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Abstract: Social work is characterized by a biological, psychological and social framework in its understanding of human behavior and development. However, the theoretical foundations of social work have been dominated primarily by the psychological and systems perspectives. In this paper the authors examine the essentialized, limited and uninterrogated notions of identity in these approaches. Given the current context of globalization they argue that the prevailing notions of identity and human development as represented in these theories are inadequate for depicting the complexities of the new social context. A post modern critical perspective offers a paradigm with which to respond to the rapidly changing context of the new world order and where the critiques of modernist concepts of self and identity can be incorporated while valuing social work's commitment to social justice. They offer a set of principles which are derived from a postmodern critical perspective; and from which to establish interventions that are more culturally accessible, enabling and relevant in a multicultural society. These include: discourse analysis, consciousness raising, giving voice, sharing power, reflexivity and transformation. Finally, they consider the challenges for integrating a postmodern critical framework within social work education and practice.
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Introduction

The human behavior and social environment curriculum is the mechanism through which the social work profession provides the theoretical understanding of human behavior and development that is needed for practice. However, debates around which theory is more relevant for social work practice represents a marked split among scholars in the field. The debate has centered primarily on the structural vs. individual approach to intervention. On the one hand, radical social work which is rooted in Marxist critiques of the power structure and economic inequalities emphasizes the structural nature of individual and social problems. However, because its emphasis is primarily on structural change, this approach has been criticized for not dealing with the immediate social needs of clients and for overlooking the emancipatory potential of everyday practice (Healy, 2000). In contrast, individual approaches are concerned with internal psychological processes and how they shape behavior. They have been criticized for not dealing with social change, and for giving less prominence to structural and environmental factors than internal psychological ones (Payne, 2005). These debates are not just about ideology; rather, they support certain ways of knowing and behaving while discouraging others. Because they privilege one type of understanding over the other, that is, interpersonal or structural, they have failed
to provide a complex analysis of how individuals participate in the construction of their world and how this in turn shapes the way they see themselves and are seen by others. Since issues of identity and development of the self are inextricably part of all practice processes, it is important that we look at and interrogate the ways in which their representation in social work either constrain or enable more empowering forms of practice. It is also worth noting that issues of identity and representation have played a key role in the development of culturally sensitive practice as various groups have fought for visibility and inclusion (Cemlyn, 2008). Taken together, they forcefully signal the need to examine the taken-for-granted assumptions of social work education and practice theories. As such, this analysis is primarily concerned with representations of self and identity in social work education and practice and the implications of these depictions for mobilizing social change. We take the position that if concepts of identity and representation are to be useful for social work practice, they must involve epistemologies that allow for dialog, interaction and change.

In the next section we provide a brief history of the most dominant theoretical approaches underlying social work practice focusing on representations of identity. Following this we consider how processes of identity formation have become unstable and fragmented in the current context of practice and the usefulness of social work theories for depicting the complexities of modern life. We argue that a postmodern critical approach offers a more useful paradigm within which to respond to the contextual variability and elusive nature of identity, while at the same time legitimizing social work’s traditional commitment to social justice. Following an elaboration of these ideas we examine a set of core principles necessary to actively mobilize this kind of work. Here we have been intentionally inclusive and have incorporated aspects of constructivist theory and narrative approaches. Accessing work produced across theoretical frameworks allows us to move beyond narrow conceptions of identity and difference and to broaden our range of understanding and responses. Our aim is to demonstrate how a postmodern critical approach can interweave with other perspectives to guide social work practice along more emancipatory lines. Finally, we consider the implications for social work education and practice.

Theoretical Foundation of Social Work

The theoretical foundation that currently informs most of social work education and practice include the following theories: psychodynamic, cognitive and systems theories and to a lesser extent, anti discrimination and anti-oppressive theories. These will be briefly explored with particular focus on assumptions of identity formation.

