Circumstancesof Postmodern Institutionalisation in the Context of Social Services

Libor MUSIL

As the title suggests, the question to which this chapter seeks an answer is related to the conditions of institutionalisation of social work in contemporary society. Consequently, the chapter bases its considerations on certain suppositions regarding the notions of "institution" and "institutionalisation". Before asking the actual question, we shall specify these suppositions in more detail.

Institution, institutionalisation and social work

In the present work, social work will be considered as an institution[1], i.e. a pattern (model) of actions and interactions accepted by people as a standard (routinely used) and legitimate (one they see justified) manner of addressing a problem recognised by them (Musil, 2013a: 11–15). From the viewpoint of this concept of "institution", "institutionalisation of social work" is a process of crystallisation (clarification) and implementation (introduction) of a relatively complex pattern of actions and interactions between social workers and people who face problems that social workers should help address.

It is apparent from the literature mapping the development of social work since the beginning of the 20th century that social work in Europe and North America was and still is understood as a specialised activity aimed at addressing problem interactions between people in need and the subjects involved in their social environment. In short, as "help specialised in addressing problem interactions" (for more details, see Musil, 2013a; Musil, 2013b). Therefore, institutionalisation of social work shall be regarded as a series of mutually related individual processes which lead to a routine use of social workers' professional help with addressing problem interactions.

According to Musil (2013a: 15-16), the individual processes of institutionalisation of social work as mentioned above consist in "recognition of the problem", "formulation of a help pattern", "acceptance of the pattern" and "routinisation of its use" (making its use a routine).

In terms of institutionalisation of social work, problem recognition consists in accepting the idea that where interactions between people in need (for example, clients with disabilities) and other subjects in society (e.g. providers of social services) take an undesirable course, this represents a specific issue that can be tackled using a specialised type of helping intervention (e.g. by accompanying the client in the process of establishing contact with a provider, etc.).

Thus, the pattern – model[2] – of specialised help with addressing problem interactions is

---

[1]The term "interaction" is used to denote a type of human action consisting in mutual reactions between two or more subjects. Thus, the words "actions and interactions" need not be always repeated and institutions can shortly be described as "patterns of actions adopted as a manner of addressing a specific problem".

[2]In the interest of clarity of this text, I knowingly simplify when formulating the framework description of the processes of institutionalisation of social work. Instead of stating that social workers formulate a "pattern, i.e.

formulated by social workers in interaction with clients and other subjects (workers of organisations in public administration, local governments and the civil sector, *inter alia* universities, the public, authors of media communications, etc.). In their interaction with clients, social workers give a practical shape to the abstract prototype of their helping interventions. (For example, when they help their clients address needs which the existing providers of social services are unable to satisfy.)

Specialised help by social workers becomes recognised when it is used. People involved in problem interactions begin to randomly use help organised based on a pattern that is being (has been) newly formulated. In this way they become acquainted with the help prototype and learn the language which can be used to describe the problems in interactions and to ask for help with such problems. If they find social workers' help effective (for example, when the provider adapts his services to the client's situation and needs thanks to the social worker's intervention), they begin to regard the new pattern as a useful means of help. Thanks to this, the provision of this help receives financial support. The latter, if provided, can be understood as a sign of recognition of usefulness of specialised help provided by social workers.

Subsequently, those involved in problem interactions routinely use the available specialised help of social workers. This means that in a situation where they are unable to address troubles in interaction with another subject, they find it quite normal to ask help from a social worker in overcoming these difficulties. And they automatically expect that other people who have similar troubles, and are uncertain about how to address them, will do the same. The expectation that people with troubles in interactions will ask a social worker for help applies to both clients (e.g. an elderly person whose provider does not respect the client's request and persistently provides services in a way which is incompatible with the client's wishes) and other subjects in their social environment (e.g. a service provider who is unable to work together with the client's close persons, or a local government in a municipality whose inhabitants complain about a lack of services capable of satisfying their unmet needs).

Problem and question

This chapter focuses on the above-defined process of institutionalisation of the field of social work in the context of Czech social services.

Relevant literature by authors writing in Czech offers five relatively clearly formulated social work patterns in the context of social services. These shall be described below, and for the time being we shall refer to them as "case social work as part of care work" (Vostrovská, 1998), "arranging for services accompanying the administration of a social legislation agenda" (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014), "arranging for comprehensive help in a given case" (Szotáková, 2014), "coordination of social and healthcare services in a community"

---

prototype", it would be more realistic to state that they formulate a "pattern or patterns, i.e. prototype or prototypes" of their specialised actions taken in addressing problem interactions.

(Kubalčíková, 2013) and "assistance in client participation in the planning of services" (Kubalčíková, 2009b). The cited authors defined these patterns theoretically and, in three of the five cases, described them also empirically[3]. This means, in my opinion, that the process of formulating patterns of help with problem interactions among various parties involved in social services in Czech society has advanced rather far.

Unlike the relatively clear delimitation of the above-specified patterns of help, literature describes some other individual processes of institutionalisation of social work in the context of social services as problematic or uncrystallised. Literature written in Czech does not provide much information on recognition of the problems people experience in interactions with providers of social services. The authors of relevant literature consider as problematic the utilisation of the above patterns of help with addressing problem interactions among social service stakeholders (see, for example, Vostrovská, 1998; Havlíková, Hubíková, 2007: 17–20; Kubalčíková: 2009a: 94–95, 2009b: 96, 98; Navrátilová, Navrátil, 2009: 82; Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, Kubalčíková, 2013: 58–69, 80–84; Kubalčíková, 2013). Examples of the use of "arranging for services accompanying the administration of a social legislation agenda", "arranging for comprehensive help" and "assistance in client participation in the planning of services" are presented by the cited authors as "islands of positive deviation" rather than a routinely used practice (see, for example, Kubalčíková, 2009b: 95–99; Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, Kubalčíková, 2013: 80-81, 83; Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014; Szotáková, 2014). Kubalčíková (2013) emphatically recommends "coordinating community-based social and healthcare services", which she considers absent.

All this leads to the thought that the relatively advanced formulation of patterns of social work in the context of social services in Czech society is not (yet?) accompanied by development of other processes of institutionalisation, i.e. recognition of a problem and routine use and acceptance of patterns of social workers' help. Methods of social workers' help to people who need social services or have difficulties with using them have been described and hence are available. The idea that the difficulties arising in interactions among social service stakeholders represent a specific problem, which should or could be addressed professionally by social workers, is not very well known. Representatives of local governments (Kubalčíková, 2013) and managers (see e.g. Musil, Kubalčíková, Hubíková, Dvořáková, 2005: 93–96; Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, Kubalčíková, 2013: 30–34, 58) usually do not take this idea into consideration in their decisions. Consequently, the use of the established patterns of social workers' help does not become routine in the context of social services. These patterns are not accepted as obvious means of addressing problems arising for people in difficulties, their close persons, employees of public administration bodies and other parties when someone finds it

---

[3] The following patterns are described empirically, usually with the use of examples: "arranging for services accompanying the administration of a social legislation agenda" (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014), "arranging for comprehensive help in a given case" (Szotáková, 2014) and "assistance in client participation in the planning of services" (Kubalčíková, 2009b).

difficult to handle interactions with providers of social services.

In this chapter, I will therefore address the following question: "According to the theory of institutionalisation of social work, what circumstances prevent routine use and recognition of the established patterns of help in addressing problem interactions in the context of Czech social services?"

The terms "social work", "institution" and "institutionalisation" as defined above are of key importance in relation to this question. The terms "social services" and "social work in the context of social services" shall be defined first in the following text. In connection with these notions, the present text will explain the conditions under which it makes sense to draw a distinction between social work and social services. It will be shown how, on the basis of the above-specified conditions, Vostrovská (1998), Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014), Szotáková (2014) and Kubalčíková (2009b, 2013) formulate five patterns of social work or, in other words, prototypes of help in problem interactions in the context of social services.

Subsequently, the term "circumstances preventing institutionalisation of social work in the context of social services" will be defined together with the manner of formulation of the suppositions regarding these circumstances.

The text will further concentrate on formulation of the suppositions of the theory of institutionalisation of social work in relation to the circumstances which, in the context of Czech social services, hinder recognition of problem with interactions, routinisation and acceptance of established patterns of help with problems of this type. Furthermore, the author's suppositions will be explained as to the manner in which recognition and routinisation of social work is affected by the following aspects: the heritage of modern development in postmodern conditions; existing concept of help in the context of social services; procedural approach of managers; prevailing employee identity of social workers; coping with the consequences of managers' procedural approach by "taking a step out of" an employment organisation to inter-occupational help nets.

Social work in the context of social services

First, an example will be provided of problem interactions between clients of social services and others involved in community planning. Kubalčíková (2009b: 96–99) shows, amongst other things, that if clients are able to express their interest in negotiating a local concept of services, it becomes apparent that their ideas differ from those of the contracting entities (local authorities) and service providers. This, however, occurs only seldom, according to Kubalčíková (2009b: 96), because *"when exercised in practice, the method of community planning … is faced especially with a formalised approach to client participation by both the contracting entities and providers of services"*. This is problematic from the clients' viewpoint. From the viewpoint of local authorities, it is in turn problematic when clients wish to express their interests. Havlíková and Hubíková found at the research site where they studied the

process of community planning that: *"Participation of a users' representative ... was seen from the outset as a threat to the smooth process of CPSS*[4]. *Users were seen as incompetent ... unfamiliar with the secrets of municipal procedures and political negotiations, lacking in systematic thinking, adopting ... self-centred standpoints and showing little flexibility."* (Havlíková, Hubíková, 2007: 18.) Thus, in context of community planning of social services, the clients' problem interactions with the local government workers and service providers become an obstacle to exercising the clients' interest. Their "formalised"[5] approach causes *"clients to be disoriented and ... having few opportunities to influence how they are handled in the system"* (Kubalčíková, 2009b: 100). Kubalčíková (2009b: 99) considers that social workers should promote a change in the course of the clients' interactions with the contracting entities and providers towards a more effective participation of the clients in the decision-making process by assisting the clients, i.e. *"helping the clients express and promote their own interests"*.

However, social workers are almost never hired to address problems in interactions between the parties involved in community planning and they usually do not address this problems on their own initiative. As a result, nobody assists clients (for example, elderly people, people with a physical or mental disability, mothers in shelters as discussed above by Kubalčíková and Havlíková, Hubíková) in their participation. Everyone knows that it is officially desirable for clients to influence the development of social services intended for them and everyone has long had an opportunity to read what social workers could or should do for bringing that expectation into reality. Despite this, nobody gives social workers the task to assist clients in their participation in decision-making. If the task springs to the mind of a social worker, they cannot be sure that they will receive praise for assisting client participation. There are many reasons for this situation. To mention just one of them, social service stakeholders look at the relationship between social work and social services in a way which does not motivate them to delegate the above task.

Kubalčíková (2009b, 2013), as well as other authors cited above (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014; Szotákov; 2014), recommend that social workers should have a different content of work than other parties active in social services. For example, they would spend their working hours by helping clients effectively express their own interests. Similar proposals will seem logical and meaningful to those who have adopted the suppositions presented in the following paragraph on the relation between social work and social services. However, most representatives of local governments, managers of provider organisations and other social service stakeholders have not adopted such suppositions. They often hold the view that social workers, like many others, should perform administrative tasks or provide care. As a result,

---

[4] The cited authors use the acronym CPSS for Community Planning of Social Services (Havlíková, Hubíková, 2007: 5).

[5] Havlíková and Hubíková (2007: 18) use the word *"administrative"* for the approach to the clients' participation in decision-making which Kubalčíková (2009b) characterises as *"formalised"*.

they do consider the possibility of having social workers addressing problems in clients' interactions with those involved in community planning (or other social service stakeholders). In this arrangement, clients usually do not receive any assistance in expressing their interests.

The idea that they should be assisted in this, or in addressing other interactions, stems from the following suppositions. First, social service stakeholders (e.g. those participating in community planning) experience troubles in mutual interactions and, as a result, may perceive these as "problem" interactions. Second, addressing problem interactions among social service stakeholders is a prerequisite for attaining a good quality in satisfying clients' needs (e.g. those underrepresented in decision-making on community plans[6]) and, therefore, should receive special attention. The third assumption is that social service stakeholders can delegate the task of addressing these difficulties to qualified social workers, creating for them a specific mission in the context of social services. This gives rise to the fourth assumption – that recognition of the specific mission of social workers allows social service stakeholders to differentiate "social work" from "social services".

