

Chapter 8

The Coming of Age of Scottish Social Services?

Sue Dumbleton and Mo McPhail

Introduction

The 'coming of age of social work' was the lofty claim made by a devolved Scottish government in response to the report of the 21st century review of social work, *Changing Lives*:

It will mark social work's coming of age as a mature profession, focusing services on promoting wellbeing, rather than the more paternalistic welfare model underpinning current legislation. (Scottish Executive, 2006b:14).

What do mature ('come of age') social services look like? What do they do and how can we recognise them? The Scottish Government (2006b:14) defines a mature social work profession as one which: embraces more personalised services, is focussed on outcomes subject to performance management, manages risk and promotes 'excellence', enshrines the position of service users and carers in service design and delivery and is subject to public service reforms. The Scottish Government's definition of 'come of age' and 'mature' is contentious and open to debate because the profession itself has not agreed the definition. For example the international definition of social work (IFSW 2004), based on ethical principles of human rights and social justice, provides an alternative perspective on 'maturity' in social services.

The Scottish Government's definition, however, does propose indicators which focus upon concrete actions and it is these which we examine here, particularly in relation to services for children and young people and services

for people who have a learning disability. Social work is, of course, far wider than these two service domains. These are referred to here as illustrative and representative examples of the broader profession. The idea that devolution in 1999 strengthened Scotland's autonomy in social work and social care in the context of UK pressures which continue to shape social policy is also discussed. The authors argue that the overall picture of social services in Scotland at the end of the first decade of the 21st century falls short of what can be seen as a 'coming of age'. Amidst severe economic and political threats, which echo UK-wide welfare and public sector reforms, the distinctively Scottish approach to social welfare and the aspirations of the social services profession to promote its core values and social justice are under threat.

Changing Lives Report of the 21st Century Social Work Review

The *Changing Lives* report was published in 2006 (Scottish Executive, 2006a). The explicit government rationale for commissioning the review identified factors such as reported uncertainty, lack of clarity and confidence in social work, increased expectations from the public and what is described as 'a series of critical reports following tragic incidents' (Scottish Executive, 2006b:4). The contention was that social services were in crisis and radical solutions needed to be found.

Major drivers of the review were two social work inquiries; one into the death of a young child (Edinburgh and Lothian's Child Protection Committee, 2003) and the other into the neglect and sexual exploitation of a young woman with learning disabilities (Scottish Executive, 2004). Both were under supervision of social work agencies at the time of the abuse. These two inquiries are considered separately in the following section to illustrate the consequences now reflected in contemporary Scottish social services policy and provision. Different media and government responses to perceived crises in social services in England and Scotland in recent times are explored.

A Pivotal Child Abuse Inquiry

The 2003 inquiry identified missed opportunities for the sharing of professional information which may have prevented the death of 11 week old

Caleb Ness Edinburgh and Lothian's Child Protection Committee (2003), at the hand of his father, a man with a history of drug related offences and a behaviour-affecting brain injury. The baby's mother also posed substantial risks due to her own drug use and involvement in the sex industry. One conclusion from this report was that the child protection process was flawed, and a confusion between the rights of parents and the rights of the child existed. This highlights concerns identified since the case of the death of Jasmine Beckford (London Borough of Brent, 1985), that there are substantive differences in the rights and needs of different family members which need to be thoroughly attended to in child protection situations.

Others had different views of the underlying problems and by implication in the response to these problems. Trades union officials and opposition councillors raised major concerns about the resource issues facing staff in all the key agencies (MacGreggor, 2004). Concerns were expressed that there was an acute shortage of skilled social workers, morale was low and pressure high amongst existing social workers. Some children on the at-risk register did not have an allocated social worker. This event gathered considerable political momentum and acted as a significant spur to a radical re-haul of social work as a profession in Scotland.

Similar debates can be detected in media and political responses to the child abuse tragedy of 'Baby P', where individual social workers were vilified and demonised. In the English context there was a vigilante response, led by the *Sun* newspaper, calling for the sacking of individual front line social work practitioners, a directive for a fundamental restructuring of social work education and the establishing of a social work college by government (Ferguson and Lavalette, 2009). In Scotland in response to the Caleb Ness inquiry Edinburgh and Lothian's Child Protection Committee (2003) the Director of Edinburgh City Council Social Work resigned his post, the call for the overhaul of social work was strengthened and a new requirement, *Key Capabilities in Child Care and Protection* (Scottish Executive, 2006c) was introduced to the four year honours qualifying social work degree. There has been resistance to the latter policy, in challenge of the assumption that solutions to social problems such as child abuse are best addressed by increased standardisation of qualifying education (McKay and Woodward,

2009). The authors argue that this reflects a much wider context of standardisation of social work education and increasing departure from social work values and critical analysis of structural roots of discrimination, disadvantage and social injustice.

