British Journal of Social Work (2002) **32,** 711–722

Social Movements, Social Justice and Social Work

Neil Thompson

Neil Thompson is a Director of Avenue Consulting Ltd and a Visiting Professor at the University of Liverpool.

Correspondence to: Neil Thompson, Avenue Consulting Ltd, PO Box 2060, Wrexham LL13 OZG, Wales, UK.

Summary

This paper explores the relationship between social movements, social justice and social work. It examines the role of social movements in promoting social justice and considers the influences of such movements in the development of emancipatory forms of social work practice. It also considers the question of whether social work can be viewed as a form of social movement in its own right. A central theme of the paper is the fundamental tension between social work as a force for social regulation and as a force for social development and emancipation.

Introduction

The historical development of anti-discriminatory practice can be traced to sets of influences both within and outside social work itself. One such external factor was clearly the role played by social movements. That is, the push from various pressure groups and related cultural formations can be seen to have played a role in challenging traditional approaches to social work and destabilizing the psychodynamic, individually oriented paradigm which held sway for many years (Barber, 1991) and laying the foundations for a more sociologically influenced theoretical base to emerge, with a clearer and stronger focus on social justice. To begin with, the sociological base was primarily a class-based analysis, gradually broadening out to take account of race and gender dimensions and, subsequently, age, disability and sexual identity (Thompson, 2001). That sociological perspective in turn laid the foundations for emancipatory practice—that is, forms of practice which seek to challenge discrimination and oppression.

This paper explores how the development of new social movements played a part in laying those foundations, giving a much higher level of attention to the pursuit of

social justice and thereby throwing the inherent social work tensions between care and control into sharp relief. This is tackled in three parts. First, I address the relationship between social movements and social justice, exploring in broad outline how various movements have contributed to the challenging of social oppression. Secondly, I consider the relationship between social movements and social work, taking account of the ways in which such movements have influenced social work thinking and practice. Finally, I pose the question of whether social work can, in itself, be seen as a form of social movement.

Social movements and social justice

To begin with, it is important that we are clear on what we mean by a social movement. Marx and McAdam (1994) offer the following definition: 'Social movements can be defined as organised efforts to promote or resist change in society that rely, at least in part, on non-institutionalised forms of political action' (p. 3, cited in Campbell and Oliver, 1996, p. 22). Della Porta and Diani (1999) argue that it is important to distinguish social movements from formal campaigning organizations:

> the difference between social movements and . . . other organizations does not consist primarily of differences in organizational characteristics or patterns of behaviour, but of the fact that social movements are not organizations, not even of a peculiar kind. . . . They are interactions between different actors which may either include formal organizations or not, depending on shifting circumstances (Della Porta and Diani, 1999, p. 16).

Social movements can be seen as an alternative to party politics as a means of attempting to influence policy in relation to particular areas (Byrne, 1997). In this respect, they constitute a form of political pressure which is part of neither mainstream party politics nor recognized pressure groups, such as Shelter, Child Poverty Action Group and so on—although social movements can at times interrelate closely with one or both of these political domains.

Although social movements certainly predate the 1960s, we can note that the decade of 'permissiveness' and social expectation was clearly a major milestone in the growth and influence of social movements. It was at this period in history that the term 'new' was added to 'social movements', such was the surge of support for social and political causes. It was also a decade when the seeds of radical social work were being sowed. However, both social movements and social work have continued to change and develop.

In some respects, social movements reflect what many would regard as the 'postmodern turn', insofar as they are characterized by fragmentation rather than unity and cohesion. Different interests are represented by different groups which relate to one another loosely if at all. Given that Clarke (1996) refers to postmodernism as 'the politicisation of difference' (p. 42), then social movements can clearly be associated with what has come to be known as postmodernity (see Thompson, 1998, for an evaluation of postmodernism in relation to social work).

