

Developing an enquiring social work practice

Developing an enquiring social work practice

Practitioners, researchers and users as scientific partners

Peter Marsh

Co-referaat: Geert van der Laan



Bohn Stafleu van Loghum

Houten 2007

© Bohn Stafleu van Loghum, 2007

Alle rechten voorbehouden. Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden verveelvoudigd, opgeslagen in een geautomatiseerd gegevensbestand, of openbaar gemaakt, in enige vorm of op enige wijze, hetzij elektronisch, mechanisch, door fotokopieën of opnamen, hetzij op enige andere manier, zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van de uitgever. Voor zover het maken van kopieën uit deze uitgave is toegestaan op grond van artikel 16b Auteurswet 1912 j^o het Besluit van 20 juni 1974, Stb. 351, zoals gewijzigd bij het Besluit van 23 augustus 1985, Stb. 471 en artikel 17 Auteurswet 1912, dient men de daarvoor wettelijk verschuldigde vergoedingen te voldoen aan de Stichting Reprorecht (Postbus 3051, 2130 KB Hoofddorp). Voor het overnemen van (een) gedeelte(n) uit deze uitgave in bloemlezingen, readers en andere compilatiewerken (artikel 16 Auteurswet 1912) dient men zich tot de uitgever te wenden.

Samensteller(s) en uitgever zijn zich volledig bewust van hun taak een betrouwbare uitgave te verzorgen. Niettemin kunnen zij geen aansprakelijkheid aanvaarden voor drukfouten en andere onjuistheden die eventueel in deze uitgave voorkomen.

ISBN 978 90 313 5207 4
NUR 741

Ontwerp binnenwerk: TEFF (www.teff.nl)
Ontwerp omslag: Studio Bassa, Culemborg

Automatische opmaak: Pre Press, Zeist

Bohn Stafleu van Loghum
Het Spoor 2
Postbus 246
3990 GA Houten

www.bsl.nl

Inhoud

Een woord vooraf	1
Developing an enquiring social work practice	3
The three bases for social work practice	4
The research base in social work	4
User views	4
Using and promoting research within social work education	5
Experiments in the real world	5
Research expenditure in social work: comparisons in the UK	6
Why so little research expenditure within social work?	7
The value of research	8
Things change, stuff happens: the special nature of social science research	8
Partnership practice and social work research	9
Science and social work: process and product	9
Social science and the evidence	10
Helping practitioners, users, and academics think better	10
The problems of self perception	11
What needs to change?	11
What would an enquiring practice achieve? An early example	11
The enquiring mind and problem solving knowledge	12
The results of an enquiring practice	13
The social work developments	13
Building on the inheritance: Family Group Conferences	14
The enquiring mind: problem solving knowledge in Family Group Conferences	15
Building on the inheritance: task centred social work	15

The enquiring mind: problem solving knowledge in task centred social work	16
Promoting an enquiring social work practice	16
Social work in 2020 as an enquiring practice	17
References	18
Onderzoeken en ondervinden	19
Praktijken	19
Partnerschap	19
Werkt onderzoek?	19
De speciale aard van sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek	20
Praktijken	20
Rationaliteit	20
Experience	21
Inbedding	21
Typen kennis en organisatie	22
De Marie Kamphuis Stichting (MKS)	25
De bijzondere leerstoel	25
MKS-lezing en MKS-prijs	26
MKS-website en MKS-archief	27

Een woord vooraf

Geheel in de lijn van de doelstelling van de Marie Kamphuis Stichting, verkent Peter Marsh in zijn lezing het belang van de verwevenheid van het uitvoerend maatschappelijk werk en onderzoek. Het gaat dan niet om onderzoek dat zich afspeelt in laboratoriumsituaties, ver van de complexe, verwarrende werkelijkheid, waarin het maatschappelijk werk plaatsvindt.

Nee, hij pleit voor onderzoek, nog meer eigenlijk voor onderzoekende geesten die met een open mind die complexe werkelijkheid benaderen. Onderzoekers die geboeid zijn door wat er precies in de praktijk gebeurt, die proberen duidelijk te krijgen wat wel werkt en wat niet en waarom dat zo is. Hij pleit voor werkers die in partnership met onderzoekers niet vasthouden aan routinematige zekerheden, maar die bereid zijn hun eigen praktijkhandelingen kritisch te beschouwen. Hij pleit voor het zoveel mogelijk betrekken van de cliënten, de users van het maatschappelijk werk, zoals hij ze noemt, bij het verwoorden van waar zij mee zitten en bij het zoeken naar een zo gericht mogelijke aanpak ervan.

Marsh is van mening dat op het gebied van het social work te weinig onderzoek plaatsvindt. Hij pleit voor meer passend en toepasbaar onderzoek.

In zijn co-referaat legt Van der Laan verbindingen tussen de praktijken van de cliënt, van de werker en van de onderzoeker. Vervolgens pleit hij voor een ‘expressieve rationaliteit’ als aanvulling op technische en normatieve professionaliteit.

Naast evidence wordt ook experience als kennisbron gezien. Inbedding van onderzoek in de praktijk is bepalend voor de manier waarin de praktijk actief gebruik maakt van kennis.

Een en ander leidt tot de vraag onder welke voorwaarden je een vruchtbare dialoog (multiloog) tussen cliënten, praktijkwerkers en onderzoekers kunt opbouwen.

Lou Jagt

Secretaris Marie Kamphuis Stichting

Developing an enquiring social work practice

Practitioners, researchers and users as scientific partners

I am very grateful for the invitation to give this lecture and honoured to follow in the path of previous lecturers. I have now spent nearly forty years in social work. Throughout this time I have had some responsibilities as a practitioner, and for the last thirty years I have had a career in teaching and research in social work at the University of Sheffield, an international centre for social science research (www.sheffield.ac.uk/socialsciences). My career has, from its earliest days, involved a concern with the connection of science and social work. I am delighted to have the privilege of this opportunity to reflect on that connection.

My principal argument will be that science has a fundamental role in social work in delivering one form of evidence that is vital for practice, and that this needs substantial investment which it is not now receiving, but I also want to argue that science has a role within the actual practice of social work which needs equal development. In the UK the funding for social work research is woefully inadequate, and arguments need to be made for its expansion, but not just for 'more of the same'. I will suggest that science has more to contribute than just products for social workers and service users to use, and that there is important value in developing within practice, amongst academics, practitioners, managers, and service users, a much greater use of research methods and research like thinking. The value of this can be seen in some of the most important development in recent decades in social work, the model of task-centred practice (taakgerichte hulpverlening – TGH), and the decision making process called Family Group Conferences (Eigen Kracht Conferenties). I will return to both of these developments, but

first we will discuss some key overall issues concerning the way that knowledge is used and developed within social work.