The Exploitation of a Woman with Learning Disabilities

A further trigger for the 21st Century review of social work were events in Scottish Borders Council and NHS Borders (Petch, 2007: 48) in which people who were considered to have a learning disability were being cared for by a convicted offender. The abuse and exploitation which they experienced was brought to light when one woman was admitted to hospital with multiple injuries resulting from physical and sexual abuse. Concerns about the conditions in which these people lived were known by social services and the health service but had not been acted upon. The report into the events (Scottish Executive 2004) identified numerous long standing failings on the part of the statutory authorities including a failure to share or act upon information, to co-ordinate services and to assess, plan, record and monitor. The events in Scottish Borders were only one in a long line of scandals and revelations of gross and 'low level' abuse and ill treatment of people with learning difficulties in Scotland and further afield (see for example HMSO, 1969; Healthcare Commission, 2007). It was partly in response to concerns that conditions which allow such abuse continue that the 21st century review was commissioned.

The Birth of Social Work and Social Care in Scotland?

If *Changing Lives* was the 'coming of age' of social services, the much earlier 1968 Social Work (Scotland) Act is often regarded as its birth (Scottish Executive, 2006b:,14). It deserves attention as it represents a major landmark in Scottish social services and is seen by some as determining the nature of services for much of the last forty years. However Fabb and Guthrie (1992) suggest that it was not as far reaching as it appears, describing the powers of Local Authorities to promote social welfare in the 1968 legislation as 'very vague'. They regard the main achievement as bringing together a number of

disparate services. For example, although powers for assistance to be made by payments in cash or kind were allowed by this legislation (thus recognising the impact of material factors for a person in need) this was subject to a wide range of interpretations.

Whilst recognising the strengths of the 1968 legislation, Ferguson (2005) claims that there were similar forces at play in England at the time; of fragmentation of services, poor co-ordination and geographical unevenness of services. He argues it was not the landmark some claim and argues convincingly that the Scottish system is based on similar assumptions to the contemporary English review; where poverty is seen as residual and individual, as opposed to as a result of structural factors associated with a particular socio economic system (Mooney, 2008). However, as Ferguson also comments, despite these assumptions there was a prevailing view at the time that social change and social justice were legitimate concerns of social work. In the context of social work, 'social justice' was later reflected in a statement of principles agreed by the International Association of Schools of Social Work and the International Federation of Social workers in 2004. Social justice is defined here as; challenging negative discrimination; recognising diversity; distributing resources equitably; challenging unjust policies and practices and working in solidarity, accompanied by a commentary that *'Social workers have an obligation to challenge social conditions that contribute to social exclusion, stigmatisation or subjugation, and to work towards an inclusive society,* (International Federation of Social Workers and International Association of Schools of Social Work, 2004;paragraph 4).

Despite its limitations, the '68 Act highlighted Scotland's distinctive approach to social work, for example, the system of Children's Hearings. This was introduced as a result of the Kilbrandon Committee (Scottish Office, 1964; see also Ferguson, 2005) to replace the more punitive approaches of juvenile courts. It was hailed as an exemplary approach. Much has, however, changed since its introduction: a review of the Children's Hearing system in 2004 warned that a more punitive approach towards offending behaviour is likely to

lead to an increase in re-offending and a greater identification with a criminal lifestyle (NCH Scotland, 2004; see also Chapter 11).

Whilst Scotland led the way in the UK in embedding the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations 1989) in the Children (Scotland) Act 1995, sadly as Aldgate (2009) comments, the implementation has proved inconsistent and definitions of 'children in need' are applied differentially across Scotland, interpreted and influenced according to the availability of resources.

The International and UK context of Scottish Social Services

When *Changing Lives* was published the impact of global economic crisis of the early 21st Century was unimagined, and probably unimaginable. As political responses to it unfold, it becomes increasingly clear that many welfare systems across the world are experiencing and facing the most severe budget reductions for generations. In a study of global influences on Australian social services, Mendes (2006) found that while global financial market policies clearly have an impact on welfare systems at the national level in terms of rates of poverty and inequality, each country responds to those challenges on the basis of its own distinctive political and cultural context. In Scotland the response can be seen as affected by the culture and politics of the nation but there are additional limitations to what can be achieved with devolved powers as a result of the continuing and substantial impact of UK wide and global economic policies, particularly in relation to the benefits system and general taxation (Mooney and Scott, 2005; Mooney et al, 2006; Stewart, 2004).

The Scottish Government's response to the impact of the recession on public services in Scotland (even before the full impact of the 2010 UK Comprehensive Spending Review is known) is, as expected, a re-evaluation of spending intentions. An acknowledgement is made in a Scottish Government briefing paper (Scottish Parliament, 2009) that there will be a likely increase in demand for social work and health services, due to the physical and psychological impact of increased unemployment, but also an admission that key social policy targets are likely to be missed. These include

social inclusion, child poverty (despite the passing of a UK wide Child Poverty Act, 2010), equality, health and homelessness targets (issues that are explored in other chapters in this volume). The link between a global banking crisis (and subsequent UK and Scottish government 'austerity' measures) and the impact on those in the most vulnerable situations in Scottish society has been widely voiced.

