Bulletin of the Social Work History Network

Aloe arborescens

kcl.ac.uk/scwru/swhn   @SociWorkHistory

On the cover: *Aloe arborescens*, illustration by Marianne Mason (1845-1932), undated, courtesy of Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Keith Bilton writes about Marianne Mason in this issue.

About the Social Work History Network

The Social Work History Network (SWHN) exists to explore the nature and growth of social work in order to inform contemporary policy and practice. Founded in 2000, it is an informal network of social workers, historians, archivists, researchers, educators, students, and social work policymakers. The Network meets three or four times a year in the United Kingdom to discuss papers given by invited speakers. Meetings are open to all. The *Bulletin of the Social Work History Network* is an e-journal: it is available on the Network website and via email to those on the mailing list.

To join the SWHN emailing list or to confirm your attendance at a meeting please contact: **stephen.martineau@kcl.ac.uk**

kcl.ac.uk/scwru/swhn

@SociWorkHistory

Editorial

Sarah Vicary

Editor, *Bulletin of the* Social Work History Network

This bulletin has been a while in the making but does not disappoint. You may be wondering as to the reason for the front cover which at first glance appears unconnected with social work but, as Keith Bilton's article goes on to explain he came across Marianne Harriet Mason by chance through a Christmas present. As the first woman to publish a collection of folk songs (hence the picture), she was also an authority on Swiss Alpine and South African plants and, of interest here, the first woman to be appointed to a senior post in the civil service as Inspector of Boarded-Out Children in England and Wales. Following a little research Keith substantiates and clarifies the connection between Marianne and the Miss Mason about whom Jean Heywood writes in her book on the history of the development of child care services. The article contains the seeds of some interesting debates including Marianne's belief that men are not able to undertake inspections as thoroughly as women or that boarding out was something of a disincentive for the poorest families to care for their own children. As Keith remarks, Marianne's papers are awaiting a biographer and perhaps the opportunity to continue this dialogue. It is certainly a remarkable life.

A second focus of this bulletin is social work education. The Network has been fortunate in the last year to have held two specific sessions on this subject as well as others related to this topic. The first, held at The University of Chester in September is described by Bridget Robb and, for those unable to attend in person, was also filmed. As Bridget comments, social work education has had many guises, illustrated by Ann Davis' description of history of the course at The University of Birmingham and also by the account of Malcolm Jordan's experiences in Kent, a somewhat different yet interesting model. Karen Lyons went on to broaden the overview when she talked about social work education in Europe and beyond, including association with the University model of Settlements, exploration of which formed some of the discussion at the pre-conference event held jointly at the European Association of Social Work Research conference held in Edinburgh on 18 April, a more detailed write up of which also appears in this bulletin.

Bridget goes on to point to the increasingly narrow definition of social work in the United Kingdom and arguably of its education, a point that was also discussed at our second event held at King's College in December and which is described in fuller detail by June Thoburn. Providing a timely precis of the regulation of social work and social work history, David Jones' presentation can now also be viewed on our website and also in a recent BASW publication which he has authored. The recent announcement of the newly appointed chair of Social Work England is the next step in this history and its influence remains to be seen. Having worked as a Mental Health Act Commissioner when this same person was chair, I am cautiously optimistic. This second session ended with a lively panel discussion about the contemporary situation, captured by June in her piece. I trust the photograph captures something of the lively debate.

In a paper authored and delivered by Peter Beresford for the Network in March 2018, service user involvement in the context of social

work and of participatory developments more widely, is detailed. Peter provides a short history of these developments referencing key texts and placing them in wider political and ideological trends. Recalling this year's centenary of suffrage, albeit for some but not all women, Peter traces developments through to participation more directly related to health, social care and social work. He argues for what he sees as a new phase in its development, what he terms reaction (from the service system) and renewal (from service users). Involvement in research and knowledge production are other key aspects of his article; the possibility of building alliances between different stakeholders and a future for participatory and co-produced social work. We thank Peter and the other two contributors to this seminar which gave much food for thought.

Echoing the content of previous editions of the *Bulletin*, Colin Slasberg's piece uses the lens of Clement Attlee in an attempt to consider how contemporary adult services can be judged. Beginning with the current policy drive of personalisation, Colin queries the rhetoric of this when measured against the reality. Going further back to the Community Care reforms, Colin suggests that the policy as a whole might be viewed as flawed. He ventures further back to the Seebohm reforms and muses on the matter and impact of the missing letter 's'. Colin discusses the tension between needs and resources as it impacts in contemporary social care and also compares this with health, especially the dissonance between the role of the doctor and social worker when managing need. He concludes that applying Attlee's principles to social care as well as to health and might bring about partnership and even integration.

Mike Burt's book review provides a fascinating insight into the development of social work education and quite neatly encompasses threads from our seminars on this topic, not least the ongoing debates about what

constitutes an appropriate curriculum. Mike also reminds us of a number of anniversaries and work that is being done to commemorate; the forthcoming special edition of the BASW supported journal: *Practice, Social Work in Action* which focusses on the history of social work education edited by myself and Professors Viv Cree and Jill Manthorpe and including articles written by both Karen Lyons and Mike Burt. The edition is published in a year that celebrates an anniversary for the journal itself and which is increasingly important in the promotion and dissemination of practitioner research. For me, what all the Network seminars make clear, and as Bridget also concludes, the profession needs to own our history and celebrate the broad scope of our past education, and ensure our new entrants understand our rich heritage. To that end I would also encourage you to consider being involved in the project being put together by BASW with a view to celebrating this heritage, the detail of which was contained in a recent email to members (see page 36).

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those who have contributed to all of this year's very successful seminars and have also helped capture in the *Bulletin* and on our website, both of which are becoming used as resources in social work education courses, for example, the newly launched postgraduate qualifying route at The Open University, which has sought our permission to do so. I trust more will follow. Also awaited is the future roll-out of the social work degree apprenticeship. Its impact will be of interest in the ongoing debate about what comprises appropriate social work education and hopefully something that our Network will capture in times to come.

Sarah Vicary, Co-ordinator of the SWHN, is a qualified, registered social worker and currently heads the Social Work Degree programme for The Open University in the North West of England and in Yorkshire.
sarah.vicary@open.ac.uk | @sao_sarah

Radical Social Work in November

About 80 people attended the SWHN meeting on Radical Social Work on 8 November 2017 at King's College London. Video of the event is now available and three of the participants, Peter Feldon, Linda de Chenu, Jeremy Weinstein, have published an open access article deriving from the occasion: 'The Case Con generation, 1970-75' in *Critical and Radical Social Work*.

Adoption in May

Terry Bamford, Joan Fratter, Anna Gupta, Brid Featherstone, John Simmonds and Martha Cover at the meeting on adoption at King's College London on 8 May 2018. We hope to have a report of the meeting, which drew around 60 attendees, in the next issue of the Bulletin.

Joint meeting in July

The Centre for Social Policy, the Child Care History Network and the

Social Work History Network present:

Children's Homes: What were they really like? Have they a future?

Tuesday 17 July 2018, 10.30am-4pm

Room G.73, Franklin-Wilkins Building (King's College London Waterloo Campus), Stamford Street, London SE1 9NH

Speakers will include Peter Higginbotham, Roger Bullock, David Lane and Ray Jones. Former residents of children's homes will also speak about their experiences. The day will be co-chaired by Jim Hyland and Terry Philpot.

The twin aims of the day are to provide a realistic picture of what life was like in children's homes in the past, and to develop a view about the potential for children's homes to meet the needs of children and young people in the future. Check website for booking details.

Exploring the history of settlements

Sarah Vicary, John Gal and Stefan Köngeter

On a lovely spring day in Edinburgh a joint pre-conference event entitled, 'Exploring the history of settlements' was led by the SWHN and ESWRA Special Interest Group on social work history research. The idea for the session was that of John and Stefan. Sarah provided support on behalf of the Network which was especially important as the session was held in the United Kingdom. In preparation for some months, we were really pleased by the response to the call for papers. The audience numbers did not disappoint either. From the photograph they all also appeared to enjoy it!

John Gal

Divided into three parts, the programme first explored historical case studies, followed by more contemporary studies and then an opportunity for discussion. To begin, Stefan Köngeter discussed the transnational development of the Settlement House Movement, identifying the different models. He was followed by Hugh Shewell who gave an insight into Basil Henriques (a family member) and the Oxford and St. George's Settlement House which he spoke about in terms of a Jewish response to Christian social reform in early twentieth century Britain. John Gal, on behalf of himself and Yehudit Avnir, then gave a paper on the Settlement Houses in the Jewish Community in Mandatory Palestine also providing a series of fascinating photographs by way of illustration. Francisco Branco then spoke to his paper, 'What a Difference an R made: Chicago's Hull House experience, French "maisons sociales" and their influence in Portugal'. The R in question

Stefan Köngeter

referred to residence, reform and research. Kate Bradley brought this first session to a close introducing us to the Poor Man's Lawyer and social work, c.1890-1939 as they existed in English settlements.

After a short break we had a first paper from Rory Crath's, 'Animating objectivity: The Chicago Settlement's use of numeric and aesthetic knowledge to render its immigrant neighbours and neighbourhood knowable,' a fascinating exploration of the use of maps. Next our own Network chair Terry Bamford spoke about 'A passion for social change – the temperance movement, social reform and settlements'. Two colleagues from The Open University then followed; Steven Malies' 'From 'Agit Prop' to community social work partnership. A look at how a Victorian Settlement in London's East End responded to the needs of its local communities in the 1970s to 1990s' and Jeanette Copperman's 'Community Development within Waterloo Action Centre 1981-1987.' Both were fascinating insights into the recent past and current use. Finally, Barbara Levy Simon introduced us to Mary Simkhovitch and in particular the influence Prussian academics held for this Settlement pioneer.

Our final session, which took place after the lunch break, allowed an opportunity for the audience to comment in more detail and for a fuller dialogue about further research in this area. Begun by Jim Minton, the current Chief Executive Officer of Toynbee Hall and Geoff Ginn, both went on to comment on the quality of the morning's speakers and also of the themes that had occurred to them. As chair, Sarah attempted to collate some of the main points of the discussion that followed; that the Settlement movement is a

Attendees at the Edinburgh meeting

broad tent and that transnational is embedded in a localised place. The audience also queried the use of concepts, for example, the German language has no literal translation of community, so what then is being discussed; is it an aspect of communality or public space where people can relate to each other and to have something in common? A further question was, which story can be told at a certain moment to a certain audience and does time count? Could these places be sites of memories which could also be addressed in the digital world, and could a new space develop? In relation to Toynbee Hall, the audience also wondered how its importance could be considered today and, if so, how does it 'translate?' In terms of future research, it was agreed that the biographical approach does fit well (as indeed some of the papers highlighted), but it was also agreed that it is important that other approaches should be considered such as network analysis; looking at people in these places being there at a point in time and also what happens over time with an emphasis on networks within as well as across. The audience also questioned whether there are lost and hidden histories, for example squatting. A further debate concerned the teaching of history and the need to deepen our understanding of the intellectual

history of social work. Do social workers have this and if so, why is it not more to the forefront? Praxis: the idea of putting theory into practice are not just historical concepts, questions or challenges, there is an interrelation between social work and social education. Kate's talk, in particular, made the audience consider the role of law in the development of social work. Other papers also gave rise to the theme of how gender and class shaped social work and also can social workers be radical and not radical at the same time, all aspects of current significance to social work education.