Psychodynamic Theories

As the first explanatory theory in social work, psychodynamic concepts and language has dominated much of social work theory and practice since the late 1920’s (Germaine in Reamer, 1994). Psychodynamic theory postulates that actions or behavior arise from people’s thought processes. That is, the mind stimulates individual behavior. Thinking and mental activity is unconscious and hidden from our knowledge. Within this perspective, the focus is on gaining insight into human behavior rather than taking action based on the analysis. The quest is to seek understanding and explanation within the therapeutic relationship where the therapist is viewed as the expert.
Although, there is an understanding that both the mind and behavior influence and are influenced by the individual’s social environment, psychodynamic theory does not consider the dynamic interaction of relationships in a cultural context (Payne, 2005). As such, the complexity and dynamism of human behavior and identity construction is narrowed. Rather, identity is essentialized and understood as stable from context to context.

**Cognitive-behavioral Theories**

Cognitive-behavioral approaches have grown steadily since the 1960’s. Within this framework, individual behavior is understood to be affected by one’s interpretation and perception of the environment. The root of discontent lies in dysfunctional and conscious cognitions. As such therapeutic interventions are designed to help clients identify and restructure their negative cognitions. Behavioral interventions focus on doing things that lead to behavioral changes. However this does not include changing systems that may contribute to dysfunctional thought processes. As with psychodynamic approaches the cultural context of behavior is undervalued and constructions of identity are fixed. Although they are widely taught in schools of social work, questions remain as to how applicable cognitive behavioral approaches are to general social work settings given the skills and experience needed to create behavioral programs as well as the technical style of practice (Payne, 2005).

**Systems and Ecological Perspectives**

Systems and ecological theories grew out of a sense of the dissatisfaction with the lack of attention to the environment in social work practice and scholarship. Within this framework, individual behavior and identity are understood as part of the interplay between individuals and their social and physical environments. However, because identities are seen fixed the possibilities to reinvent the self in relation to changing context are limited. Moreover, while systems theories include a wider social context in the analysis of human behavior and identity, interventions are focused on helping individuals to adapt to the existing social structure.

The focus of intervention within the ecological perspective is also on the individual, with the goal of finding a good fit between the client and his/her environment. Germaine’s and Gitterman’s (1980) life model of social work practice is noted as the most prominent framework of ecological systems theory. But here again, work is centered on adaptation to the environment rather than social change.

**Anti Discrimination and Anti Oppression Theories**

More recently, there has been a significant amount of literature on anti oppressive or anti-discriminatory practice. These theories provide a structural analysis of issues of discrimination and oppression primarily as they relate to race and ethnicity. Interventions focus on cultural and social relationships as a way to respond to oppression (Cemlyn, 2008). As with the other theories underlying social work practice, identity is associated with certain experiences which exist in an essential form. A key claim of anti-racist and anti discrimination theories is that identities can be understood only in relation to overarching social structures. These broader social structures order local identities. As such, social categories such as race, class, and gender are believed to determine one’s identification and access to power (Healy, 1999).
Within the UK context, where they have received broad support, critics (McLaughlin, as cited in Gemlyn, 2008) argue that despite the rhetoric of social justice and change, anti-oppressive and anti-discrimination practice have become about interpersonal behaviors rather than structural inequalities.

In summary, current social work theories pivot on notions of a self-contained unified subject (Jessup and Rogerson, 1999). Although they recognize the influence of broader social structures in the development of human behavior, identity is fixed and exists in an essential form. The goal of practice is to find the psychosocial cause of the problem and to identify a solution which will enable the client to function within existing social structures. As such, they are historically linear, developmental, and reformative in their conceptualization (Jessup and Rogerson, 1999). We highlight issues of identity and representation because they constitute a key focal point in the search for a fair and just society. As Fook (2002) notes, how we construct the self determines the degree to which it can or cannot be changed and the possibilities for doing so. In the next section we discuss the current context of practice focusing on how processes of identity formation have become unstable and fragmented in the new social order. We also examine the usefulness of current social work theories for depicting this complexity.