Additionally, Scott and Mooney (2009 and see also Chapter 1 in this book) consider other UK wide issues such as constraints on citizenship, immigration and welfare entitlements and their impact on effectively tackling social justice issues from a Scottish base. They argue that given the reserved powers of the Westminster Parliament on the level of welfare benefits and the minimum wage and taxation there is a limit to what a Scottish Government can do to change what remains a deeply divided and unequal society (see also Chapter 3).

In his analysis of policy divergence across the UK, Birrell (2007, 2009) finds that although there is a high degree of control by the devolved administrations, there are common tendencies away from separate social work departments and towards greater integration of public services. A key policy difference is that criminal justice services remain in the domain of local authority social work services in Scotland. Significant policy divergence relates to free personal care of older people in Scotland, whether in community or residential contexts, on a universal service basis. What are often called 'flagship' policies such as these are, however, threatened by recession-driven budget reductions.

The changing nature of the relationship between state and citizen is also important. An emphasis on increased regulation, centralized control, consumerist discourse and the narrative of 'choice' and 'control' can all be seen in policy position papers prior to *Changing Lives* (Scottish Executive, 1999, 2000a, 2001, 2003). Such approaches may be seen to undermine principles of democracy and accountability (Mooney and Scott, 2005). They represent a shift that is part of a broader move from the mid 1970s onward, in the UK, USA and in some other European countries. Jessop (1990) outlines this as a move away from a 'Keynesian welfare state' to a new model of welfare services based on assumptions about the role of government as

facilitator of conditions for economic success rather than a promoter of social justice or the provision of welfare.

Devolution as an on-going Process: Social Services with Children and Young People

Aldgate (2009) argues that a greater clarity and autonomy of welfare policy in relation to social work with children and young people Scotland has emerged since 1998, with the exception of the benefits system, which has significant impact upon the Scottish Government's anti-poverty strategy. One view is that recent policies for children may reflect the growing confidence of the devolved government in Scotland (Stewart, 2004). Another view reflects the importance of the welfare principle established by the 1968 Social Work (Scotland) Act. This is seen to lay the basis for a more integrated, child centred approach to children's services across both universal such as health and education as in specialised services, such as social work and social care. Aldgate (2009) argues that this principle, a distinctly Scottish welfare principle, was the precursor to a holistic and inclusive approach to children and young people, based on the children's rights agenda, an emphasis on social justice and a drive for early intervention, later articulated in the policy documents, *'It's everyone's job to make sure I'm alright'* (Scottish Executive, 2002a) and the policy of *'Getting It Right for Every Child'* (Scottish Parliament, 2008). High aspirations of children's well-being coupled with strong statements about collective societal responsibility for children are contained in these policies, tempered however by the impact of enduring poverty on children's well being and curtailment of life chances (see Chapter 5).

A report on monitoring poverty and social exclusion in Scotland in 2010 by Parekh et al. (2010) illustrates this enduring challenge, concluding that although Scotland had a lower unemployment and child poverty rate than England at the start of the recession in 2008, Scotland has subsequently fared worse. Unemployment is at its highest level since 1996. Child poverty rose by 2% in 2009 in Scotland, compared to a 1% rise in England. Further risks to these proud aspirations are identified by Aldgate (2009) in the wake of the SNP concordat arrangements, implemented from 2008 as Local

Authorities are given an enhanced responsibility for devolved budget in return for an agreement not to raise council tax.

Theories and explanations of poverty do not figure in the 21st century review of social work, which presents some difficulty in assessing the under-theorised solutions proposed. Underlining this policy approach is a worldview that seeks to explain welfare problems in individual terms, rather than through a structural analysis. Other researchers have found that children who are referred to Children's Panel are disproportionately from social backgrounds where families are dependent on benefits and social housing (Waterhouse et al, 2000).

It is difficult to make absolute assertions about the links between child maltreatment and poverty though there is some evidence of a link between stress and poverty and social deprivation, drug use and mental health issues (Devaney, 2009; Dyson, 2008). Whilst acknowledging the complexity of inter-related factors, Dyson calls for a greater awareness of the impact of financial hardship and other forms of deprivation and that the resultant stress can lead to an increased risk of maltreatment by parents living in poverty.

Despite a proliferation of policy and legislation, the words of Asquith and Stafford (1995) continue to resonate that; *'In short the development of policies and practices that impact on families and children which ignore basic social inequalities in the distribution of wealth and life chances may offer little by the way of attempts to ameliorate the conditions in which families find themselves.* (Asquith and Stafford, 1995, pp 4).