Adoption of the fourth assumption is conditional on adoption of the preceding three. This condition, however, is often not satisfied. Some social service stakeholders are convinced that no troubles arise in their interactions with others[7]. On the other hand, there are other social service stakeholders, who believe that although troubles in interactions do exist, they do not deserve attention, either because they are insignificant or because people address them spontaneously or because it is not desirable to address them[8]. From these points of view,

---

[6] Havlíková and Hubíková (2007: 18) describe how the community studied by them coped with fears that users lack competence to negotiate in the "triad" of contracting entities, providers and users: *"Since the requirement for user participation in the triad could not be ignored, they attempted to sidestep it to some degree. For that position, they engaged a ... 'quasi user' ... a person who had some experience with the use of social services while acting as the provider of a specific service."* Since he was a service provider, they regarded him as competent, a quality they would not expect users to have. *"However, even this 'competent user' role became empty over time and the user in fact ceased to exist as a member of the triad."*

[7] Data on the view which neglects troubles in interactions among social service stakeholders are not available. Some findings indirectly suggest that troubles in interactions among social service stakeholders remain outside the frame of reference of representatives of local governments. For example, Misconiová, Průša a Vostrovská (2003: 8–9) state that according to the interviewed mayors (or those who completed the questionnaire for them – author's note) *"social work with a client can only be done through his placement in a children's home"* and *"some ... understand the term 'social work' as work with a general practitioner or reduce it to technical requirements for buildings"*. The observation made by Kubalčíková (2013: 60–63) that the interviewed representatives of local governments show, amongst other things, *"a clear tendency to see the family as a key element in providing the necessary assistance"* seems to be a symptom of a lack of focus on interactions related to care for the elderly; the interviewed believed that such assistance should be provided in co-operation with field services or a relief service (*"the possibility of a short-term placement of the person they look after"*). Nevertheless, *"... for municipal representatives, family carers do not represent a specific client segment which needs ... attention"*. The findings of Kubalčíková seem to suggest that the interviewed neglected the possibility that cooperation of care recipients, home carers, professional carers and relief service needs to be coordinated and that difficulties may arise in the relationships among these parties.

[8] For example, according to Valová and Janebová, the workers of a residential facility sometimes address lacking resources by receiving only clients with a higher degree of dependence and hence a higher allowance for care. As a consequence, *"you collect a higher allowance for care from them but then again they obviously need more care"*. (Valová, Janebová, 2015: 16.) Such attempts at increasing the income of the organisation introduce tensions into interactions with applicants who need care but would bring less money into the facility as well as with clients

troubles in interactions do not appear as a serious problem and, consequently, there is no reason for distinguishing social work from social services. If "social work" is regarded as help in problem interactions, and if some believe that troubles in interactions do not exist or that there is no reason to address them, then, in their eyes, "social work" has no subject to address. As a result of this view, it may never come to the mind of municipal authorities or managers of provider organisations that they could task social workers with assisting clients in their attempts to express their interest in the process of community planning.

It is also possible that some social service stakeholders understand troubles in mutual interactions as a serious problem but they believe that it should be addressed by someone else than social workers. As Baláž (2011) points out, a rather common idea is that this should be a manager's task. In this case, the third of the above suppositions is not satisfied, because it does not seem appropriate to delegate the addressing of troubles in interactions to social workers. In such an arrangement, the latter have no specific mission in the context of social services (e.g. community planning). The idea that problems in interactions should be addressed by a manager also casts doubts on the assumption that special attention should be paid to problem interactions. If a manager is to deal with troubles in interactions, (s)he should obviously do this in parallel with many other, usually "more serious" management aspects. Therefore, it cannot be assumed that a manager would pay close attention to addressing troubles in interactions (for example, clients' troubles in negotiations with contracting entities and providers).

Differentiation between "social work" and "social services" can be expected among those social service stakeholders who assume that troubles[9] exist in mutual interactions and believe that the troubles need to be addressed and that a social worker should professionally assist in addressing them. Those who reflect the above suppositions perceive "social work in the context of social services" as follows:

"Social services" and "social work" can be seen as two different types of helping activities, which differ by their focus and the helping actions of those who perform them. For decades, "peoples' troubles in interactions with subjects in their social environment" (Wilensky, Lebeaux, 1965, 286–291, 315–316; Bartlett, 1970; Abel, 1994; Laan v.d., 1998a; Lorenz, 2004: 146–147, 2006; Payne, 2006; Musil, 2013a, and other authors) have been seen as the focus of social work. On the other hand, the subject of focus of social services appears to consist in "unmet needs of individuals" (Dustin, 2007; Wash, Holton, 2008). For those who assume that

---

who "pay better" but the facility is unable to provide them with adequate care due to a lack of capacity. For the staff of the facility, such problem interactions become an everyday part of their work – although they exist, it is better to ignore them, not to see them as a problem or not to address them as one.

[9] In this text, the term "troubles" refers to three types of obstacles to the desirable conduct of interactions between social service stakeholders. First, expected obstacles which social service stakeholders expect to occur very likely or unavoidably (e.g. a lack of information among those involved in the interactions which hinders coordination of their activities). Second, expected obstacles which social service stakeholders believe may, but need not, appear (e.g. differences between those involved in the interactions that may, if they occur, hinder coordination). Third, unexpected obstacles (such as unique personality traits, unexpected illness, unexpected habits of a party to the interactions, technical defect).

there are problem interactions among social service stakeholders and that these interactions should be addressed by social workers, social work concentrates on "help with troubles in interactions with the social environment" while social services deal with "meeting unmet needs of individuals".

Understood in the above-described manner, social work is not focused directly on meeting unmet needs but rather on shaping the interactions or relationships which are essential for meeting them. For example, it focuses on promotion of clients' involvement in decision-making on the community plan; on overcoming the obstacles which prevent the client from establishing contact with the social service provider; on facilitating problematic cooperation between carers and nurses in two NGOs; etc.

In these circumstances, social services appear as a wide range of various helping activities characterised by the fact that they directly result in meeting clients' unmet needs. These activities are usually considered to include care, personal assistance, provision of housing and related care, sometimes nursing, physiotherapy, various types of support therapies, etc.

Social service stakeholders are those who in one way or another participate in the provision of help to users of social services or who knowingly participate in the creation of conditions for provision of such help. Generally, there are six types of social service stakeholders: First, potential or existing clients or users, i.e. those whose legitimate needs are not satisfied or those who receive help in satisfying their needs. Second, informal or formally recognised helping workers. It is useful to divide the latter into workers helping in an employment relationship and volunteers. It is equally useful to divide them by qualification or field in which they provide help to social services clients – for example, carers, personal assistants, social workers, nurses, doctors, physiotherapists, psychologists, lawyers, teachers, etc. Organisations which provide help to clients of social services and representatives of such organisations represent the third type of social service stakeholders. The fourth type consists of public administration authorities and local governments, which, forming policies for social services and performing tasks in the area of public administration, influence the decision-making and activities of other social service stakeholders. Those involved in the financing of social services are the fifth type of stakeholders. The sixth type of social service stakeholders consists of help nets whose activities take place with participation of stakeholders of all the above types across various groups, occupations and organisations.

The above-described types of stakeholders mutually overlap. For example, some public administration authorities participate in the funding of social services. Workers of helping professions may simultaneously operate in the position of employees or representatives of organisations providing help to users of social services and participants in inter-occupational help nets dealing with a specific case or designing help and promoting the interests of clients from a specified target group etc.

Interactions (in general, rather than just problem interactions) among all of the

above-specified social service stakeholders have an effect on the availability and quality of help in meeting unmet needs of potential and existing clients. This set of interactions and their effects on the availability and quality of help in meeting unmet needs can be understood as the "context of social work in social services", i.e. one in which can give rise to a prototype of social worker – a person who provides professional help to social service stakeholders in addressing troubles in their mutual interactions.

The following can be seen as "suitable conditions" for materialisation of the social worker prototype: First, social workers are able to offer professional help in addressing troubles in interactions to other parties involved in social services. Second, a social service stakeholder requests that they provide such help. Third, the relevant social service stakeholder pays them, either directly or through his employer, for satisfying the request. Fourth, someone employs social workers as experts expected to provide help with troubles in interactions among social service stakeholders. They can also become self-employed experts.

All this may occur, and sporadically occurs, if social service stakeholders adopt the four suppositions formulated at the beginning of this subchapter, i. e., they consider that problem interactions exist in social services; that special attention should be paid to such interactions; that it is desirable that social workers should be asked to address them in a professional manner; and, thus, it is appropriate to distinguish between social work and social services.

Established patterns of social work in the context of social services

With a few exceptions, the authors who described (in their texts written in Czech) the patterns of social work in social services mentioned in the beginning of this chapter base their considerations on the above suppositions. A more detailed discussion of those suppositions follows. It will be explained how the authors writing about the patterns formulate their suppositions regarding problem interactions among social service stakeholders, about the attention paid to such interactions, about the manner in which these are addressed by social workers and the distinctions are drawn between social work and social services.

Case social work as part of care

The pattern identified in the title of this subchapter was described Vostrovská (1998), who has been popularising it in the environment of the Czech Care Services Society (hereinafter "CCSS") since the 1990s.

Vostrovská (1998: 3) considers it problematic that the caring *"is persistently and incompetently viewed as the exercise of purely auxiliary tasks"* and that it is thought that *"social conscience is sufficient"* as a qualification for caring. Vostrovská (1998: 2–3) considers that where this *"incompetent view"* is employed, there is an absence of appropriate support for qualification of workers in care services and hence the quality of social work in practice which, according to Vostrovská, *"naturally emerges"* in the care context.

Therefore, for the cited author, problem interactions exist between the CCSS and unspecified advocates of improper views of care services. It is likely that, in the cited article, Vostrovská had mainly two parties in mind: founders of care services, or rather the employers of workers in the care service sector, and the Association of Educators in Social Work. She seems to view the interactions between them as problematic because both of them, under the influence of prejudice, did not support[10] the endeavour of the CCSS to increase the qualifications for the exercise of the kind of social work which, according to Vostrovská's experience, spontaneously emerges in the care context as a response to clients' expectations.

Vostrovská states, unfortunately without providing empirical evidence[11], that *"the need for provision of comprehensive services emerges very naturally in the care sector"* and, consequently, *"a comprehensive approach is taken to the client's order"*. This takes place *"in the carer-territorial manager (or social worker) team"* and the comprehensive approach to the order is conditional[12] on the human relationship between the client and the staff. (Vostrovká, 1998: 2.) Thus, Vostrovská views the carer and the territorial manager (or social worker) as a collective provider of social work. The work includes *"performance of social inquiries, ... definition of social diagnosis, ... proposal of measures"*. The client *"becomes rather strongly fixed on 'his' carer, territorial manager or social worker"*, spontaneously approaches this key figure and the latter continuously provides the client and his/her broader family with advice and, if applicable, crisis support (Vostrovká, 1998: 2–3). Improvement of this model of *"case social work"* would deserve support, according to Vostrovská, because *"without its involvement ... care services cannot be delivered"* (Vostrovská, 1998: 1–2).

Vostrovská seems to express rather clearly certain conditions for recognition of social work in social services. She assumes that meeting, or addressing, continuously emerging needs and situations brings clients troubles in establishing contacts with the providers of other services. She further considers that problem interactions exist between the CCSS and parties from which the CCSS expects recognition of and support for case social work in care services. According to Vostrovská, appropriate attention should be paid to resolution of such problem interactions between clients and services and between the care sector and employers, as well as educators, in

---

[10] The founders, especially municipal authorities, the Czech Charity and some other NGOs most often believed at the time when the cited article by Vostrovská (1998) was written that *"a care worker does not need more than elementary education; (s)he must routinely master everyday work at home and ... the related hygienic practices and should complete the 'sanitary' (healthcare) course"* (Musil et al., 2006: 15). At the same time the Association of Educators in Social Work (a civic association of social work schools, hereinafter "the Association") refused to discuss the CCSS' application for membership with the substantiation that the applicant was not an educator in social work. The Association added that it did not see care as part of social work and that social workers who were members of the CCSS could exercise their professional interests as members of the Social Workers' Society. This shows that the Association did not support the endeavour of the head of the CCSS at the time to emphasise the qualifications for carer.

[11] It should be added that Vostrovská endeavoured to provide empirical evidence of her idea of comprehensive approach to the order of a client of care services and co-authored a research report on Integrated Domestic Social Care and Health Care in 2003 (see Misconiová, Průša, Vostrovská, 2003).

[12] Literally, *"... the client's order* [is] *addressed with a comprehensive approach where the created human relationship is not inconsiderable"* (Vostrovská, 1998: 2).

the field of social work.

