7 Practising feminist approaches

Annie Hudson with Lorraine Ayensu, Catherine Oadley and Matilde Patocchi

'Feminism' signals to some people very negative images about those who choose to so define themselves; in contrast to others it connotes positive values about women working together to challenge oppressive aspects of their lives. Consequently, it is probably important to emphasize at the outset that this chapter seeks to provide neither an instructional guide to feminist social work practice, nor a series of banner slogans under which the 'converted' may align themselves. We share Hanmer and Statham's view that all too often definitions of feminists and feminism have become exclusive rather than inclusive (Hanmer and Statham 1988) and hope that this discussion will have a purchase on the working day realities of a diverse range of social work practitioners and managers. It is our intention to indicate not only some of the possibilities but also some of the inevitable tensions that result from attempting to translate some of the experiential wisdom accumulated by women collectively into everyday social work practice.

The discussion below draws on our experiences of working together in a social work team in an inner-city area of Bristol. Our relatively diverse social identities and biographies have engendered as much difference as consensus in our ideas about feminist and anti-sexist social work practice. We believe that this is not only a potential strength as opposed to a weakness, but also that it is a reflection of a much broader diversity about the most appropriate means of infusing social work's dominant institutions with the potentially radical concepts implicit within different strands of feminist thought and practice (see, for example, the collection of writings in Langan and Day 1992). Our shared starting point is that feminist analysis can be invaluable for etching out how social workers, including those working in statutory agencies, can begin to address, rather than ignore, the unequal position of women that characterizes so many facets of social relations. Challenging myriad manifestations of gender inequalities, like challenging race, class and other forms of oppression, is, however, an exceedingly complex task. To suggest otherwise would be naive and misleading.

Social workers are confronted daily by the consequences of women's oppression. These may be in the form of witnessing the brutal results of male physical or sexual violence or the more subtle, but equally invidious, manifestations of gender inequalities such as the unquestioned duties felt by many women to care for and about their children, relatives and male partners despite the considerable cost they may accrue for themselves (Dalley 1988). Whilst these are not necessarily new revelations, during the past decade or so feminism has provided social workers with greater clarity and purpose about the imperative of finding ways of challenging and doing something about such inequities, whilst accepting that such endeavours are likely to be relatively piecemeal (see, for example, Marchant and Wearing 1986; Hanmer and Statham 1988; Dominelli and McLeod 1989).

A review of the impact of feminism on social work is particularly timely as the effects of the Children Act 1989 and the National Health Service and Community Care Act 1990 take root in social work agencies. Both Acts contain within them both progressive and regressive potentials as far as the social relations of gender are concerned. Community care policies, with their emphasis on needs-led assessments, on consumer choice and on the duty to consult carers seem superficially to acknowledge the rights and needs of informal carers, the overwhelming majority of whom are women, and also to challenge attitudes that professionals 'know best'. Yet, as many social workers and managers have come to recognize, the 'pluriform care market' ideology (Lupton 1992) that central government has impelled local authorities to stimulate works, in many respects, directly against the needs and interests of women as front-line carers both paid and unpaid. The diversification of relatively cheap community care schemes relies on maintaining women as low paid and low status workers. This trend is likely to intensify as private sector service providers increase their share of the community care 'market', since indications are that private agencies offer less favourable pay and conditions than local government workers have come to receive. Central government statements indicating that aggregated information about unmet needs are unlikely to be officially published has exacerbated concerns that the real needs of community care users and their informal carers will not be credited. The gendered segregation of social services departments means, moreover, that it is largely female staff who are the bearers of messages to users and carers that resources will not meet their needs.

The Children Act 1989 was similarly predicated on traditional views of family life. Whilst also apparently aiming to redress imbalances in professional and state power, the Act barely begins to question structural and institutionalized sources of inequality either within individual families or between families from different social groups (see, for example MacDonald 1991; Langan 1992). It should be noted that the Act makes no reference to

the importance of taking account of a child's gender in decision making. Moreover, the Children Act's underpinning principle of parental partnership implies that parenthood is a genderless concept and reality. Whilst this might be a long-term social policy objective, the reality is that gender defines and shapes virtually every aspect of familial relationships.