Devolution as an on-going Process: Social Services with People with Learning Disabilities

Contemporary Scottish policy in relation to learning disability services was set out shortly after the re-establishment of the Scottish Parliament in 1999 and well before *Changing Lives* in 2006. In 2000, the publication of *The Same As You? A review of services for people with learning disabilities* by the Scottish Executive (2000b) was the first learning disability policy initiative in Scotland for over 20 years. It sought to quicken the pace of change in service provision and support people with learning disabilities to take greater control over their lives. The extent to which *The Same As You?* has fulfilled its promise is being

reviewed in 2010 -11, a decade from its publication. The review seems likely to confirm that there has been slower progress over the intervening decade than the original report recommended. *The Same As You?* is not a social services report. However, the influence of the social model of disability on learning disability services (though heavily critiqued in relation to people with learning disability) and the report's stated commitment to social inclusion, equality and fairness (Scottish Executive 2000b: iii) ensure that social services workers, among many other groups, play an important role in realising its aims.

As long ago as 2000, the Scottish Executive (2000b:96) recommended that, 'Everyone with a learning disability, who wants to, should be able to have a 'personal life plan'. *Changing Lives* not only welcomed increasingly personalised services but saw them as inevitable (Scottish Executive, 2006: 32). Originally embraced by the New Labour governments of the early 21st century, the term personalisation has become prominent in many aspects of social policy – and no more so than in policies associated with social work and social care (Duffy, 2010). The 'personal' in 'personalisation' creates the impression of an individualised, carefully crafted and decidedly not institutionalised approach to services. Although, as Ferguson notes, there is no formally accepted definition of the term, it carries with it connotations of a positive approach to providing support (2007: 389). For who would not wish to receive support which is personalised in what Ferguson calls the 'common sense definition' of services tailored to meet individual need? History, for people who have learning difficulties, in the form of institutional care, still casts a long and bleak shadow over current service provision. Accounts, personal testimony and academic research of institutional care abound (see for example Atkinson et al, 1997; Atkinson et al, 2005; Ingham 2002; Anderson and Langa, 1997) and are cast almost entirely in a negative light.

A current aim of policy and services is to promote the 'social inclusion' of people with learning disabilities and 'social justice' in relation to them (MacIntyre, 2008). *Changing Lives* makes numerous references to 'social inclusion' seeing its promotion as a key role of social work. This focus on social inclusion in relation to people with learning disabilities places *The Same As You?* and *Changing Lives* in the broader policy context of devolved

Scotland. Most people wish to feel part of the society in which they live. Beyond the 'warmly persuasive' words (Raymond Williams, cited in Ferguson 2007:389) what this actually means for people who have learning disabilities is less clear. People with learning disabilities experience bullying, harassment, poverty, and physical or mental ill health in far greater measure relative to the general population (Chih Hoong Sin et al, 2009; Emerson, 2007; Enable 1999, 2007; MacIntyre, 2008; Parckar, 2008; Stalker et al, 1999;) and to this extent their marginalisation is endemic in Scottish society, as it is in most Western countries.

Furthermore, as Quarriers (2008: 3) discovered, "*People with learning disabilities living in the family home (12,625 people, over 50% of the adults with a learning disability known to local authorities) have become the invisible*" and quotes a local authority representative as saying, "*we don't know if people [with learning disabilities] are dead or just not getting a service*". The implication that people known to local authorities and receiving a service are 'socially included' is debatable. Nonetheless it is important to hear the views of people who require services but do not, for whatever reason receive them. The underlying philosophy for this is described as a new type of partnership between the individual and the state (Scottish Executive, 2006: 34) promoting wellbeing rather than the paternalistic welfare model of the past. A paradox of such policy is that people who are in some circumstances described as 'vulnerable' are somehow to be empowered as 'citizen leaders' to shape the development of services. Identities of vulnerability suggest passivity, powerlessness, dependence and continue to convey a paternalistic view of people who use social services of the kind which the Scottish Executive sought to eliminate (2006). As Ager and McPhail (2008) comment:

'Their experience and insight of services is acknowledged, but there is little recognition of the transfer of power required that will equip those who are vulnerable to exert 'real influence'.

(Ager and McPhail, 2008: 9).

The self advocacy movement has had considerable influence in ensuring that the voice of people who have a learning disability is heard in decisions, policies and practices that affect them – but the extent to which their voices are *really* heard is contested.