The three bases for social work practice

The knowledge base of social work is drawn from the three areas of:

- user views and wishes,
- professional judgement, and
- research.

All three elements will be involved in any practice situation, and be part of the practice carried out. Different degrees of importance will be given to each in different circumstances. All are important, but of course there will be many circumstances where there is little research, as we will discuss shortly.

The research base in social work

Over the past century there has been a substantial expansion of research in the social sciences, but in the UK the work that is directly relevant to social work, carried out by those with an involvement in social work practice, usually social work academics, has been small. Research that is directly focused on social work problems, and has direct applicability has not grown at the same rate as other social science areas. With my long standing colleague Professor Mike Fisher, from the Social Care Institute for Excellence in London, I have outlined these issues in the national report on the development of social work research which we published two years ago (Marsh & Fisher, 2005). This report argues that the lack of investment in social work research is a significant problem, but it also notes that there are particular strands to UK social work research which are of great importance, and which need to be built on. We have continued to develop this argument in a forthcoming article about the development of problem-solving knowledge in social work (see Marsh & Fisher, in press). The need to *criticise* the lack of research and to *celebrate* the nature of the research we have done, forms the underpinning of my lecture today. First lets have the celebration.

User views

The first major development in social work research that we should celebrate is its pioneering role in putting the views of service users at the heart of evaluative research. Well before other helping professions, Mayer and Timms began this work when they published a ground breaking book called ‘The Client Speaks’ (1970) which had user views as the core of a research study. This development has been an outstanding contribution from social work, and nowadays major evaluations in any of the helping professions recognise, and normally give voice to, the opinions of the service users. In

social work we can be proud that we have been amongst the very earliest in the field (see the summary in Fisher, 1983), and have made a substantial methodological contribution to a development that is now accepted as best practice. Alongside this, social work has also been an important site for the development of research that is controlled by users, and research that is carried out by users. The centrality of their views is now expressed in a variety of ways. It is of course part of the threefold basis for social work practice that I referred to earlier.

Using and promoting research within social work education

The second celebration that I wish to highlight is the continuing attempt to promote and use the fruits of social research within social work education. In other disciplines this is a relatively recent development, but we can point to at least a sixty year history of attempting this within social work. As this lecture is an opportunity for me to reflect on the lessons from my own research and career, it seems appropriate to note the comments of one of my relatives, my father, in his 1949 lecture to inaugurate the new School of Social Work, Victoria University of Wellington, where he said that

'A feature of training which has in the past been neglected, but which is at last receiving the attention it deserves, is that of social research. In the last forty years tremendous advances have been made in the various fields of social activity, yet little is known of their effects.' (Marsh, 1949)

There is a long and proud history of the many different ways that social work education has tried to place research at its heart, and as this lecture progresses it will become clear that I regard that attempt as a very important base for future development. Again, in common with the pioneering work in user views, the professional education that we are discussing here will help within the three fold base for practice.

Experiments in the real world

Social work research is normally undertaken in very difficult environments where people are under great pressure and stress, and it is remarkable that in this context the research has pioneered, well before others considered it was practical, the use of controlled experiments in a community setting. Over forty years ago Tilda Goldberg conducted a random control trial in a social, rather than medical setting, to test the value of different forms of training for work with older people (Goldberg, 1970). This is a major contribution to the development of applied social research, and to the knowledge base of social work.

Overall social work in the UK has a substantial history to be proud of, in its attempts to intertwine developments in research with the world of practice. In the work on user views can be seen elements of the partnership base that is now a prominent part of UK social work, and an area we will return to later. In the work in education we can see a central role for research in professional training, and in attempting experiments we can see methods developments that have been at the cutting edge of research, and are attuned to the needs of practice.

Clearly there is good research within social work, but while the quality may be good is the quantity satisfactory?

Research expenditure in social work: comparisons in the UK

For decades UK social work academics have complained that there is not enough research, and particularly not enough relevant research. I suspect the same complaints are heard in other countries. Around five years ago a national debate began in the UK about this issue, led by the specialist body representing social work academics, and my colleague Professor Fisher and I began work on providing a more detailed analysis of the funding picture. The reasons for needing a substantial research base are very similar in social work as they are in medicine. Social work decisions have substantial, and often long term effects on people's lives, and all the arguments that doctors have, quite rightly, put forward for the need for research in health have equal validity within social work (see Marsh & Fisher, 2005: 3-4). The best comparator area in health is primary care. This area covers community based health services, in the UK provided by doctors who are general practitioners, and who work in local surgeries alongside nurses and others. This service is a front line one, dealing directly with the public, like social work, it covers a very wide range of problems, like social work, its practice has a complex connection to knowledge needing a diverse range of research methods, like social work.

So what is the comparative picture between health in general, primary care in particular, and social work? A commonly accepted measure for appropriate levels of research expenditure is to look at research as a percentage of total service expenditure. In the UK the Government recommends that this should be at least 2.5% in all sectors, and in health this is greatly exceeded (with of course major expenditure from the pharmaceutical companies). However in social services, which deliver social work in the UK, it is nowhere near met, as can be seen from the table. Health overall contributes 5.3% of service expenditure to research, while social services contributes 0.3%, a difference of around 17 times. Maybe this is primarily a result of the large pharmaceutical expenditure. What is the expenditure that the Government alone makes? Well this is around 0.6% in health, and 0.04% in social services, still a difference of around 16 times. How much each year is spent directly by

the UK government providing research for general practice doctors and how much for social workers? Well there is about £1,450 for each Doctor, and £60 for each social worker. This time the difference is over 24 times.

Table 1			Research expenditure in health and social services in the UK		
<i>Overall R&D expenditure as % of total service expenditure</i>					<i>Ratio</i>
<i>Health</i>		<i>Social Services</i>			
5.36%		0.31%			17.19
<i>Government direct R&D as % of total service expenditure</i>					
<i>Health</i>		<i>Social Services</i>			
0.64%		0.04%			16.00
<i>Government direct R&D per head for GPs and Social Workers</i>					
<i>General Practitioners</i>		<i>Social Workers</i>			
£ 1,465.73		£ 60.22			24.34

All figures from Marsh and Fisher, 2005:25

These figures are stark, and show the major changes that are needed over the coming years. Given the strong and longstanding needs of social work how has this very imbalanced situation come about?

Why so little research expenditure within social work?