Not all theorists, however, would subscribe to a postmodernist perspective. For example, Habermas (1987) writes of 'high modernity', rather than postmodernity. However, he too recognizes the fragmentation of social movements when he focuses on their 'particularism'—that is, their tendency to focus on specific causes rather than general social, cultural or political formations or movements. As Hewitt (1996) points out:

> Habermas characterises social movements by their specific orientation to specific concerns arising in the cultural field—for example, the needs of marginalized groups for cultural identity—which cannot be allayed by recourse to traditional measures of material compensation and redistribution (Hewitt, 1996, p. 207).

Habermas' view of social movements is that they are concerned with specific cultural objectives about quality of life in relation to 'equality, self-realisation, participation and human rights' (Hewitt, 1996, p. 207). There are clearly strong echoes here with contemporary emphases in social work, or at least in progressive or emancipatory approaches to social work.

Another theorist whose work would be consistent with the fragmentation thesis but who would also not attract the label 'postmodernist' would be Sartre. In his work on social theory, Sartre drew a distinction between what he called a series, a group-in-fusion and a fused group (Sartre, 1982). A series refers to a group of people who have something in common (people waiting in a bus queue is an example Sartre uses), but who are not united or organized, integrated or bonded in any way. Indeed, a characteristic of a series is that the members can at any time become competitors or even enemies (for example, if the bus arrives and there is not enough room for everyone in the queue to board). A series is therefore a very unstable group, riven with (the potential for) conflict and therefore not a firm basis for collective action.

A group-in-fusion, by contrast, refers to a group of people who have come together with a common cause and are in the process of establishing ways of working together, still struggling to establish norms and agreed practices and approaches. A fused group is another step away from a series. That is, it has gone beyond a group-in-fusion and has actually achieved that fusion. In this way, it is more stable and potentially more powerful and effective as a basis for collective action than a group-in-fusion which is still finding its way. However, the danger with a fused group is that it can easily become institutionalized—that is, it can become rigid and inflexible in its ways. in this way the group becomes 'reified', an entity in its own right which can act against the actions (or 'praxis') of group members.

Given the fluid nature of social movements, they can largely be seen as 'groups-in-fusion', although some can be seen to have achieved at least elements of fused group status. It is this fluidity and separation from institutionalized political structures that gives social movements their potency in so far as they can have the flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances and seek to influence change without being held back by the constraints of a formalized organization and the inbuilt inertia of institutionalization.

One characteristic of the emergence of the 'new social movements' as they became known, was that their focus was much broader than the traditional emphasis

on economic matters associated with worker and trade union movements. That is, new social movements addressed a broad range of social and political concerns, including: women's rights and the rise of feminism; anti-racist struggles; disability; older people's rights; gay liberation; anti-psychiatry and so on. What united these diverse struggles was the pursuit of social justice through attempts to challenge oppression and the processes of discrimination which give rise to it.

Space does not permit a detailed analysis of these various movements or indeed of the many others, and so I shall restrict myself to a brief exposition of those that I see as the most relevant to social work. This will lay the foundation for our discussion of social movements and social work.

The women's movement

The push for equality of the sexes and the rise of the feminist movement have had a significant impact on the social world, raising considerable awareness of the insidious effects of patriarchal cultures and structures in shaping the life chances of women and men. Although we are, as Bryson (1999) points out, a long way from genuine gender equality, the women's movement has succeeded in raising awareness of gender oppression and the need to develop more egalitarian forms of practice.

It is also fair to say that the movement has gone beyond awareness-raising to achieve some important advancements—for example in promoting women's citizenship rights, although clearly with much still to be achieved (Lister, 1997). See Segal (1999) for a discussion of the importance of the rise of feminism in shaping the contemporary social order and cultural practices.

'Black power'

The fight against racism has a long and complex history. The development of the 'black power' movement in the 1960s was a significant part of that history insofar as it played a significant part in raising awareness of racial inequalities and placed the eradication of racism firmly on the political agenda. In the UK, the recognition of cultural diversity as a very real part of the social fabric has been slow in coming and is still not accepted by many sections of the community who hold on to images of the UK as a 'white' nation.