One of the recommendations of *The Same As You?* and a measure to promote the inclusion of service user and carer voices, was the introduction of a system of local area co-ordination (LAC). Originating in Western Australia, LAC is designed to build personal and community supports around individuals with learning disabilities and their families. The focus on individuals resonates with the drive to provide more personalised services. LAC however, is not a service provider; rather it is a system for developing community supports and increasing 'social capital' (Stalker et al, 2007) and for brokering relationships which can develop such supports. Through the promotion of these networks and the interventions of local area coordination *The Same As You?* proposed that the social inclusion of people with learning disabilities would be increased. But the development of LAC has been patchy and uneven across Scotland. Problems exist with its role, status and funding. In some areas it is both welcome and effective; in others less so and in some it does not exist at all (Stalker et al., 2007). Despite its vision of being a universal service, access to LAC is limited by factors such as geography and local priorities diminishing the opportunities for increased social inclusion which it was introduced to develop. LAC has a strong value base and is committed to working in person-centred ways to promote social inclusion. In this respect it is difficult to distinguish between LAC and social services. One difference is that LAC is supposed to be a universal service which can be accessed without assessment.

Despite the recommendations of *The Same As You?* and *Changing Lives*, the introduction of new legislation, the regular overhaul of service provision, increased regulation, training and surveillance of the workforce and the overarching service delivery principles of 'choice' and 'control' the lives of people with learning disabilities in contemporary Scotland remain impoverished. Because the lives of many, though by no means all, people with learning disability were blighted by historical approaches to institutional

care the tendency to view current service provision 'in the community' as better prevails. However, in times of economic stringency people with learning disabilities are, '*disproportionately affected through a period of tightening public expenditure*' (Learning Disability Alliance Scotland, 2010: 1). So, many people with learning disabilities in Scotland today experience little in the way of social justice, which results in their continued marginalisation. Johnson and Walmsley (2010) explore an inherent contradiction in the realisation of a 'good life', as proposed by western philosophy (of which inclusion in a society's most basic principles is one aspect [Nussbaum cited by Johnson and Walmsley 2010:59]), for people with learning difficulties. Contemporary policy tends to focus, as this chapter has discussed, on the individual. For people with a learning disability this usually results in a practice focus on individual deficits and outputs such as 'independent travel training', single tenancies with visiting support, a round of 'community based' activities such as visiting shopping centres or bowling alleys. For Johnson and Walmsley this ignores the Western philosophical position that possession of reason and the capacity to reflect are constituents of a 'good life'. A lack of reason is, they contend, one of the defining characteristics of a person with a learning disability. Because of this people with learning disabilities are not only discriminated against but the very goal of a good life, as it is seen through Western eyes, is difficult if not impossible to attain.

Further, a focus on individual rather than collective responses leaves people already marginalised at risk of further exclusion. In the anxiety not to repeat now discredited historical 'collective' approaches have opportunities to focus on structural inequalities been lost? Expressions of collective approaches, such as Adult Training Centres or long stay hospitals, were run counter to 21st century public policy directives. However, in the view of some service users, not every aspect of such services was negative (see for example exhibitions from Sense Scotland, 2009; Open University, 2008). Rather, a complex picture of the importance of attachment and sense of belonging emerges.

Social services workers grapple constantly with dilemmas and competing rights and demands. Is Johnson and Walmsley's view compatible with contemporary Scottish social work practice with people who have learning disabilities? For widely accepted contemporary reasons, and in keeping with

the law, current practice recognises the human rights of people who have a learning disability and tends to emphasise positive personal capacities. Is the mark of a mature profession, one which has 'come of age', however not an openness to considering points of view such as Johnson and Walmsely's even if they run counter to the prevailing policy and practice landscape, are challenging, possibly pessimistic and perhaps distasteful?

Conclusion: Have Scottish Social Services Come of Age?

This chapter refers to many social policy achievements, both pre-devolution and since 1999 in Scottish social services, of which Scotland can be proud. A shining example is the policy *Getting It Right For Every Child* (Scottish Parliament, 2008) whose foundations can be largely attributed to a distinctively Scottish approach in the mid 1960s to the welfare of children and young people who offend or are offended against. The argument presented here is that this enlightened thinking some 50 years ago has helped to shape and inform an integrated and holistic approach to supporting the well-being of children, underpinned by social justice perspectives of equality and human rights.

In social services with people with learning disabilities there has been enduring activity to promote meaningful involvement in service provision and in wider social debates. This contemporary policy imperative (see for example Duncan, 2007; Levin, 2004) has been implemented to a greater or lesser extent with people who have learning disabilities throughout the UK and internationally (see for example Mitchell et al., 2006). Many people welcome the personalisation agenda in contrast to the oppressive regimes of institutional care, whether in a care home or in 'the community'. Local Authority services for adults with learning disabilities have for some years been provided by 'integrated' teams of social work, health and sometimes other professionals (Slevin et al 2008). This practice is likely to increase as the Government responds positively to the recommendations of the Christie Report (Scottish Government 2011)

Thus, social services provision for people with learning difficulties in contemporary Scotland shares many aspirational characteristics with that of other nations: a commitment to the involvement of people who use services and their carers in decisions affecting their lives, a move to more 'personalised' services, statutory regulation of services and the increased involvement of the independent sector in service provision. The extent to which these aspirations are realised is debatable but they do fit with the Scottish Executive's vision of a sector which has 'come of age'.