However, Vostrovská does not share the assumption that flexible response to emerging needs and situations of the client should be entrusted to social workers. She assumes that flexible response to the development of the client's situation should involve "his/her" key worker – carer, territorial manager or social worker, with whom the client established a *"human relationship"* (Vostrovská, 1998: 2). The relationship ensures that the client has confidence in the key worker. And the worker, equipped with understanding stemming from that relationship, is able to interpret the client's needs or troubles to those who arrange for solutions, or directly ensures that they are addressed. Hence, according to Vostrovská, specialisation and occupational qualification of the social worker is not a key prerequisite for a flexible response and, if appropriate, intermediation of interactions with the full range of other providers of help. She considers that a long-term contact and relationship with the client is a precondition for flexible response to the client's changing needs and situation.

It seems that the emphasis of the key person and the person's relationship with the client gives rise to Vostrovská's ambiguous understanding of the relationship between care (social services) and social work. Vostrovská distinguishes between two dimensions of care. She refers to one as *"material help"*, which *"satisfies the client's elementary human needs"*[13]. To the second she refers to as *"case social work"*, the content of which is to arrange for a flexible and comprehensive solution within the relationship of the key worker with the client. The author assumes that: *"Material help in the form of services almost always occurs in the context of psychosocial help"* and *"it is necessary to combine* [it] *with other forms of help on the basis of a correct social diagnosis"* (Vostrovská, 1998: 3). While she draws a distinction between social work and social services, she does not regard them as two separate occupations. She recommends performing them "as a pair" of two inseparable activities.

Arranging for services accompanying the administration of a social legislation agenda

We assume that the prototype of social work which is referred to in this text as "arranging for services accompanying the administration of a social legislation agenda" is well-known not only abroad (see, for example, Hagen, 1987; Lipsky, 1991; Brodkin, 1997; Brock, Harknett, 1998 and other authors) but also among social workers in the Czech Republic (for example, Musil, Janská, 2011). It seems to have established itself in the practice of district authorities and, later, authorities of municipal self-governments (hereinafter "local governments"). From there it was transferred in 2012 by some social workers as part of their domain-specific knowledge to the contact offices of the Labour Office (hereinafter the "contact offices"). Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014:72) described this social work pattern within their research aimed at *"identifying the widest possible range of methods of addressing cases of people with*

---

[13] Vostrovská (1998: 3) places the *"feeling of certainty, safety, emotional satisfaction, and also the possibility of free expression and potential activation"* among *"basic human needs"*.

material need applied by social workers of contact offices and local governments". The text of their article suggests that the three authors were motivated to formulate the above intention by the suppositions which are identified above as the preconditions for differentiation between social work and social services. However, Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková formulate them rather specifically within the topic of social work with people with material need[14].

In contrast to Vostrovská (see above), Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014: 72 *et seq.*) base their considerations on the assumption that helping clients with a wide range of problems, and arranging for further help for them, including help by social services providers, should be performed specifically by social workers. They believe that any troublesome interactions between clients and social services providers should be professionally treated by social workers. They refer to social services as a method of help social workers should arrange for, but not exercise. Consequently, they regard social services and social work as two different helping activities. Although they do not explicitly specify this assumption, it is implicitly present throughout the cited article.

For example, the authors note that, according to their findings, in contact with clients with material need, social workers at contact offices and local governments quite often do not address the problems which lead to, or result from, the clients' material need (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014: 72). As a result of the lack of attention paid to these problems, social workers *"do not pay attention to arranging for services which could help address these problems and the overall situation of people with material need"* (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014: 72). The three authors believe that if interactions between social workers and people with material need do not result in arranging for help in addressing a wide range of problems of people with material need through the provision of social services (or some other type of help), they must be regarded as problem interactions. They do not make it possible to *"comprehensively address... the life situation"* of people with material need (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014: 72).

It follows that arranging for a more comprehensive solution of the situation of people with material need is not entirely common. Contact offices commonly believe that help to these people should consist in processing their applications for benefits of assistance in material need (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014: 72), while in the opinion of local governments, they should receive assistance in processing their applications (Musil et al., 2013: 64). Consequently, according to the cited authors, it is necessary to find out whether social workers know and use patterns of help which address, in addition to processing of applications for benefits, also other problems of persons with material need and are able arrange for help with these problems. If so, Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014: 72–73) consider that such

---

[14] Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014: 72, 85) refer to both successful and unsuccessful applicants for benefits of assistance in material need as "people with material need". They do so to show that not only the recipients of the relevant benefit, i.e. "clients in material need", but also "people endangered by material need" may become the target group of social work. This includes people whose application for the benefit is yet to be processed, unsuccessful applicants, people entitled to the benefit who do not apply for it and people with decreasing income who have not yet applied for the benefit of assistance in material need.

patterns should enrich the range of activities of social workers and support their ability to respond more effectively to the diverse problems and situations accompanying material need. Thus, the cited authors think that problems in interactions between social workers oriented towards administrative work and their clients with material need should be addressed, that the attention of social workers should be directed towards a wider range of problems of people with material need and arranging for help with these problems and that social workers should be offered methodological help with this task. It was for this reason that they tried to study the ideas of social workers at contact offices and local governments with respect to the methods of addressing the cases of people with material need in order to learn the widest possible range of such methods.

During the thus-oriented research, the social workers at selected contact offices and local governments described eleven methods of help to people with material need. The three researchers divided them into four sets[15] (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014: 77–78). Each set encompasses methods of help showing congruent features and each can thus be interpreted as a specific pattern of help to people with material need. One of the four patterns is related to the context of social services. For the purposes of this chapter, it shall be identified as "arranging for services accompanying the administration of a social legislation agenda". The reason for this terminology shall be explained below.

Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014: 78, 80–81) consider that this pattern is characterised by social worker s' endeavour to help satisfy the needs of a (successful or unsuccessful) applicant for benefits using actions directed at subjects in the applicant's social environment. This includes service providers, e.g. housing providers. In addition to actions aiming at service providers, social workers also mentioned actions targeting other types of subjects, such as creditors, employers, providers of benefits, etc.

The cited authors described two versions of "arranging for services accompanying the administration of a social legislation agenda". In some cases, the social worker *"does not try to address the client's situation in a comprehensive manner but responds to the immediate risk of general degradation of the situation, e.g. as a result of lost housing"*. Thus, (s)he endeavours to *"direct his/her action towards those whose conduct appears to them* [social workers] *to be an obstacle to resolution of the client's urgent problem"* – in the case concerned, the housing provider. In other cases social workers address the client's situation more comprehensively. They try to *"instruct* [clients] *in skills or habits unknown to them so far through learning, supervision or advice"*. In addition, *"in an endeavour to arrange, for example, for a change in the conditions of debt repayment, use of a social service ..., provision of a benefit, etc."*, they try

---

[15] Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014: 77–78) refer to these four patterns as follows: *"satisfying needs through benefits in material need"*, *"satisfying needs through benefits in material need and actions directed at competences of people in material need"*, *"satisfying needs using actions directed at the social environment"*, and *"changing interactions using actions directed at the social environment"*. This article concentrates especially on the third of the four patterns.

to *"act towards creditors, service providers or clerks. In doing so, they employ diverse combinations of advocacy (defending the interests) of the client, accompanying or representing the client in negotiations."*(Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014: 80–81.)

The above prototype of social work includes the idea that the agenda of benefits of assistance in material need offers contacts with people with material need that should be used as an opportunity to provide further help. Such contacts need not necessarily arise from standard processing of applications for benefits but also preparation of such applications, handling the consequences of unsuccessful applications and addressing the client's problem with meeting the relevant obligations. This idea is not presented explicitly in the cited article; however, some statements of the cited authors can be interpreted as indirect proof of its presence in social workers' thoughts. For example, as an example of arranging for help by a social worker at a contact office, Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková (2014: 81) chose the situation of a homeless person who had lost entitlement to the benefit of assistance in material need and hence ceased to be able to pay housing in a shelter as a result of his removal from the records of the Labour Office as a form of penalty. It was this particular bagatelle trouble with authorities that motivated the social worker's endeavour to keep the client in the shelter. Another (and not isolated) citation in the text quotes a social worker of a local government, who comments on the transfer of the benefit agenda to contact offices as a lost opportunity for helping people with material need: *"While we* [as the local government] *also paid out ... the benefits, ... we were able to work with the clients far easier, to direct them far easier"* (Musil et al., 2013: 63–64).

Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that arranging for services in itself is not a constitutive element of the pattern of social work described by Musil and his co-authors. It seems that, in the minds of the social workers on whose testimonies Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková rely, the contacts established in connection with the administration of the relevant benefit agenda are an absolute prerequisite for the arrangement for services. This seems to indicate that the pattern of social work discussed in this sub-chapter should be relatively easy to transfer to the context of administration of any analogous agenda anchored in social legislation, from benefits of various kinds to social and legal protection.

Arranging for comprehensive help in a given case

The pattern referred to here as "arranging for comprehensive help in a given case" and the above-described pattern identified by Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková share a characteristic feature consisting in the fact that the social worker focuses on case work and on arranging for further help. The difference is in the definition of the role of the social worker and the target group (s)he works with.

The above-described pattern combines arranging for provision of services and administration of a specific social legislation agenda and is therefore based on the assumption that the social worker specialises in the relevant agenda. From this point of view, the problem

addressed within the relevant agenda is a key factor in defining the target group and the role of the social worker. (In the following text, it shall be referred to as the "agenda-relevant problem" or just "relevant problem"). People with the relevant problem, e.g. poverty, which may or need not become "material need" according to the standards of the relevant agenda, are considered to be one of the possible target groups. The social worker as the administrator of the given agenda is expected to help people in addressing the relevant problem as well as other troubles, especially those which have an effect on resolution of the agenda-relevant problem. As a rule, the social worker informs the client of the available means of help with these problems and (s)he may arrange for help with other troubles. It is admitted that, in a certain situation, it may be appropriate to reduce help to administration of the given agenda.

This is not true in the pattern referred to in this text as "arranging for comprehensive help in a given case". Its initial suppositions are presented in Szotáková (2014). There are two such suppositions. First, the client has more than one, or even many, mutually related problems and needs help in addressing them. Second, effective help in addressing a set of problems is conditional on cooperation among more than one, or many, helping subjects, which need to be linked together in order to ensure such cooperation. Therefore, it is crucial to create a coordinated net of helping parties capable of responding adequately to the cluster of the client's interwoven problems (Szotáková, 2014: 63–64, 65). From this point of view, people with *"multiple problems"* are primarily seen as the target group (Szotáková, 2014: 62, 63, 65). This primary focus on clients with numerous problems does not rule out intentional arranging for comprehensive help as an approach to help to people from a specific target group, such as people with a mental disease or addiction (Szotáková, 2014: 64–65). It is not expected, however, that help limited to resolution of a single problem of the client could be effective.

In this framework, the key worker is referred to as the *"case manager"*. Szotáková (2014: 62–64) points out the ambiguity of this term[16] and clearly defines her understanding of the role of a case manager. The task of the case manager is to work together with the client in defining the problems and the help the client needs in addressing them; to arrange for and co-ordinate a net of helping subjects to provide the necessary help to the client; to facilitate client's orientation in the range of services and other sources of help; and to accompany him/her in cooperation with those participating in the helping net.

Thus, Szotáková assumes that the key task of a case manager is to create and coordinate a help net appropriate to the set of the client's problems and to accompany the client through that net. She explains that the emphasis on this definition of the task is a *"response to fragmentation*

---

[16] Szotáková (2014: 63–64) distinguishes between two co ncepts of a case manager; this term can either be understood to designate a person who *"can provide the client with a relationship and, simultaneously, help him/her ensure coordination of the individual elements of the system and care sequence"*, or it can refer to a person whose *"task ... is to evaluate clients' needs and ... to be responsible for coordination ... utilisation of funds"* in hiring services aimed at *"satisfying the eligible needs"* of the client. Szotáková identifies herself with the former of the above approaches, the one which, in contrast to the latter, includes a helping relationship and accompaniment of the client.

of service provision" and assumes that *"coordination of services and accompaniment of the client in their use"* should make it possible to eliminate this problem (2014: 64–65). It is therefore possible to say that, in Szotáková's eyes, "arranging for comprehensive help in a given case" is a response to the little-comprehensive and hence problematic interactions between clients and service providers. The cited author explains that the above problems in interactions started to receive attention in early 1970s as endeavours to transit clients from institutional to community care began to gain ground in the United States. However, adequate sources of support for the former patients' lives in communities outside institutions were not available and it was necessary to *"provide clients with a relationship and, at the same time, help them ensure coordination of the individual elements of the system and sequence of care"*. (Szotáková, 2014: 63.) A method of help was created for clients *"who need resources from various service sectors",* concentrating on coordination of individual services that, according to Summers (2012: 47), each specialise solely in satisfaction of isolated types of needs and accompaniment of specific individuals through the net of such services.