Overall, this was a hugely enjoyable day, supported by a range of high quality papers and an international audience with a real interest in the topic. John, Stefan and I plan to build on this momentum and are considering an edited book possibly in the book series launched at the Conference by the publishers, Policy Press. If members of the Network are inspired by what they have read here and would like to contribute do please get in touch:

sarah.vicary@open.ac.uk

john.gal@mail.huji.ac.il

koengeter@uni-trier.de

Shaping a profession: the historical development of social work education and training

Bridget Robb

The Social Work History Network met at the University of Chester on 13 September 2017

Walking from the train station to the Riverside building of Chester University one sees signs of Chester's long history as a military base and market town – with its spectacular walls and Elizabethan shopping streets. And on to the Riverside building of the university next to the River Dee, where we were welcomed by Mike Burt on behalf of the university, one of the co-sponsors of SWHN.

In the basement of the building Mike and colleagues have developed a museum on the history of nursing and social work. There is a display of old equipment used in nursing – and lots of books from the history of social work. It reminds us how difficult it is to make our history real and vibrant to ourselves, let alone others.

Yet the talks brought a vibrancy as we heard about aspects of the history of social work education – so it was good that the talks were filmed and will be available electronically.

First Professor Ann Davis shared her exploration of the archive at Birmingham University about the social work education course there. The start of her journey had been because of the threat of potential closure in 2007 and the imminent arrival

of a new vice-chancellor. Thinking how to respond to the immediate challenges, Ann decided to explore the university archive – and found a wealth of material about the 100 years social work had been taught in the university. She drew on this material to present the case to the university for the continuation of the course – and won. An example of how good use of history is relevant for today and the future.

So what happened in Birmingham? Ann gave a handout of the changes to the curriculum.

In 1908/09 a certificate course was run in Social Study for those training for Social and Philanthropic Work. It included study of the constitution, industrial history, economics, law and visits were included to institutions linked to the Poor Law, Education, Justice, Industrial Conditions, and finally Sanitation and Hygiene.

In 1948/9 there was a certificate for non-graduates and a diploma for graduates in Social Study. Candidates were selected by interview and the course included visits of observation, practical work. The lectures were on British history, economics, social administration, psychology and social and political philosophy. A range of options included industrial law, social medicine and local government administration. Career options included Personnel Management and Youth Work as well as Social Work.

In 1968/69 the Diploma in Social Work was a one-year course to provide "general training in social casework", open to people with social administration degrees only. Study included sociology, understanding groups, human growth and development, family law, and special teaching for those working in mental health, child care or probation. Everyone had field placements with

practice teachers, and both field and academic study were assessed for the award of the diploma.

This all sounded very familiar to my own experience at Nottingham University in 1972 when in my social administration degree I studied similar subjects – doing placements in the Personnel department at British Leyland in Oxford, a Benefits office in Liverpool and a social work office in Sussex, and the career options were social work, personnel management or health management. Following on from this, my one-year MA/CQSW course typified the transition from the casework model to the systems theory focus, linked to the newly created social services departments. Although we did some experiential work it was nothing like the experience described by Malcolm Jordan.

Malcolm shared his experience as a tutor on the new two-year social work course set up at that time in Maidstone, Kent. Being a new programme, Kent supported all the staff to attend the National Institute of Social Work course to ensure they were all skilled teachers.

They took a radically different experiential approach to the course, whereby staff and students were co-members. There was continuous assessment and no exams. Staff gave our papers 24 hours before classes, which were then discussed in the class. Written work submitted by students was given full feedback by staff, but no marks were given. Subjects studied included "thinking about thinking", "intervention", "self and society", "principles and practice of social work".

Placements included 1 week in a school, 4 weeks residential and 14 weeks in the field in year one, and 56% in the filed in year two. Practice teachers and tutors were equally involved in the final assessment of the students, which included

 norm, though the content of the programme has normally been closely linked to the way that social welfare was delivered in the country.

placement reports, 4 pieces of work in any format (essay/art/a play, etc) and a research project.

Malcolm reflected that this was exhausting and challenging for staff and students. The external examiner report in 1976 described the course as" innovative and stimulating…students leave…challenged and stretched to the limits of their ability…but with a zest to continue learning".

The final speaker, Professor Karen Lyons, spoke about the links to European social work education.

In 1900 there were social work schools in London, Amsterdam, Berlin and New York. In 1928 there was a meeting in Paris of the organisations which have now become the International Federation of Social Work and the International Association of the Schools of Social Work. And in this early 20th century period there were "exchange visits" by staff between Settlements established by these schools.

However, the growth in systematic links across European social work schools has been since there was funding provided by the EEC in the 1980s. Programmes like ERASMUS, SOCRATES, LEONARDO and DAPHNE, have provided funding for staff and student exchanges and fostered joint research projects.

At a structural level, the Bologna Declaration of 1999, and the subsequent development of the European Higher Education Area in 2010 have provided European benchmarks for social work programmes in the UK – which have sometimes been in tension to domestic policy and practice drivers.

Karen then described the range of social work programmes across the EU. The diversity has been enormous in terms of length of programmes, their content and the quantity and quality assurance of practical placements. There has been no European

This is still frustrating for professional associations, universities and social workers alike. I was part of discussions in IFSW Europe about the idea of a European passport for social work. This

diversity killed off the feasibility of this. It also results in the high fees for international social workers who want to register in the UK, as the details of each person's education and training has to be individually checked.

This afternoon's programme demonstrated how social work in the UK has become increasingly narrowly defined over the decades as professions have split off and sought earlier and earlier specialisation of knowledge and practice.

We see this currently with probation and youth justice – and personnel management is not even on our radar (though I seem to remember hearing that when registration started there were a number of social workers in personnel departments).

So at a time when the move in England is increasingly to shorter highly specific courses –

does this matter? Does it matter that employers regularly criticise the newly qualified social workers in England, yet happily recruit newly qualified social workers from Europe and the rest of the world?

As governments and universities in their funding discussions collude to narrow the definition of social work, the profession needs to own our history and celebrate the broad scope of our past education, and ensure our new entrants understand our rich heritage.

Bridget Robb is a member of the SWHN Steering Group. She was CEO of the British Association of Social Workers and General Secretary of the Social Workers Union until she retired in 2016.

A film was made of the Chester meeting.

Social work education and regulation: London meeting of the Network

June Thoburn

June Thoburn, member of SWHN's Steering Group, attended the Network meeting on 5 December 2017.

Given the time of year, with Christmas approaching, and a subject that might not light up everyone's eyes, it was good to see a turnout of around 50 (some stalwarts, some new to the Network) undoubtedly attracted by a very eminent platform of speakers.

A seemingly inauspicious start, with a room booking clash, facilitated some lively chatter in the corridors of King's College. Many thanks to Stephen and Terry for their efforts in sorting it, but sadly this meant a shorter formal meeting.

Professor Ann Davis generously assisted the Chair, Terry Bamford, by shortening the presentation on her exploration of '*100 years of a changing social work curriculum at Birmingham University'*. Happily, she is already on record via the video of her talk at our Chester meeting on the SWHN website. She also provided a handout of curriculum changes from the start of 'Training for Social and Philanthropic Work' at Birmingham University in 1908 to the present, more closely government-regulated MA and BA in Social Work.

David Jones used his very wide vantage points as a former President of the International Federation of Social Workers as well as a succession of posts over the years within BASW and government-linked bodies to present a lively and informative

History of Regulating Social Work and Social Work Education. He started by speaking of his current project for BASW and the newly formed 'Standing Conference on Social Work' to describe the present position and debate the issues around the regulation of social work. David commented that he has been surprised – not to say shocked – by the lack of awareness about key questions in regulation of many people in senior positions in national bodies. He described how the history of regulation goes back in one form or another to the beginnings of social work practice and education for social work in the early years of the 20th century. A key milestone was BASW's strong commitment to the rights of social work clients to an equitable and quality service – exemplified by Bill Jordan's 1975 BASW conference paper *Clients are Fellow Citizens.* He recounted how only BASW had consistently advocated social work as a registered profession whilst politicians, civil servants, trades unions, and employers in the statutory and voluntary sector had moved between opposition and agreement over the years, until support coalesced around the broadly favourable Rowntree-funded report of Professor Roy Parker. The resulting General Social Services Council (GSSC) Implementation Group worked on the details and the framework was almost ready to go when the new Labour government came in in 1997 with a manifesto commitment to legislate as a priority. The General Social Care Council (GSCC) in England and parallel bodies in the rest of the UK, were launched in 2002. David ended his summary with the comment that, in contrast to the way in which GSCC was set up, when it was abolished in 2010 and the key statutory roles passed to the HCPC, there was a distinct lack of consultation, and that this was also the case with

the legislation setting up Social Work England under the Children and Social Work Act 2017.

A brief chat over tea was followed by a panel discussion led by Dame Moira Gibb (former Chair of the Social Work Task Force and Reform Board and present Chair of Skills for Care); Professor David Croisdale-Appleby, author of the Department of Health funded report on social work education and a former Chair of Skills for Care; and, Professor Ray Jones, Emeritus Professor of Social Work at Kingston University who has had several key roles in social work service provision and social work education. They led a very lively discussion around the range of topics already raised, and several more. These included the possible reasons why the proposals of the Reform Board appear to have faltered; the implications for a unified profession of the appointment of two Chief Social Workers instead of the single one recommended by the Reform Board; the respective place of University MA and BA programmes and the 'fast-track' and specialist social work training programmes, and where apprenticeships may fit; the relationship between regulation, citizen protection and the growth of outsourcing and profit making – and many more.

June Thoburn sits on the Steering Group of the Social Work History Network. This meeting took place 5 December 2017 at King's College London.

Dame Moira Gibb, Professor Croisdale-Appleby and Professor Ray Jones at the meeting on 5 December 2017

Service user involvement in social work and beyond; exploring its origins and destinations

Peter Beresford

Peter Beresford OBE spoke at the Social Work History Network meeting in London on 27 March 2018

Introduction

There is now growing pressure for user and carer involvement in social work internationally (Dill et al, 2016). England with its requirements for such involvement in all aspects of training and a central budget to support it highlights the progress made. In some senses, participation, can be said to be an inherent part of social work, with its longstanding commitment to advocacy and social justice (Dominelli, 2009), but participation has also emerged as a distinct and innovative strand in social work. This pressure for user involvement reflects values and commitments within social work itself but it also reflects much broader developments and ideas and the timing and nature of its emergence relate to these too. It did not come out of nowhere. Instead it reflects much bigger political, ideological, cultural, social and personal changes. I want in this discussion to try briefly to unpack these complex interactions, because of their importance for understanding this development, and also to help us take It forward more effectively and challenge barriers in its way. I want to put this development of user involvement both in the context of social work and of participatory developments more generally.