On the face of it, and in relation to these policies, Scotland could be deemed to be well on the way to a fine and wise old age. On the one hand, the call is for collective social responsibility for the well-being of children and on the other people are to be involved in the development of care services tailored to their individual need. Both, however, are threatened by the combination of non-ring fenced Local Authority budgets, the impact of the global financial crisis and the UK and Scottish Government responses.

Furthermore if the impact of poverty and inequality are not acknowledged when a tragedy involving social services occurs, the response tends to be focused on a demonization of individual workers and the subsequent strengthening of a managerial agenda of standards, regulation and inspection, as opposed to solutions based on an understanding of the social and material aspects of the situation (Ferguson and Lavalette 2009). We concur with the views expressed by Ritchie and Woodward (2009), which are even more compelling in the political and ideological context at the end of the first decade of the 21st century, that *Changing Lives* simply does not fully reflect the social and political reality of Scotland and that:

'a 'lack of concern of broader social justice issues increases the likelihood that there is a transfer of risk to poor communities and to individuals'.

(Ritchie and Woodward, 2009: 527).

Social work's own international definition, itself quoted in the 21st century review, reflects a preferable emphasis to the then Scottish Government's definition of a mature social services sector. In our view the language of the international definition of social work reflects a narrative of social justice and human rights, which contrasts favourably with a managerial discourse of performance management, welfare reform and consumerisation of service users and carers contained in the *Changing Lives* report. A briefing paper commissioned for the review highlights a common concern expressed by social services workers that, '*Regulation has become more important than promotion of core values.*' (Scottish Government, 2005). Regrettably this statement is not fully developed in the review's findings. Internationally agreed and accepted standards are, in our view, better measures by which the maturity of contemporary social services can be measured, given that they reflect the stated value base of the international community of social services workers.

Further Resources

Emgulu, A. and Shaw, M. (eds) (2010) *Community Empowerment: Critical Perspectives from Scotland, The Glasgow Papers*, Edinburgh: Community Development Journal.

Ferguson, I. and Woodward, R. (2009) *Radical Social Work in Practice*, Bristol: The Policy Press

Hothersall, S. (2010) 2nd edition, *Social Work with Children, Young People and their Families in Scotland*, Exeter: Learning Matters,

www.learningmatters.co.uk

Johnson, K. and Walmsley, J. with Wolfe, M. (2010) *People with Intellectual Disabilities Towards a good life?* Bristol: The Policy Press.

MacIntyre, G (2008) *Learning Disability and Social Inclusion* Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press

www.socialworkfuture – Social Work Action Network

www.cpag.org.uk/scotland - Child Poverty Action Group in Scotland

www.sclld.org.uk – Scottish Consortium for Learning Disability

www.peoplefirstscotland.org People First Scotland

www.ldascotland.org Learning Disability Alliance Scotland

References

- Ager, W. and McPhail, M. (2008) 'Issues of Power in Service User and Carer Involvement: Partnership, Process and Outcomes' in McPhail, M. (ed.) (2007) *Service User and Carer Involvement: Beyond Good Intentions*, Glasgow: Dunedin Press, pp 7 - 22.
- Aldgate, J. (2009) The impact of devolution for children in Scotland, K802 [Critical practice with children and young people](#), Milton Keynes: The Open University.
- Anderson, N. and Langa, A. (1997) The Development of Institutional Care for 'idiots' and 'imbeciles' in Scotland *History of Psychiatry* vol. 8, no 30 pp 243 – 266.
- Asquith, S. and Stafford, A. (1995) *Families and the Future*, Edinburgh: HMSO.
- Atkinson, D. Jackson, M. and Walmsley, J. (1997) *Forgotten Lives Exploring the History of Learning Disability* Kidderminster: BILD Publications.
- Atkinson, D. Nind, M. Rolph, S. and Welshman, J. (2005) *Witnesses to Change Families, Learning Difficulties and History* Kidderminster: BILD Publications.
- Birrell, D. (2007) *Devolution and Social Care: Are There Four Systems of Social Care in the United Kingdom?*
Paper Presented at the Social Policy Association Conference: University of Birmingham, <http://www.sochealth.co.uk/news/birrell.htm>
- Birrell, D. (2009) *The Impact of Devolution on Social Policy*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Chih, H. S. Hedges, A. Cook, C. Mguni, N. and Comber, N. (2009) *Disabled people's experiences of targeted violence and hostility* Research Report 21 Manchester: Office for Public Management.
- Croall, H., Mooney, G. and Munro, M. (eds) (2010) *Criminal Justice in Scotland*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Devaney, J. (2009) 'Chronic Child Abuse: The Characteristics and Careers of Children Caught up in the Child Protection System', *British Journal of Social Work*, Vol.39, no. 1: pp 24-45.