The term 'black power movement' is perhaps a misleading one, as the fight against racism owes much to that movement but also goes far beyond it. While social work has played its part in developing anti-racism, the successes have been far from comprehensive and much remains to be achieved (Penketh, 2000; Williams *et al*., 1998).

'Grey power'

The political voice of older people has perhaps never been a major one (Walker and Naegele, 1999), although the rise of what became known as the 'grey power' move-

ment clearly made a contribution to putting older people's rights and needs on the agenda. Ginn (1996) argues that: 'The notion that elderly people as a group wield power in developed societies does not stand up to examination' (p. 128). However, she goes on to point out that the phrase, 'grey power':

> has been used by elderly people's organisations to express their collective resistance to ageist stereotypes of dependence and social redundancy and to assert the continuity of human agency into later life. Echoing 'Black Power', the phrase implicitly suggests consciousness of a parallel with the struggles of other groups which are both materially disadvantaged and socially devalued (Ginn, 1996, p. 129).

Ageism as a form of discrimination and thus as a source of oppression has received far less attention than the more well-established fields of anti-racism and anti-sexism, which in itself can be seen to reflect the marginalization of older people in contemporary western societies.

The disabled people's movement

The emergence of the social model of disability has had quite a significant impact on the field of disability studies and, perhaps to a lesser extent, disability services. The key notion that it is the social attitudes of a disablist ideology that have the effect of *dis*abling people, rather than their actual physical impairments has been a very influential one, helping many people move away from a model of individual pathology. The disabled people's movement has developed around this concept and has been instrumental in promoting it as an alternative to traditional individualist perspectives.

Oliver (1990) captures the point well when he argues that:

> if disability is defined as social oppression, then disabled people will be seen as the collective victims of an uncaring or unknowing society rather than as individual victims of circumstance. Such a view will be translated into social policies geared towards alleviating oppression rather than compensating individuals. It almost goes without saying that at present, the individual and tragic view of disability dominates both social interactions and social policies (Oliver, 1990, p. 3).

Gay liberation

The view that homosexuality is a form of mental illness has by no means been eradicated altogether, but its position as a dominant idea has been very strongly challenged by the gay liberation movement (Neal and Davies, 1996). The development of 'queer' theory—that is, theorization of same sex relationships and social attitudes towards them—has been a noted aspect of contemporary social thought. See, for example Duberman *et al*. (1991) and Blasius and Phelan (1997).

An important feature of this literature and the movement of which it forms a part is the critique of traditional, medicalized models of sexual identity. Gay liberation

has succeeded in helping to make homosexuality a mainstream social issue rather than a marginalized cultural field.

Mental health survivors

The mental health survivors movement is premised on the view that the mental health system is profoundly oppressive and that may of the difficulties experienced by people with mental health needs are caused, or at least exacerbated, by the system itself. The development of this movement is associated with the theoretical perspective that came to be known as anti-psychiatry. Although many people were involved in developing this perspective, perhaps the two best-known theorists are Ronald Laing and David Cooper (see Laing and Cooper, 1964) Although some of their claims (particularly those of David Cooper) have been dismissed as untenable, much of their approach has stood the test of time and continues to act as a thorn in the side of the medical and psychiatric establishment.

As with the gay liberation movement, a significant feature of the mental health survivors' movement is a rejection of a medical model of mental distress. The mental health survivors' movement has consistently challenged the disempowerment and stigmatization inherent in medicalized approaches to mental health problems.

People first

The tendency to depersonalize people with learning disabilities has been challenged by the *People first* movement, with its emphasis on the importance of avoiding approaches to learning disability which fail to recognize the rights and strengths of people with learning disabilities. The movement has challenged the view of people with learning disabilities as 'perpetual children' and has sought to promote greater user involvement and a less patronizing, stigmatizing and dependency-creating approach to their health and social welfare needs.

Although the examples given here clearly have a part to play in the pursuit of social justice, it is also important to note that not all social movements make a contribution to social justice. For example, fascist social movements could hardly be described as making a contribution to social justice but they none the less remain social movements.