The way in which the differential needs and social responsibilities of mothers and fathers respectively are generally subsumed under the sole category of 'parents' is explained in part by the indebtedness of large sections of the Children Act to the *Report of the Inquiry into Child Abuse in Cleveland* (Butler-Sloss 1988). The report failed to highlight either the maleness of most perpetrators or the specific conflicts and dilemmas faced by many women whose children had disclosed sexual abuse by their male partners. Such official silencing of gender in what was arguably one of the key social policy debates of the 1980s is a further illustration of the state's continued denial of the significance of gender, and of the role which white middle-class men so often occupy in gatekeeping and commanding the operations of the welfare 'industry' (Campbell 1988; Hudson 1992).

DEFINING OUR TERMS: WHAT CONSTITUTES FEMINIST APPROACHES?

Feminism has never been an easy concept to identify or to define. Broadly speaking, however, feminism can be regarded as referring to beliefs that all dimensions of social relations are shaped by the structure of power relations between women and men. As such then, feminism provides a template for making sense of the diverse and often contrasting ways in which women experience inequality in so many facets of their lives—at home, at work and in the wider community. Power relations, however, are not simply an issue of some having 'it' and others being without 'it'. Such a view is far too simplistic. What is required instead is careful scrutiny of the specific power relations which may be obtaining in any particular situation and how these impact on the particular women and men involved.

The importance of avoiding simplistic presumptions about the sources and manifestations of gender oppression is highlighted by the very great material and social differences which exist between different groups of women (Lorde 1984; Segal 1987). Feminism has rightly sometimes been castigated for being synonymous with the values and experiences of white, heterosexual and middle-class women. Such a criticism is as valid of many commentaries about social work as elsewhere. That dominant models of feminism have so often been treated with suspicion and anger by many black and working-class women should come as no surprise to anyone (see, for example, Shah 1989).

A number of features have characterized the integration of feminist approaches into social work policy and practice. First, it is evident that feminist approaches are intrinsically threatening to many of social work's traditionally held beliefs. The notion of professional objectivity or neutrality, for example, is disputed by the feminist emphasis on the invariable influence of our values and how they inescapably permeate all that we do both professionally and personally. Mary Eaton's research illustrates such patterns. This indicated that probation officers are likely to use home visits with their female clients to comment and adjudicate upon their domestic competence. In contrast, home visits to male clients were frequently used as an opportunity to learn more about the defendant's domestic relationships rather than his domestic competence. Such findings exemplify how social workers frequently continue to presume the centrality of the domestic role in women's lives and to expect that they should account for their menfolk's actions (Eaton 1986). The impact of such presumptions on child protection policy and practice is discussed later.

Second, endeavours to integrate feminist perspectives into social work have increasingly sought to recognize both the strength and the meaning of diversities between women, as well as the complex nature of power differentials between worker and client. Social work may have begun to address the significance of different forms of oppression but there remains a strong inclination to reduce the complexities of the lives of users to neat little boxes labelled 'race', 'gender', 'class' and so on. The reality of individuals' lives is of course very different. None of us belongs to one social compartment; we are simultaneously female or male, black or white, working class or middle class. That said, each of us has our own very individual biography and understanding of the meaning of all the social categories to which we may belong.

Ahmed's discussion of the shortcomings of feminist accounts about young Asian women is pertinent here. She demonstrates how social workers often simplistically reduce conflicts experienced by some young Asian women to explanations of their preference for white British values over those of their parents (Ahmed 1986). When working with black young women, social workers must therefore ensure that their assessments and intervention revolve around a critical appreciation of the specific impact of racism and class as well as sexism and the young woman's particular relationship with her family.

Similarly, women with disabilities have drawn attention to the exclusion by much mainstream feminism of the experiences of disabled women. Jenny Morris, for example has criticized the tendency (possibly even replicated within parts of this chapter) to consider questions about community care via a focus on women as carers, rather than through an equally important focus on the needs and rights of women who are themselves disabled (Morris 1991).

Hughes and Mtezuka make similar points about the needs of older women and emphasize the importance of social work assessments encompassing an appreciation of the strengths and resources which older women have gained from their life experiences (Hughes and Mtezuka 1992).