I have adopted an historical lens to try and make sense of user involvement in social work in this discussion because it not only allows us to put it in historical context and make better sense of its origins, relations and development. It is also likely to help us avoid the tendency to 'reify' participatory developments and treat them in a narrow technicist way, instead of exploring and unpacking their ideological, philosophical, policy and professional ramifications, problems and possibilities.

Often the approach to undertaking and advancing 'user involvement' has been one based on the production of abstracted 'how to do it' guides and related to this, the creation of models for involvement. One of the earliest and still one of the most often cited is Arnstein's 'Ladder of Citizen Participation' (Arnstein, 1969). The problem with such uni-dimensional approaches to participation is that while in some cases recognizing power differences, they still struggle to address its essentially *political* nature. As a result, they tend to be reductionist, over-simplifying and ill-suited to dealing with the real life complexities and ambiguities of such involvement (Beresford and Croft, 1993).

Beginnings?

The text that is generally identified as the first in UK literature to explore user or client involvement was *The Client Speaks*, published in 1970 (Mayer and Timms, 1970). But this wasn't actually concerned with involving service users, but instead merely turned to them as a data source (Beresford and Croft, 1987). Writing about user and carer involvement in social work in 2007 Janet Warren suggested it had really emerged in the 1990s and:

'needs to be understood within the much broader context of the social, cultural, economic and political changes … over the last 60 years in particular' (Warren, 2007, p34).

A short history of participation and user involvement

I agree and that's my aim here, even if I can only headline issues. This demands an exploration of the histories of both participation and social work. I shall begin with participation.

It is important to remember that for at least the first quarter of the twentieth century, while we are talking here about provisions for participatory democracy, many people did not even have voting rights under representative democracy. It is helpful to see this quest for universal suffrage as the first stage of modern movements for a say in society, its institutions and services. It also perhaps constitutes the first of several phases that can be identified as a basis for making sense of the growing pressure for greater participation or user involvement in social work and other policies and services.

These phases shouldn't be seen as narrowly sequential. Overlaps and inconsistencies can be identified. They highlight the need not to isolate or reify developments in participation. These have taken place in different ways, at different times and paces in different countries. They may also interact and co-exist with each other in different ways. But the broad phases identified here do nonetheless, I think, reflect wider international political and ideological trends.

Phase One: Working for universal suffrage and social rights

From the vantage point of the early twenty first century, it can still be shocking to be reminded how long it took to achieve universal suffrage even in supposedly 'advanced western democratic societies'. Thus it was not until 1918 in the UK that the Representation of the People Act gave women the vote provided they were aged over 30 and either they, or their husband, met a property qualification. Until 1918, when the property qualification for men was abolished, only about 60 per cent of men had the vote. The rate of change was rapid. In 1900, less than seven million people in the UK had the right to vote. This had risen to more than 21 million, more than half the population, by 1918. However, not until 1928 under the Equal Franchise Act did women in the UK share equal voting rights with men (Cole, 2006).

But if the first half of the twentieth century was a time of increasing democratization and the extension of suffrage here, it was also a time of growing suffering worldwide. The two world wars and international inter-war economic depressions, caused enormous problems of want, death, disease, suffering and hunger globally. In a time of increasing political, economic and social uncertainty and inequality, rising pressure for electoral representation came to be coupled internationally with pressure for the achievement of social rights. Such rights are taken to include the right to work, to decent housing, education, adequate income and social security and proper social, health and medical services (Beresford, 2016).

This first major expression of this struggle for 'social citizenship' was the creation of post-second world war welfare states, first in the UK and then other countries. The UK welfare state's proponents saw it as having a key role to play in the protection and promotion of people's economic and social well-being. The welfare state's policy provisions and legislation were seen as compensating for inequalities arising from the market, in contrast to the Poor Law which sought to police and regulate people disadvantaged in society and through the market (Marshall, 1950). What such thinking failed to take account of, as subsequent critiques from feminist, black and disability rights perspectives have highlighted, were the inherent biases of such concepts of citizenship which were very much tied to the thinking and discriminations of their time.

Phase Two: Provisions for participatory democracy and community development

The initial struggle for political and social rights can be seen as leading to the second stage of struggle for further democratisation. In the UK, the beginning of this phase is associated with the 1960s and was linked with the return to power of left of centre Labour governments after years of right of centre Conservative government. The social policy theoretician Titmuss and others pointed out that welfare services established to counter-balance inequalities in society were failing to do so and that longstanding inequalities and exclusions remained (Titmuss, 1968; Halsey, 1972). Public and social services were emerging as having their own problems and limitations as an approach to compensating for structural problems and inequalities.

As rising inequalities, exclusions and regressive redistribution were highlighted, a range of focuses and approaches for change were developed. These centred on concepts of social compensation and community involvement. Community based approaches range from highly structured, state and professionally led schemes operating locally and around issues, to much more autonomous approaches encouraging independent collective community, developing ideas of 'empowerment' and 'conscientization'. All highlight participation, but with a tendency in both towards increasing professionalization and state control (Craig et al, 2011; Ledwith, 2016), thus the so-called Community Development Programme, Education Priority Areas and Urban policy in the late 1960s and 70s.

They sought to target help on disadvantaged groups (including women, young people, Black and minority ethnic groups and poor people) and areas (notably 'inner city areas') identified as disadvantaged. All sought to 'involve' the people they were working with, although they were generally professionally led. Some were more consensual and some conflict based (CDP, 1977; Loney, 1983). Local involvement was often limited, tokenistic and paternalistic. Poverty remained a continuing problem and was indisputably linked with persistent (and ultimately worsening) economic and social inequality in British society and institutions (Atkinson, 1983).

If involving people was part and parcel of the community development and anti-poverty strategies of this time, it was the central feature of a second strand that then emerged – new provisions for public participation in state land planning. The notion of public participation embodied in this was essentially one of public consultation and appeal.

One of the abiding problems of modern public participation are restrictions that operate on who actually gets involved. It was rapidly apparent in efforts to involve people in land use planning. These exercises, essentially based on expecting people to respond to invitations to get involved and relying on traditional public meetings and conventional verbal and written skills tend to disadvantage and exclude people on the basis of class, ethnicity, gender, age and disability (Beresford and Beresford, 1984). They also put a premium on verbal, writing and other social skills which inherently discriminates against less confident, assertive, well educated people. They have tended to involve a very limited and biased range of people.

Phase Three: Provisions for participation in health and social care

The third phase of interest in participation is much more directly related to social work, health and social care and the groups associated with it. This was the emergence of specific requirements for user involvement in health and social care reform beginning with the Children Act (1989) and National Health Service and Community Care Act (1990). These offered people the right to comment, complain and to have a say in the management or running of services. This reflected the consumerist/managerialist ideology underpinning such state or service system driven schemes for involvement, with involvement effectively being at the level of market research or

consultation. The right to complaint (which only applied when things had already gone wrong) tended to be experienced as an individualising and stressful measure (Beresford and Croft, 1993).

Two very different developments are linked with this phase of participation/user involvement; first the emergence of the New Political Right from the nineteen seventies (culminating in the emergence of neoliberal ideology) and, second, the development of new social movements, whose origins can be seen in the 1960s. These movements included the Black civil rights, women's, (LGBTQ), movements, associated with identity, as well as the disabled people's and other service user movements (Jordan and Lent, 1999; Todd and Taylor, 2004).

If state-based pressure for participation was concerned with hearing people's views, on a market research/ consultative basis, the pressure from new social movements was for political and personal change and their direct involvement and say in making it happen – a shift in power.

The pioneering UK disabled people's movement, for example, challenged dominant understandings of disability, rejected conventional interpretations of it in narrow terms of 'personal tragedy' and instead developed a new social model of disability, which highlighting the discriminatory social responses to impairment which 'disabled' people in society. Disabled campaigners called for a new approach to policy and provision based on the philosophy of 'independent living' which challenged disabling barriers and supported people with impairments – physical, sensory, or intellectual, to live on as equal terms as possible to non-disabled people (Oliver, 1983 and 1990; Charlton, 1998). Emerging user movements placed an emphasis on people speaking for themselves, for collective action to support their empowerment through developing their own 'user led' organisations and on bringing about broader social and political change.

The shared language of involvement of these two competing and conflicting pressures for participation disguise fundamental differences between them and have confused the issues. While the emergence of service user movements and development of neoliberalism can be seen as having some common origins; notably a reaction against paternalistic top-down state welfare systems, in many other senses they sit at opposite ends of an ideological spectrum. Pressures for privatisation and a reduced role for the state bear little relation to service users' calls for democratisation and empowerment. The consumerist concerns of the neoliberal state and service system do not sit comfortably with the quest for democratisation and empowerment of service users and their allies.

Key areas which have emerged from service users themselves for involvement are user involvement in professional training, learning and education; the development of user led research and knowledge production and the development of user-controlled initiatives and approaches. These continue to be important.

But if much has been achieved we have perhaps now reached a new stage in the development of participation generally and user involvement in social work specifically. This is a time of increasing conflict and challenge over the idea and its implementation, perhaps best framed as a new phase in its development.

Phase Four: reaction and renewal

For a long time, there has been a tendency to fudge inherent contradictions between the competing approaches to participation. Their proponents have sought to advance their own agendas and highlighted the practical rather than ideological problems underlying resulting difficulties. But more recently we seem to be entering a new phase of user involvement, where these conflicts have become more apparent, positions have seemed to become more polarized and protagonists have emerged as in greater conflict with each other. Thus, for all the talk of the rights and say of the service consumer, the continuing dominance of neoliberal ideology in social policy has meant that the latter has become

increasingly harsh and residual, service users have been increasingly marginalized and disempowered and the two positions have become increasingly polarized. It has become increasingly difficult to maintain the sense that formal arrangements for participation can offer people a real say as public services and welfare provision has been increasingly cut back despite a massive outcry against this.

Reaction – from the service system

Since the economic crisis of 2007-8, UK public policy has rested on the idea of 'austerity' with sharp cuts made in public services and the implementation of so-called 'welfare reform', based on reducing access to and expenditure on welfare benefits, particularly targeting poor, unemployed and disabled people. The extreme effects of such policies have been evidenced and highlighted by service users themselves as well as academic research, but this has had little effect in ameliorating such policy (O'Hara, 2014; Garthwaite, 2016; Beresford, 2016),

At the same time, disabled people's and service users' organisations are face rising insecurity, having an increasing struggle to continue and, many are closing. They have long had inferior access to funding compared with traditional charities and this situation now seems to have worsened as funding has declined. Instead of progress being made towards services becoming more democratic, access to their support is increasingly restricted and their social control role highlighted.