It is worth spending a few moments to consider the possible reasons for this utterly inadequate level of funding, as the reasons why it has come about could form continuing blockages to future funding development (see Marsh and Fisher, in press). Undoubtedly there has been a major problem of lack of co-ordination of different funders and lack of a national strategic approach in this area. No one has had responsibility for the overall area, and no one has seen the big picture. There may also be attitudinal issues concerning a view, probably more implicit than explicit, that the low economic status of many of the social services users makes them somehow less deserving than, say, medical patients. There may also be issues of a lack of understanding of the nature of social problems, with a mistaken view that somehow they are much simpler than health ones. Finally there may also, in the English speaking world in particular, be an assumption that the

substantial body of work from the USA makes up for local work, a view which implies a level of transferability which may be over-optimistic in the context of very different US and European social and health policies, and indeed cultures.

These and other arguments against increased funding need to be kept in mind as we develop the case for increases over the coming years, but now let us turn to a more detailed examination of that case and the ways that research will contribute to better services.

The value of research

Increasing the research base would provide key products for the developments of the best social work services.

There can be major contributions to *effectiveness*, although the likelihood of simple ‘do x and get y’ research messages in the complex social world is not high. Despite this some very clear messages have emerged, not least in the area of *ineffectiveness* of seemingly effective programmes which seem on the face of it to be self-evidently worthwhile. One of the best known examples is the ‘Scared Straight’ approach to juvenile crime, where ex-prisoners talk to first time offenders to scare them off a life of crime ... and where studies showed that it actually made future offending more likely. We do need many more evaluations of intervention programmes.

There can also be major contributions to *efficiency*, providing a simpler way of doing things to the benefit of all. Comparing different routes to the same goal is a valuable way of making sure we are doing things efficiently.

It is also important to test *popularity*, which alongside the necessity of effectiveness, and the benefits of efficiency, is a vital ingredient in decisions about practice.

We need to evaluate, compare, and survey, to promote effectiveness, efficiency and popularity within our practice. But I want to argue that research can provide even more than this, therefore making the case for increased expenditure on social work research even stronger.

Things change, stuff happens: the special nature of social science research

The research that delivers the products that we have talked about so far is social science research. This research has developed ways of managing the difficult, and nearly always uncontrolled, social world that it operates within. It recognises human agency and emotion, for example, as central factors

to be understood, and perhaps controlled for, in all its studies. In allowing for the fact that people take decisions and have emotions in the real world, and that things do not stand still while we study them, there are strong parallels with the world of social work practice.

People need to play an active role in social services, not just be passive recipients, it is not the same as being anaesthetised and operated on (although a surprising range of social issues can affect apparently controlled medical environments). People change as programmes develop, when you ‘mend’ one thing it often means another problem arises; so good services recognise the constant need to *pay attention to changing circumstances*. Finally people need to *feel safe* in the intimate discussions that can occur, and when they engage with potentially threatening aspects of their social world.

All of these issues are also tackled by the social scientist. In settings outside the laboratory the science becomes more complex. Understanding social actions, events, and causes is highly challenging for reasons that social work practitioners understand very well.

Partnership practice and social work research

Practitioners face the challenge of understanding the social world in a partnership with service users. The idea of partnership practice is central within modern UK social work, in legislation, practice, research and social work education. The argument that I am putting forward here extends that partnership to research and researchers. Good social science research fits well with partnership practice, an enquiring mind in a partnership approach, and enquiring minds from all partners.

Science and social work: process and product

What is the implication of this close affinity between social science and social work, and between social work research and partnership practice in particular? I want to suggest that the affinity offers the opportunity to help with the incredible diversity faced in social work practice, where there will always be known unknowns, but also unknown unknowns. Practitioners and users need to develop a partnership for the best practice, and I want to argue that the partnership will benefit from the addition of the researcher to the initial pair, not least because it will help us ‘know what we know’.

There is more to the contribution of research to practice than just research studies as products.

Social science and the evidence

The argument about the value of social science research as both process and product has been developed in a seminal book by Gilovich (1993), called *'How we know what isn't so'*. His arguments are worth laying out in some detail, as the general case he makes is, in my view, particularly relevant in social work.

In a key passage he says:

'There is indeed much to admire about the progress made in the "hard" sciences - progress that the social sciences will likely never match. Nevertheless, it is important to acknowledge that there is a special benefit from studying the messy, complex phenomena that constitute the subject matter of the social sciences. Dealing with such irregular, uncertain phenomena has led to a number of methodological innovations. Social scientists are generally more familiar than those in other fields with how easy it is to be misled by the evidence of everyday experience, and they are more aware of the methodological controls that are necessary before one can draw firm conclusions from a set of data.' (Gilovich,1993:193)

Social sciences play a key role in helping in social work via their particular ability to help with the skilled thinking that is inevitably involved in the particularly complex social world of practice.

Helping practitioners, users, and academics think better

I have already suggested that there may be some, including some who control research finance, who think that social problems are somehow easier to understand and solve than health problems. This may well be why programmes persist that appear so self-evidently right, but which in practice do little good and maybe even harm (such as the 'Scared Straight' intervention). Programmes that are designed to help with parenting are another case, where good intentioned work is clearly not enough, as some approaches are notably more effective than others (see Utting et al, 2007: 7). But isn't this just the effectiveness argument that was made earlier? It is, but it also depends on a scepticism about our self-perception of practice, where we stand back from the undoubtedly well-intentioned to ask, regularly, whether or not we are achieving the desired outcomes. Good intentions are not enough, and to make sure we are doing our best in social work we need the attitudes, the thought processes, and sometimes the methods, of the social scientist.

This is because of complexity, but it is also because our commitment to our own perceptions is often unhealthily strong. We want to believe that we do well, especially when we intend well. But the reality may be very different from the perception, and in social work we need to know that.

The problems of self perception

Gilovich examines this problem of self perception and his arguments are again worth noting in some detail, when he says that:

'We tend to believe that we possess a host of socially desirable characteristics, and that we are free of most of those that are socially undesirable. For example, a large majority of the general public thinks that they are more intelligent (Wylie, 1979) more fair-minded (Liebrand et al, 1986) less prejudiced (Fields & Schuman, 1976) and more skilled behind the wheel of an automobile (Svenson, 1981) than the average person. ... A survey of one million high-school seniors found that 70% thought they were above average in leadership ability, and only 2% thought they were below average. In terms of ability to get along with others, all students thought they were above average, 60% thought they were in the top 10%, and 25% thought they were in the top 1%! (Princeton College Board, 1977) Lest one think that such inflated self-assessments occur only in the minds of callow high-school students, it should be pointed out that a survey of university professors found that 94% thought they were better at their jobs than their average colleague (Cross, 1977).'
(Gilovich, 1993:77)

Practitioners, service users and researchers need to work together to make sure that they are not victims of this phenomenon, they need enquiring minds and not just the products of enquiry.