**Current Context of Practice**

One of the distinguishing features of social work is its emphasis on the environment. As such it is important for social workers to understand the context of their practice both in terms of the possibilities and challenges it holds for change. The current practice environment has been characterized as a period of globalization. Robertson, (as cited in Fook, 2002) refers to globalization as a compressing of the world through technological and economic means. This has resulted in social, political, and cultural changes. Jordan (2004) argues that globalization and the accompanying new world order have transformed the certainties of collective life into a landscape that is fragmented, unpredictable and in a state of flux. The breakdown in organizing structures has resulted in mass displacement of people around the world and has increased the disparities between the poor and the rich. It has also resulted in new forms of domination, social exclusion, and social and cultural injustice (Fook, 2002).

In discussing the effects of globalization, Lorenz (2008) points out that issues of race, ethnic identity, and difference have become paramount. He notes, that people no longer fit into a coherent whole as a result of blood connections or fixed cultural allegiances. Rather, they have multiple and fluid identities that have to be constantly negotiated and legitimated. Within this context, issues of citizenship and immigration have also taken on global significance. While these changes have affected everyone, people experience them differently according to their resource status. Because social workers work on the margins of society they are more likely to interact with people who have become causalities of this insecure existence (Jordan, 2004).

Although there is widespread acknowledgement of the realities of post modernity, social work has sought to understand the issues raised by the current context within a modernist paradigm. Lorenz (2008) claims for example, that the modernist linear approach to history and identity is still evident today in the cultural adjustment strategies aimed at assimilating immigrants. Humphries (2004, as cited in Gemlyn, 2008) goes further by arguing that in the context of work with asylum seekers social work has been drawn into implementing racist
policies. Others maintain that the current emphasis on management, efficiency, risk reduction, and the preoccupation with rules and procedures, represents an escape route from the complexities of social problems, the contradictions embedded in the interventions needed to address them and the inevitable conflict and doubt in which they are entangled (Webb, 2001).

In order to meet the challenges of a post modern world, the foundational assumptions of social work need to incorporate different ways of knowing and being, an appreciation of the complexity of identity and modes of work in which social justice is furthered. To begin with, the immutable, objective criteria of identity as conceptualized in current social work theories are no longer adequate for dealing with issues of difference and belonging. Given the aforementioned assumptions, their capacity for representing the uncertainty and dynamism of change oriented practice is also limited.

We believe that postmodern critical theory offers a paradigm within which to respond to the rapidly changing context of the modern world, and where the critiques of modernist concepts of self and identity can be incorporated. In support of our proposition, in the next section we outline those aspects of post modern critical theory that are of particular significance to social work stressing the ways in which they facilitate an understanding of changing subjectivities and individual agency.

**Postmodern Critical Theory and Social Work**

The framework that we believe holds the most promise for an emancipatory social work practice is one which Pease and Fook (1999) call post modern critical theory. The post modern view involves a critique of all totalizing theories or organizing frameworks. Within this approach there is no one universal truth or reality. Reality is socially constructed out of the language of multiple and diverse stories. As a result it is unstable and open to interpretation. In contrast, the dominant view in social work is that there is an objective reality or truth which can be measured and known through research. As such, science is used to provide universal explanations for human action and so called “value free” techniques derived from this research is applied to individuals and social problems. However, difficulties often arise because the knowledge gained in this way often has limited cultural relevance.

Within the post modern perspective meaning arises through dialog, and is interpreted in relation to specific social, historical, and political contexts. As such, there are no privileged positions. By allowing clients to collaborate in the construction of meaning based on their experiences, it opens up possibilities for difference, multiple subjectivities and the ability to create locally appropriate realities.

A post modern perspective also means valuing uncertainty (Pease and Fook, 1999). When social workers recognize that their view is only one of several alternative positions it becomes possible to explore other accounts and histories. A new form of practice which is contextual, and constructed within a genuine respect for the knowledge and experiences of clients can be developed (Pease and Fook, 1999). However, this challenges the professionalizing project of social work as the values and knowledge that underpin practice are contested.