Social movements and social work

The interrelationships between the various social movements and social work have been complex and varied. There is, of course, no simple, direct relationship between the two. However, it is quite clear that social movements have influenced social work thinking and practice in a number of ways. We shall now explore some of those influences and consider the difference they have made.

Mullaly (2001) presents a model for a progressive approach to social work in which discrimination and oppression are challenged and social justice is promoted. Part of this model is a role for 'new social movement theory': 'based on locality and/or interest, cultural/social identities, a neopopulist view of democracy, and strategies of empowerment and community autonomy' (p. 317). This is consistent with a recognized trend in social work in particular and social policy in general towards a more prominent role for service users in shaping service provision and related matters of planning, evaluation and education and training. This has become relatively well-established in relation to disability, learning disability and mental health, and is beginning to become established in children's services (Thomas, 2000) and, to a lesser extent, services to older people (Roberts and Chapman, 2001). We can loosely refer to a user participation movement, but this can be nothing more than a loose usage of the term, as the reality is that there is no unified user movement, but rather a diverse and fragmented set of specific user participation movements in relation to specific client groups.

In some respects, this user participation movement has had the effect of challenging the complacency of a traditional model of professionalism based on the notion of 'we know best'. The notion of professionalism is an ambiguous one. It can refer to a commitment to high standards, to learning and development, to ethical practice and to accountability. In this regard, it is compatible with emancipatory practice and the pursuit of social justice. However, it can also refer to elitism and relations of dominance and subordination, in which case it is far from compatible with social justice (Hugman, 1998; Thompson, 2000*a*). The challenge social work faces, therefore, is to develop forms of professionalism which are consistent with, and welcoming of, user participation and a commitment to equality and social justice—that is, professionalism based on partnership.

Although the various social movements which can be seen to have influenced social work are disparate and fragmented in many ways, they do none the less manifest a number of recurring themes. Space does not permit a detailed analysis or exposition of these themes, but two in particular can be highlighted. First, as already noted, there is the challenge to the traditional model of professionalism based on an elitist assumption that 'we know best'. Social movements have helped to challenge the orthodoxy of such a view and to expose the actual or potential abuses and misuses of power inherent in practising according to that paradigm. Secondly, there is an emphasis on what has come to be known as 'user involvement' or 'user participation'—a much stronger focus on hearing the voice of clients and carers and recognizing them as important stakeholders in the development, provision and evaluation of services.

What both these themes have in common is an underpinning model of partnership, an approach to practice based on shared collective endeavours, premised on a shared understanding of the problems being addressed and the means of tackling them. A partnership-based model of professionalism is therefore an important approach to develop. As Donnison (1998) puts it, people whose job it is to solve social problems and meet human needs should: 'recognise that it would be incompetent and unprofessional to neglect the evidence which can be offered by those who

actually experience these needs and problems'. He goes on to add that, where such an approach works well, it helps to: 'dissolve social hierarchies, to make public services accountable and to ensure that everyone is treated with the respect that each human being deserves' (Donnison, 1998, p. 67).

Social work as a social movement

Social work is a contested area. What I mean by that is that definitions of the nature and purpose of social work are by no means the subject of a comfortable consensus. Different interest groups within and outside social work play a part in shaping not only the context of social work but also the very nature of the enterprise (Payne, 1996; Thompson, 2000*b*).

Payne (2002) argues that social work comprises three aims: effective service provision, empowerment and social transformation. Empowerment goes beyond service provision and seeks to support users of social work services in attaining greater control over their lives and circumstances. Empowerment forms the basis of the potential for transformation, for changing social relations to enable people to have more satisfying lives.

As Mullaly (1993) comments, in describing 'structural social work', his version of emancipatory practice:

> The guiding principle for structural social work practice is that everything we do must in some way contribute to the goal of social transformation. This does not mean that the legitimate, here-and-now immediate needs of people are ignored. Rather, structural social work practice comprises a simultaneous two-pronged approach: (1) to provide practical, humanitarian care to the victims and casualties of our patriarchal, liberal-capitalist society; and (2) to restructure society along socialist lines (Mullaly, 1993, p. 153).