What needs to change?

How might we go about making both product and process of research relevant? The good news is that trying to do both things will work well.

The best way to expand the production of research is to spread knowledge of the process of research.

We need to use the under-used resources of practitioners, improve the under-developed resources of academia, and develop the abilities of the user. We will return to some detail about this in the final stages of this lecture, but the overall aims are clear: we will need practitioners that understand research, researchers that understand practice, and users that understand both.

What would an enquiring practice achieve? An early example

What might we expect from the development of this enquiring practice? We have some good examples within social work, but others have been here before, and we should learn from them, and use the benefits they found to make the case within our profession. Lets look at one of the earliest examples in health, where the results were obvious, dramatic, and very welcome. It is a

story that you may know, but if so it is worth repeating as it demonstrates so well the idea of an inquiring practice.

In the 1840s, maternity deaths during child birth were distressingly high, with up to 30% of women dying, in some settings, from puerperal childbed fever. A Viennese hospital reduced these deaths in a short period of enquiring practice to just 1%. We will look at how this was achieved.

The enquiring mind and problem solving knowledge

In a mid 19C Viennese Hospital, Josef Semmelweis, the Doctor in charge of an ‘obstetrical’ clinic, was very concerned that there were a substantial number of deaths from puerperal childbed fever amongst the mothers to be in the hospital wards. Crucially he noticed that the two wards in the hospital had very different rates of mortality. It should be added that the pregnant women noted this as well, and problems were arising as they tried to choose the ‘better’ ward! Semmelweis began his enquiry by asking if there was a regular pattern, or was this just a dreadful phenomenon in some particular years, and this is what he found.

Table 2			
<i>Puerperal fever mortality rates</i>	1844	1845	1846
Ward one	8.2%	6.8%	11.4%
Ward two	2.3%	2.0%	2.7%

So the situation on the each ward was very different, and continued to be so, in each year. He also noted a relatively low level of mortality from the fever among those giving birth outside the hospital. Something in one hospital ward appeared to be the problem. He began to explore the reasons why the deaths might be occurring, working through various options. He was prepared both to enquire (for example were the deaths due to overcrowding, causing infection to spread, but actually ward two was the most crowded, not least because the pregnant women were very keen to avoid ward one! ... an example of the enquiring patient that we will return to), and to experiment (for example he speculated that deaths may have been due to shock, following the priest walking through the ward ringing the bell and prominently giving the last sacraments, but when he persuaded the priest not to use the bell, and to be discreet, deaths did not fall).

The results of an enquiring practice

Semmelweis continued theorising and experimenting, he continued his enquiring practice, leading to a final experiment designed to improve hygiene on ward one, where doctors would typically move directly from autopsies, without washing, to undertake examinations of the women (the other ward was predominantly staffed by nurses, who did not conduct autopsies). When staff started washing their hands, in chlorinated lime, deaths fell dramatically and in 1848 there was a 1.27% death rate in ward one, and 1.33% in ward two.

Table 3	
<i>Puerperal fever mortality rates</i>	1848
Ward one	1.27%
Ward two	1.33%

Underlying this success story was an enquiring mind, that looked at problem regularities, asked questions about what might help, explored them theoretically and tested the resultant ideas through analysis and experiment. It is interesting to note that others in the medical profession did not accept his findings for a substantial period, but that would be the subject of a different lecture.

Semmelweis was both a researcher engaged in practice, and a practitioner engaged with research. And service users were doing their own studies of the impact of the lack of research!!

The social work developments

The social work field has, of course, a shorter history of enquiring practice, and has not achieved nearly enough in this area despite some pioneering work as I have outlined. However from the earliest days there have been calls to develop practice along the lines I am proposing here.

Mary Richmond, in 1917, in her major account of the methods underpinning social work, *Social Diagnosis*, argued that we should build on:

'the evident desire of social workers to abandon claim to respect based upon good intentions alone; we should meet halfway their earnest endeavors to subject the processes of their task to critical analysis; and should encourage them to measure their work by the best standards supplied by experience...' (Richmond, 1917: 25).

Social work in the UK has not universally developed along these lines, and indeed has clearly not yet won the arguments for funding of research, and teaching of research methods. Some areas, for example the use of social learning theory and of single case experimental designs have shown promising developments but are far from mainstream practice. However at least two areas of enquiring practice have developed substantially, and although they are far from universally applied, they do indicate the promise of the model I am proposing here. Both represent a combination of evidence-based practice and partnership practice. Both represent the combination of research product and process. Both have involved practitioners, academics and service users working together in a variety of ways to develop practice. I shall now turn to these two areas, covering Family Group Conferences (Eigen Kracht Conferenties) and task-centred practice (taakgerichte hulpverlening – TGH), before concluding with some key lessons from this work that would help develop the model of enquiring practice over the coming years.

Building on the inheritance: Family Group Conferences

Family Group Conferences (FGCs) are a decision making process, designed for situations where there are serious social problems, and most developed in the field of child welfare (but also covering adult care, mental health, criminal justice and other areas).

They developed via user pressure in New Zealand, they used the best research in continuing development, and in their nearly twenty year development in the UK and elsewhere they have continued to improve via a process of enquiry, and an alliance of researchers, practitioners and service users.

The Conferences are convened by an independent co-ordinator, who arranges a meeting of extended family and professionals. The meeting has detailed preparation, good information, private time for the family, and aims to develop a plan to meet relevant needs agreed by all the family and fully endorsed by the professionals. Nearly all of the Conferences do agree such a plan.

This brief summary hides the enormous complexity of doing this work in the messy situations of all families, and the type of problems that come the way of Family Group Conferences.

Research on the Conferences (Marsh and Crow, 1998) has involved questions such as the following:

- Can you get the family involved?
- Can you cover all types of problems?
- Do you get agreement on reasonable plans?

(the answer to these questions, by the way, is ‘yes’!)

This work has fed directly into policy development, but the interesting issue for the purposes of the argument here, is that it has been closely linked with practice, and so has also been able to answer questions about what practitioners should do, and has therefore moved beyond broad outline of policy, or broad exhortation. Helping with practice development needs answers to large and small questions, which need to be rooted in the practice world.

Research funding has often come from the development projects, and been very small scale, which is welcome, but much more could have been done if large scale funding had been available. The practitioners, the researchers, and the families involved have met at conferences, all parties to the process have conducted studies, and the results of these studies have in turn been debated by all the parties, with the practice continuing to improve as a result. There has been a real partnership development in this area.