In this method of help, the client can be accompanied and the services coordinated by *"social workers, nurses, psychologists and other helping workers"* (Szotáková, 2014: 67, 69). The cited author does not place emphasis on the professional qualification of the case manager and pays attention to the list of skills expected of him/her[17] (Szotáková, 2014: 67). She seems to base her considerations on the assumption that social workers, in the same way as specialists from other occupations, can act as competent mediators of comprehensive help in a given case if they have the required skills.

Szotáková believes that where social workers (or workers from other helping professions) have these skills, they play a different role as case managers than workers providing social services. The task of a social worker in the role of a case manager is not to provide social services but to arrange for them within the case and coordinate the help provided by social services organisations to individual clients.

Coordination of community-based social and healthcare services

Similarly to Szotáková, Kubalčíková (2013) also points out the need for coordination of help. The latter author, however, pays attention to the lack of coordination of services at the *"local level",* rather than within a single case. Specifically, she considers administrative districts of "municipalities with extended competence" where such a municipality, i.e. one of

---

17 A case manager should concentrate on the client's welfare, defence of his/her interests and promotion of his/her independence; it should be a patient and persistent person who is open to multi-occupational communication. (S)he should be able to maintain confidentiality, to establish and maintain a relationship with the client and people who are important for the client, engage the client and other relevant persons in resolution of the situation, gain an insight into the client's needs and abilities and the possibilities available to those who help him/her, be aware of the available sources of help, including informal sources, select a suitable intervention, arrange for appropriate services in time, coordinate the activities of various participants of the help net, carry out evaluation of the net and use supervision. (According to Szotáková, 2014: 67.)

several administratively linked municipalities, plays the role of an administrative centre. (Kubalčíková, 2013: 62–63.) Therefore, she deals with interactions among clients, service providers and local governments operating in several municipalities within a broader administrative unit. In Kubalčíková's words (2013: 62–63), Szotáková contemplates coordination of services from the *"micro"* perspective, while Kubalčíková approaches it from the *"macro"* perspective.

From the latter perspective, she identifies problems in interactions among municipalities, clients and providers of healthcare and social services.

The problem, according to Kubalčíková, lies in *"poor preparedness of municipalities to assume an active role in providing social care and health care for elderly people with limited self-reliance"*. Amongst other things, this results in a lack of help provided to the elderly and their families at the right time. According to the author's findings, municipal authorities provide for help to elderly people *"intuitively"*, sometimes *"influenced by their personal experience of care for a close person"*. They provide for help to elderly people if they receive an impetus from a social worker at the administrative centre, i.e. the municipality with extended competence. On the other hand, they do not specifically create grounds for managing future situations of elderly people and their families that can and do occur in many households in the municipality. As Kubalčíková found, municipal authorities consider it a matter of the family to provide for the necessary help. However, they do not see family carers as clients in need of support. Therefore, problems in care for elderly people with limited self-reliance are not monitored in the municipalities and there is a lack of staff to coordinate social and healthcare services from the viewpoint of appropriateness of their response to the potential of family carers. According to Kubalčíková, representatives of municipalities which are not administrative centres admit that, in dealing with individual cases, it is necessary to respond to the requirements of social workers from the municipality with extended competence, i.e. one which performs the administrative centre role. However, according to the cited author, they usually do not consider that they should create grounds for future provision of timely help appropriate to the situation of elderly people and their families. They hence do not establish long-term cooperation with service providers from the broader area. This is true despite the fact that their municipalities are usually unable to ensure help that would appropriately respond to changes in the needs of elderly people and the possibilities of their families. (Kubalčíková, 2013: 62–63.)

The necessary interactions, i.e. negotiations on the provision of appropriate capacities, structure of the services offered and cooperation of service providers – local governments, service providers and representatives of families – do not take place. Consequently, the existing capacity and structure of the services unlinked to one another makes it impossible to respond reasonably to the overall development of the situation of the given target group. As a result, in providing for care for their close persons, families do not have an adequate opportunity to

compensate for the deficits in their possibilities by using previously prepared external resources.

Kubalčíková (2013: 63) holds the view that the cooperation platform offered by community planning could be used in addressing the above problems. However, according to the author (Kubalčíková, 2013: 56), such a platform can only be used if *"macro approaches are applied in social work"*. This means, more specifically, using *"specialised social workers dealing with coordination of .... services"*, thus providing for *"appropriate setting of comprehensive social care and health care for elderly people through out-patient and field services"*, as well as *"adapting the environment, including availability of follow-up services and suitable housing"*. Kubalčíková assumes that specialised social workers should attain these objectives *inter alia* by monitoring the relation between the needs of elderly people, the possibilities of their families and the social care and health care services available in the municipalities within the relevant administrative district. In addition to this, they should intermediate negotiations on an appropriate set-up of services and proper timing of their provision. One of the means of such intermediation should consist in a support for the *"operation of multidisciplinary teams at the local level where decision-making and setting* [of the services] *… would take place with participation of social workers, doctors and other medical personnel, ergotherapists ... the family ... and the elderly person"*. (Kubalčíková, 2013: 56).

The proposed way of addressing problems in interactions among clients, providers and local governments in municipalities is based on the assumption that social workers and workers of social services would assume clearly distinguishable roles. From the "macro" perspective, social workers would continuously coordinate the negotiations between local governments, clients and the net of providers from the entire administrative district of the municipality with extended competence on adapting the services offered to the development of the target group of elderly people and their families. Being familiar with the agreements in the formulation of which they participated, providers would respond in time to changes in the lives of elderly people with limited self-reliance and carers from among their family members, satisfy their diverse needs and, if appropriate, provide other specialised professional help.

Assistance in client participation in the planning of services
The description of the pattern following which a social worker should help the client express and promote his/her own interest in the process of community planning (Kubalčíková, 2009b: 99) was used as an example above, in the introduction to the sub-chapter discussing the term "social work in the context of social services". Therefore, we shall only briefly mention its main premises.

As shown by individual studies in negotiation of local concepts of services, if clients and, where appropriate, their close persons are able to express their interests, it becomes obvious that their ideas of the necessary help differ from the ideas of the representatives of local

governments (i.e. contracting entities) and service providers (Kubalčíková, 2009b: 96–99). Nonetheless, or rather, for this reason, participation of clients in community planning is faced with a "formal approach" of contracting entities and service providers to clients' participation in the decision-making (Kubalčíková, 2009b: 96; Havlíková, Hubíková, 2007: 18). Kubalčíková (2009b: 95, 100) considers this problematic, believing that it deprives clients of sufficient opportunity to influence which of their needs will be satisfied by service providers and the way in which this will be done. In this situation, services satisfy other needs than preferred by the clients. Or they do not satisfy them in a manner that would suit clients.

Kubalčíková (2009b: 95, 99–96) believes that this can be prevented if social workers assist clients in expressing and promoting their interests. They should help them understand the procedures of negotiation and decision-making and, if needed, help them clarify, formulate or express their interests; support their ability to identify sources of resolution of difficult situations; defend their right to express their standpoint in their own way; make sure that arguments expressed by clients are taken into consideration, *inter alia* where clients are not present, and that their standpoints are not neglected as "marginal" or "incompetent", for example when formulating conclusions from negotiations; reflect clients' requirements and everyday difficulties and try to understand better how clients think and what they need, including what they need from social workers, etc. Fulfilment of the thus-defined role of a social worker should help clients gain control over the allocation of resources and create a system of help in the interest of those who will use that help.

Circumstances of recognition and routine use of social work patterns in the context of social services

The above-specified patterns of social work in the context of social services have support in foreign literature from which most of the authors draw their inspiration (Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014: 73–74; Szotáková, 2014: 62–67; Kubalčíková, 2009b: 95–96; Kubalčíková, 2013: 55–57). They were published in Czech; some of them are rather popular among social workers and used, though not very systematically. What, in Czech society, prevents politicians, representatives of state authorities and local governments, managers of helping organisations, social workers and people who are uncertain about ways of dealing with other people, authorities and organisations around them, from recognising the problems to which these patterns respond, accepting the ways of dealing with the problems offered by these patterns and beginning to use them routinely? At the time being there is no answer to this question that would rely to systematic empirical research. However, the individual empirical findings as cited above are available, as well as the concept of postmodern institutionalisation of social work (see Musil, 2013a). On the basis of the latter, we shall try to formulate suppositions concerning the circumstances which dampen, or influence, the process of institutionalisation of social work in the context of social services.

We shall intentionally not refer to "factors" but rather "circumstances" which influence recognition of problems in interactions among the parties involved in social services and also acceptance and routine use of the known methods of addressing them.

The word "factors" suggests conditions whose effects can be seen notwithstanding the framework of their everyday action and which can be clearly operationalised and empirically verified in a straightforward manner. An example of this concept of factors is the effect of employers' willingness to invest in higher salaries enabling administrators to deal with more problems of both eligible and non-eligible applicants and to employ client participation assistants at municipal authorities.

It is reasonable to assume that the effect of factors such as "willingness to invest", which are obvious "at first glance", follows from a wider context of circumstances "hidden" behind them and in fact causing the "willingness to invest" or some other factor of similar nature. Such "less visible" circumstances seem to be manifold and combined in various manners in individual organisations, territories and networks. It follows that their effect could not be recognised if someone wished to observe them irrespective of the context of everyday life in an organisation, territory or network of helping subjects. In addition, the circumstances are often cultural or personal (psychological) and have the nature of subjectively and often inadvertently constructed and applied assumptions or meanings. An example of such a circumstance can consist in employee and professional identity and loyalty, variously constructed and experienced by managers and frontline workers of a helping organisation. Other examples of cultural and personal circumstances of institutionalisation of social work include "formal approach to client participation" and "intuitive approach of municipal authorities to ensuring help to elderly people" which, as noted above, were described by Kubalčíková. Considering that these and similar circumstances are variously combined at various places in society, observing their effects without taking account of their everyday effect means to giving up the understanding of their effect on institutionalisation of social work.

For example, at a place where there is a group of citizens who defend the interests of people with disabilities, a formal approach of authorities to client participation in community planning can inspire a social worker to assist the citizens. On the other hand, at a place where there is no such group, the social worker may inadvertently apply the formal approach of the local government. However, everything may depend on the professional focus of the social worker, his/her personality or his/her loyalty with the authority. Openness or authoritarian approach on the part of his/her superiors can also play a role. A straightforward operationalisation of the effect of these, and similar, circumstances is not possible because their effect on institutionalisation of social work patterns is always modified by specific and often cultural characteristics of specific organisations, territories or networks, and also psychological characteristics of the people active in them. It follows that the effect of the thus-understood circumstances of institutionalisation of social work patterns cannot be empirically "verified"

because their combinations and modifications cannot be hypothetically foreseen in the given social context. Instead, some degree of patience must be employed in order to understand their effect in an organisational or local context.

Therefore, the following text shall not discuss "factors" but "circumstances" of institutionalisation of social work in the context of social services. General suppositions concerning such circumstances shall be formulated on the basis of the theory of postmodern institutionalisation. It does not seem correct to believe that these suppositions are automatically valid for individual organisations, territories or help nets. In order to understand specific organisations, territories or networks, it is necessary to apply them – consider whether and in what sense they can help understand how a pattern of addressing problems in interactions among social service stakeholders is employed within a specific social system or what prevents application of that pattern.

By outlining several types of such circumstances, this text hopes to provide theoretical inspiration to social workers and perhaps also managers and local policy makers who wish to gain a systematic understanding of the combination of circumstances which influences institutionalisation of established patterns of social work in their organisation, administrative district, territory or help net. They can take the above assumptions to focus their attention on the theoretically assumed circumstances of postmodern institutionalisation of social work in social services and ask questions as to whether, in what context and how these operate in their organisation, territory or network.

Suppositions concerning effects of the heritage of modern development in postmodern conditions

In literature written in Czech, the following are identified as problems in interactions among social service stakeholders: lack of support for the exercise of social work in care services; lack arrangements for help with a more comprehensive way of addressing the situation of applicants for assistance provided by the state; lack of coordination among social service stakeholders within a case and within a territory; formal approach to clients' participation in decision-making. These problems in interactions have been described but not recognised and if established patterns of their addressing by social service stakeholders are accepted and used, this is done randomly rather than routinely, and only sporadically (Vostrovská; 1998; Musil, Hubíková, Havlíková, 2014; Szotáková, 2014; Kubalčíková, 2013; 2009b). To be fully institutionalised and hence routinely used, it is reasonable to assume that this must be done in contemporary Czech society and hence postmodern conditions, in a contemporary, i.e. postmodern, manner.

