self-Awareness from a Critical Theory Perspective." Social Service Review. 73(4): 451-475.
- Lakeman, Lee. 2005. Obsession, With Intent. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Lecomte, Roland. 1990. "Connecting Private Troubles and Public Issues in Social Work Education." In Brian Wharf, ed. Social Work and Social Change in Canada. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart 31-51.

- Leighninger, Leslie. 2000. Creating a New Profession: The Beginnings of Social Work Education in the United States. Virginia: Council on Social Work Education.
- Leslie, Donald & Rosemary Cassano. 2003. "The Working Definition of Social Work Practice: Does it Work?" Research on Social Work Practice 13(3):366-75.
- Longclaws, Lyle. 1994. "Social Work and the Medicine Wheel Framework." In Social Work Processes.
- Mullaly, R. P. 2002. "Anti-Oppressive Social Work at the Structural Level and Selected Principles of Anti-Oppressive Social Work." In R. P. Mullaly. Challenging Oppression: A Critical Social Work Approach Don Mills, On: Oxford University Press 193-211.
- Ng, Roxana. 1995. The Politics of Community Services: Immigrant Women, Class and State. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.
- Parton, Nigel. 1996. "Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work: An Introduction." In Nigel Parton, ed., Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work London: Routledge, 4-18.
- Parton, Nigel. 1996. "Social Work, Risk and the 'Blaming System'." In N. Parton, ed., Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work London: Routledge, 98-114.
- Peck, Jamie and Adam Tickell. 2002. "Neoliberalizing Space." Antipode 38:380-404.
- Prior, J. 2004. "Anti-Oppressive Practice: Why Bother?" In H.G. Eriksson and T. Tjelflaat, eds. Residential Care: Horizons for the New Century. Aldershot, Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing 3-22.
- Pulkingham, Jane and Gordon Ternowetsky. 1999. "Neo-liberalism and Retrenchment: Employment, Universality, Safety-Net Provisions and a Collapsing Canadian Welfare State." In Dave Broad and Wayne Antony, eds., Citizens or Consumers? Social Policy in a Market Society. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing: 84-98.
- Rose, Nikolas 1996a. "The Death of the Social? Re-figuring the Territory of Government." Economy and Society. 25(3):327-356.
- Rose, Nikolas. 1996b. "Governing 'Advanced' Liberal Democracies." In Andrew Barry, Thomas Osborne and Nikolas Rose, eds., Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, Neo-Liberalism and Rationalities of Government. London: University College Press, 37-64.
- Scott, Beverley J. 2004. Establishing Professional Social Work in Vancouver and at the University of British Columbia. Vancouver: Beverly Scott.
- Shebib, Bob. 2003. "Choices: Interviewing and Counselling Skills for Canadians." Toronto: Prentice Hall.

- Shera, Wes, ed. Emerging Perspectives on Anti-Oppressive Practice. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Shoemaker, Linda. 1998. "Early Conflicts in Social Work Education." Social Service Review. June:182-191.
- Sin, R. and M. C. Yan. 2003. "Margins as Centres: A Theory of Social Inclusion in Anti-Oppression Social Work." In W. Shera, ed. Emerging Perspectives on Anti-Oppressive Practice. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press 25-41.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 2002. "Institutional Ethnography," In Tim May, ed., Qualitative Research in Action. London: Sage: 17-52.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1990. The Conceptual Practices of Power : A Feminist Sociology of Knowledge. Boston, Northeastern University Press.
- Smith, Dorothy E. 1987. The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Smith, Ruth L. 1990. "Order and Disorder: The Naturalization of Poverty." Cultural Critique Winter: 209-229.
- Social Work Education Consortium. 2000. Social Work Education in British Columbia: Planning for the Future Social Work Education Consortium British Columbia Schools of Social Work.
- Tester, F. J. 2003a. "Anti-Oppressive Theory and Practice as the Organizing Theme for Social Work Education: The Case Against." Canadian Social Work Review 20(1): 127-132.
- Tester, F. J. 2003b. "Rebuttal: Difference, Dissent and Common Ground." Canadian Social Work Review 20(1): 137-138.
- Tice, Karen. 1998. Tales of Wayward Girls and Immoral Women. Urbana & Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. 2001. "The Anthropology of the State in the Age of Globalization: Close Encounters of the Deceptive Kind." Current Anthropology. 42(1): 125-137.
- Webb, Stephen A. 2006. Social Work in Risk Society: Social and Political Perspectives. Hampshire & New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wharf, Brian. 1990. "Introduction." In Brian Wharf, ed. Social Work and Social Change in Canada. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart 9-30.
- Williams, Fiona. 1996. "Postmodernism, Feminism and the Question of Difference." In Nigel Parton, ed. Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work. London, New York: Routledge 61-78.

Van Soest, D. and B. Garcia. 2003. "A Theoretical Framework for Teaching and Learning About Diversity for Social Justice." In D. Van Soest and B. Garcia. Diversity Education for Social Justice: Mastering Teaching Skills. Alexandria: Council on Social Work Education 3-27.