It is often difficult and possibly even embarrassing to acknowledge the frequency with which many of us (but particularly those of us who are white, middle class and heterosexual) presume that our experiences and values are of universal validity. At times we may have even been driven by a secular version of the moral fervour that propelled many of social work's Victorian foremothers, such as Octavia Hill, into philanthropic action. The danger of such evangelical zeal is no less when it stems from feminist philosophy than when it was Victorian Christian philanthropy. In the 1980s one of the authors began undertaking some research into work with 'troublesome young women'. An initial premise for the research was the importance of affirming young women's rights to determine their own sexuality. With hindsight, however, it is apparent that the dominant model of sexuality underpinning that research analysis was not only heterosexist but also class defined. It was accepted, for example, that adequate, free and accessible contraception resources were a crucial component of maximizing young women's choices, particularly in relation to the possibility of 'premature' motherhood. One consequence of talking more extensively to young women was the acknowledgment that the research premises represented only one version of reality. Early motherhood constitutes, for many working-class young women, a valid and not necessarily negative way of achieving a mature adult status and responsibility. Early motherhood is, in short, a source of joy and pleasure for some young women, contrary to many popular and professional preconceptions (Sharpe 1987).

A further feature of feminist approaches to social work has been an emphasis on the need to develop practice theories and methods which are dynamic and responsive to new insights about power relations. Nowhere has this been more apparent than in child sexual abuse. The recognition that women do, albeit infrequently, sexually abuse children was contrary to what many of us had wanted to believe in the early 1980s. This was profoundly disturbing. The recognition that women could be perpetrators of sexual abuse entailed not only listening to the distress and sense of betrayal by those who had been abused by adult women, but it also meant that we had to face up to the limitations of earlier theorizations of child sexual abuse that developed out of campaigns in the early 1980s against the injustice of sexual abuse. The need to rework earlier feminist conceptualizations about sexual abuse has also necessitated a re-examination of practice methods. It is clear, for example, that social workers must be alert to the possibility of sexual abuse of any child by male and female adults. Similarly, it is also fundamental that intervention with female perpetrators, as with male perpetrators, is based on

the need to confront the behaviour and not on individual pathology models since this would be to reproduce the very criticisms which feminists have levelled at traditional perspectives (Hudson 1992).

Finally, feminist approaches have sought to build up a reservoir of practical experience about different ways of responding to the gendered needs of clients and workers more equitably. There is now a substantive body of knowledge and direct experience around a number of different practice areas (see Langan and Day 1992 for a collection of articles around different user, organizational and service delivery issues). In some respects the number of publications available about feminist and anti-sexist practice within Great Britain is a poor reflection of the diversity and extensiveness of endeavours by many women (and some men) to challenge and address gender inequalities in their employing agencies. This may reflect the continued difficulty which feminist ideas have in gaining anything more than passing reference in many quarters of social work (but particularly in senior management and academia).

There have been, and no doubt will continue to be, debates about the relative merits of work with men having a key place on the feminist agenda (Segal 1990). There is a risk that, in expending energies on developing anti-sexist practice with men, women's perspectives, needs and values will once more be occluded from public view and debate. That said, the reality is that men do play very significant emotional and social roles in the lives of many women. To cast them to the shadows of our assessment and intervention is unlikely to assist women. If feminist approaches in social work are to meet with any success, then an exclusive concentration on work with women is ultimately likely to engender only half-hearted solutions. This is an area in which male practitioners, managers and educators have a potentially vital role. They have an unequivocal responsibility to challenge both their own attitudes and practices as well as those of male colleagues and thereby to develop gradually a greater repertoire of wisdom about working with male service users.

The remainder of this chapter examines two specific issues which bring into sharp relief some of the tensions and possibilities of feminist approaches to social work. The tension between control and empowerment objectives is considered, followed by discussion of some of the initiatives which will be needed if women employees in social work organizations are to receive a fairer deal.

EMPOWERMENT OR CONTROL?

Feminism's objective of addressing the many-faceted sources and forms of women's oppression would appear to be at odds with social work's historical origins and with its contemporary role in regulating deviant and dissident

individuals and families. Social work's control roles have a number of particular resonances for feminist approaches. First, women's status as gatekeepers of family affairs assigns them the unremitting responsibility of maintaining and supporting the family both at an institutional and individual level. When the state identifies a 'problem' within a particular family, it invariably initially focuses its gaze on women in their roles as primary carers and agents of discipline.