There are different expressions of post modernism reflecting the extent to which they break with modernity. In this analysis we side with those expressions of post modernism that accept some values of modernity. We echo Is'e's (1999) contention that it is important for social work to retain a universalist vision of human rights and social justice. A number of scholars have sought to explain why some universalist positions are important for social
work practice. (Ife, 1999; Cemlyn, 2008; Leonard, 1994). At the center of their argument is the notion that the vision of a just and fair society requires holding a universalist position based on humanism and a relativism which values difference. Ife (1999) notes for example, that it is in the valuing of difference that human rights and social justice principles can be achieved. Further, he suggests that the "vision of a common universalist humanity has inspired many of the most significant movements for global justice, and to reject such a vision is to reject a powerful impetus for progressive social change" (p. 218). The task is to value difference while maintaining an understanding of universal human values. He argues that this can be done by counterbalancing universalism in a discourse of human rights and social justice with relativism in the discourse of human needs.

Critical social science incorporates a range of social theories including feminism, multiculturalism, anti-racist, and liberation theology (Healy, 1999). However all critical theories seek human emancipation. At the heart of these approaches is a recognition that the everyday struggles of people are rooted in oppressive social structures and that these challenges cannot be overcome without changing the systems and structures that give rise to them. We believe that an "affirmative" post modernism (Roseau, 1992) which emphasizes the importance of context and difference; informed by critical theory can contribute to the construction of a social work practice that is concerned with social justice and values diversity, difference, and change.

There are many possibilities for post modern critical theory to specifically address some of the concerns about modernist notions of self and identity. For example, post modern critical theory rejects positivist notions of fixed identities. Rather, they posit that identities are formed in context and therefore can only be understood in context over time (Fook, 2002). For example, while social categories such as race, class, and gender are understood as fixed categories with which people identify, post modern critical theory recognizes that the ways in which they are performed might vary from situation to situation (Fook, 2002). As a result, it is possible that an identity which confers disadvantage in one context will be privileged in another. This means that operations of power are also contextually determined, fluid and unstable.

For post modern critical theorists, the continual reconstruction of reality plays a key role in the empowerment of marginalized groups. In creating their own narratives people take responsibility for constructing their own identity and lifestyles (Fook, 2002). It can restore a sense of agency to the individual. However, as post modern critical theorists point out, identities can be contradictory. For example, it is widely accepted that members of marginalized groups often internalize the identity and stories that have been constructed for them. As a result, the stories that people tell may be infused with discourses that are not their own, leading them to sometimes behave in ways that work against their best interest. As such a foundational aim of post modern critical theory is to raise peoples’ awareness of where their beliefs come from and how they are used to keep them in their current situation. This is done by examining the assumptions, language and myths that underpin particular positions. As Foucault (1982, as cited in Healy, 1999) contends, transformation is not to discover what we are but rather, to refuse what we are.

Finally, post modern critical theory acknowledges that individuals possess a number of identities across a range of social categories. As such they reject the dualist thinking of modernist approaches. That is, the tendency to construct the world in binary opposites. For example, worker/client, black/white, middleclass/working class, man/woman etc. Ife (1999)
maintains that the dualist constitution of identity has prevented more radical conceptualizations that can lead to progressive change. Others suggest that it can suppress points of similarity and connection which are integral to practice processes (Healy, 1999). Fook (2002) notes that within the dualist formulation, one member of the pair is usually privileged over the other. Moreover, in assigning a higher value to one item over the other, difference is often suppressed and/or devalued. In contrast, post modern critical theory draws our attention to the enactment of identity within specific contexts. This creates space for the recognition of difference and where the fluid and uncertain aspects of identity can emerge.

In the following section, we describe a set of core principles that are necessary to express these ideas and with which we can establish effective forms of intervention.

**Core Practice Principles for a Postmodern Critical Approach to Social Work**

There are several practitioner-scholars who works within a post modern critical framework and whose work provide the foundation through which these core principles are defined. They include the critical social work practice of Jan Fook (2002), the narrative approach of White and Epston (1990) and constructivist social work of Parton and O'Byrne (2000). As Weis et al., (2009) maintain, working across difference both within and among theory better enables us to track changing structural circumstances, to engage in analysis that accounts for such changes both on a micro and macro level, and to theorize the ways that individuals and groups behave and live in relation to the sociopolitical context of their lives. The goal is to create a space where multiple ways of knowing and responding are welcome in a search for effective interventions.