It's not just that prevailing ideology has made life more difficult for service users, what is also happening is that policy is being made more regressive but with a pretence of participation, for example in relation to progressive ideas of:

- Self-management
- Peer support
- Recovery

Each of these ideas originating with service users has being subverted and realigned with neoliberal

values. Thus self-management in mental health policy is not so much about 'managing' in the sense of being able to regain personal control, but 'managing' in the 'new managerialist' sense that has come to permeate neoliberal social policy. 'Peer support' has been institutionalised into the role of 'peer support worker'. Instead of being based on an alternative user-led paradigm challenging psychiatry, such roles seem increasingly framed as lower paid ancillary jobs incorporated into the prevailing ideas and structures of psychiatry. (Penny and Prescott, 2016; Penny, 2018). The idea of 'recovery' has been advanced in official policy as challenging the historic writing-off of mental health service users as permanently damaged, dependent and unreclaimable. But it is actually tied to a bio-medical model. It does not take long to work out that if someone is seen as 'recovered' then they may also be seen as no longer needing support. The reality has been that the idea of recovery has been bound up in neoliberal psychiatric thinking with forcing service users to employment as a primary focus. (Gadsby, 2015).

The reality is that while the policy atmosphere is one that seems sensitive to and supportive of users, there is little effective support for this; policy's direction of travel is in many ways antagonistic to it and there are fewer resources made available to support it.

Renewal – from service users

While years of neoliberalism have certainly imposed limits on the development of user involvement, as well as on service users' rights and say, it would be wrong to assume that it has killed progress. Indeed, what we can see is an increasing focus and indeed in some sense, a strengthening of activity. Thus, UK welfare service users, while coming under attack from welfare reform policies, have been in the lead in challenging such developments, often providing the evidence and impetus for challenging them (Beresford, 2012). While experiencing much suffering in recent years, service users and their organisations have extended both their critiques

and their action in relation to social work and other policies and services. Some key areas of activity include:

- Widening involvement and campaigning, challenging exclusions

- Involvement in professional and occupational training;

- Involvement in research and knowledge production

- The development of 'Mad Studies'.

Widening involvement and campaigning, challenging exclusions

Beginning with the disabled people's movement, service users, have long highlighted that conventional approaches to participation tend to exclude many groups and individuals. Continuing efforts have been made by service users and their ULOs to challenge exclusions, for example, recently people with long term debilitating conditions have asserted their particular difficulties and right to be involved. Service users themselves have highlighted the ways in which social media and networking can challenge such barriers (as well as reinforcing them). A study by the user led network Shaping Our Lives, has evidenced the way in which diverse involvement is restricted. It identified big barriers in the way of five major groups, but also strategies to overcome them. Such groups of service users are excluded according to:

- Equality issues; on the basis of gender, sexuality, ethnicity, class, culture, belief, age, disability and so on

- Where they live; if they are homeless, travellers, in prison, in welfare institutions, refugees and so on

- Communicating differently; they do not speak the prevailing language, it is not their first language, they are deaf and used sign language, etc

- The nature of their impairments; where these are seen as too complex or severe to mean they could or would want to contribute

- Where they are seen as unwanted voices; they do not necessarily say what authorities wanted to hear, are seen as a problem, disruptive etc. These includes neuro-diverse people and people affected by dementia (Beresford, 2013).

Involvement in professional and occupational training

Involving service users (and family carers) in professional education and training has long been seen as one of the most effective ways of improving the nature and culture of social work. PowerUs, a partnership of social work educators and service users which already involves twelve countries, has sought to develop methods of mutual learning in order to change social work practice to be more effective in supporting the empowerment of marginalized groups (http://powerus.eu). Its 'gap-mending' process brings service users and social work students together to learn together on as equal terms as possible. The idea is about bridging divisions between service users and social work students in their learning through new approaches to user involvement. It also represents an alternative approach to the increasing emphasis under neoliberal politics on graduate and elite/fast track approaches to social work education, giving value to 'user knowledge', rather than just academic qualifications. People 'meet as people' on gap-mending courses; service users get formal recognition and accreditation for the skills they offer as well as the skills they gain. Social work students with 'lived experience' as service users are valued for it and can share it if they wish to. Perhaps most important is the building of trust and understanding between service users and would-be social workers which is likely to have a profound effect on future relations and practice between them.

Involvement in research and knowledge production

Research has been the site of one of the most complex and contentious struggles between service users and neoliberal ideology. Its origins can be seen to lie in the struggles first of feminists and then disabled people – to challenge what some have called 'epistemic violence' and exclusion, from the 1970s and regain control over their 'experiential' knowledge – the knowledge that comes out of people's individual and collective lived experience. We have seen the rapid development of user-controlled research. Existing research structures also began to show an increasing interest in involving research subjects in research process, framed in the UK in terms of 'public and patient involvement' or PPI. For some time, there has seemed to be some convergence between these two developments. But increasingly tensions have emerged between the consumerist/managerialist aims of such involvement in much mainstream psychiatric and other health research under neoliberalism and the emancipatory goals of mental health service users/survivors (Rose, Carr and Beresford, 2018). Thus, PPI is coming under increasing attack as 'centered on a construction of the abstract, rational, compliant, and self-managing patient' under neoliberalism (Madden and Speed, 2017).

The development of 'Mad Studies'

Finally, I want to turn to the emergence of 'Mad Studies' because it brings together many of the progressive aims and aspirations of service users in relation to social work and other areas of professional activity and highlights the possibility of building alliances between different stakeholders to achieve these aims. Mad studies is a field of study and action relating to what are more often called 'mental health' policy, services and service users, which has its origins in Canada and which is now fast gaining interest internationally (LeFrancois, Menzies and Reaume, 2013). What generally seems to define the key elements of mad studies is that:

- First, it is definitely divorcing us and itself from a simplistic biomedical model. It allows other understandings and disciplines to come into it instead of solely medical dominance – sociology, anthropology, social work, cultural studies, feminist, queer studies, disability studies, history.

- Second, it places a value on first person knowledge. This is positioned/situated research – you can't just be talking from nowhere, as if you had no place in the proceedings – as it has been in psychiatry.

- But Mad Studies values and has a place for all our first hand experiential knowledge; that's why such a wide range of roles and standpoints can contribute equally to it if they are happy to sign up to its core principles. It isn't only us as survivors/mental health service users, but allies, professionals, researchers, loved ones, and so on. This is a venture we can all work for together in alliance. So it includes the experiential knowledge of service users, the practice knowledge of workers and the knowledge from those offering support, of family carers, as important bases for future research and development (Beresford and Russo, 2016).

Here, with such continuing pioneering from service users, their organisations and allies, we can see a set of markers for a positive future for participatory and co-produced social work. To make this point is not to minimise the barriers now facing such social work. These have to be accepted as real and far-reaching. But rather it is to challenge the sense of inevitability about the present neoliberal direction of travel of both social policy generally and social work specifically in western societies like the UK. Also, it reminds us that there is an alternative and that this alternative is already in process of development.

Peter Beresford OBE is Professor of Citizen Participation at the University of Essex, Co-Chair of the disabled people's and service users' organisation and network, Shaping Our Lives and Emeritus Professor of Social Policy at Brunel University London. His latest book (co-edited with Sarah Carr) is Social Policy First Hand (Policy Press 2018 forthcoming)

Peter spoke at the Network 27 March 2018. Also speaking at the meeting were Colin Cameron and Robert Tapsfield. See the SWHN website for further details.

References

Arnstein, S.R. (1969), A Ladder Of Citizen Participation, *Journal of the American Institute of Planning* (JAIP), Vol 35, No4, July, pp216-224.

Atkinson, A. B. (1983), *The Economics Of Inequality*. Oxford, Clarendon Press Oxford University Press.

Beresford, P. (2012), From 'Vulnerable' To Vanguard: Challenging the Coalition, in, Davison, S. and Rutherford, J. (editors), Welfare Reform: The dread of things to come, *Soundings*, London, Lawrence Wishart, pp66-77.

Beresford, P. (2013), *Beyond the Usual Suspects: Towards inclusive User Involvement* – Research Report, London, Shaping Our Lives.

Beresford, P. (2016), *All Our Welfare: Towards participatory social policy*, Bristol, Policy Press.

Beresford, P. and Croft, S. (1987), Are We Really Listening?: The Client Speaks, by John Meyer and Noel Timms (1970), in Philpot, T. (editor), *On Second Thoughts: Reassessments of the Literature of social work*, London, Community Care/Reed Publishing, pp50-55.

Beresford P. and Croft, S. (1993), *Citizen Involvement: A practical guide for change*, 1993, Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Beresford, P. and Beresford, S. (1984), *A Say In The Future: Planning, participation and meeting social need*, 2nd Edition, London, Battersea Community Action.

Beresford P. and Croft, S. (1993), *Citizen Involvement: A practical guide for change*, 1993, Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Beresford, P. and Russo, R. (2016), Supporting the sustainability of Mad Studies and preventing its co-option, *Disability & Society,* Volume 31, Issue 2, February, pages 270-274,

CDP, (1977), *Gilding The Ghetto: The state and the poverty experiments*, Location not known, Community Development Inter-Project Editorial Team.

Charlton, J.I. (1998), *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability, oppression and empowerment*, California, University of California Press.

Cole, M. (2006), *Democracy In Britain*, (Politics Studies Guides), Edinburghe, Edinburgh University Press.

Craig, G. Mayo, M. Popple, K. Shaw, M. Taylor, M. (editors), (2011), *The Community Development Reader: History, themes and issues*, Bristol, Policy Press.

Dill, K. Montgomery, L. Davidson, G. Duffy, J. (2016), Service User Involvement In Social Work Education: The road less traveled, *Field Educator*, Vol. 6. No 2, November, pp1-10.

Dominelli, L. (2009), *Introducing Social Work*, Short Introductions, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Gadsby, J. (2015), The Recovery Star Meets The Unrecovery Star, Critical Mental Health Nurses' Network, October 19th, CMHNursing, https://criticalmhnursing.org/2015/10/19/the-recovery-star-meets-the-unrecovery-star/ .

Garthwaite, K. (2016), Hunger Pains: Life inside foodbank Britain, Bristol, Policy Press.

Halsey, A.H. (editor), (1972), *Trends In British Society Since 1900: A guide to the changing social structure of Britain*, Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan.

T. Jordan, and A. Lent, (editors), (1999), *Storming The Millennium: The new politics of change*, London, Lawrence and Wishart.

Ledwith, M. (2016), *Community Development In Action: Putting Friere into practice*, Bristol, Policy Press.

Le Francois, B.A. Menzies, R. and Reaume, G. (editors), (2013), *Mad Matters: A Critical Reader in Canadian Mad Studies*, Toronto, Canada, Canadian Scholars Press.

Loney, M. (1983), *Community Against Government: British Community Development Project, 1968–78, (Studies in Social Policy and Welfare)*, London, Heinemann Educational Books.