Women are generally presumed to be more culpable than their male partners when their families experience difficulties. Attention is thereby diverted away not only from the impact of male roles but also from structural inequalities emanating from poverty and racism. Child care work evidences such patterns most starkly (Parton 1990). Agency case records and the discourse of child protection case conferences are frequently the mechanisms by which welfare professionals express their views about the culpability of individual women to stimulate, develop and care for their children. Rather than addressing the impact of poverty and the inadequacy of material resources to support women in looking after children it is individual women who are frequently castigated and deemed to have failed.

Social work intervention, in common with the practice of allied welfare institutions such as health and social security, often revolves around the perpetuation of negative associations between the (perceived) sexual behaviour of women clients and their capacity to be 'good mothers'. The 'known fact' that a woman works as a prostitute, for example, is sometimes deployed as an index of her potential to be an incompetent parent even though there is no proven correlation. Similarly, a key determinant in decision making about young women perceived to be 'troublesome' by their families, social workers and other professionals is the extent to which such young women are thought to be, or are 'at risk' of sexual activity and possibly 'promiscuity' (Hudson 1989).

Black women clients are particularly susceptible to negative stereotypes about their capacities to be 'good enough' mothers. Such stereotypes emanate from suppositions about their sexual behaviour. One particularly commonplace presumption is that Afro-Caribbean women will frequently have many sexual partners which in turn generates presumptions of their amorality and incompetence to manage the demands of motherhood. Risk assessment checklists used by child protection agencies are frequently simplistic and uncritical, often classifying black families as being 'high risk' particularly when parents are young and single (Channer and Parton 1990). Such images contradict evidence that young Afro-Caribbean mothers tend to have a mature sense of responsibility and ability to cope as mothers (Channer and Parton 1990). Such evidence complements our own experiences of the capacities of the young black women with whom we work, some of whom

have themselves been in care. Such young black women may develop important social networks which serve to provide not only social and emotional support and enjoyment, but also positive resistance against myriad difficulties that they may face, whether this is from intrusive welfare officials (including social workers such as ourselves), from male partners or from demanding small children.

In a similar vein, racist stereotypes which portray Asian women as passive and dependent can result in negative constructions about their parenting capacities. An Asian woman who is reluctant to allow her child to play on the street outside, or on the local playground, may find herself at the receiving end of negative judgements by social workers or health visitors who perceive her as inhibiting her children's social development. The reality may of course be very different since the woman may be concerned to protect her children from the endemic racism of many neighbourhoods.

Feminists, in common with other 'radical' social workers, have drawn attention to the way in which the focus on individual 'cases' detracts time and time again from the inadequacy of resources to support women in their private and public roles. In recent years, social work resources have been increasingly prioritized for families defined as 'high risk', thereby confirming the apparently unrelenting shift back to a residual rather than a universalistic model of welfare. It is working-class and minority ethnic families who are the main victims of such 'residualization of local authority services' and who benefit least from the expanding private and voluntary services which cost more than many women can afford (Langan 1992:83).

Black women have particularly limited welfare service choices. The much publicized cases of Asian women being unjustly imprisoned following conviction for killing their violent husbands have highlighted Asian women's extremely limited access to resources which would open up rather than foreclose their options for leaving violent men. In many areas of the country, for example, Asian women have to travel hundreds of miles before they will find a women's refuge that will meet their needs.

Similarly, shortfalls in interpreter services in many social work agencies may particularly penalize Asian women. A significant proportion of Asian women who wish to access welfare services are often reliant on male partners or relatives to communicate with white officials such as social workers, thereby limiting the possibility of their receiving services in their own right and on their own terms.

Empowerment is a concept which has been a *sine qua non* of feminist perspectives, as in other strands of radical social work thinking (Ward and Mullender 1991). Empowerment is none the less a notion about which it is very much easier to theorize and sloganize than to translate into everyday working principles and practice. In statutory agencies particularly, the pressure

to 'cover your backs' can easily stifle initiative and risk taking. As already indicated, consumer participation and partnership are ostensibly at the heart of both the Children Act 1989 and the National Health Service and Community Care Act 1990. Yet both pieces of legislation have unequivocally failed to address structural sources of inequality and oppression.