The enquiring mind: problem solving knowledge in Family Group Conferences

We can point to a number of key practice lessons that have been learnt as a result of the enquiring practice in FGCs (Marsh, in press). They show the value of using social science in social work via a partnership between practitioners, researchers and service users. What are some of these lessons?

We know much more about ‘who is family?’ and how to explore this question. We can help the professionals coming to the Conferences because we understand more about their concerns, and the best ways for them to convey information to the participants. We can be careful about meeting location, as we now realise some of the complications that can arise if particular types of places are used for the Conferences (for example what might be thought of as ‘neutral’ territory and what is definitely not). We know that private time for the family to consider the issues is a vital element of the process, and that a range of potential difficulties around this can be overcome even in potentially very fraught circumstances. The practice and the research are developing hand in hand.

Building on the inheritance: task centred social work

My second example concerns a model of practice that now has over forty years of development behind it, and has had some access to larger scale research funding over that time, also with highly successful outcomes, and near universal applicability in social work. Task-centred social work is probably taught in every UK University programme. It is a product of the fruitful relationship of science and social work.

What is this model of social work? In brief summary: a task-centred practitioner would negotiate appropriate programmes of help, and provide work based on an agreement between the worker and the service user. The work would address specific problems, and specify the goals to be achieved. When necessary these problems and goals would include those required by the law or by a court. The work would then proceed in a series of incremental steps, involving specific tasks, as part of an overall plan, towards the agreed goals.

This brief summary, hides the enormous complexity of doing this work in practice, and just as with Family Group Conferences, translating it into practice needs continued development.

The enquiring mind: problem solving knowledge in task centred social work

Task-centred work began from one of the clearest examples of the link between social science and practice with Bill Reid's experimental social work PhD, which was completed in 1963. Development has continued via practitioners conducting research, post-graduate students undertaking projects, large scale projects based in practice research units, and via work with service users on models of partnership practice (for example Marsh and Fisher, 1992). In recent work we have looked at the ways that practitioners could use portfolios of examples from their own practice to help us understand the best ways of promoting and implementing the model (Marsh & Doel, 2005).

So what might this example, and that of Family Group Conferences, indicate for future developments? How can we really make these practice models mainstream, and enhance the partnership of researcher, practitioner and service user that lies at the heart of them.

The lessons indicate the need for the promotion not just of the use of research but of the production and development of research, and not just research from the academics, but from practitioners and from service users.

Promoting an enquiring social work practice

We need to rediscover and promote our history of enquiring social work, and actively combat any claims that we need less or no research in our profession. We need to add to the money available for research, because this can clearly deliver better services, and we need to make sure that this money provides an increase in the ability to do and use research as well ... not just for academic researchers but for practitioners and for service users. There are many positive developments in service user involvement in enquiring practice that we could cover, but that would need another lecture about, for example, the

resourcefulness of service users and their links with research (Muir Gray, 2002), or ways that service users are now conducting research themselves.

So we have a good story to tell, a strong case, and a range of developments that we can and should build on. If we can tell the story, convey the case, and build on the developments what might social work look like in a decade or so from now?

Social work in 2020 as an enquiring practice

In 2020 we would have fully recognised the need for research in social work to be considered for its value as process as well as product. There would be a partnership in research between academics, practitioners and service users to deliver both process and product, combining evidence based practice and partnership practice.

Practitioners would be taught to analyse and think through problems in a scientific way, as appropriate to partnership based practice. There would be research training in qualifying courses, and funds for small scale research projects. National conferences and events would encourage dialogues between practitioners, users and researchers.

Academics would be engaged with practice so that they can relate well to practice concerns and consider relevance and applicability as key ingredients of research work. They would be equipped with skills to undertake practice research, and be able to bid for access to substantially increased research funding, with some of them working in dedicated practice research units.

Service users would have access to many different ways of accessing research information, and for those who wanted to engage more directly in research there would be relevant training available. Some would be engaged as research advisers, and some would conduct research. Some of them would not just conduct research, but engage in the teaching of research to others.

Assuming that you think the arguments that I have put forward make this desirable is it really attainable? Of course I cannot guarantee this, but I can point to work in the UK that is developing the foundations. The UK now has a national academic social work research strategy, and a review of the training for research. There is some finance available for small scale practice research projects, via primary care sources. There is a national conference involving practitioners, researchers and users. There is likely to be a national inquiry into new funding options for social work research, and there is a new national collaborating body for research funders. Service users do have better access to research information via the Social Care Institute for Excellence, and there is a national body, called INVOLVE, supporting their direct engagement in research.

These are all key parts of the foundation, they are strategies, surveys, discussions, or small scale starts. They all point in the right direction, and it does not seem unrealistic to aim by the year 2020 for a practice of social work where the science was genuinely intrinsic, and social work was comprehensively an enquiring practice.

References

- Cross, P. (1977). Not can but will college teaching be improved? *New directions for Higher Education*. Spring, 17, 1-15.
- Fields, J.M. & H. Schuman (1976) Public beliefs about the beliefs of the public. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 40, 427-48
- Fisher, M., Ed. (1983). *Speaking of Clients*. Social Services Monographs: Research in Practice. Sheffield, Joint Unit for Social Services Research, University of Sheffield.
- Gilovich, T. (1993). *How We Know What Isn't So*. New York, The Free Press.
- Goldberg, E. (1970). *Helping the Aged*. London, George Allen and Unwin.
- Liebrand, W.B.G, D.M. Messick, & F.J.M. Wolters (1986) Why we are fairer than others: A cross-cultural replication and extension. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 590-604
- Marsh, D. C. (1949). *Inaugural Lecture: Social Work, Its Aims and Methods*. Wellington, New Zealand, Victoria University.
- Marsh, P. (in press). Engaging Children, Young People and their Families via Family Group Conferences in Calder, M.C., Ed. *The Carrot or the Stick? Towards Effective Practice with Involuntary Clients in Safeguarding Children Work*. Lyme Regis, Russell House Publishing.
- Marsh, P. and G. Crow (1998). *Family Group Conferences in Child Welfare*. Oxford, Blackwell Science.
- Marsh, P. and M. Doel (2005). *The Task-Centred Book*. London, Routledge.
- Marsh, P. and M. Fisher (in press). The Development of Problem-solving Knowledge for Social Care Practice. *British Journal of Social Work* 38(5).
- Marsh, P. and M. Fisher (2005). *Developing the Evidence for Social Work and Social Care Practice*. London, Social Care Institute for Excellence.
- Marsh, P. and M. Fisher (1992). *Good Intentions: developing partnership in social services*. York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Mayer, J. E. and N. Timms (1970). *The Client Speaks*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Muir Gray, J. A. (2002). *The Resourceful Patient*. Oxford, Rosetta Press.
- Princeton College Board (1977). *1976-1977 Student descriptive questionnaire*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Reid, W. J. (1963). *An Experimental Study of Methods Used in Casework Treatment*, Columbia University School of Social Work, New York, U.S.A.
- Richmond, M. (1917). *Social Diagnosis*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.
- Svenson, O. (1981). Are we all less risky and more skillful than our fellow drivers? *Acta Psychologica*, 47, 143-48.
- Utting, D., H. Monteiro, et al. (2007). *Interventions for children at risk of developing an antisocial personality disorder*. London, Policy Research Bureau.
- Wylie, R.C. (1979). *The self-concept (Vol. 2): Theory and research on selected topics*. Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press.