**Discourse Analysis**

Critical theorists believe that language is the place where our sense of self is constructed. It provides us with normalizing truths which in turn shapes our lives and our reality. Therefore, to make sense of different experiences, post modern critical theory uses discourse analysis to deconstruct the underlying structures, boundaries and hierarchies of totalizing theories. This is done through a process of dialog. The goal is to uncover hidden, marginalized, and multiple perspectives (Fook, 2002). In contrast to the positivist paradigm which sees language as a reflector of a rational unified world, for post modern critical theorists language and their signified meanings represent a powerful site for change. Jessup and Rogerson (1999) remind us that without critical questioning people hold on to cultural meanings about who they are or ought to be even in situations that are oppressive.

**Consciousness Raising**

Conscious raising means helping clients to understand the extent to which the social context has shaped their lives. Post modern critical theorists argue that the success of power is proportional to its ability to hide and or mask its own mechanisms (Foucault, 1982). Extending this principle means engaging in analysis directed at uncovering the mechanism's of power and how they operate and are maintained in daily life (Strega, 2005). This awareness coupled with their emerging voice can help clients more accurately assess the possibilities for resist-
ance and social action. Thus, unlike traditional approaches, the role of the practitioner is not to help the client adjust to their circumstances but to disrupt the status quo. However, critical theorists warn that because our views arise from our own sociocultural experiences our understanding is only partial. As Weedon (1987) notes, to deny our own partiality is to fail to acknowledge that our version is only part of the truth and represents a particular interest. Consequently, we need to guard against imposing our views on others in our attempts to raise their consciousness. This balancing act is to key to all critical social justice work.

**Giving Voice**

Understanding how the voice of marginalized groups has been silenced, suppressed or unrecognized is central to all postmodern critical approaches. Also of critical importance is the ability to communicate the experiences and realities of the oppressed (Ladison-Billings and Tate, 1995). These scholars note that the “voice” component of critical theory is a first step on the road to justice. As such a key goal in working with marginalized groups is amplifying both their individual and collective voice. Translating the commitment to give voice means allowing oppressed groups to tell their stories- not only about the events in their lives but how they have responded to them and how they have changed given the context.

Bond et al. (2000) suggest that in order to understand the limits of our conceptual frameworks we must begin our inquiry by trying to understand the experiences of marginalized people. As such, giving voice also means approaching clients and communities with the belief that they know what questions and problems they want addressed (Goodman et al, 2004). Without the authentic voices of people our interventions and research questions may fail to capture the needs and concerns of marginalized groups in ways that they have characterized them (Goodman et al, 2004).

**Reflexivity**

Given the complexity of social justice work, a prominent theme in all critical approaches is the need for practitioners to recognize their situatedness with regard to power and how it intersects with race, class, gender, sexuality and so forth. This allows the practitioner to account for the context of his/her life. However, it challenges modernist notions of objectivity and neutrality within the practice context. Critical theorists argue that practitioners must also be alert to their own prejudices, how they are implicated in their practice decisions and how they can make it less so. This can be done through ongoing purposeful self examination. Hercising (2005) maintains that ongoing self examination allows for a more complex and robust analysis of who and why certain relations interact in particular ways.

**Sharing Power**

By seeking to share power through the practice process the traditional relationship between worker and client can become more egalitarian. However, this means recognizing the role of power in the relationship and understanding the “other” as a different person with a different history. From this perspective, the knowledge and wisdom of the worker is not privileged over that of the client. Rather, alternative strategies in which the skills and knowledge of both professionals and clients can be heard become paramount. Each learns from the
other's experience. Reflexivity can be used to sensitize workers to the many ways that they reproduce the oppression of clients by virtue of their privilege as professionals. For example, workers can be encouraged to see how the hierarchical and potentially exploitive nature of the relationship between professionals and clients reflects broader social arrangements and inequalities. By recognizing different knowledge and experiences, the possibilities they offer for transformation and action can be developed.