Central to the concept of empowerment in social work is the idea that individuals are not passive victims of their situations. Many facets of the women's movement, such as Women's Aid and Rape Crisis Centres, have demonstrated the effectiveness and power of women developing practical strategies to challenge and alter their circumstances. In social work agencies, empowerment necessarily entails moving away from presumptions that we are 'experts' and that clients should be the passive recipients of our services. A number of projects working with young women 'in trouble' have drawn attention to the potential of encouraging young women to engage in activities which etch out different and non-traditional concepts of youthful femininity (Mountain 1988). Ward and Mullender have similarly argued that self-directed groupwork based on anti-oppressive values can help reject the 'splintering of the public and private' (Ward and Mullender 1991:29).

The successful expansion of the power of women service users is conditional on assessments linking individuals' needs, resources and problems with broader structural dynamics. It is, however, equally crucial that the capacities of adult women are not strengthened at the expense of the safety and security of potentially more vulnerable individuals, such as children, young people or adults with learning disabilities. A key challenge is how best to ensure that women's rights and power are maximized at the same time as challenging other forms of oppression and disadvantage. The undoubted tension between social work's policing roles and the empowerment of women is unlikely to evaporate. Indeed the tension has arguably become intensified in recent years as right-wing welfare ideologies have increased their grip on the financing and operations of social work agencies.

TOWARDS GREATER GENDER EQUITY IN SOCIAL WORK ORGANIZATIONS

At first sight women employees in social work organizations appear to have a relatively strong profile. Women are undoubtedly strongly physically represented within social work organizations, for example 86 per cent of the workforce in English and Welsh social services departments are female (Social Services Inspectorate 1992a). Additionally, at least when compared to some parts of the private sector, female social services staff generally enjoy relatively fair work conditions as far as issues such as fair selection interviewing, maternity leave and the availability of part-time and career

break schemes are concerned. At closer sight, however, it becomes clear that the reality is very different. Indeed, as Jane King has pointed out, social services are run mostly by men while surviving and thriving on the goodwill and resilience of legions of women (King 1992). Men have undoubtedly been extremely successful in achieving and consolidating their power, prestige and high pay within social work agencies. In 1990, for example, 88 per cent of directors of social services in England and Wales, and 80 per cent of assistant or divisional directors were male (Social Services Inspectorate 1992a). It is particularly telling that, despite the impact of feminism and equal opportunities policies, there are now virtually no more female directors of social services in England and Wales than were appointed in the early 1970s when those departments were created. Women's employment patterns and relationship to the labour market, historical legacies and presumptions that tend to define 'good managers' in male-orientated terms and differential career values and aspirations are but some of the factors explaining the relative lack of power of female social services staff. Specific groups of women, such as black women and women with disabilities, experience particularly unequal opportunities for organizational power and status. More substantive evidence of and discussion about such patterns can be found elsewhere (see, for example, Howe 1986; Lupton 1992; Social Services Inspectorate 1992a; Social Services Inspectorate 1992b).

Three types of initiative stand out as urgent priorities. First, whilst policy statements are only ever the first step towards organizational equality and justice, many social services departments and voluntary agencies around the country could start with refining much further the bland statements of intent which so often characterize all aspects of their equal opportunities policies. In drawing up concrete and specific action plans, attention must be given to the differential needs of specific social groups of women. Black women managers, for example, have articulated how they are frequently marginalized and by-passed in agencies where power continues to be concentrated in white groups (Social Services Inspectorate 1992a). Domiciliary care staff, such as home care workers, have often had to deal with working in isolation yet also having a high measure of responsibility for which they receive low pay and minimal training or promotional opportunities. These are but two examples of how different groups of women staff will have different needs and priorities, all of which warrant detailed attention by gender and women's equality policies. Sexual harassment policies and procedures must be effectively implemented alongside equality policies if women employees are to feel safe and secure in taking up issues and grievances when they have cause to do so.