While it is important to acknowledge that much social work practice struggles to achieve even the aims of service provision, let alone those of empowerment and social transformation, we should not lose sight of the potential for positive developments in empowering forms of practice (Adams, 1996, 1998) as part of establishing a basis for making a contribution to social transformation.

This is not to return to the idealistic optimism of the early days of radical social work (Thompson, 1992, 1998), but rather, as Healy (2000) argues, to tackle the question of social transformation more cautiously: 'Postmodernists reject visions of massive social transformation as a chimera and demand, instead, greater caution and constraint in the formation of critical practice objectives and processes' (p. 2). This, in turn, does not mean an abandonment of goals of empowerment and social transformation and an acceptance of service provision as the most that can be achieved, for, as Payne (2000) argues, social work practice can, and often does, go beyond its bureaucratic confines.

A basic premise of any social movement must be the belief that change can be achieved through collective action. Without such a belief, social movements would not be possible. Here we can draw a parallel with social work, insofar as social work

activities are geared towards change, based on the assumption that such changes are possible. However, a major issue, often contested, is that of whether change at the individual or familial level is all that is possible, or whether it is feasible to envisage social work making a contribution to broader changes in social relations and the social order.

While so much of social work continues to be characterized by defeatism and cynicism (Thompson, 2000*b*), the potential for playing a part in broader social change will be undermined. This is further accentuated by the low status of social work in the eyes of the general public and the poor media image that has developed largely but not exclusively as a result of inquiries into child deaths within the child protection arena. However, it should also be recognized that a failure to achieve significant success to date does not mean that the potential for future progress does not exist. This is a point to which I shall return below.

A further parallel that can be drawn between social movements and social work hinges on the relationship between social movements and formal political organization on the one hand and social work and the state on the other. That is, while social movements are certainly part of the political sphere, their relationship with formal political organizations and structures is complex, as is the relationship between social work and the state. Social movements bring pressure to bear on formal political organizations and processes, and such pressure can be supportive of those organizations and their objectives or, by contrast can challenge and seek to undermine them. There is no simple, one-dimensional relationship between social movements and other political forces. Similarly, social work can be seen to be supportive of state initiatives and objectives in many ways, but can also run counter to these and be a thorn in the side of the formal power structures of the state.

White (1999), in a paper on feminist social work and the state, argues that British social work is a 'state-mediated occupation, located in a bureau-professional regime' (p. 109). Let us explore in more detail what this means.

First, there can be no doubt that social work is state-mediated, in the sense that the state, through its legal and policy framework, sets the parameters for intervention (Howe, 1996). Even social work in the voluntary or private sectors is regulated by the statutory framework and much of it is also funded by the state, indirectly at least. Unlike social movements, then, social work does not have the ability to divorce itself entirely from the established political framework of the state. However, there remains considerable scope for flexibility of thought and action within the broad parameters of the statutory framework. As Parton (1996) argues: 'perhaps we have wider scope for creativity and self-determination than we often assume and that things can be changed' (p. 17).

Secondly, social work is a 'bureau-profession'. This refers to a combination of bureaucratic framework and a degree of professional autonomy. It is not a profession in the classic sense, with its connotations of self-government, but nor is it an occupation in which autonomy is, or can be, entirely absent (Jordan, 1990).

Clearly, then, there are constraints upon social work, given its roots in the statutory framework. However, we should be wary of adopting a reductionist approach to these roots. The potential for reductionism arises if we neglect two important sets

of factors. First, as already noted, although statutory constraints clearly exist, the scope for action within those broad parameters should not be underestimated.

Second, we should not neglect the important role of the voluntary sector and the significant contribution it can make to shaping social work practices and indeed discourses. It is clearly a mistake to see social work in purely statutory terms. Indeed, it is often in the voluntary sector that more participative approaches are to be found, with perhaps a greater emphasis on collective action.