Onderzoeken en ondervinden

Co-referaat bij de Marie Kamphuis-lezing door Peter Marsh op 21 november 2007

Geert van der Laan

De lezing heeft als titel: *Developing an enquiring social work practice: practitioners, researchers and users as scientific partners.*

Marsh behandelt daarin een aantal centrale thema's:

Praktijken

De praktijk vormt volgens Marsh de kern van het maatschappelijk werk. Het gaat om een drievoudige onderbouwing daarvan: onderzoek, professioneel oordeelsvermogen en opvattingen en wensen van cliënten.

Partnerschap

Het is volgens hem algemeen bekend dat het partnerschap (wederkerigheid in de relatie) tussen cliënt en werker het hart vormt van *effectiviteit* (onderzoek), *ethiek* (burgerschap) en *efficiëntie* (de cliënt doet het werk). In een partnerschap beheerst geen van beiden de situatie. Ze zijn gelijkwaardig. Principes van partnerschap dienen ook in onderzoek te worden toegepast. Alleen in laboratoriumonderzoek heeft de onderzoeker de zaak volledig onder controle. Wat we nodig hebben zijn praktijkwerkers met gevoel voor onderzoek en onderzoekers met inzicht in de praktijk. Hij spreekt over een onderzoekers-praktijkwerkers-continuüm. Aan beide kanten dienen er veranderingen doorgevoerd te worden.

Werkt onderzoek?

Er zijn volgens Marsh drie hoofdproblemen: (a) te weinig onderzoek (b) te weinig passend onderzoek (c) te weinig toepasbaar onderzoek. We hebben behoefte aan meer onderzoek, maar dat moet vooral adequaat zijn, toepas-

baar en relevant. Onderzoekers moeten in staat zijn zich in de uitdagingen in de praktijk te verdiepen en de taal van de praktijk te beheersen. Taakgericht werken als voorbeeld.

De speciale aard van sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek

Het bijzondere van onderzoek buiten het laboratorium is dat mensen (objecten) veranderen tijdens de interventie. Marsh zoekt dan ook naar een ‘combination of evidence-based practice and partnership practice’.

Er zijn nogal wat overeenkomsten tussen de UK en Nederland. Er zijn bijvoorbeeld voor het maatschappelijk werk weinig fondsen voor onderzoek. Ondanks de inspanningen van de bestuursvoorzitter van de NVMW, Theo Roes, blijft het – in vergelijking met andere sectoren – onder de maat. Een belangrijke impuls komt van de instelling van de lectoraten in het HBO. Van de kant van de wetenschap is er de laatste tijd veel belangstelling ontstaan voor praktische logica en professionele logica. De situatie is dus niet ongunstig.

Marsh pleit voor meer onderzoek. Dat zal iedereen onderschrijven. Maar wat voor onderzoek? Welke kennisagenda houdt het maatschappelijk werk erop na? En wat is adequaat onderzoek?

Een paar opmerkingen hierover.

Praktijken

Er is inderdaad sprake van drie maatschappelijke praktijken: de praktijk van de cliënt, van de werker en van de onderzoeker. Wat deze verbindt is wat mij betreft ‘burgerschap’: de cliënt als burger, de professional als burger (institutioneel burgerschap) en de onderzoeker als burger. Het gaat om de (gezamenlijke) bijdrage aan een democratische rechts- en verzorgingsstaat.

Dat levert verschillende rechten en plichten op en daarmee samenhangend een ‘gelaagdheid’ in de communicatie. Ieder heeft eigen verantwoordelijkheden en eigen expertise en ‘kennismacht’.

Rationaliteit

De tweede verbinding wordt gevormd door de aard van de rationaliteit in die rollen: een brede (zowel feiten, normen als expressies) of smalle rationaliteit (instrumentele doelrationaliteit). Ik wil een pleidooi voeren voor ‘expressieve professionaliteit’, als aanvulling op technische en normatieve professionaliteit. Expressieve rationaliteit betekent dat je jezelf in het geding brengt. Je reageert op de zelfomschrijving van de cliënt door je te uiten over wat de cliënt met je doet, wat hij of zij bij jou teweegbrengt. Dat is een kwestie van

‘ervaren’. De ervaring is een belangrijke kennisbron voor uitvoerend werkers.

Experience

Er is de laatste tijd veel belangstelling voor de status van ‘ervaring’ in het wetenschappelijke wereldje. Tegenover evidence wordt er gepleit voor experience als kennisbron. Denk aan Huizinga’s *ervaring* van de middeleeuwen (herfsttij, ondergaande zon enz.). Wat is de status van ervaring van cliënten, praktijkwerkers en onderzoekers? Hoe valt dat te verbinden? Hoe kunnen een casus als nieuw en onverwacht ervaren? Een combinatie van onderzoeken en ondervinden.

Kunnen we spreken van ‘de cliënt als object’ en ‘de professional en de onderzoeker als subject’? als ik Marsh goed begrijp, moeten we van het subject-objectschema af. We zijn zowel subject als object. Vandaar mijn titel: *Ervaren en ondervinden*.

Marsh verwijst herhaaldelijk naar het belang van de taakgerichte hulpverlening. In mijn visie is de taakgerichte hulpverlening een handelingsmodel van het maatschappelijk werk. Lou Jagt is bezig daarover een mooi proefschrift te schrijven. De invloed van de Amerikaanse filosoof en pedagoog Dewey op de taakgerichte hulpverlening komt daar duidelijk uit naar voren. Bij Dewey zijn handelen en ervaren aan elkaar gekoppeld. Bernstein zei ooit: ‘The key concept in Dewey’s philosophy is experience.’ Biesta en Miedema stellen over Dewey: ‘Handelen is een noodzakelijk aspect van kennisverwerving’.