What does this mean? First, full institutionalisation of social work in the context of social services has not occurred through the methods of modernity, i.e. professionalisation, and can no longer occur using such methods because the conditions of modernity have passed. Second, if it

does occur, this happens in a manner which corresponds to postmodern conditions. Third, aspirations towards postmodern institutionalisation cannot build on any recognition of social work in the context of social services in the conditions of modernity – social work in the context of social services has not won recognition because it did not undergo the process of professionalisation in the time of modernity[18]. Fourth, aspirations towards postmodern institutionalisation of social work are dampened by the routine presence of professions which established themselves in a modern way in the past.

In order to detail these four suppositions and point out their likely links with the difficulties of institutionalisation of social work in the context of social services, we shall first typologically[19] define the concept of "modern" and "postmodern" institutionalisation of social work (according to Musil, 2013a).

The idea of "modern institutionalisation" is based on the assumption that social work gained recognition in society at the end of the 19th and the initial two thirds of the 20th century[20]. This shall be further referred to as "modern" society.

People who perceive themselves as living in modern society assume that individuals and families are organised in it into a relatively small number of large and culturally homogeneous groups (Beck, 1992), nations, social classes and corporations[21]. Actors of state power who build on this assumption organise public services (e.g. propaganda, subsidised art, schooling, social services, etc.) in such a way as to promote citizens' identification with the proper standard of a member of the national entity (Lorenz, 2006). Individuals adopting the same assumption find models for their personal identity in collective ideas of those large, culturally homogeneous groups (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992). People find important those public authorities (e.g. politicians and experts) that offer them "grand narratives", visions of a progress towards a better future for all. In them, future appears as materialisation of the values on which collective prototypes of individual entities are based (e.g. social security, growing living standard of families, better quality of life, etc.). As a result, people have confidence in grand narratives. (Lyotard, 1993.)

With the above suppositions, the idea of institutionalisation of social work is based on the term "professionalisation" (see Wilensky, Lebeaux, 1965: 283–308). From this point of view, a

---

[18] Therefore, foreign findings are not directly applicable. As a rule, they are related to social work which established itself in the conditions of modernity, and present-day reflection is hence related to postmodern opposition and re-adaptation of social workers to de-professionalisation (Clark, Newman, 1997; Dustin, 2007; White, 2009 and other authors).

[19] The term "typologically" is used to express that a "pure" picture of precisely "modern" and precisely "postmodern" institutionalisation of social work will be depicted while disregarding the assumption that modern or postmodern features of institutionalisation are manifested in a fragmentary, more or less settled manner.

[20] Authors discussing the birth of social work as a profession (Wilensky, Lebeaux, 1965; Lubove, 1968; McBeath a Webb, 1991; Tice, 1998; Lorenz, 2006) situate institutionalisation of social work to the above period.

[21] In this text, the term "corporations" denotes groups of people linked by solidarity and interests following from their similar position in the structure of national economy and also membership of organisations in which people linked by economic solidarity and interests associate either autonomously or with support of the state.

national consensus on the standard of proper behaviour of a professional should exist in modern society[22]. If social workers meet the expectations of this consensus, society accepts social work as a "profession" (also "professional occupation")[23].

The word "professionalisation" refers to a process in which a group of specialists attains the characteristics of the profession and meets the standards of behaviour of a professional, where the attainment of those characteristics and meeting of the standard are interdependent (Wilensky, Lebeaux, 1965: 283–285, 299). In relation to social work, this means that a group of specialists in addressing problems in interactions creates an autonomous disciplinary organisation which defines the specific activities of its members and regulates access to their exercise. This way it ensures that social workers act in accordance with the ethos of prioritising the interests of clients and other standards of proper professional conduct. This gives the professional organisation a reputation – in the eyes of the public and the elite, it becomes a guarantee that social workers act in accordance with the consensual expectations of the national entity. This reputation enables the organised group of specialists in addressing problem interactions to gain public acceptance of their monopoly on the performance of its specific activities and perhaps also to negotiate with politicians on legislative guarantees for that monopoly.

The concept of "postmodern institutionalisation" substantially differs from the understanding of modern professionalisation. Postmodern institutionalisation is based on the assumption that social work gains recognition in present-day society, which is further referred to as "postmodern" society[24].

According to theoretical suppositions, people in that society lose sight of the idea of large groups, and mass identification with collective ideas of such large groups is vanishing (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992). Crimes organised by the state were legitimised in the 20th century by the promise of a future public good. Therefore, people began to suspect that history was not advancing towards a better world and distrust prevailed over the grand narratives that were promising such goals. (Lyotard, 1993.) This suggests that, in decision-making, people do not

---

[22] According to Wilensky and Lebeaux (1965: 285), standards of behaviour of a professional apply to the following: technical competence; avoidance of emotional involvement in contact with clients; provision of a high-quality service without regard to personal sentiment; prioritising clients' interests to other interests if they are in conflict.

[23] It is considered that profession is an organised group of specialists showing the following characteristics (see Wilensky, Lebeaux, 1965: 283–308; Greenwood, 1976; Howe, 1986: 114–118 an d other authors): clear definition and theoretical substantiation of specialised activities (field of activity, purpose and method of help); ethos of preference of clients' interests; autonomous disciplinary association; professional organisation having control over members' professional competence; acceptance of monopoly of specialists in the given occupation on the exercise of specialised activities.

[24] Beck (1992) and Giddens (1991) believe that the above characteristics of present-day society are not a display of a radical transformation, and hence postmodernity, but rather accomplishment or escalation of the principles of modern society. This is the reason why they refer to present-day society as *"late modern"*. In this text, we shall nevertheless use the term "postmodern". This seems correct because we have taken only those arguments from the texts of Beck and Giddens which are explicitly postulated also by authors discussing *"postmodern society"* (see especially Lyotard, 1993).

take account of the prospects of long-term direction towards the collective values of large groups and grand narratives; instead they find useful what they believe can be done "right now", when addressing a current problem (Payne, 2012). In order to resolve what they perceive as a current problem, they temporarily unite and work together in temporary social nets, i.e. pragmatic alliances with those who right now feel the need to deal with a similar problem. (Beck, 1992; Lyotard, 1993 and other authors.) In the context of helping work, "inter-occupational help nets" are a specific type of a temporary pragmatic alliance. These are temporary groupings in which workers from various helping professions and organisations temporarily work together with clients or others involved in their situations in addressing the problems of a client or a target group (Musil, 2013a). According to Giddens and Beck, the range of identity models proliferated based on electronic communication. As a result, personal identities of individuals become individualised, i.e. everyone must choose from among the diverse models available and establish his/her personal life project. This results in a considerable differentiation of personal identities and subcultures. (Giddens, 1991; Beck, 1992.) It is assumed that the individualisation of identities, proliferation of subcultures and abandonment of the perspective of collective ideas of large groups changes the view of truth and the nature of communication. All truths and interpretations based on them, notwithstanding endorsement of their contents, are respected as valid; all of them are hence relative and none is recognised as absolute. This also applies to the truth of the experts which no longer has the authority of specialised knowledge incomprehensible to laypersons. Instead of the "expert – layperson" pair, e.g. doctor and patient, two experts now emerge in people's eyes, each of them seeing the knowledge of the other from the distance of his/her own truth. (Howe, 1994; Nečasová, Dohnalová, Rídlová, 2012.) In this arrangement, it becomes meaningless to distinguish between situations in which one communicates with people inside and outside of his/her own culture. Every communication is inter-cultural because it takes place among people with different identities and different understanding of what topics should be discussed and what "truths" can be said about them. (Lorenz, 2006.) It is possible to negotiate and reach temporarily valid agreements on what to discuss, with what suppositions and how (Lyotard, 1993; Lorenz, 2006; Fawcett, 2012).

If institutionalisation of established patterns of social work in the context of social services takes place under the above suppositions, it consists in "negotiation of resolution of current problems in inter-occupational help nets on a case-by-case basis". This means, according to Musil (2013a), that social workers may gain recognition of usefulness of some of these patterns by negotiation in temporary groupings of workers from various helping professions, organisations, clients or others involved in their situations who together address a current problem. A social worker can make an original proposal to win those involved in an inter-occupational help net where the worker presently operates for the usefulness of a social work pattern. In other words, the social worker complements the shared idea of the way in

which the problem at hand should be addressed by proposing how to address an individual aspect of the problem and others accept that proposal as a viable one. This is possible only if the social worker's contribution uses a pattern of help in addressing problem interactions among social service stakeholders with which the worker is familiar; as such the contribution must concern an aspect of the situation of the client or the target group which is not subject to professional attention of people from other occupations involved in the net; the social worker must be able to convince the others that his/her proposal is useful not only because of its originality but also the social worker's ability to engage in further negotiations on it, to present arguments and, if needed, to modify the proposal; in retrospect, the others involved in the net must view the implementation of the contribution by the social worker as a success.

All the above takes place on a case-by-case basis, again and again. In postmodern conditions, the institutionalisation of a pattern and its modifications takes place repeatedly. A social worker's contribution becomes an institution (recognised pattern) if the social worker and the other members of the net expect that the pattern could prove successful again in an analogous situation, e.g. when addressing a similar case. This does not mean, however, that it will be seen as valid next time without further consideration. Problems, clients and cases differ and nets change. It is likely that those involved in addressing the next problem will understand a "tried and tested" pattern as a possibility which needs to be discussed in terms of its appropriateness. Advocates of various truths will get together in the new situation and it will again be necessary to negotiate with them the recognition of usefulness of the previously established pattern.

Thus, the social worker is forced to improvise while establishing a routine in improvisation thanks to experience from the previous negotiations. (S)he cannot expect that the previously tested addressing pattern will be automatically recognised as useful. The social worker must respond to the possible doubts of others and be able to "connect" his/her proposals with their ideas, understand what they propose and determine what (s)he can add. Nevertheless, if a clear definition of the field of his/her activity is available to him/her (for example, (s)he specialises in addressing problem interactions), knows the repeatedly tested patterns of addressing them and has experience from discussion on their modification, his/her improvisation is not unprepared. (S)he can rely on the institutionalised knowledge of his/her field and can therefore assume that the other participants generally expect him/her to propose what (s)he actually proposes.

The transient nature of social nets, relativity of truths and impermanency of negotiation results creates uncertainty in the people of the postmodern era. According to Lorenz, they cope with that uncertainty in two ways: mutual inter-cultural clarification and returning to a clear validity of some concepts of modernity. In the latter case, they face the feeling of chaos by postulating generally valid ideas of what is desirable and, using these ideas, classify people's conduct as "right" or "wrong". (Lorenz, 2006.) In order to personally adapt to the conditions they perceive as unstable, they reach for those modernity ideas that lost confidence of the public

due to their "universal validity". This way, however, they do not become part of large groups of people with whom they would intrinsically and in the long term share their clear standpoint. They use modernity ideas such as Fordist management methods[25] (Dustin, 2007: 13–30), exclusivity of domain-specific knowledge (Witkin, Iversen, 2008: 489), competent expert and incompetent layperson (Nečasová, Dohnalová, Rídlová, 2012: 14–15, 18–21) etc. in an individualised manner. They see them as clear standpoints, from the perspective of which they can "arrange" for themselves the chaotic world, thus reducing their personal uncertainties. Therefore, if seems that if we encounter decision-making according to the universally valid modernist truths in contemporary discourse, this does not mean that we have again entered a world of large groups which, led by authorities, aspire for the remote horizons of grand narratives. Instead we are faced with individuals or pragmatic alliances which use modernist truths in an entirely postmodern style – as means of accomplishment of their personal difficulties and partial projects. This seems to apply to the actions of social service stakeholders who take part in attempts at institutionalisation of social work patterns.

It is therefore not likely that the processes of modern and postmodern institutionalisation take place in parallel in the present framework of Czech social services. These two methods of institutionalisation are based on conditions so different that, similar to Kuhn's paradigms, they seem incapable of dominating in parallel in society. Thus, if social service stakeholders express, for example, modernist convictions of the "need for a uniform methodology" etc., this is not meant to say that unified by the vision of a single authority, they are determined to devoutly fulfil a remote goal by acting according to strictly set rules. Instead, they try to cope in an individualised manner with the confused rules and unpredictable decision-making by politicians, managers and clients as well as the ensuing personal uncertainties.