- Duffy, S (2010) 'The Citizenship Theory of Social Justice: Exploring the Meaning of Personalisation for Social Workers', *Journal of Social Work Practice* Vol. 24, 3 pp 235 – 267.
- Duncan, B (2007) *Inspecting for improvement in Scotland* Journal of Care Services Management Vol. 2, Number 1 pp 17 – 27.
- Dyson, C. (2008) *Poverty and child maltreatment*, NSPCC child protection, http://www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/research/briefings/poverty_wda56897.htm
- Edinburgh and Lothian's Child Protection Committee (2003) *The Report of The Caleb Ness Inquiry*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh and Lothian's Child Protection Committee.
- Emerson, E. (2007) *The Mental Health of Children and Adolescents with Learning Disabilities in Britain*. Lancaster: The Institute for Health Research.
- Enable (1999) *Stop It! Bullying and Harassment of People with Learning Disabilities*, Glasgow: Enable.
- Enable (2007) *Speak Up! The Bullying of Children with Learning Disabilities*, Glasgow: Enable.
- Fabb, J. and Guthrie, T.G. (1992) *Social Work and the Law in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Butterworths.
- Ferguson, I. (2005) 'Social work and social care in the 'new' Scotland' in G. Mooney and G. Scott (eds.) **Exploring Social Policy in the 'New' Scotland**, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 221-238.
- Ferguson, I. (2007) 'Increasing User Choice or Privatizing Risk? The Antinomies of Personalisation' *British Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 37, No 3: pp 387 -403.
- Ferguson, I. and Lavalette, M. (2007) 'Beyond Power Discourse: Alienation and Social Work', **British Journal of Social Work**, Vol. 34 No.3: pp 297-312.
- Ferguson, I. and Lavalette, M. (eds) (2009) *M. Social Work After Baby P*, Liverpool: Liverpool Hope University.
- Healthcare Commission (2007) *Investigation into the service for people with learning disabilities* provided by Sutton and Merton Primary Care Trust London, Healthcare Commission.
- HMSO (1969) *Report of the Committee of Inquiry into Allegations of Ill-treatment of Patients and Other Irregularities at the Ely Hospital Cardiff*, Cmnd. 3975.

Ingham, N. (Ed) (2002) *Gogarburn Lives* Edinburgh: Living Memory Association.

International Federation of Social Workers and International Association of Schools of Social Work (2004), *Ethics in Social Work, Statement of Principles*, Bern, Switzerland, <http://www.ifsw.org/p38000324.html>

Jessop, B (2002) *The Future of the Capitalist State*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Johnson, K. and Walmsley, J. with Woolfe, M. (2010) *People with intellectual disabilities. Towards a good life?* Bristol: Policy Press.

Learning Disability Alliance Scotland (2010) Written Submission to the Scottish Government Equal Opportunities Committee

www.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/equal/Budget%20process%202011-12/subs/BSP08LDA.pdf Accessed 29.09.10

Levin, E. (2004) *Involving service users and carers in social work education* London: Social Care Institute for Excellence.

London Borough of Brent (1985) *A Child in Trust, Panel of Enquiry into the Circumstances Surrounding the Death of Jasmine Beckford*, Wembley, Middlesex: London Borough of Brent.

MacGreggor, F. (2004) 'Vulnerable Youngsters Remain at Risk in City' *Edinburgh Evening News*, 14th August, 2004.

MacIntyre, G. (2008) *Learning Disability and Social Inclusion* Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.

MacKay, K. and Woodward, R. (2010) Exploring the Place of Values in the New Social Work Degree in Scotland, *Journal of Social Work Education: The International Journal*, Vol.29, Issue 6: pp 633-645.

McPhail, M. (ed.) (2008) *Service User and Carer Involvement: Beyond Good Intentions*, Glasgow, Dunedin Academic Press.

Mendes, P. (2006) 'Welfare lobby groups responding to globalization – A case Study of the Australian Council of Social Service' *International Social Work*, Vol.49, No.6: pp 693-704.

Mitchell, D. Traustadóttir, R. Chapman, R. Townson, L. Ingham, N. Ledger, S. (eds) (2006) *Exploring Experiences of Advocacy by People with Learning Disabilities: Testimonies of Resistance* London: Jessica Kingsley.