Ankersmit zegt over ervaring dat hoe wij kleuren ervaren iets anders is dan hoe we op een natuurwetenschappelijke manier kleuren beschrijven in termen van bijvoorbeeld de klassieke optica van Newton. Volgens Ankersmit gaat de ervaring gaat vooraf aan de categorieën van subject en object. Werkelijke interactie tussen subject en object (direct en onmiddellijk) ontstaat als het subject ook werkelijk ‘gevormd’ wordt door het object, zoals je hand en je vingers ook werkelijk de vorm aannemen van de vaas die je in de hand houdt.

Inbedding

Niet zozeer de methodologie, maar de inbedding van onderzoek in de praktijk is bepalend voor de manier waarop wetenschappelijke kennis ‘indaalt’ in de praktijk. Of beter gezegd: de mate waarin de praktijk (actief) gebruik maakt van kennis. Vaak is er sprake van tegengestelde belangen. De praktijk ‘wil het niet weten’. Het komt in de strategische situatie ‘even niet uit’. Op dat moment is er geen sprake van wederkerigheid op voet van gelijkheid, maar van calculerend en strategisch gedrag.

Voor onderzoekers geldt dat materiedeskundigheid (grondige kennis van het veld) cruciaal is.

In discussies over onderzoek wordt doorgaans veel nadruk gelegd op de methodologie. De uitkomsten en de implementatie van onderzoek worden echter ook sterk beïnvloed door de manier waarop de onderzochte, het onderzoek en de onderzoeker zijn *ingebed* in de context. Deze context functioneert als een Umwelt, een door de actoren geconstrueerde omgeving.

De context geeft op zijn beurt betekenis aan de feitelijke, de normatieve en de expressieve aspecten in het onderzoek. Betekenisgeving heeft een sturende werking.

In die zin is (in de wereld van zorg en welzijn) de relatie tussen hulpverlener en cliënt niet wezenlijk anders dan de relatie tussen onderzoeker en onderzochte (dikwijls in het kader van een opdracht). Inbedding betekent de omkering van de stuurrichting. Als het goed is stuurt de cliënt de professional en de onderzochte de onderzoeker. Als de laatsten hun professionele verantwoordelijkheid nemen, is het omgekeerde echter eveneens het geval. Wederkerigheid dus.

De kwaliteit van deze relaties bepaalt in hoge mate de kwaliteit van het onderzoek. Als er bijvoorbeeld sprake is van een vertrouwensrelatie, kan dat de ‘waarheidsvinding’ aanzienlijk verbeteren, omdat de onderzoeker gegevens toegespeeld krijgt waar andere onderzoekers de vinger nooit achter zullen krijgen. Tegelijkertijd kan de onderzoeker zich aanzienlijk kritischer opstellen, omdat men hem (binnen de vertrouwensrelatie) immers als zodanig accepteert.

Hetzelfde geldt voor de implementatie van de resultaten. Meestal gebeurt dat aan het eind, maar er is geen enkele reden om daar niet eens mee te beginnen. Dat geeft een veel beter zicht op de samenhang binnen de context. Implementatie is een ander woord voor inbedding, zowel aan het begin, in de loop van het proces als aan het eind van het onderzoek.

In de biologie wordt de uitwisseling tussen organisme en omgeving bijvoorbeeld aangeduid als een *embedded system*, dus een systeem dat (organisch) is ingebed in de omringende wereld. Het belang van inbedding voor het effectief functioneren van organismen is dat er een koppeling gemaakt wordt tussen cognities (de centrale processor), handelen (activiteiten) en omgeving. Ook hier: wederkerigheid.

Net zoals de cliënt een intake doet bij de hulpverlener toetst de onderzochte zijn veronderstellingen bij de onderzoeker. Reflectie daarop behoort een onderdeel van het onderzoek te zijn.

Typen kennis en organisatie

Voor zowel arbeidsorganisaties, opleidingen als beroepsverenigingen geldt dat er een relatie is tussen het type kennis (rationaliteit) dat men hanteert en het type organisatie.

Ervaringskennis (meestal impliciete kennis) gedijt vooral in een organisatie waarin managers ook afgaan op hun eigen ervaringskennis (adhocratie).

Gecodeerde en geformaliseerde kennis doet het daarentegen goed in een

‘machinebureaucratie’, zoals Minzberg het noemt. De centrale organisatieprincipes daarin zijn: specialisering, standaardisatie en beheersing.

Ingebedde kennis is gepast in een type organisatie dat de stabiliteit en de efficiëntie van een bureaucratie combineert met de flexibiliteit en de teamdynamica van een adhocratie. We zouden dit een matrix-organisatie kunnen noemen.

Welke kennis past in de professionele organisaties in het maatschappelijk werk? Marsh wijst terecht op de speciale aard van sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek: schieten op een bewegend doel vanuit een rijdende trein.

Een en ander leidt tot de vraag onder welke voorwaarden je een vruchtbare dialoog (multiloog) tussen cliënten, praktijkwerkers en onderzoekers kunt opbouwen. Aan de hand van praktijkvoorbeelden zal dat worden uitgewerkt.

De Marie Kamphuis Stichting (MKS)

De naam van Marie Kamphuis staat voor: initiatieven nemen, doorzettingsvermogen, trots zijn op het beroep maatschappelijk werker, niet aflatende inzet om dit beroep bij bestuurders en het grote publiek onder de aandacht te brengen. En niet in de laatste plaats voor het op flexibele wijze nieuwe ontwikkelingen op het terrein van methoden en technieken inpassen in de praktijk van het maatschappelijk werk in Nederland.

Het lag daarom voor de hand dat haar naam verbonden zou worden aan de in 1989 opgerichte stichting voor de vestiging van de bijzondere leerstoel ‘Grondslagen van het maatschappelijk werk’ aan de universiteit van Utrecht. Tegelijkertijd beseft het bestuur van de MKS dat deze keuze de verplichting inhoudt om niet alleen in haar naam, maar ook met de haar kenmerkende inzet en overtuigingskracht de grondslagen van het maatschappelijk werk verder uit te bouwen en het werk voor het voetlicht te brengen.

De bijzondere leerstoel

Vooruitlopend op de vestiging van de bijzondere leerstoel in 1994 werd in november 1993 het congres ‘De lerende professie’ gehouden. Daarin werd een overzicht gegeven van de stand van zaken in het Nederlandse maatschappelijk werk en naderhand verscheen een boek met dezelfde titel. Met zijn oratie ‘Leren van gevallen’ gaf bijzonder hoogleraar Geert van der Laan in 1994 de richting aan waarin volgens hem de verbinding tussen praktijk en theorie gevonden moet worden. Vanaf die tijd heeft de bezetter van de leerstoel in binnen- en buitenland een groot aantal artikelen gepubliceerd over allerlei facetten van en ontwikkelingen in het maatschappelijk werk, heeft hij deelgenomen aan talloze congressen en seminars en is hij betrokken bij vele projecten op het gebied van het maatschappelijk werk. Hij had een werkzaam aandeel in de viering van het 100 jarig bestaan van het maatschappelijk werk in Nederland en geeft mede sturing aan het project Casus Consult dat via het internet het leren van maatschappelijk werkgevallen in praktijk brengt.