Madden, M. and Speed, E. (2017), Beware Zombies and unicorns: Toward Critical patient and public involvement in Health Research in a neoliberal Context, in, *Frontiers in Sociology*, Vol 2, No 7, doi 10.3389/soc.2017.00007

Marshall, T.H., 1950, *Citizenship and Social Class And Other Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, J. and Timms, N. (1970), *The Client Speaks: Working class impressions of casework*, London, Routledge.

O'Hara, M. (2014b), *Austerity Bites: A journey to the sharp end of cuts in the UK*, Bristol, Policy Press.

Oliver, M. (1983), *Social Work And Disabled People*, Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Oliver, M. (1990), *The Politics Of Disablement*, Basingstoke, Macmillan and St Martin's Press.

Penny, D. (2018), Who Gets To Define 'Peer Support'?, in, *Mad In America*, February 10th, https://www.madinamerica.com/2018/02/who-gets-to-define-peer-support/ .

Penny, D. and Prescott, L. (2016), The co-optation of survivor knowledge: the danger of substituted values and voice, Russo, J. and Sweeney, A. (editors), *Searching For A Rose Garden; Challenging psychiatry, fostering mad studies*, Ross-on-Wye, PCCS Books, pp35-45.

Rose, D. Carr, S. Beresford, P. (2018), Widening Cross-Disciplnary Research For Mental Health: What is missing from the Research Councils' UK mental health agenda?, Current Issues, Disability & Society, Vol 33, Issue 3, https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2018.1423907

Titmuss, R.M. (1968), *Commitment To Welfare*, London, George Allen and Unwin.

Todd, M.J. and Taylor, G, (editors), (2004), *Democracy And Participation: Popular protest and new social movements,* London, Merlin Press.

Warren, J. (2007), *Service User And Carer Participation In Social Work*, Transforming Social Work Practice series, Exeter, Learning Matters.

Flowers, folk songs and fostering

Keith Bilton

I met Marianne Harriet Mason in a Christmas present, in Steve Roud's *Folk Song in England.*[1] "Marianne Mason (1845 – 1932) was the first woman to publish a collection of folk songs. She was born in London and was the daughter of a lawyer, but was related through her maternal grandfather to the Mitford family from Northumberland, which she clearly thought her most important genealogical connection. She was the first woman to be appointed to a senior post in the Civil Service, as Inspector of Boarded-Out Children in England and Wales, a position she held for twenty-five years and took very seriously, making a huge contribution to the development of childcare (*sic*) in her time." Martin Graebe[2] summarises her importance to the study of folk song: "[S]he was the first woman to collect traditional songs; and her book, *Nursery Rhymes and Country Songs* (1877), was the first collection of traditional songs obtained orally, and presented with piano accompaniments intended for the drawing room, to be made available to the public." I ought, of course, to have known of her already, as Jean Heywood's classic history of the development of child care services[3] records that "In 1885 the Local Government Board appointed an Inspector, Miss Mason, whose duties were to visit all the children boarded out in unions other than their own, and to inspect the work of the boarding-out committees, helping them with advice about the placing and supervision of children", and goes on to quote at length from Miss Mason's reports to the Board. But before looking at Heywood's book or using the Borough library service to access the Dictionary of National Biography, I searched the internet, and the first thing I found was a Kew Gardens blog,[4] "the marvellous achievements of Marianne Mason". This must, I thought, be a different Marianne Mason, but no: "The artist Marianne Mason had a diverse range of talents. Her work with plants in Africa became of great interest to Kew, but this was only part of her remarkable life.... Marianne was known as an authority on folk music, an expert on Swiss alpines and South African plants, and the first woman to hold a senior post of inspector in the Civil Service!"

Her entry in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,[5] which concentrates on her work with boarded-out children, calls her Harriet Mason, but to botanists and folk singers she is Marianne. Jean Heywood sticks to "Miss Mason".

Miss Mason served as the Local Government Board's inspector of boarded-out children from 1885 until her retirement in 1910. The Board had been established in 1871 to take over public health and local government functions from the Home Secretary and the Privy Council and to assume all the functions of the Poor Law Board, which was abolished. At the local level, however, destitute adults and abandoned and orphan children remained the responsibility of Poor Law Boards of Guardians, which were not replaced by local authority public assistance committees until

---

[1] Faber & Faber (2017)

[2] "Old Songs and Sugar Mice", Folk Music Journal, Vol. 10, No. 4 (2014)

[3] Heywood, Jean S*., Children in Care*, Routledge and Kegan Paul (1959, revised 1965)

[4] *The marvellous achievements of Marianne Mason*, kew.org > Blogs > Library, Art & Archives

Blog https://www.kew.org/blogs/library-art-and-archives/the-marvellous-achievements-of-marianne-mason Accessed 29/04/2018

[5] Field, Katherine, "(Marianne) Harriet Mason", Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

1930. One of the last acts of the Poor Law Board had been to issue in November 1870 an Order regulating the boarding-out of pauper children. The Order applied only to specified Poor Law Unions and Parishes in large towns, and allowed them to board children out in rural areas. Miss Mason visited these children, and reported to her Board on the arrangements made by the local Poor Law Guardians for the selection and supervision of foster homes. Her reports were forthright, as a few examples will show.

"I must again draw attention to the uselessness of visits made by men because, to speak quite plainly, men cannot turn up girls' petticoats, take off their stockings, and look at their shoulders &c., and without this kind of inspection, it is, as I have said, impossible to ascertain the real facts as to the children's treatment, and it is only guess work."[6]

"There may even be too much supervision and visiting: continual interference in detail only tends to shift the responsibility from the foster parents who have the actual care of the children to the committee, whose duty it is to see and ascertain that the foster parents are treating them properly. A thorough examination from time to time of the children's bodily condition is the only way to know this for certain. Quality, not quantity, is to be desired in supervision."[7]

"A foster mother told me that she would object to the visits of paltry people, and that there was no real lady in the parish; and she carried out her threatened resistance to the visits of a lady whom she did not think good enough."[8]

The term "boarding-out" survived in English law until 1991.[9] Marianne Harriet Mason would have witnessed its growing acceptability as a way of caring for pauper children. The duty under the Poor Laws to look after all those who "went on the Parish" led to the deterrent Reform Act of 1834, and there was a similar anxiety that the boarding-out of pauper children might seem unduly attractive to poor families. As late as 1871, Henry Fawcett, Professor of Economics at the University of Cambridge, wrote: "If a labouring man sees that pauper children boarded-out with a neighbour are much better provided for in every way than his own children, and that their maintenance and schooling and doctoring do not depend as in his own case, on the fluctuations of the labour market, he can hardly avoid coming to look on the condition of pauperism as highly desirable, at least for the children, and in any case, where the large family was a burden, there would be a strong temptation to desert a child or two in order to secure for them a desirable home."[10] Boarding-out in Marianne Harriet Mason's time was seen as a permanent separation of children from their parents, and in 1889 a Poor Law (Amendment) Act gave Boards of Guardians a power to assume a parent's rights and powers over a child if that parent had deserted the child. Ten years later, the power was extended to cover orphan children and those whose parents were disabled, in prison or unfit to have their care.[11]

---

[6] Macdonald, Helen J., "Boarding-Out and the Scottish Poor Law, 1845 - 1914", *The Scottish Historical Review,* Vol. 75, No. 200, Part 2 (October 1996)*,* Edinburgh University Press, (quoting Miss Mason's report in the 23rd Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1894)

[7] Heywood, op. cit.

[8] Macdonald, op.cit., (quoting Miss Mason's report in the 25th Annual Report of the Local Government Board, 1896)

[9] In 1991 The Boarding-out of Children (Foster Placement) Regulations of 1988 were replaced by The Foster Placement (Children) Regulations.

[10] *Pauperism: Its Causes and Remedies*, London (1871), quoted in Macdonald (op.cit.)

[11] When, under The Children Act of 1948, Poor Law arrangements were replaced by voluntary reception into care, local authorities inherited this power to assume parental rights (which, like the

In her retirement Marianne spent much time in southern Africa with one of her brothers, Canon Edward Mason, studying and painting the flora. She left her plant collection to Kew Gardens. Three plants, *Indigofera masoniae, Watsoniae masoniae, and Crocosmia masoniae*, are named after her.

Already a Fellow of the Royal Horticultural Society, Marianne Mason was among the first group of women to become in 1913 a Fellow of the Royal Geographical Society. "The decision ... to admit women Fellows marked the conclusion of a protracted debate extending over 20 years. The controversy surrounding women's admission drew the Society into the broader questions within contemporary British science and politics. These included the nature of scientific progress, national efficiency, imperial patronage, social justice and the moral rights of citizens."[12]

As well as being a practising Anglican, Marianne Mason was also a member of the Psychical Research Society, who wrote about thought-reading and conducted amateur experiments on the subject.[13]

Her papers, including letters and a handwritten autobiography, are in the Nottinghamshire archives, awaiting her biographer.

Keith Bilton is co-founder of the SWHN and former Chair of its Steering Group.

---

term "boarding-out", lasted until 1991), but the Act also provided that, unless parental rights and powers had been assumed, the local authority should, if it seemed consistent with the child's welfare, try to discharge the child to the care of a parent, guardian, relative or friend. The Children Act of 1989 replaced voluntary reception into care with a duty to accommodate and look after children, and placed this duty within Part III of the Act, "Local Authority Support for Children and Families", thus reinforcing the message that what had been voluntary care should be seen as a family support service and not as a way of separating children from parents. The reductions in local government expenditure required by

Central Government austerity programmes since 2008 have led to serious cuts in family support services, and have also played a part in putting vulnerable families at greater risk of care proceedings. Together with current advocacy of hastening children through local authority care into adoption placements, this is creating a pattern which Miss Mason might recognise.

[12] Bell, Morag and McEwan, Cheryl, "The Admission of Women Fellows to the Royal Geographical Society, 1892-1914: the Controversy and the Outcome", *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 162, No. 3 (Nov. 1996)

[13] Field, op.cit.

Back to the future with Clement Attlee: solving today's problems in adult social care through the lens of Attlee's vision

Colin Slasberg

The last issue of the *Bulletin* carried an article by Jonathan Dickens which was an abridged version of an article published in the *British Journal of Social Work*.[1] It showed that, almost by accident, Attlee became involved in social work, which greatly changed him and his view of social issues. Jonathan describes Attlee as the man who '*was changed by social work and who went on to change society*'. With such an epithet, there can surely be no better person through whose eyes the social work profession might judge the service of today.

The focus of this paper is social care for adults. It's an area of great contention. Some say great changes are in process whilst others think it remains an impoverished and depersonalising service with poor prospects. This paper asks the following question. Based on what we know of Attlee's views, what would he have made of today's situation, and what action, if any, might he think is required? The exercise is much more than a mildly entertaining parlour game. Jonathan expresses the view that Attlee's outlook on social work resonates powerfully with what many of us believe to represent the best of social work today. Might it enable much needed light to be thrown on modern dilemmas and contradictions?

An outline of Attlee's thinking

We have the advantage that in 1920, he wrote a book called *The Social Worker.*[2] It was a synthesis of his views of social work and the policy context within which social work takes place. Jonathan helps us to capture the essence of his thinking by drawing on this book.