**Transformation**

Transformation is a process wherein the practitioner seeks to transform social institutions through political and social action in order to support clients. It is a particularly important part of all critical theories. Within a post modern critical perspective, transformation is achieved through consciousness raising and praxis. That is, acting on the analysis in practice and then revising practice by using the ideas generated by one's action. Because knowledge and action are linked praxis occurs across both the personal and the political. The realization of how one is oppressed frees individuals to act to improve their circumstances.

**Implications for Social Work Education and Practice**

In this section we discuss a number of challenges that educators and practitioners are likely to face integrating a post modern critical perspective into their work. They include difficulties in creating space in an already crowded curriculum, lack of knowledge among faculty, the disconnect between theory and practice and the constraints raised by the practice settings in which most social workers are employed.

**Creating Space in a Crowded Curriculum**

A major challenge to incorporating a postmodern critical perspective within social work education is finding space in an already crowded curriculum. The competing demands from licensing bodies, agencies, and institutions of higher education make it necessary for schools to focus on psychological theories almost to the exclusion of all others (Saleebey, 2005). Moreover, given the plethora of these theories, students have little opportunities to take social justice oriented courses as electives.

**Faculty Preparation**

Even if room is made in the curriculum, faculty preparation and training presents a further challenge. Most faculty are unfamiliar with post modern and critical theories as they have been trained to understand and apply social work knowledge using modernist ideas and ways of knowing. As such they may not have the skills and understanding necessary to teach postmodern critical theory. Others may be resistant to adopting a post modern perspective as their pedagogy and practice are embedded in forms of understanding in which they are personally vested.

Further, critical theory requires a dialectic perspective from which critical analyses and understanding can be fostered. This demands an equalizing of the relationship between students and faculty where educators are non-experts. Thus, among the challenges for faculty in adopting a post modern critical approach to teaching and learning is fear of diminished
power. Training faculty to facilitate meaningful dialogue and engagement within the classroom where students feel safe to deal with difficult discussions about structural oppression, particularly when the discussion may lead to issues of White privilege is yet another challenge (Abrams and Moio, 2009). A post modern critical approach to learning may also be problematic for some students as they may be reluctant to identify their own positions of privilege or accept their role in oppression.

**Theory/Practice Split**

As discussed earlier, micro and macro practice are conceptualized separately within social work education. This has led to a situation where social workers either do interpersonal work or social change work. In contrast, post modern critical theory demands that theory be grounded to practice. Relatedly, it rejects the separation between the personal and the political or micro and macro conceptualization of practice. Courses of action must occur across all forms of practice. While this approach is more compatible with the social justice mandate of social work, practitioners who have been trained to conceptualize the personal and political separately may struggle with incorporating this perspective into their practice.

**Practice Settings**

Even if they are able to integrate knowledge and action, the apolitical nature of most practice settings would also create obstacles for practitioners. As such, another concern that we share is the lack of opportunities to do social justice work given the practice realities in the settings where the vast majority of social workers work. Students have often expressed frustration with the inability to integrate what they learn in the classroom into their work with clients. Yet, developing a capacity for reflexive thinking and practice requires students to move back and forth between field experiences and conceptualizations. Among the reasons given for the lack of opportunity to do social justice work are; the move toward managed care, restrictive agency policies, crisis driven nature of the field leaving little or no room for reflexive practice, and lack of supervision and training. Agencies also struggle with the realities of downsizing and the emphasis on productivity and billable hours (Ornstein and Moses, 2010).

**Conclusion**

It is essential that the human behavior curriculum prepare students to assess and plan for interventions at all levels in a range of practice settings (Farley et al., 2002; Zaparanick and Wodarski, 2004; Taylor et al., 2004). As we have argued, the current philosophical grounding of mainstream social work is inadequate for accomplishing this task. Given the complexity and dynamism of the current practice context, we advocate for a more inclusive approach which acknowledges the existence of multiple and diverse ways of being and where the social justice goals of social work can be realized. As we demonstrate, critical post modern theory provides a paradigm that allows for recognizing the uncertain and shifting boundaries of identity and for developing new understandings and action. As Fook (2002) notes, the recognition that there are many aspects to the self made in social context allows us to see and appreciate the complexities of peoples’ day to day experiences and most importantly, to envisage how they might be changed.
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