De leerstoel is met ingang van 1 oktober 2005 gevestigd aan de Universiteit

voor Humanistiek in Utrecht. Geert van der Laan is ook aan deze leerstoel als bijzonder hoogleraar verbonden.

MKS-lezing en MKS-prijs

Het vestigen en instandhouden van de bijzondere leerstoel is een belangrijk maar niet het enige initiatief van de MKS. Zo organiseert zij om de twee jaar een Marie Kamphuis-lezing waarin onderwerpen op het snijvlak van maatschappelijk werk en maatschappelijke ontwikkelingen worden besproken. Ook reikt zij, eveneens om de twee jaar, de Marie Kamphuis-prijs uit aan personen of instellingen die een bijdrage hebben geleverd aan innovaties op het gebied van uitvoerend maatschappelijk werk. De eerste MKS-lezing werd gehouden op 18 november 1999 door prof.dr. Walter Lorenz van de universiteit van Cork (Ierland) en droeg als titel 'Facing up to history – social work between timeless universalism and contingent particularism'. Een co-referaat werd verzorgd door Nora van Riet.

De tweede lezing werd op 21 november 2001 gehouden door prof.dr. Jan Willem Duyvendak en had als titel 'Maatschappelijk (op)bouwwerk? De actualiteit van Marie Kamphuis en Jo Boer.' Een co-referaat werd verzorgd door drs. Lies Schilder.

De derde Marie Kamphuis-lezing werd gehouden door dr. Eileen Munroe, die als hoogleraar verbonden is aan de London School of Economics. Dr. Eileen Munroe heeft gepubliceerd over de verhouding tussen uitvoerend maatschappelijk werk (vooral over het werk in de kinderbescherming) en wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Zij is zelf afkomstig uit het maatschappelijk werk en is door haar universitaire studie overtuigd geraakt van de noodzaak dat in het maatschappelijk werk meer gebruik gemaakt dient te worden van de resultaten van wetenschappelijk onderzoek. In haar lezing nuanceert zij dit standpunt omdat in Engeland door een te eenzijdige nadruk op het toepassen van risk assessment instruments de intuïtieve skills van maatschappelijk werkers geen kans meer krijgen. Het co-referaat werd gehouden door prof.dr. Corine de Ruiter.

De vierde Marie Kamphuis-lezing werd gehouden door Rob van Pagee en Jan van Lieshout die de Eigen Kracht Conferenties voor het voetlicht brachten. Het co-referaat werd verzorgd door prof.dr. Carol van Nijnatten.

De MKS-prijs werd in 2002 gewonnen door Wil van Duuren en Janny van Heerbeek voor het project Meidengroep van Jeugd en Gezin in Gouda, in 2004 door Hilda van Spijker, Annemiek Blom, Diny Rozendal en Titia Brouwer met het project 'Dutch four' van de Academische ziekenhuizen in Utrecht, Amsterdam en Nijmegen en in 2006 door Resy Abel en Zeki Celik-kaya van de Stichting Maatschappelijke Dienstverlening in Delfshaven met het project Programma Oudere Migranten (POM).

MKS-website en MKS-archief

De MKS presenteert zich ook op het internet met de website www.mks.nl (bezoekersaantal tot nu toe rond de 2000) waarop informatie te vinden valt over de stichting, over Marie Kamphuis, over maatschappelijk werk, over maatschappelijk werkers (The Hall of Fame) en over het MKS-archief. Dit laatste verdient enige toelichting. In het kader van haar dissertatie-onderzoek naar sekse en de geschiedenis van het maatschappelijk werk in Nederland en de Verenigde Staten (1996) ontdekte historica Berteke Waaldijk dat Marie Kamphuis beschikt over een uitgebreide collectie publicaties op het gebied van maatschappelijk werk. Deze collectie is van groot belang voor wetenschappelijk onderzoek naar de geschiedenis en de grondslagen van het maatschappelijk werk. De MKS heeft het vervolgens tot haar taak gerekend te zorgen voor een plaats waar de collectie van Marie Kamphuis, uitgebreid met ander materiaal, kan worden ondergebracht, bewaard en ontsloten. Dank zij een schenking van de (voormalige) Stichting Voorziening ter Ondersteuning van de Landelijke Taken van het Maatschappelijk Werk en de medewerking van de Universiteit voor Humanistiek kon het Marie Kamphuis-archief zijn deuren openen. Dit gebeurde op 29 september 1999 tijdens de feestelijke opening van het jubileum '100 jaar maatschappelijk werk, helpen kun je leren'.

Het MKS-archief wil een centrum zijn voor de geschiedenis van het Nederlandse maatschappelijk werk en ziet de verzameling van Marie Kamphuis als een basis van de collectie. Een lastig punt hierbij is dat beheer en uitbreiding van het archief professionele inbreng vragen en dat hieraan kosten zijn verbonden, die de MKS niet of nauwelijks kan dragen. De stichting krijgt geen overheidssubsidie en is voor haar werk afhankelijk van donaties en giften van derden.

De MKS is een stichting die wordt gedragen door mensen die zich verbonden voelen met het maatschappelijk werk. Om de herkenbaarheid van de stichting te vergroten vermelden wij namen en functies van de bestuursleden in alfabetische volgorde: Rik Bovenberg, directeur van de AMW-instelling Maatschappelijke Dienstverlening Flevoland in Lelystad, drs. Harry Hens, medewerkers van het NIZW in Utrecht, prof.dr. Douwe van Houten, hoogleraar Sociaal Beleid en directeur onderzoeksinstituut Universiteit voor Humanistiek in Utrecht, Lou Jagt, eindredacteur *Paspoort Maatschappelijk Werk*, drs. Marlies van der Linden, voormalig docent aan de Hogeschool van Amsterdam en opleider van supervisors, drs. Lisbeth Verharen, docent theorie en methoden maatschappelijk werk en dienstverlening aan de Hogeschool van Arnhem en Nijmegen, en prof.dr. Berteke Waaldijk, hoogleraar aan de Universiteit van Utrecht.

Prof.dr. Geert van der Laan, bijzonder hoogleraar aan de Universiteit voor Humanistiek in Utrecht, en lector aan de Fontys Hogeschool in Eindhoven, is adviseur van het bestuur.

Henny Dhondt verzorgt secretariaatswerkzaamheden voor de MKS.