Social movements, as we have seen, are characterized by collective action, joint action to establish common goals. In this regard, social work is a 'mixed bag'. While social work activity is understandably characterized by diversity and fragmentation, with individuals working in an 'atomized' way, pursuing particular goals in relation to specific individuals and families, there is—potentially at least—the basis for collective endeavours. These would include adopting larger-scale macro approaches in some circumstances (anti-poverty strategies, for example) and seeking to influence the wider social policy agenda. Donnison (1998) makes apt comment when he argues that:

> Collective concern and collective action call for effective public services staffed by credible professions. Battered though the reputations of some of them have been in recent years, the credibility and effectiveness of these professions are still vital requirements for a fair and democratic society. No-one else can ensure that everyone has opportunities to work and the skills required for it, that everyone gets good medical care when it is needed, that plans for urban development take account of social justice and sustainability. Yet we cannot simply reinstate the old, bureaucratic, top-down system of local government which we used to rely on. New forms of governance—more democratic, responsive and inclusive—are needed (Donnison, 1998, p. 194).

Social work can make a contribution to 'more democratic, responsive and inclusive' forms of governance at the very least by leading by example, moving away from an ethos of 'we know best' professionalism to one based on partnership.

Social movements have clearly played a significant role in pursuing social justice and raising awareness of the need for social injustices to be highlighted and addressed. They have also, directly or indirectly, had a significant influence on the development of social work and the emergence of a much stronger and clearer emphasis on social justice above and beyond traditional concerns with individual and family welfare. In this respect, social movements have played a part in shaping the critical, progressive edge of contemporary social work.

A more difficult issue to address is that of whether social work can itself be seen as a form of social movement. My answer to this question must be no, as the statutory roots of the profession make it impossible to have the flexibility, fluidity and influence of a free-floating social movement. However, it would be a qualified no, as I would see significant parallels for social work with some aspects of social movements, not least the push towards the empowerment and social transformation of which Payne (2002) writes. Professional social work is not simply an organ of the state and is therefore in a position to seek to influence the state and the political sphere more broadly.

However, it is important to keep the situation in perspective. Terms like 'play a part in' or 'make a contribution to' should not be overestimated. Just as a social movement can be only one player in a complex web of political actions, interactions and discourses, so too can a progressive social work be but one small part in the development of a more just and humane society.

Conclusion

Social movements are now an established part of the political scene and can be seen to have chalked up a number of important successes over the years in relation to their specific goals and the pursuit of social justice more generally. Social work too has made significant advances in developing its progressive edge and making a contribution to social justice, although we must be careful not to overestimate the progress made or underestimate how much remains to be done. However, what is clear is that, partly as a result of the influence of social movements on social work, the profession is now in a much stronger position to move away from the traditional individualistic approach which paid little or no attention to wider cultural and structural factors and to act as a force for social amelioration and the challenging of injustice, discrimination and oppression.

References

Adams, R. (1996) *Empowerment and Social Work*, 2nd edn, London, Macmillan, now Palgrave.

Adams, R. (1998) 'Strategies of empowerment: taking account of protests by people', in Lesňik, B. (ed.), *Countering Discrimination in Social Work*, Aldershot, Avebury.

Barber, J. G. (1991) *Beyond Casework*, London, Macmillan.

Blasius, M. and Phelan, M. (eds) (1997) *We are Everywhere: A Historical Sourcebook of Gay and Lesbian Politics*, London, Routledge.

Bryson, V. (1999) *Feminist Debates: Issues of Theory and Political Practice*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Byrne, P. (1997) *Social Movements in Britain*, London, Routledge.

Campbell, J. and Oliver, M. (1996) *Disability Politics: Understanding Our Past, Changing Our Future*, London, Routledge.

Clarke, J. (1996) 'After Social Work', in Parton, N. (ed.), *Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work*, London, Routledge.

Davies, D. and Neal, C. (eds) (1996) *Pink Therapy: A Guide for Counsellors and Therapists Working with Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Clients*, Buckingham, Open University Press.