So far we have discussed a purely present, and hence individualised, use of modernist truths. This postmodern phenomenon must be differentiated from the effects of the results, or "traces", of modern development in the current attempts at winning recognition for usefulness of social work patterns. The development of professionalisation has left two such traces in Czech society: first, the routinely established professions set up in the 19th and the initial two thirds of the 20th century, and second, a vague indication of an idea of the social work discipline. It seems that, today, the difference between axiomatic acceptance of established professions and the vagueness of the picture of social work is retarding the postmodernist attempts at institutionalisation of social work in the context of social services. It is likely that individual social workers negotiate their original contribution to addressing the problems of social service stakeholders in various inter-occupational help nets (for example, case conferences, triads of community planning, as part of the agenda of allowance for care with review doctors, etc.). Their endeavour could lead to clarification of patterns of help with problem interactions and

---

[25]According to Dustin (2007: xi), a Fordist organisation is characterised by standardised, non-differentiated products, mass consumption, vertical hierarchical management, centralised bureaucracy, clear delimitation of specialisations with clearly defined activities, role expectations from workers and a collective philosophy.

recognition of their usefulness. However, such acceptance is prevented by the contrast between the vague picture of social work and the clear status of long-established professions. The perception schemes of the public, politicians and experts from helping professions with whom social workers negotiate are dominated by the idea of modern, explicitly established professions such as medicine, psychiatry, the legal profession or judiciary, perhaps also psychology and special pedagogy. From the everyday perspective, these professions appear to have been present "from time immemorial". Therefore, politicians, managers, the public, helping workers and often even social workers spontaneously consider as serious those problems and methods of addressing them that were defined by doctors, lawyers, psychologists and special pedagogues. We assume that, in contrast to their robust image of clearly established and routinely used institutions, something as vague and blurred as social work is not taken seriously by the public, managers, politicians and colleagues from other occupations. Being so overshadowed, it is difficult to bring attention to addressing troubles in interactions.

Therefore, social workers must often strive to ensure that the hypothetical partners notice their attempts at proposing something. As a manifestation of the incomplete institutionalisation of social work, nobody expects them to come up with a specific and original contribution. A positive feedback operates between two traces from the past: the less obvious institutionalisation of social work has been so far in the context of social services, the more further attempts at its establishment are dampened by the fact that people's attention focuses on the authority of the professions established earlier. The less clear an idea people have of social work, the more its already blurred image disappears in contrast with the clear image of the professions established earlier. While modern methods of institutionalisation do not flourish any more, the institutions which they allowed to emerge prevail and remain in operation.

Suppositions on the effects of the existing approach to help in the context of social services

Modern professionalisation also gave rise to the notion of help as support for managing the personal deficits of an individual.

At a recent conference of the Association of Shelters, the author of this text analysed the premise that help with problems in interactions is important for work with homeless people and consists in actions directed at the client and others in his/her environment. After the lecture the author was approached by a shelter worker: *"You want us to work with the environment!? That's too complicated; it is easier to deal with an individual."* At first sight he did not argue. He just pointed out that there is not enough space for work with both parties to problem interactions in his personal project. However, considering that he took my premise seriously and that it was said at the conference that the homeless face involuntary rather than voluntary social isolation, he in fact indirectly argued with my position. In my opinion, the colleague from the shelter inadvertently admitted that the problems of the homeless who end up in isolation can

be addressed by working with homeless individuals.

Similar views are common among Czech social service stakeholders and they rely on the popular belief that "help" should consist in compensating those personal deficits of clients that prevent them from satisfying their needs. The idea of help that consists in actions aimed at all parties to problem interactions is not in accordance with this approach. If the concept of help as compensation for personal deficits of clients is very widespread, it could operate as one of the obstacles to the full institutionalisation of established patterns of social work in the context of social services. If those social service stakeholders understand "help" as work with clients' personal deficits, it is understandable that it is not common to accept troubles in interactions as a specific problem whose resolution requires professional help.

The established modern professions as discussed above have a great influence on the ideas of social service stakeholders concerning work with people. They share the characteristic of spontaneous acceptance of the idea of help as work with an individual. In the process of modern professionalisation, medicine, psychiatry, psychology and special pedagogy each specialised separately in compensation for a certain type of personal deficits. It thus appears that social service stakeholders inherited from the modern professions a grand narrative indicating that problems in society stem from deficits of individuals and can hence be addressed through provision of help specialising in the individual types of these deficits. In the context of that heritage, social work finds it difficult to promote its understanding of help with problems in interactions between clients and the social environment.

The effect of the above-mentioned idea of help with the individual on institutionalisation of social work patterns is formulated here as a hypothesis not just because we do not have many empirical findings on this phenomenon. The other reason is that the existence of help conceived as work with clients' personal deficits, and perhaps other circumstances of the effects of such help, are likely to differ between organisations, territories and help nets. Therefore, when the need arises, the effects of the discourse of individual-oriented help on the acceptance of social work patterns needs to be examined individually in each such organisation, territory and help net. For the purposes of such examination, the concept of help as "compensation for personal deficits" shall be described in more detail below.

From this perspective, the problem to be addressed by the helping person is that the needs of an individual are not satisfied due to a personal deficit of that individual. A personal deficit can consist in a medical, psychological, cultural, economic or some other limitation of the individual. If the helping person assumes that the deficit can be mitigated, (s)he will consider that his/her actions should be directed at the deficit. If the helping person does not expect the deficit to be reduced, (s)he will consider satisfaction of the unmet needs of his/her clients as the desired course of action. In both cases the individual with the deficit is considered to be the subject of the helping person's action.

From the perspective of "compensation for personal deficits", it is considered that the

objective is to satisfy the needs of the individual with the deficit. It is assumed that these can be satisfied in four different ways: by saturating unmet needs through provision of resources (such as subsistence, housing, contact, etc.); by substituting the individual's deficient function (for example, cleaning performed by some other individual, provision of a compensation aid, etc.); by changing the deficient function of the individual which can be achieved by remedying that function (treatment, rehabilitation, physiotherapy, memory training, etc.); or by teaching (for example, training of an activity, teaching to understand a situation, training of behaviour in a role, stimulating a change in attitudes, etc.). It is assumed that the above methods of attaining the objective, i.e. satisfaction of needs by the individual with the deficit, can be combined.

Ideas on appropriate combinations are often stereotypically established in individual organisations or territories. Where this is the case, helping persons are not favourably disposed towards trying to find a unique combination of methods of compensating for individual deficits that would be adapted to the specific combinations of deficits of the individual concerned. In such cases, the inclination of social service stakeholders to provide help with personal deficits obstructs the application of social work patterns aimed at coordination or comprehensiveness of help.

From the perspective of the discourse of help with personal deficits, it is possible to concentrate on support for interactions. This topic can emerge, for example, when help is provided in saturating needs in personal relationships or when it is necessary to coordinate the use of a combination of the above methods of fulfilment of the expected objective of help. In the discourse of compensating for personal deficits, support for interactions, if the helping worker pays attention to it at all, is seen as means of satisfying needs rather than the primary object of the helping person's actions. Therefore, it can be assumed that in helping organisations, territories or nets in which social service stakeholders understand help as work with an individual, the idea of troubles in interactions as a specific problem remains outside the focus of their attention and the patterns of addressing this problem are not accepted.

Suppositions on the effects of managers' procedural approach

According to suppositions on postmodern society, social service stakeholders regard as useful what they believe is done successfully, or appears useful, when addressing the problem at hand. It is also assumed that evaluation methods are individualised or negotiated on a case-by-case basis and hence considerably variable. A social worker cannot expect that what other social service stakeholders regard as useful and successful in one case will be evaluated using the same criteria and in the same way in another case.

In this respect, according to Musil (2013a: 63–67), literature written in English refers to four types of criteria for evaluating usefulness encountered by social workers in the present context of social services. These are: "practical help successfully delivered to an individual", "problem

interactions successfully arranged for"; "the requirements for performance, efficiency and budget control successfully met"; "it was successfully ensured that the disobedient behaved appropriately, thus limiting risks" (Musil, 2013a: 63–67).

At the first glance, we are facing contradictory statements. On the one hand, a considerable variability is expected of the evaluation of what is successfully done and hence regarded as useful. On the other hand, an empirical description is provided of a few types of evaluation criteria for immediate usefulness or success. The contradiction vanishes if we distinguish between the purpose and criterion of evaluation of immediate usefulness, where a criterion is understood as a means used by the evaluator to meet the intended objective of the evaluation. The evaluator need not publicly declare the objective and (s)he may legitimise the use of a criterion or the resulting evaluation by referring to some other purpose accepted by the public or some other party. We shall assume that social service stakeholders use "methods of evaluation of usefulness" which consist of the "objective" of evaluation of immediate usefulness, the applied "evaluation criterion" and the "method of legitimisation" of the applied evaluation criterion or result.

This seems to be Dustin's line of thought when she explains why Fordist management methods, which are based on a predetermined delimitation of subordinates' activities promoted as an "absolute" truth, became widespread in the individualised society of relative truths. Dustin argues that social services managers welcome observance of prescribed procedures and budgetary limitations in order to curtail unpredictability in social workers' actions, thus coping with their own personal uncertainty. Managers find it important that social workers be interested in controllable outputs. On the other hand, social workers find it important to communicate with clients, as a result of which they respond to hardly predictable circumstances of communication with clients. This creates feelings of uncertainty in managers, and they try to address these by applying the Fordist approach. (Dustin, 2007: 13–30.)

It can be concluded that, in Dustin's eyes, the Fordist evaluation of usefulness is a tool, escape from the personal uncertainty which accompanies the unpredictability of responses of subordinates to the changing circumstances of communication with clients, i.e. the objective. Dustin does not claim this explicitly but, in her story, managers do not present the above personal objective of the use of the Fordist evaluation and they legitimise their approach by the interest of the state or organisation in efficiency.

If we distinguish between objective, criteria and legitimisation as three elements of the method of evaluation, the paradox of the four types of criteria and expected variability of evaluation vanishes. The diversity of evaluation of usefulness by managers does not result for the variability of the applied criteria. It can be caused by three types of criteria: diversity of evaluation objectives, which is based on individualised life plans and pragmatic arrangements of managers; transience and variability of the objectives of evaluation that managers negotiate on a case-by-case basis within the transient pragmatic alliances; variability of the interests of

managers, who respond to changing conditions, e.g. changes in political tasks, legislation, methodical instructions, funding sources and methods of financing, financial standing of the organisation, personal situation, etc. Managers look at changes from the viewpoint of their individualised personal plans, which makes them change their interests. The evaluation criteria are constant but the objectives of their use change and become differentiated.

According to English-written literature (McBeath, Webb, 1991: 759; Howe, 1994: 527–530; Harris, 2003; Dustin, 2007: 129–134 and other authors), it seems that managers in social services organisations find it useful to use the "performance, efficiency and budget control" criteria when evaluating usefulness of social workers' actions and the criteria of "limiting risks by ensuring that the disobedient behave properly". The criteria of "help to a specific individual" and "intermediation of interactions which were problematic" are less important to them.

For example, Dustin says that politicians' order is to provide citizens with services the state is obliged to provide under the law, in the most economical way possible. Therefore, managers of social services organisations require their subordinate social workers to: identify legally recognised client needs; propose and contractually ensure services intended to satisfy such needs; in doing this, observe the budgetary limitations set by their superiors; all this without establishing a relationship with the client and having any interest in the client's personal problems. The managers' approach is Fordist-procedural: they want the social worker to proceed in a predefined way: identify predetermined needs; select and purchase services from a predefined list; select and purchase services in such a way as not to exceed a previously permitted amount of total costs; and deal with nothing in the client's life that was not set beforehand. Thus, according to Dustin, social workers' actions are useful in the eyes of managers at organisations to the extent that they are "calculable" and can be audited. Subordinate social workers respect the above limitations on their activities. However, led by their domain-specific knowledge, they take interest in clients' problems and negotiate and intermediate services that help them resolve these problems more appropriately than services that are given by the pre-defined list and "fit into" the budgetary limit. They do this despite the superiors' procedural requirements and mostly at variance with the superiors' expectations. (Dustin, 2007: 129, 134–139.)

Howe shows that in the eyes of state policy makers and managers, even the criterion of "limiting risks by ensuring that the disobedient behave properly" has a procedural nature. According to him, policy makers do not expect helping organisations to attain a change in the behaviour which deviates from the standards of mainstream society by working with the causes of that deviation. According to Howe, expecting them to do so would be compatible with the standard knowledge of social work. They do not demand any understanding of the problems of the "disobedient" or a change in his/her attitude. Instead, they expect that his/her conformity and compliance will be ensured. From this perspective, it is a success when a social worker negotiates conditions with the "disobedient" client under which (s)he will act in a conform

manner. The conformity standard is set beforehand. The objective is not to ensure that the "disobedient" accepts the standard. Instead, the objective is to show that (s)he has fulfilled it. (Howe, 1994: 527–530.)