Jonathan sets out how Attlee placed *social work* within the broader concept of the *social service* idea.

- Jonathan summarises Attlee's view about good *social work* as '*radical, relationship based, realistic and reciprocal*'. Attlee believed it was about working *with* people, not *for* them. He wrote '*Every social worker is almost certain to be an agitator*' on the basis that '*If he or she learns certain facts and believes that they are due to certain causes which are beyond the power of an individual to remove, it is impossible to rest contented with the limited amount of good that can be done by following old methods*'. Today, we might use the word *advocate* to describe someone who promotes the interests of the individual in the way Attlee describes. Others might describe such practice as *radical*. He added that a primary rule was '*never to forget that one is dealing with individuals, not just cases*' and for social workers to remember that the people they work with have '*the same human relationships as themselves*'. These words will resonate powerfully for social workers familiar with the profession's Code of Ethics.[3]

---

[1] Jonathan Dickens (2017) Clement Attlee and the social service idea – messages for social work in England, BJSW

[2] https://archive.org/details/socialworker00attliala

[3] https://www.basw.co.uk/codeofethics/

- Jonathan tells us that his *social service* idea was that the established order of charitable intervention should be replaced with a new understanding '*grounded in social justice and citizenship, replacing generosity with justice, benevolence with duty, condescension with respect'.* Attlee was particularly scornful of charity, saying '*The evil of charity is that it tends to make the charitable think that he has done his duty by giving away some trifling sum, his conscience is put to sleep, and he takes no trouble to consider the social problem any further . . . . Very many do not realise that you must be just before you are generous'.*

He had a strong dislike of the Charity Organisation Society – the COS – which was the principal agency of relief alongside the formal state provision through the Poor Law. It was rooted in the philosophy that laid responsibility for disadvantage on the disadvantaged, and did not shy away from punitive approaches, often playing a key role in administering them. It set stringent needs tests for resources to be offered. The COS was known amongst poorer communities as '*cringe or starve'*. Attlee described their charity a '*hard and unlovely thing'*.

How does the modern social care service fare against this thinking?

Personalisation is the core idea underpinning the modern service. We can be very confident that, if personalisation is taken to mean that care and support fits around the needs of the person, Attlee would have approved very strongly. It fits with well with his social service idea of a system based on *duty*, not *charity*. It requires the unique needs of the person to be known and the state accepting a responsibility to provide the resources to meet them. Personalisation cannot work on the basis of the state merely handing out whatever resources it

has chosen to make available. He would have understood the word 'personalisation' as simply the modern day language to describe a concept he would have been very familiar with.

We can expect it would also have delighted him that personalised support would require social work practice that measured up to his criteria for good social work. Personalisation is the embodiment of treating people as *individuals* not *cases*. The practitioner must get to know the person as an individual to know their unique needs and unique support requirements. The nuance of each individual means this can only be achieved through a *relationship* built on *respect* for the person's own thoughts and feelings. And practice would be *radical* if, as Jonathan points out, radicalism means getting to the root of problems, and challenging the status quo if it does not offer the person what they require. Day by day this makes the social worker what Attlee would call an agitator on behalf of every service user.

We might, however, expect him to have questions in relation to how *realistic* personalisation is in the context of cost. More on this later.

Given this very positive picture painted at the strategic level, he would have been mystified to learn that 70% of service users say that their views are listened to either 'never', 'rarely' or at best only 'sometimes' when their needs are assessed and support planned.[4] How can such a person centred policy as personalisation result in levels of engagement that are quite possibly little different from the Edwardian days in which Attlee cut his teeth? His concern would be heightened to find a social work profession so ill at ease about with itself for practices that create widespread dependency[5] through a system described as an '*institutional machine'* that it felt the need to launch a strategy in 2017 to promote practice that would be '*strengths and well being based'.*[6] How can this be the case

---

[4] *Think Local Act Personal – Survey of service users into impact of the Care Act, 2017*
[5] *Local Government Association (2102) – Adult social care efficiency programme*

[6] Think Local Act Personal – Developing a strengths based and well being approach to social work practice

given the profession is working within the context of such a positive policy as *personalisation*?

To understand this, it is necessary to distinguish the vision of personalisation from the strategy to deliver it. The fundamental concept is the idea of the 'personal budget', an entitlement to a sum of money given to people 'up-front' so they can choose their own supports and services. It is unlikely Attlee would have approved this strategy. Jonathan points out that he believed help should not be given 'naively, indiscriminately' and should be based on what we would call today a 'good assessment'.

And he would also have wondered how it was decided how much money to give people. He would have approved the idea of the originators of the strategy that the allocation should be sufficient to enable 'full citizenship'. It's a bold concept rooted in what is *just*. However, the uniqueness of each individual would require an 'open cheque' approach to funding for such allocations to be given as an entitlement. He would wonder how any Chancellor would agree to it.

So it would have been no surprise to Attlee to learn that the strategy was proving undeliverable and so was simply not happening on the ground.[7] This would explain to him the gap between the rhetoric of personalisation and the reality. It is a concern troubling the agency charged with delivering personalisation.[8]

Looking back in time

If he stepped further back in time he would learn this was not the first time a similar vision had been sought but failed to be delivered because the strategy was flawed. The Community Care reforms 20 years ago had the same vision for how things

should be, but using the language of its day. Government accepted the service was inherently institutionalised having created a '*one size fits all*' culture.[9] Assessment practices were described as '*service led*', not '*person centred*' and disempowered service users. A new system called *Assessment and Care Management* was introduced. Its aim was to bring about '*tailor made*' care packages that were '*needs led*'. The original idea, developed in work at the University of Kent in the 1980's, was that the *assessment* element would be separated from the *care management* element – hence the word '*and*' in the title – with the assessment carried out prior to and, crucially, uninfluenced by resource considerations.

But it didn't happen that way. When the guidance to the Community Care Act of 1990 came to be written, the radical idea of separating the assessment from resource considerations was not taken forward. It encouraged 'need' to continue to be seen '*within available resources.*'[10] The oppressive and controlling practices continued.

And if he stepped back another 20 years to 1968 he would have seen same syndrome repeated. The Seebohm report[11] sought to address the problems created by what was a fragmented system that seemed to treat symptoms but failed to tackle causes. He recommended the creation of a service with a vision that would;

> '*reach far beyond the discovery and rescue of social casualties; it will enable the greatest number of individuals to act reciprocally, giving and receiving service for the well-being of the whole community*'

---

[7] Ten years on – what can we make of personal budget. Department of health social care blog, guest entry https://socialcare.blog.gov.uk/2017/08/09/ten-years-on-what-can-we-make-of-personal-budgets/

[8] https://www.thinklocalactpersonal.org.uk/Blog/Do-we-need-to-do-personalisation-differently/
[9] White Paper, Caring for People. 1989
[10] Assessment and Care Management- Guidance for Practitioners
[11] Seebohm, F. (1968) Report of the Committee on Local Authority and Allied Personal Social Services

Not least in relation to the principle of *reciprocity* but also its *radicalism*, this is again a vision we can expect Attlee would heartily approve. But, yet again, it didn't happen this way. Jonathan Dickens draws our attention to another, tiny fragment in history but with enormous consequence – the letter 's'. Seebohm suggested the title *Social Service Departments* for the new service, taking his lead directly from Attlee's *social service* idea. But in the event, an 's' was added and Social Service**s** Department**s** were created. The addition of the letter 's' ensured the focus remained on dispensing of services.

Tracing the problem back to its roots

So what is it that has so stubbornly resisted all attempts at change? We have to go back another 20 years, to 1948 and the creation of the service that Attlee himself was responsible for as Prime Minister. Was there something about the path upon which social care was set that accounts for it not only falling short of Attlee's own vision of social service, but in a way that has proved so utterly resistant to all attempts to change it in the following 70 years?

The Attlee government was very clear about what care for older and disabled people should not be, but had no real vision what it should be. Care of older and disabled people was the last piece of the welfare state jigsaw, with Aneurin Bevan, Attlee's Health Minister, calling them '*the residual categories of people*' whose needs they must address.[12] He couldn't have been more clear, or impassioned, that the policy of providing for them in the punitive workhouses under the Poor Law was a great social wrong. Bringing an end to this policy was an imperative shared on all sides of the House.

The plan was that the poor law administration would be disbanded, the workhouses closed and responsibility for people who need care would transfer to local authorities. However, quite what local authorities would do is not articulated. Bevan said simply local authorities would create '*special schemes, both domiciliary and otherwise*'.

The lack of vision need be no surprise in the context of the day. The fact that people with care and support needs were cared for in the system designed to address poverty reveals the view that infirmity and disability was seen as a private matter that only became a public concern if the person did not have the means to address their own care needs.

The desire to rescue vulnerable people from punitive conditions was clearly an act of authentic compassion. But in the absence of a tangible alternative, it was only compassion that carried over to form the basis for the new service. This raised the question of how compassionate will the state be? It could be more, it could be less, and potentially limitless. Bevan addressed this by saying the extent of the help local authorities would provide '*will depend on our resources*'.

It would perhaps horrify Attlee to realise that, however inadvertently, his government had created the conditions for the type of charity, albeit state sponsored, he so roundly disapproved. The service could not live up to the fundamental edict of being '*just before being generous*' simply because there was no concept of what would be *just*.

The service was set on a path that has left it exposed to the full weight of criticism Attlee had previously levelled at the COS. The fundamental needs testing process behind

---

[12] Hansard, 1947
http://hansard.millbanksystems.com/commons/19
47/nov/24/national-assistance-bill#S5CV0444P0_19471124_HOC_262

the '*cringe or starve*' experience of the service carried forward into state provision for older and disabled people. The challenge local authorities were handed by the Attlee government was how to shape what they considered 'need' so it matched the resource central government made available. This is delivered through *eligibility criteria*. People are tested against the criteria to determine if they will receive support.

Needs testing through eligibility criteria kept at bay the fear of a bottomless pit of need. In the first four decades, it was delivered by councils investing in services and then setting eligibility criteria in relation to those services. The Community Care reforms modified the process. In response to the criticism of the culture being service led, the eligibility test moved from being rooted in *services* to *needs,* at least nominally. Councils would control spending by standardising and specifying the range of needs they deemed 'eligible'. The eligibility test remained, but took a different form. The situation was if anything worsened as overt criteria for services were replaced with eligibility tests set covertly by budget holders through 'street level bureaucracies'.[13] This added a pernicious dimension to the process, deepening mistrust between councils and service users.