Della Porta, D. and Diani, M. (1999) *Social Movements: An Introduction*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Donnison, D. (1998) *Policies for a Just Society*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.

Duberman, M. B., Vicinus, M. and Chauncey, G. (eds) (1991) *Hidden from History: Reclaiming the Gay and Lesbian Past*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Ginn, J. (1996) 'Grey power: Age-based organisations' response to structured inequalities', in Taylor, D. (ed.), *Critical Social Policy: A Reader*, London, Sage.

Habermas, J. (1987) *The Theory of Communicative Action: Volume II: Lifeworld and System*, Cambridge, Polity.
Healy, K. (2000) *Social Work Practices: Contemporary Perspectives on Change*, London, Sage.
Hewitt, M. (1996) 'Social movements and social need: problems with postmodern political theory', in Taylor, D. (ed.), *Critical Social Policy: A Reader*, London, Sage
Howe, D. (1996) 'Surface and Depth in Social Work Practice', in Parton, N. (ed.), *Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work*, London, Routledge.
Hugman, R. (1998) *Social Welfare and Social Values*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
Jordan, B. (1990) *Social Work in an Unjust Society*, Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf.
Laing, R. D. and Cooper, D. (1964) *Reason and Violence: A Decade of Sartre's Thought*, London, Tavistock.
Lister, R. (1997) *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
Marx, G. and McAdam, D. (1994) *Collective Behavior and Social Movements*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.
Mullaly, B. (1993) *Structural Social Work: Ideology, Theory and Practice*, Toronto, McLelland and Stewart.
Mullaly, B. (2001) 'Confronting the politics of despair: Toward the Reconstruction of progressive social work in a global economy and postmodern age', *Social Work Education* **20** (3).
Neal, C. and Davies, D. (1996) 'Introduction', in Davies, D. and Neal, C. (eds), *Pink Therapy: A Guide for Counsellors and Therapists Working with Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual Clients*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
Oliver, M. (1990) *The Politics of Disablement*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
Parton, N. (1996) 'Social theory, social change and social work: An introduction', in Parton, N. (ed.), *Social Theory, Social Change and Social Work*, London, Routledge.
Payne, M. (1996) *What is Professional Social Work?*, Birmingham, Venture Press.
Payne, M. (2000) *Anti-Bureaucratic Social Work*, Birmingham, Venture Press.
Payne, M. (2002) 'Balancing the equation', *Professional Social Work*, January.
Penketh, L. (2000) *Tackling Institutional Racism: Anti-Racist Policies and Social Work Education and Training*, Bristol, The Policy Press.
Roberts, K. and Chapman, T. (2001) *Realising Participation: Elderly People as Active Users of Health and Social Care*, Aldershot, Ashgate.
Sartre, J-P. (1982) *Critique of Dialectical Reason*, London, Verso.
Segal, L. (1999) *Why Feminism?*, Oxford, Polity Press.
Thomas, N. (2000) *Children, Family and the State: Decision-making and Child Participation*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
Thompson, N. (1992) *Existentialism and Social Work*, Aldershot, Avebury.
Thompson, N. (1998) *Promoting Equality: Challenging Discrimination and Oppression in the Human Services*, London, Palgrave Macmillan.
Thompson, N. (2000*a*) 'Towards a new professionalism', in National Assembly for Wales, *Moving On: A Report on the Lost in Care Conference*, Bangor, University of Wales, Bangor.
Thompson, N. (2000*b*) *Understanding Social Work: Preparing for Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
Thompson, N. (2001) *Anti-discriminatory Practice*, 3rd edn, Basingstoke, Palgrave.
Walker, A. and Naegele, G. (1999) *The Politics of Old Age in Europe*, Buckingham, Open University Press.
White, V. (1999) 'Feminist social work and the state: A British perspective', in Lesňik, B. (ed.), *Social Work and the State*, Brighton, Pavilion.
Williams, C., Soydan, H. and Johnson, M. R. D. (eds) (1998) *Social Work and Minorities: European Perspectives*, London, Routledge.