Here again, what matters is to ensure that the result of the social workers' actions can be audited. From the viewpoint of social work knowledge, a useful result could be, for example, if the client changed his/her attitude to the risks of his/her "disobedient" behaviour (Hepworth et al., 2010) or if (s)he overcame his/her scruples and decided to talk about the psychosocial problems that cause his/her "disobedience" (Laan v. d., 1998), etc. On the other hand, this does not appear to be useful or successful from the viewpoint of the political strategy discussed by Howe. Success is deemed to exist when a demonstrable change in behaviour occurs which is controllable and reportable, or measurable in terms of costs.

Both from the viewpoint of "performance, efficiency and budget control" and from the viewpoint of "limiting risks by ensuring that the disobedient behave properly", it appears useful to effectuate the set procedures, which is to ensure that the actions of social workers can be audited. According to the English-written literature written so far, the thus-understood criteria of usefulness are employed by state policy makers and managers at social services organisations. The question is whether and, if so, in what respects this assumption is relevant for policy makers and social service stakeholders in Czech society.

To be able to answer this question, it is necessary to examine the situations where insistence on set procedures and the possibility of auditing social workers' action can become an appropriate tool. In the context of Czech social services, there seem to exist at least four types of purposes of evaluation of usefulness that place an emphasis on observance of set procedures: economic rationality; bureaucratic rationality; rationality of power; and rationality of a ritualised procedural approach. In terms of economic rationality, emphasis on procedural approach attains a favourable input/output ratio for social workers' actions and actions of other social service stakeholders. In terms of bureaucratic rationality, emphasis on procedural approach seems to operate as a means of ensuring that all citizens' requests are handled in the same way without any bias on the clerk's part. In terms of rationality of power, emphasis on procedural approach is a means of ensuring or maintaining influence on subordinates. In terms of rationality of a ritualised procedural approach, emphasis on procedural approach appears to be an end in itself: those who demand and view the procedural approach as useful do not pursue economic ends, the citizens' right to having their request administered according to set rules or personal power. They simply consider that people in an organisation should all proceed in the same way, in a pre-set manner.

In our opinion, Czech social service stakeholders often perceive the procedural approach to usefulness as an obvious thing; they are often motivated by the rationality of the ritualised procedural approach. They are often unable to imagine any actions other than procedural and any evaluations of usefulness other than such that emphasise procedural actions as the means of

attainment of their individualised personal strategies. There is no empirical support for this statement other than that experience has shown that social service stakeholders justify proposed innovations by an existing lack of a "uniform approach" and the need to introduce one. We have also seen social service stakeholders reluctant to accept a proposed innovation after realising that it did not lead to a "uniform approach".

The assumption that Czech social service stakeholders experience the procedural approach and evaluation of usefulness as important *per se* is not to say that individuals, groups, parts of organisations or local help nets cannot be motivated by the rationality of power, economic, bureaucratic or some very specific, individualised rationality. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that the declaration of objectives that are based on these types of rationality are often used as a means of legitimisation of a ritualised approach to procedurally perceived usefulness and its evaluation.

These suppositions give rise to the belief that the arguments brought forward by Dustin, Howe and other authors writing in English, according to whom those involved in social services policies and managers find it useful to effectuate previously set procedures that can be audited, are also relevant in the context of Czech social services. However, it seems reasonable to believe that the cited authors' emphasis on "calculability" and "auditability" does not make it possible to fully understand the entire range of objectives in relation to which Czech social service stakeholders consider that observance of set procedures is useful. The following can be recommended to those examining such objectives: to understand them as individualised; to differentiate the authentic objective of the use of procedural evaluation and its public legitimisation; to take into consideration the assumption that observance of set procedures may be based on rationality of ritualised procedural actions.

We therefore assume that Czech social service stakeholders often regard procedural actions as useful and prefer evaluations that are based on the assumption that this type of actions is appropriate. It is a question whether this aspect limits institutionalisation of social work patterns in the context of social services.

One of the key premises of social work is that clients' situations are unique and multilayered, encompassing several interdependent problems and that successful help to clients is hence conditional on the social worker's ability to recognise the unique combination of circumstances in the clients' lives, understand them and apply this knowledge in helping the clients address the entire range of their life difficulties. In other words, the client's troubles in interactions with subjects in his/her social environment emerge, and can be addressed, in the context of the unique set of his/her various life circumstances. It follows that from the viewpoint of social work, "situational approach" is seen as a prerequisite of effective help with troubles in interactions. From the perspective of situational approach, a social worker operates with a comprehensive, and hence unique, combination of various life circumstances, which needs to be recognised in interaction with the client in order to allow for a search for a

comprehensive set of means of addressing that combination. This premise lies behind each of the five patterns of social work cited above in this chapter.

The emphasis placed by policy makers and social services managers on procedural actions and positive evaluation of conformity with pre-set procedures is accompanied by negative perception of actions that are based on the social worker's situational approach. If a predetermined solution is considered appropriate, there is a negative perception of any actions that are aimed at studying, for an undefined period of time, a situation that was not understood beforehand, and "only" then beginning to look for a previously unknown combination of approaches to resolution and creating grounds for application of such approaches. From the proceduralist viewpoint, situational approach has all conceivable negative features. If the established social work patterns in the context of social services are based on the situational approach, they are hardly acceptable for policy makers and managers in social services. It is unknown how much time will be required and what parties will need to be involved, it is impossible to estimate the costs, and the desired outcome is not clear from the outset. If the characteristics of a social worker's actions are not known beforehand, it is impossible to say beforehand what parameters his/her actions should have and, consequently, auditing them is impossible. It is impossible to determine clear inputs (the problem to be addressed, costs), conduct (method and time of addressing the problem), and outputs (result to be achieved, economic outcome).

The parameters of the social worker's action can be pre-set in the language of finance, using words such as costs, working hours, profits, etc. (see above – Dustin and the criterion of "performance, efficiency and budget control") or in the legal language, using words such as standard appropriate course of action (see above – Howe and the criterion of "limiting risks by ensuring that the disobedient behave properly"). If the legislature or manager accepts that the social worker should, in the first place, use his/her professional knowledge to identify the problem and the required solution, they are unable to define the parameters of the social worker's actions through the language of finance and the language of law. This seems to be the reason why established patterns of social work are alien or hardly acceptable for policy makers and managers in social services.

Suppositions on employee identity

The above statement that "institutionalisation of social work takes place in a postmodern way" means that, in the context of negotiations with social service stakeholders in inter-occupational help nets, social workers use patterns of help with troubles in interactions. Furthermore, it indicates that social workers use these patterns as a starting point for their specific contribution to addressing the problem which exists in the given net at the given time. To be able to succeed with this contribution in negotiations, i.e. to win acceptance for its usefulness, they need to improvise. This does not mean to act without any preparation, but to

proportionately apply and modify the previously acquired domain-specific knowledge and skills. In order for such procedure to be taken, social workers must be well acquainted and take ownership of the patterns of help related to interactions among social service stakeholders. In other words, in the necessary improvisation, they must be able to rely on their domain-specific knowledge and professional identity, know what they can specifically offer as social workers and perceive this as a part of their personal projects.

However, the condition of clear domain-specific knowledge and a strong professional identity often remains unmet because social workers' identity in social services seems to be an employee identity rather than an professional identity. This means that social workers tend to construe their personal role in the process of help from the perspective of loyalty to the rules determined by the employer rather than from the perspective of the expectation that they will independently and proportionately apply specialised domain-specific knowledge and skills.

A social worker's idea of his/her own role in the process of help may include both elements – employee loyalty and independent application of domain-specific knowledge. However, it is reasonable to assume (and the reasons for this assumption are specified below) that loyalty to the employer's rules and expectations is what usually prevails. If this assumption is valid, it is likely that, in negotiations in an inter-occupational net, a social worker will offer primarily solutions that will allow him/her to preserve his/her loyalty to the employer. This reduces the likelihood that within the help net, (s)he will attempt to offer a specific contribution based on social work knowledge and patterns. If (s)he attempted to do so, and this attempt collided with loyalty to the employer, (s)he would likely prefer to save his/her loyalty to the employer.

It seems logical that loyalty to the employer and endeavour to offer a specific contribution of social work need not be mutually exclusive. A situation may occur where the employer expects the social worker to offer applications of the domain-specific knowledge of social work in inter-occupational nets (for example, at case conferences) using his/her own judgement. Nevertheless, such situations can only occur if the employer's rules and expectations are based on the knowledge and interests of social work as a field. This is rather unlikely in contemporary Czech social services organisations. Employers and managers tend to promote their interests by emphasising observance of the procedural rules given by the valid legislation, central guidelines, funding providers and intra-organisational regulations. In the context of Czech social services, these types of rules are only rarely based on domain-specific knowledge.

Therefore, it can be assumed that social workers in social services organisations prefer employee identity in their personal projects, although not without reservations. What motivates them to do so? In terms of the concept of postmodern institutionalisation, the reason can be at least threefold: social workers are not self-employed – they see their employer as the source of status and security and use their roles in the organisation as protection against the chaos of postmodernity.

Since they are not self-employed, the position of social workers always depends, to some

extent, on loyalty to the role defined by the employer. However, employers usually do not formulate the role of social workers from the viewpoint of the specific knowledge of social work. Managers of Czech social services organisations rarely have the professional identity of a social worker and, consequently, the knowledge and language of social work do not play a significant role in the organisations they manage. Therefore, a social worker with a strong professional identity faces the following dilemma: "I will either apply my professional knowledge on the basis of my own judgement but will not meet the expectations of the managers who are indifferent to the professional aspects of social work or I will meet the expectations of the employer but will resign to the possibility of independently using my professional knowledge."Even a social worker who is strongly identified with his/her field will find it difficult, in these circumstances, to define and maintain his/her role in the organisation so as to ensure it is based on the professional identity and specialised knowledge of social work.

The second reason for preferring employee identity is historical. It seems that Czech social workers see the source of their status and security in the employer and their own position in the organisation rather than in their profession and domain-specific knowledge. This premise relies on the arguments presented by Freidson (1986), according to whom there are two ways in which specialists traditionally acquired status and protection of their position on the market. In the Anglo-American tradition, this was done through negotiations of organised specialist groups in political arenas, while in the continental tradition specialists acquired status and protection of their market position in state-controlled elite schools which were a reliable qualification for elite positions in the civil service. The Anglo-American tradition supported specialists to identify with the specialised knowledge of the profession and professional association, while the continental tradition supported identification with a position in the civil service. (Freidson, 1986: 32–35; see also Wilensky, Lebeaux, 1965: 283–308 and McBeath, Webb, 1991: 747–748.) Šamalík (1995) documents the presence of the continental tradition in the Austro-Hungarian empire. Therefore, it can be assumed that Czech social workers as those continuing this tradition will expect status and its protection from the employer's organisation and not from affiliation with their profession.

The third reason for the prevailing emphasis on employee identity stems from the above assumption that people sometimes escape from the uncertainty posed by postmodernity by returning to quasi-modernist, authoritative truths. Life in a postmodern organisation creates uncertainty in social workers. The factors by which managers assess what was successful are diverse and variable. Managers change them as the measures introduced by the legislature and changes in the methods of funding modify their own interests. Managers and clients do not see social workers' knowledge as an obvious authority and treat it as any other relative "truth". In such circumstances, every solution must be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. Therefore, it seems that nothing is automatically guaranteed. In this situation, many social workers prefer the procedures and evaluation schemes prescribed by managers. This gives them a feeling of

stability and simplicity in the flow of impermanent changes. Frontline social workers avoid negotiation, and the improvisation of inter-occupational negotiations with workers from other organisations, by concentrating on the roles and procedures prescribed by their managers. This consolidates their identification with the role in the organisation and employee identity.

It seems that the aforementioned factors promoting employee identity dampen the attractiveness of inter-occupational negotiations, in which it is necessary to try and reach transient arrangements under circumstances which are not fully guaranteed. This is the reason why social workers with a prevailing employee identity are careful to enter inter-occupational nets, where they are able to seek acceptance of effectiveness of their occupation's patterns, or they enter such nets only to a limited extent. This means that opportunities for institutionalisation of social work patterns are often missed.

Conclusion: stepping out of the employement organisation ambit and into inter-occupational help nets

The above suppositions regarding the circumstances which prevent acceptance and routine use of established patterns of help in addressing problem interactions among social service stakeholders can serve as a basis for seeking an answer to the question of this chapter in individual organisations, territories and inter-occupational help nets.