The needs testing process set in train by Attlee's government created the focus on 'casualties' that bothered Seebohm, and was the source of the 'one size fits all' culture and de-personalisation.[14]

Comparison with health care

The approach to the tension between needs and resources in social care compared starkly with the approach adopted in health care. The NHS founding principles[15] created two vital differences with social care. First, there was a clear vision. It was that people should have the healthiest mind and body that health care can make possible. 'Clinical need' arises if a clinician diagnoses something wrong with mind or body and there is an approved treatment to address it. As the technology of health care changes, so does the scope of 'clinical need'. The process of approving health treatments may take into account the cost effectiveness of treatments. It is likely most people will agree that cost effectiveness is an appropriate consideration on the premise that getting value for money is a good thing. However, cost effectiveness is quite different from affordability and does not deliver affordability. It is perfectly possible to have a range of needs being met in the most cost effective way, but the total cost exceeds the available resource.

The second difference was that, once clinical need was established, it would be a public responsibility to ensure the need is met. This requires the service to be funded to meet all clinical needs. The mechanism to manage need exceeding resources is the waiting list. There is a familiar pattern whereby if the government of the day is less willing to invest in public services, the waiting list grows and if the government of the day is more willing to invest waiting goes down.

In effect, in health resources follows need while in social care need follows resources. National policy in social care is now

---

[13] Research in practice for adults, Dartington (2014) Leaders briefing – resource allocation
[14] *The eligibility question – the real source of de-personalisation (Slasberg and Beresford, 2016). Disability and Society*

[15] http://www.nhs.uk/NHSEngland/thenhs/about/Pages/nhscoreprinciples.aspx

constructed in a way that makes it unlawful for there to be any unmet need.[16]

The approach to health care amply satisfied Attlee's *social service* idea. It was a system based not on *charity* or *benevolence*, but *justice* and *duty.* It built from the principle that having the best possible health of mind and body is a universal right, albeit a right sustained by a popular consensus rather than written into law. Social care was the opposite, with no vision of what would be *just*, it fell to state sponsored *benevolence* to sustain it.

The role of the doctor and the social worker in the management of needs and resources

It is good practice in both health prescribing and social care for plans to be cost effective. There is no merit in profligacy. However, where they diverge is that doctors are not expected to deliver affordability, but social workers are. Doctors apply technical knowledge in the diagnosis and selection of treatments. This affords practitioner freedom. Social workers, however are required to shape their view of the person to deliver the locally set eligibility test. They are managed by the people who determine the criteria. This creates an oppressive practice environment.

Servicing the eligibility test is the core function of the assessment practice process. It has resulted in practice that comprehensively fails Attlee's measures of good social work. Far from being *agitators*, practitioners become mere pawns of the system. Instead of a focus on *relationships* with the person as an active and respected contributor, the key dynamic of the exchanges is the practitioner gathering information to apply the eligibility test.

All would agree that Attlee and Bevan were right to prioritise ending the cruelty ofthe workhouses. But there was no thinking at the time to guide them in creating an alternative that could match the shining achievement in health. It was a case of a job being only half done. If this can be viewed with hindsight as an understandable act of omission, their successors perhaps cannot escape criticism for not completing the job before now. New thinking has been available for over 30 years that would satisfy Attlee's vision for social service and for social work.

New thinking

In the 1970's, the *independent living movement* of disabled people emerged. They completely rejected what they described as the 'personal tragedy' view of disability, and the paternalistic and institutionalized nature of provision it led to. They saw themselves as perfectly capable of living in and contributing to society on the same terms as non disabled people so long as they were given the right support. This is the nub of what they meant by *independent living*. They had no confidence in the ability of the state system to adapt to their view. Their solution was to be given the cash rather than care to allow them to construct and manage their own support.

In all but one respect, although seeing disabled people as radical and independent not mere recipients of compassion would be new to him, Attlee would surely have seen eye to eye with them. For the first time, there was a tangible view of what would be *just* in responding to disability, which if accepted would lead to the corollary sense of *duty* upon the state in responding to people in need of care and support. This

---

[16] Research in practice for adults, Dartington (2015). Resource Allocation, Leaders Briefing.

would replace mere *benevolence* and the *condescension* that comes with it.

In terms of social work, for disabled people who needed support to work through their needs and support requirements to achieve *independent living*, this new thinking creates a practice process that in - all but one respect - matches up to Attlee's criteria;

- A process based on *relationship* would be essential to identify the uniqueness of each person's needs to achieve independent living, sometimes called the 'lived experience' of need. This would replace the officiousness of practitioners gathering information to establish if the person could be deemed to have 'eligible' needs.

- It would be *radical,* in the sense that the practice process would not simply fit the person into what already existed, but would have to say if what is available is not up to the task.

- It would be *reciprocal* in that the nature of the exchange could be citizen to citizen. The practitioner would no longer hold power over the person in the form of administering a test using criteria familiar only to practitioners and their managers.

The one respect that would have concerned him would have been whether it is *realistic*. How much would it cost? The movement would not have been able to give an honest answer. Certainly it persuaded the government of the day it would be cheaper. But they did so by pulling the wool over their eyes by allowing them to confuse the

hourly cost with the total cost. Without the overheads of formal services, the hourly cost was less. But the much greater volume of support required to achieve *independent living* meant the total cost was greater.

Applying the new thinking

The Direct Payments Act was passed in 1996. However, it has only ever been used by a small minority, about 5% of service users, to manage their own support.[17] Research has shown it takes considerable levels of skills, time and energy to take this route. Also, far from costing less, the top tier spend rather more. One piece of research[18] found people with a direct payment spending 44% more than the rest. This happens because the person's own assessments of the *lived experience* of their needs - which they bring to the council - disables the budget holders from applying their eligibility tests. There is little read across from the *lived experience* of need to *eligible* need.

The effect has been to create a two tier service. The top tier get a service that amply meets Attlee's vision of social service and the bottom tier one that equally amply does not. This begs the question, what will it take to create a social service that meets Attlee's vision for all?

Is better funding the answer?

Many believe the problem would be addressed by a major increase in funding. Some practitioners claim that that lack of resources means working in person centred ways is not possible. We might expect Attlee to raise an eyebrow. Surely it doesn't have to be the case that the only conditions under which it is possible to deliver a service that is *just* and *respectfu*l are if people get

---

[17] *Slasberg and Beresford (2015). Further lessons from the continuing failure of personal budgets to deliver personalisation. Research in Policy and Practice*

[18] Woolham and Benton (2009) Self directed support and personal budgets in a large shire county – impact on outcomes and cost

all the resources they require. He would most likely be rather scornful of practitioners who blame a 6.4%[19] reduction in spend over the past five years for their practice not being personalized.

Pouring more money into the bottom tier would be to spurn Attlee's advice that justice must precede generosity. This means the first challenge must be to create a system that extends the *justness* claimed by the top tier for themselves to all.[20] A system that puts justice before generosity.

We can look to how the NHS works. If we have something wrong with mind or body, and there is an approved treatment for it, we don't expect a doctor to deny the need if the treatment is not immediately available. If the need is not urgent, we might have to wait. If the gap between needs and resources increases, so the waiting time grows. But as waiting lists grow, so does political pressure to close the gap between needs and resources again. Waiting lists mean suffering and anxiety. Similarly, unmet need in social care results in suffering and anxiety. The difference is that in social care it is denied and remains hidden.

However, there is nothing in law to stop social care replicating the approach of health. It would require the following;

1. The first requirement is a vision. For disabled people, the vision was *independent living*. This might be too particular to working age disabled people. A broader vision, and indeed the language of the Care Act, would be *well being*. The Care Act identifies nine areas of well being from physical considerations to engagement in the community. Social care then ceases to be an end in itself and becomes the *means* to achieve the end of well being. This would place social care alongside health in that health care is merely the technical *means* to deliver the *vision* of best possible health of mind and body.

2. All assessments must identify all needs that have to be met to deliver the right level of well being for the person. The assessment should identify the most cost effective way of meeting these needs, but should have no regard to affordability. The concept of *eligibility* to control spending would be abandoned. This would place social care needs on the same footing as *clinical need* in health.

3. Decisions about how much assessed need can be afforded must take place *subsequent* to the assessment. This would replace the current policy whereby all assessed need must be met, making unmet need unlawful. The Care Act has created provisions that make this possible, albeit the current policy means those provisions have yet to be implemented[21]. Needs that require public funding that cannot be afforded would be acknowledged with the individual and met as and when funding permits. This will place unmet need in social care on the same footing as health needs that are on a waiting list.

4. *Information about unmet needs requiring public funding would be*

---

[19] Institute of Fiscal Studies (2017) The geography of local authority social care 2009/10 to 2015/16
[20] Slasberg and Beresford (2015) Building on the original strengths of direct payments to build a better future for social care. Disability and Society

[21] Slasberg and Beresford (2015) Guidance to the Care Act – undermining ambitions for change, Disability and Society

aggregated and used in the short term to ensure equity, and in the medium term to inform the democratic process of the funding levels required to ensure well being for all older and disabled people. This will replace the current system which denies such information. Estimates of funding required currently rely on epidemiological projections. These have little discernible impact on the political process. Real time information about unmet need in social care would fulfill a similar function to waiting lists in health. This would mean that, as in health, society was being '*just before being generous'* with regard to older and disabled people.

These steps would mean that all of Attlee's conditions for a good *social service,* with good *social work* at its heart, would be met. Social workers would be free to treat people as *individuals*, not *cases.* Social workers will be able to escape the shackles of a system that requires them to practice in inherently conservative ways. Crucially, it would also finally satisfy the requirement of being *realistic.*

In conclusion

We can be confident that Attlee's natural humility would have enabled him to acknowledge gracefully if he believed this approach would mean the completion of a job he was able to only half complete.

If this approach were adopted, it would open the door for today's political leaders to tackle the other great divide between health and social care bequeathed by the 1948 reforms. While health care has been universal, the view has persisted that publicly funded social care is only for those without the means to fund their own support. Today's leaders would be able to respond to the very different social conditions of today. Whilst in Attlee's time, infirmity and disability were seen as private concerns for those sadly afflicted, in a modern, diverse society people with physical and mental impairments are seen to make important contributions to their families and to society. To contribute they need the best possible well being no less than the best possible health of mind and body. Social care would become a means to a valued end, best possible well being, alongside health care as the means to best possible health of mind and body.   Social care would cease to be merely an end in itself attracting little value.

Applying Attlee's principles to social care as well as to health would thus create the conditions for a meaningful partnership between partners of equals. And that might bring into view that most elusive of political objectives - the integration of health and social care.

Colin Slasberg CQSW is a social care consultant.