- Mooney, G. (2008) 'Explaining Poverty, Social Exclusion and Inequality: Towards a Structural Approach', in Ridge, T. and Wright, S. (eds) *Understanding Inequality, Poverty, Wealth*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 61-78.
- Mooney, G. and Scott, G. (eds) (2005) *Exploring Social Policy in the 'New' Scotland*, Bristol: Polity Press.
- Mooney, G., Sweeney, T. and Law, A. (eds) (2006) *Social Care, Health and Welfare in Contemporary Scotland*, Paisley: Kynloch and Blaney
- Mooney, G. and Wright, S. (2009) 'Social Policy in the Devolved Scotland: Towards a Scottish Welfare State? *Social policy and Society*, Vol.8, No3: 361-365.
- NCH Scotland 2004 *Where is Kilbrandon now? Report and Recommendations from the Inquiry*, Glasgow, NCH
www.nch.org.uk/kilbrandonnow
- Nussbaum, M. (2006) 'Frontiers of justice. Disability nationality species membership' Cambridge: Harvard University Press cited in Johnson, K. and Walmsley, J. with Woolfe, M. (2010) *People with intellectual disabilities. Towards a good life?* Bristol: Policy Press.
- Open University (2008) *Days Gone By. The History of Day Centres for People with Learning Disabilities in Croydon*, Croydon: Museum of Croydon.
- Parckar, G. (2008) *Disability Poverty in the UK* London: Leonard Cheshire Disability.
- Parketh, A. (2010) *Monitoring poverty and social exclusion in Scotland*, York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation www.jrf.org.uk/publications/mopes-scotland-2010
- Petch, A. (2007) Care citizenship and community in Scotland in Balloch, S and Hill, M (eds.) *Care Community and Citizenship research and practice in a changing policy context* Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Quarriers (2008) *Missed Out Missing Out Adults with learning disabilities who live in the family home and their right to recognition and resources* Bridge of Weir: Quarriers.
- Ritchie, A. and Woodward, R. (2009) 'Changing Lives: Critical reflections on the social work change programme for Scotland, *Critical Social Policy*, Vol.29, No.3: pp 510- 532.

Scott, G. and Mooney, G. (2009) 'Poverty and Social Justice in the Devolved Scotland: Neoliberalism Meets Social Democracy?', *Social Policy and Society*, 8, 3, pp. 379-389.

Scottish Executive, (1999) *Aiming for Excellence: Modernising Social Work*.

Scottish Executive (2000a) 'The Way Forward to Care': A Policy Position paper Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2000b) *The Same As You? A review of services for people with learning disabilities*, Edinburgh Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2001) *Changing for the future, social services for the 21st century* Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2002) *It's Everyone's job to make sure I'm alright, Report of the Child Protection Audit and Review*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2003) *Partnership for a Better Scotland*, Edinburgh: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2003/05/17150/21952>

Scottish Executive (2004) *Investigations into Scottish Borders Council and NHS Borders Services for People with Learning Disabilities: Joint Statement from the Mental Welfare Commission and the Social Work Services Inspectorate* <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2004/05/19333/36719>

Accessed 27.09.10.

Scottish Executive (2006a) *Changing Lives: Report of the 21st Century Social Work Review*, Edinburgh, Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2006b) *Scottish Executive Response to the Report of the 21st Century Social Work Review: Changing Lives*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Executive (2006c) *Key Capabilities in Child Care and protection*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Scottish Government (2011) *Commission on the Future of Public Services (The Christie Report)* Edinburgh, Crown Office

Scottish Office (1964) *The Kilbrandon Report, Children and Young Persons, Scotland; Report by the Committee Appointed by the Secretary of State for Scotland*, Edinburgh: HMSO

Scottish Parliament (2008) *Getting It Right for Every Child*

<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/YoungPeople/childrenservices/girfec>

Scottish Parliament (2009) Spice Briefing, UK Budget 2009, Edinburgh

Scottish Parliament

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/business/research/briefings-09/SB09-26.pdf>

Sense Scotland (2009) *In Our Own Voices: Leaving New Craigs Glasgow*: Sense Scotland.

Slevin, E, Truesdale-Kennedy, M, McConkey, R, Barr, O and Taggart, L (2008) 'Community learning disability teams: developments, composition and good practice' *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities*, 12 (1): 59 – 79

Stalker, K. Cadogan, L. and Petrie, M. (1999) *'If you don't ask you don't get' Review of services to people with learning disabilities; the views of people who use services and their carers* Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Stalker, K. Malloch, M. Barry, M. and Watson, J. (2007) *Evaluation of the Implementation of Local Area Co-ordination in Scotland*, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Stewart, J. (2004) *Taking Stock, Scottish Social Welfare after Devolution*, Bristol: Polity Press.

The Scottish Government, (2005) *The Role of the Social Worker in the 21st Century: A Literature Review*:

www.scotland.gov/Publications/2005/12/1994633/46349

United Nations (1989) *UN Convention on the Rights of the Child*, Geneva: UN

Waterhouse, L., McGhee, J., Whyte, W., Loucks, N., Kay, H., and Stewart, R. (2000) *The Evaluation of Children's Hearings in Scotland*, Edinburgh, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit.

Williams, R. (1975) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* Glasgow,

Fontana in Ferguson, I (2007) *Increasing User Choice or Privatizing Risk?*

The Antinomies of Personalisation *British Journal of Social Work*, 37: pp 387 – 403.