In terms of the concept of postmodern institutionalisation, these factors are interdependent. The above-described chain of circumstances creates the impression that any continued institutionalisation of social work patterns as defined in the first half of this chapter is unavoidably blocked. It should be added, therefore, that the door remains open at the end of the chain of circumstances. We are disregarding the fact that managers in some organisations apply a less procedural approach to their subordinates than others and that there exist a few organisations where the above patterns of social work in the context of social work are pursued. Without these exceptions, it would not be possible to cite the examples provided by Musil, Hubíková and Havlíková and also Szotáková.

Our attention is focused on social workers who, in their employment organisations, face the dilemma between a loyal employee who follows the set procedures and an autonomous user of domain-specific knowledge. Some of them cope with this dilemma by "stepping out" of the employment organisation into inter-occupational help nets.

This happens in two ways: in "case" and "thematic" help nets. First, in "case help nets", the parties involved sometimes negotiate, with the assistance of the social worker, a solution to a case, including arranging for help with several problems faced by the client. This can take place at "case conferences". There are organisations and geographical territories in which managers taking the procedural approach are able to transform the official guidelines of a case conference into a set of binding procedures, which the parties involved ritually exercise only to accomplish the rituals. On the other hand, some case conferences become grounds of a creative

inter-occupational negotiation, in which various perspectives are combined into an original solution of the set of problems faced by the client.

Second, in addition to "case inter-occupational help nets", there also exist "thematic inter-occupational help nets" (see Musil, 2013a: 54–58). In these nets, helping workers with various types of specialised knowledge together discuss theoretical, methodological, strategic, financial and other aspects of work with a specific target group (for example, drug addicts, foreigners, minorities, homeless people, etc.) or an analogous set of aspects relating to a specific help provision method (for example, field work, social rehabilitation, comprehensive help in a given case, work in healthcare facilities, low-threshold services). Thus, instead of a certain case, this type of inter-occupational net focuses on a set of questions related to a certain topic.

Some social workers, motivated by their interest in a comprehensive discussion of a specific topic with people from various occupations, join these thematic nets. Together with others, they form shared knowledge of "their" topic with which they identify, according to the findings of Růžičková and Musil. Simultaneously, they clarify in the discussion with people from other occupations and organisations what "unique" contributions they can offer, thus refining their social worker's identity. (Růžičková, Musil, 2008: 86–87.) In the inter-occupational discussion, they contemplate help to their clients from diverse viewpoints and, as a result, their ideas of work with clients can take a different direction than when directly influenced by the procedural requirements of employers and superiors. In the inter-occupational environment of a thematic help net, the ideas of help close to social work patterns can be accepted as useful more likely than in the procedural environment of employment organisations. Evidence of this is available, for example, in Szotáková (2014).

References
ABEL, E. K. (1994) Benevolence and Social Control: Advice from the Children's Bureau in the Early Twentieth Century. **Social Service Review,** Vol. 68, No. 1, pp. 1   19.
BARTLETT, H. (1970)**The Common Base of Social Work Practice.** New York: NASW.
BALÁŽ, R. (2011) **Důsledky zvládání dilemat sociálních pracovníků-manažerů charitních služeb** *(Consequences of Dilemma-Coping by Social Workers – Managers of Charity Services).* (Thesis.) Brno: Faculty of Social Studies of Masaryk University.
BECK, U. (1992) **Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity.** London etc.: Sage.
BROCK, T., HARKNETT, K.: A Comparison of Two Welfare-to-Work Case Management Models. **Social Security Review**, 1998, Vol. 72, No. 4, pp. 493   520.
BRODKIN, E. Z.: Inside the Welfare Contract: Discretion and Accountability in State Welfare Administration. **Social Security Review**, 1997, Vol. 71, No. 1, pp. 1   33.
CLARK, J., NEWMAN, J. (1997) **The Managerial State.** London: Sage.
DUSTIN, D. (2007) **The McDonaldization of Social Work.** Aldershot–Burlington: Ashgate.
FAWCETT, B. (2012) **Postmodernism.** In: Grey, M., Webb, S. A., Praca socjalna, Teorie i Metody, Podręcznik akademicky, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN, pp. 164–176.
FREIDSON, E. (1986) **Professional Powers. A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge.** Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
GIDDENS, A. (1991) **Modernity and Self-Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern**

Age. Oxford: Polity Press.

GREENWOOD, E. (1976) **Attributes of Profession.** In Gilbert, N., Spetch, H., The Emergence of Social Welfare and Social Work, Itasca: F. E. Peacock Publishers, pp. 302–318.

HAGEN, J.L. (1987) Income Maintenance Workers: Technicians or Service Providers? **Social Service Review**, Vol. 61, No. 2, pp. 261271.

Hepworth, D.H., Rooney, R.H., Rooney, G.D., Strom-Gottfried, K., Larsen, J.A. (2010) **Direct Social Work Practice. Theory and Skills.** Belmont: Brooks/Cole.

HARRIS, J. (2003) **The Social Work Business.** London   New York: Routledge.

HAVLÍKOVÁ, J., HUBÍKOVÁ, O. (2007) Význam komunitního plánování sociálních služeb při řešení problému sociální exkluze na lokální úrovni *(Role of Community Planning of Social Services in Addressing the Problem of Social Exclusion at the Local Level)*. **Sociológia**, Vol. 39, Iss. 1, pp. 5–28.

HOWE, D.: (1986) **Social Workers and Their Practice in Welfare Bureaucracies.** Aldershot–Vermont: Gower.

HOWE, D. (1994) Modernity, Postmodernity and Social Work. **British Journal of Social Work**, Vol. 24, Iss. 5, pp. 513–532.

KUBALČÍKOVÁ, K. (2009a). Role uživatele a zjišťování potřeb v procesu komunitního plánování sociálních služeb *(Role of the User and Needs Assessment in the Process of Community Planning of Social Services)*. **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca,** 9, Iss. 1, pp. 85–96.

KUBALČÍKOVÁ, K. (2009b) Role klienta při vytváření specifické zakázky sociální práce na místní úrovni *(Client's Role in Creating a Specific Order for Social Work at the Local Level)*. **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca,** 9, Iss. 3, pp. 93–102.

KUBALČÍKOVÁ, K. (2013) Obce a jejich participace při poskytování péče o seniory se sníženou soběstačností, Aktivní hráč, nebo přihlížející? *(Municipalities and Their Participation in the Provision of Care for Elderly People with Reduced Self-Reliance. Active Players or Passive Spectators?)*   **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca,** 13, Iss. 4, pp. 54–65.

LAAN van der, G. (1998a) **Otázky legitimace sociální práce *(Aspects of Social Work Legitimacy)*.** Boskovice: Albert.

LAAN van der, G. (1998b) The Professional Role of Social Work in a Market Environment. **European Journal of Social Work**, Vol. 1, Iss. 1, pp. 31   40.

LORENZ, W. (2004) **Research as an Element in Social Work's Ongoing Search for Identity.** In: Lovelock, R., Lyons, K., Powel, J., Reflecting on Social Work – Discipline and Profession, Aldershot – Burlington: Ashgate, pp. 145–162.

LORENZ, W. (2006) **Perspectives on European Social Work – From the Birth of the Nation State to the Impact of Globalisation.** Opladen: Barbara Budrich.

LYOTARD, J.-F. (1993) **O postmodernismu.**   Postmoderno vysvětlované dětem a Postmoderní situace *(On Postmodernism. Postmodernity Explained to Children and Postmodern Situations)*. Prague: Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

McBEATH, G. B., WEBB, S. A. (1991) 'Social Work, Modernity and Postmodernity'. **Sociological Review**, Vol. 39, Iss. 4, pp. 745–762.

MISCONIOVÁ, B., PRŮŠA, L., VOSTROVSKÁ, H. (2003) **Integrovaná domácí sociálně zdravotní péče *(Integrated In-Home Social Care and Health Care)*.** Prague: RILSA.

MUSIL, L., KUBALČÍKOVÁ, K., HUBÍKOVÁ, O., DVOŘÁKOVÁ, M. (2006) **Kvalifikační potřeby pracovníků v sociálních službách pro seniory *(Qualification Needs of Workers in Social Services for the Elderly)*.** (Final report.) Prague: RILSA, Brno Research Centre.

MUSIL, L. (2012) Jak překonávat obtíže při zprostředkování souběžné pomoci pro klienta? *(How to Overcome Obstacles in Mediating Parallel Help for the Client?)* **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca,** 12, Iss. 3, pp. 52–76.

MUSIL, L. (2013a) **Challenges of Postmodern Institutionalisation for Education in Social**

Work. In Matulayová, T., Musil, L. (eds.) Social Work, Education and Postmodernity. Theory and Studies in Selected Czech, Slovak and Polish Issues, Liberec: Technical University of Liberec, pp.10–72.

MUSIL, L. (2013b) **Identita oboru sociální práce *(Identity of the Social Work Occupation).*** In: MATOUŠEK O. a kol., Encyklopedie sociální práce *(Social Work Encyclopaedia)*, Prague: Portál, pp. 512–513.

MUSIL, L., JANSKÁ, V.: **Dilema 'loajálního úředníka a empatického pomocníka' a akceptace změn *(Loyal Clerk and Emphatic Helper' Dilemma and Acceptance of Changes).*** In Winkler, J., Žižlavský, M. (eds.), Institucionální změna a veřejná politika, Analýza politiky zaměstnanosti *(Institutional Change and Public Policy, Analysis of Employment Policy)*, Masaryk University – muniPRESS, Brno 2011, pp. 123–149.

MUSIL, L., HUBÍKOVÁ, O., HAVLÍKOVÁ, J. (2014) Sociální práce s lidmi s hmotnou nouzí *(Social Work with People with Material Need).* **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca,** 14, Iss. 2, pp. 71–86.

MUSIL, L., HUBÍKOVÁ, O., HAVLÍKOVÁ, J., KUBALČÍKOVÁ, K. (2013) **Raná fáze implementace reformy v rámci agendy dávek pomoci v hmotné nouzi *(Early Phase of Implementation of a Reform in the Agenda of Benefits in Material Need).*** Prague, RILSA

MUSIL, L., KUBALČÍKOVÁ, K., HUBÍKOVÁ, O., DVOŘÁKOVÁ, M. (2005) **Kvalifikační potřeby pracovníků v sociálních službách pro seniory *(Qualification Needs of Workers in Social Services for the Elderly).* (Final report.)** Prague, RILSA

NAVRÁTILOVÁ, J., NAVRÁTIL, P. (2009) Komunitní plánování jako forma podpory životních projektů *(Community Planning as a Form of Support to Life Projects).* **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca**, Vol. 9, Iss. 3, pp. 74–84.

NEČASOVÁ, M., DOHNALOVÁ, Z., RÍDLOVÁ, R. (2012) User of Social Services in Postmodern Times. **Czech and Slovak Social Work**, Vol. 12, Iss. 5, pp. 13–23.

PAYNE, M. (2006) **What is Professional Social Work?** Bristol: BASW.

PAYNE, M. (2012) **Social Worker's Changing Identities and Social Roles.** (Lecture held on 20 March 2012.) Brno, Faculty of Social Studies of Masaryk University.

RŮŽIČKOVÁ, D., MUSIL, L. (2009) Hledají sociální pracovníci kolektivní identitu? *(Are Social Workers Looking for a Collective Identity?)* **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca**, Vol. 9, Iss. 3, pp. 79–92.

ŠAMALÍK, F. (1995) **Josefínské osvícenství v pohledu moderních historiků *(Josephinian Enlightenment Viewed by Modern Historians).*** In: Machovec, M. (ed.), Problém tolerance v dějinách a perspektivě, Prague: Academia, pp. 94– 113.

SZOTÁKOVÁ, M. (2014) Case management: aktivní zapojení klienta i pracovníka do spolupráce *(Case Management: Active Involvement of the Client and Worker in Cooperation).* **Sociální práce/Sociálna práca**, Vol. 14, Iss. 3, pp. 61–80.

VOSTROVSKÁ, H. (1998) **Reálná podoba pečovatelské služby *(Care Services in Reality).*** (Manuscript.)

WALSH, J., HOLTON, V. (2008) **Case Management.** In: Rowe, W., Rapp-Paglicci, L.A. (eds.), Comprehensive Handbook of Social Work and Social Welfare, Vol. 3 Social Work Practice, New Jersey, Wiley, 2008, pp. 161–182.

WILENSKY, H. L., LEBEAUX, Ch. N. (1965) **Industrial Society and Social Welfare.** New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

WHITE, V. (2009) **Quiet Challenges? Professional Practice in Modernised Social Work.** In: Harris, J., White, V. (eds.), Modernising Social Work, Critical Considerations, Bristol: Policy Press, pp. 129–144.