Book review

Mike Burt

Mike Burt discusses Elizabeth Macadam's *The Equipment of the Social Worker* (1925)

I have chosen to review Elizabeth Macadam's text *The Equipment of the Social Worker*, published in 1925, to coincide with current interest which is being shown in the history of the education and training of social workers.[1] The Social Work History Network has recently held meetings in Chester and London covering the subject, with the former venue being filmed and available at https://vimeo.com/album/4777151 or via the Network's website www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/policy-institute/scwru/swhn. During 2018 a Special Issue of the journal *Practice* will feature articles about the history of social work education and training. Also in 2018, longevity in the study of social work at two universities is being celebrated. At the University of Birmingham, students will have been enrolled for one hundred and ten years. Not far behind, the University of Edinburgh will be celebrating its centenary of delivering courses in social work: a website documents activity, including a timeline which highlights significant developments in social work education and training, mainly in the UK. The Joint University Council Social Work Education Committee, which represents most university social work departments, celebrates its formation in 1918 as the Joint University Council for Social Studies.[2]

At the time of writing *The Equipment of the Social Worker*, Elizabeth Macadam had been the general secretary of the Joint University Council for Social Studies since 1919. From the beginning of the twentieth century Elizabeth Macadam was a particularly influential pioneer in the development of social work. Susan Pederson's biography of Eleanor Rathbone contains a number of references to her because of their close friendship which started in Liverpool and extended to them living together in London. However, Pederson's research concludes that Elizabeth Macadam went to some lengths to ensure that limited information would be available about her after her death. She was born in a small village, Chryston, north of Glasgow in 1871. With the intention of securing a profession for herself, she gained experience in 'Kinder Garten' work in Germany, following which she joined the Women's University Settlement in Southwark in 1898. Drawing on settlement reports, Pederson notes that Elizabeth Macadam had a positive character and was particularly good at influencing 'rough young boys and girls' who attended the classes. She remained until 1902 when she was appointed as Warden of the Victoria Women's Settlement in Liverpool. Elizabeth Macadam contributed significantly to the development of social service in Liverpool and in 1910 she was appointed by the University of Liverpool to the new post of lecturer in the methods and practice of social work.[3]

In *The Equipment of the Social Worker* Elizabeth Macadam traced the development of the demand for courses of social studies, highlighting the impetus provided by the expansion of welfare work in munitions factories and in local communities during the Second World War. She pointed out that the extensive welfare legislation enacted prior to the War had not been

---

[1] E. Macadam, *The Equipment of the Social Worker* (1925), London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
[2] An outline history of the Joint Council is provided in R. Chapman, The Origins of the Joint University Council and the Background to *Public Policy and*

Administration: An Interpretation, *Public Policy and Administration* 22, 1 (2007).
[3] S. Pederson, *Eleanor Rathbone and the Politics of Conscience* (2004), New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 78-97.

accompanied by any scheme of training and that post war reconstruction had been limited in its effectiveness. Noting that the provisions of the Poor Law were expected to be distributed between local authority public departments as recommended by the Maclean Committee which reported in 1918, she argued that a further opportunity lay ahead for a planned approach to the training of staff

Elizabeth Macadam drew attention to the expansion in the number of people working in the '…new type of services which for want of a better title we call social work or social administration'.[4] She went on to list examples of posts in both public and voluntary bodies suggesting that '…the number of professional openings which have been created at least justifies the assertion that social work is a profession in the making'.[5] Examples of social work in local and central public departments included factory inspectors, sanitary inspectors and health visitors, inspectors of boarded-out children, organisers of children's care committees and juvenile organisations, investigators of old age pension claims, managers and rent collectors under local housing authorities, women police, probation officers, and relieving officers. In voluntary bodies Elizabeth Macadam listed the work of hospital almoners, organisers and secretaries of Councils of Social Welfare, charity organisation visitors, child welfare agencies, clubs, holiday funds, social activities of churches and religious organisations, and settlement workers.[6]

Elizabeth Macadam outlined the early development of courses of social study in London at the London School of Economics and Bedford College, and at universities in Liverpool, Birmingham, Bristol, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Oxford and Leeds; providing details of admissions, curricula, administrative arrangements for practical work. She stated the case for 'the university as the centre of social study' arguing

that '…the university alone has the equipment which will preserve the essential unity of the social sciences…', although she also pointed to their importance in the study of other subjects including medicine, law and town planning.[7] Elizabeth Macadam was further persuaded of the importance of the university in maintaining '…the high standard of study that the still undiscovered potentialities of a new profession demand'.[8] The importance she attached to the coherence of social studies subjects is reflected in her assertion that although there were many types of social work, including some very narrow fields, social workers should be trained in a way which would enable them to move between different jobs with a widely recognised qualification. With a view to a more collective approach to the development of social work as a profession she therefore advised against too many separate bodies devising their own, usually relatively short, training courses.

Nevertheless, one of Elizabeth Macadam's principal concerns was to promote the study of the social sciences more widely. Included in her list of subjects taught at schools of social study were social history, economic history, social and industrial psychology, social philosophy, principles and practice of social work, central and local government, and public health. She recognised that such study was relevant to a wide range of occupations which, together with social work, addressed 'social life'. Elizabeth Macadam further recognised that there was a significant overlap between the work of public health and social work and also suggested that the study of law could '…help to produce the precision and clarity of mind so desirable in a field of work liable to the evils of vague thinking, emotionalism, and rule-of-thumb methods'.[9]

In relation to 'practical work' which she thought should follow a period of academic social study, Elizabeth Macadam called for similar systematic arrangements as for academic study, including the

---

[4] Macadam, *The Equipment*, p. 22.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 22.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 22-23.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 52-53.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[9] *Ibid.*, p.61.

appointment of a director of practical work. Its purpose was to help students understand social conditions and give them experience of different forms of social administration. She acknowledged the difficulties which this presented and noted in particular the valuable provision made by the councils of social welfare, charity organization, and recreational organisations: in particular she valued the work carried out in settlements where students would experience a critical approach to social problems. Nevertheless, she identified the danger of students being impressed by the wide range of institutions for social welfare and neglecting to notice that governments should address the evils of the housing shortage and unemployment.

Elizabeth Macadam's study of requirements for the training of social workers gave rise to two issues which came to be significant for the subsequent development of social work in the United Kingdom (UK). The first issue concerns the range of social work occupations for which she thought there should be both a social studies qualification and vocational practical experience. In my review of *The Social Workers' Guide* (1911) in the last *Bulletin of the Social Work History Network* I drew attention to the diverse range of voluntary and salaried roles which were sometimes collectively referred to as social work. David Burnham has written a paper detailing the functions of many of those roles as they developed during the First World War.[10]

By the 1920s social work had become a more common designation and Elizabeth Macadam noted in relation to training that its 'great diversity' caused considerable difficulty in the provision of training. As a consequence she suggested that '…some forms of social work require more specialization than others, and some from the nature of their functions are gradually becoming differentiated into independent

professions…'.[11] She regarded industrial welfare as 'the best illustration of a department of social work which is rapidly becoming an independent profession', approving of the newly formed Welfare Workers' Institute statement about the need for qualifications.[12] Although she argued that there were a number of departments of the civil service which, in dealing with 'personal needs and social conditions' could reasonably be regarded as social work (and potentially in local government as services expanded), Elizabeth Macadam also referred to the work as public administration. Moreover, she approved of the recently formed Institute of Public Administration's statement about the importance of social study for '[t]he vocational or professional practice of public administration'.[13] Her discussion of health visitors (who also had a representative body) expressed reservations about their changing role, noting that although the original focus of their work had been social rather than medical the emphasis was changing to a health function: she preferred to emphasise the importance of the social and preventive work of health visitors. In contrast, Elizabeth Macadam noted the significance for social work of the systematic form of training required by the Institute of Hospital Almoners, acknowledging its specialised nature (although referring to the very small number of hospital almoners) but advocating that it could become a model for the future. Although Elizabeth Macadam acknowledged that some occupational groups were leading to even greater diversification, she did not take the opportunity of discussing the implications of this other than to emphasise the importance of common social principles arising from a period of social study. In *The Equipment of the Social Worker* there is minimal information about the specific roles and

---

[10] D. Burnham, The Great War: Suffrage, Surveillance and the First Crisis in Social Work, in *Bulletin of the Social Work History Network*, 3, 2 (December 2016).

[11] Macadam, *The Equipment*, p. 113.
[12] *Ibid*., p. 113 and p. 121.
[13] *Ibid*., p. 126.

tasks of social workers and no blueprint of how the 'new profession' could develop.[14]

That issue is illustrated by a second issue which arises in the text, which relates to the contrast between the basis of social study education and training in the UK with the approach in the United States (US). Elizabeth Macadam suggested that because of the early location of UK social work training in the universities there was an emphasis on grounding in social principles through academic study. Whereas social work training in the US developed mainly in schools of social work, often developed in association with agencies, staffed by practitioners and was based more on 'technique', in particular case work. Elizabeth Macadam therefore looked forward to the time when teachers in the UK were both practitioners and philosophers. However, in addition to not addressing the specific roles and tasks of social workers, neither does she refer elsewhere in the text to any development of case work in the UK.

Although Elizabeth Macadam continued to support the development of social work her principal concern in *The Equipment of the Social Worker* therefore appears to be the development of social study by a wide range of occupational groups and based on her advocacy of social reform more widely. Regrettably, in her subsequent text she reported that departments of social study were found in only ten universities and that even though State provision of welfare had increased, with a few exceptions, new training requirements had not been introduced.[15]

Dr Mike Burt is a member of the SWHN Steering Group and Honorary Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Health and Social Care, University of Chester.

---

[14] I have addressed the development of some occupational groups in M. Burt, Social Work Occupations in England, 1900-39: Changing the Focus, *International Social Work*, 51, 6 (2008).

[15] E. Macadam, *The New Philanthropy* (1934), London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., p. 293.

"Curating our past to create our future"

Gaby Zavoli of BASW writes:

A proposed application for a heritage lottery funded project for BASW centred around the history and heritage of social work and BASW as an organisation, focusing on its past and creating further engagement opportunities for its future, for BASW jubilee year 2020.

We would like to propose a Heritage Lottery Funded bid to be written for BASW. This would involve applying to the Heritage Lottery Fund for a sum of money to fund a project to be produced to train volunteers, create an exhibition, build a legacy project (be that a social work hub or something to further develop new opportunities), using partner and affiliate organisations such as museums, community groups and schools, creating an oral histories archive of social workers stories and putting together a physical archive involving documents held.

Ruth Allen (BASW Chief Executive) and Gaby Zavoli (BASW Membership Officer) have met to discuss ideas for legacy projects for BASW involving the wider community giving the organisation a greater reach and helping to acknowledge the changing work undertaken by social workers around the UK. This has also involved an interesting discussion with some BASW founding members regarding previous research done by the Social Work History Network and interesting ideas for a project taking BASW into its jubilee year. This bid would focus on BASW and social work around the UK from the very beginnings of a professional association to the present day moving forward in to the future. This will be a legacy project.

We believe a legacy project would be wonderful for BASW going into its golden jubilee year of 2020. This project will be UK-wide.

We are holding an open day on 12 May 2018 at the BASW offices in Birmingham for members to discuss the proposed project and collate suggestions and ideas for the project. This will be held between 12pm and 4pm on Saturday 12 May 2018 at the BASW offices, 37 Wellesley House, Waterloo Street, Birmingham, B2 5PP.

If you are unable to attend the event, but you would like to send suggestions regarding what you would like to see included in the project, please contact Gaby Zavoli via email: gabriella.zavoli@basw.co.uk

Bulletin of the Social Work History Network

2018 Volume 5, Issue 1