Second, the structure and design of jobs within social services departments

requires overhauling. Many women staff need more extensive opportunities to enable them to take time off for caring responsibilities at the same time as keeping abreast, through training and other career development activities, of organizational and practice changes. Similarly, it continues to be difficult for many women to work full time alongside managing the demands of their families. More flexible working arrangements and more positive attitudes towards part-time and job-sharing work are strongly indicated. To our knowledge there have not yet been any examples of job-sharing social services directors; the day that event occurs may begin to presage social work organizations that are making full and equitable use of their female staff resources.

Finally, some redefinition of what constitutes a 'good manager' is demanded. Attention has been drawn elsewhere to the subtle and not so subtle ways in which the contributions and resources of female managers are frequently undermined or ignored (see, for example, Walby 1987; Morris 1988). No wonder then that for many women social workers, management does not have the allure that it may do for their male colleagues. The position of female managers is unlikely to be promoted, moreover, by the evolution of what has been termed the 'new managerialist approach' (Lupton 1992) with its emphasis on quantitive performance measures and an explicitly masculinized culture (as manifest, for example, on the need to be 'tough' and commanding in relation to subordinate staff). Recent Social Services Inspectorate reports and initiatives indicate that there is now greater recognition of the need for all agencies to establish and evaluate a range of training and development schemes for potential and actual women managers. The ability and will of agencies to deliver such schemes will, however, be severely tested in the face of other competing priorities such as community care.

Feminist approaches will have to continue to adjust and adapt in response to the changing shape of social work. As already indicated this is not likely to be an easy task given continued assaults on the resourcing of social services agencies. This chapter has sketched out some of the key components of feminist social work practice. This is, however, a very much easier task than realizing feminist principles in everyday social work practice. The demands of doing the 'job' of social work, particularly in large statutory departments, mean that the potential of many of the best of feminist intentions are often quickly blunted. It is consequently extremely important that, as well as constantly scrutinizing our own practice, apparently small steps towards the successful challenge of oppressive values and practices are also recognized and validated.

REFERENCES

Ahmed, S. (1986) 'Cultural racism in work with Asian women and girls', in S.Ahmed, J.Cheetham, and J.Small *Social Work with Black Children and their Families,* London: Batsford.

Butler-Sloss Committee (1988) *Report of the Inquiry into Child Abuse in Cleveland,* London: HMSO.

Campbell, B. (1988) *Unofficial Secrets, Child Sexual Abuse—The Cleveland Case,* London: Virago.

Channer, Y. and Parton, N. (1990) 'Racism, cultural relativism and child protection', in Violence Against Children Study Group, *Taking Child Abuse Seriously,* London: Unwin Hyman.

Dalley, G. (1988) *Ideologies of Caring,* London: Macmillan.

Dominelli, L. and McLeod, E. (1989) *Feminist Social Work,* London: Macmillan.

Eaton, M. (1986) *Justice for Women?,* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Hanmer, J. and Statham, D. (1988) *Women and Social Work,* London: Macmillan.

Howe, D. (1986) 'The segregation of women and their work in the personal social services', *Critical Social Policy* 15, Spring, 21–35.

Hudson, A. (1989) '"Troublesome Girls": towards alternative definitions and policies', in M.Cain (ed.) *Growing Up Good,* London: Sage.

Hudson, A. (1992) 'The child sexual abuse "industry"', in M.Langan and L.Day (eds) *Women, Oppression and Social Work,* London: Routledge.

Hughes, B. and Mtezuka, M. (1992) 'Social work and older women', in M.Langan and L.Day (eds) *Women, Oppression and Social Work,* London: Routledge.

King, J. (1992) 'Women: a demographic time bomb', *Community Care,* 2 July, 16–17.

Langan, M. (1992) 'Who cares? Women in the mixed economy of care', in M.Langan and L.Day (eds) *Women, Oppression and Social Work,* London: Routledge.

Langan, M. and Day, L. (eds) (1992) *Women, Oppression and Social Work,* London: Routledge.

Lorde, A. (1984) *Sister Outsider,* Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.

Lupton, C. (1992) 'Feminism, managerialism, and performance measurement', in M. Langan and L.Day (eds) *Women, Oppression and Social Work,* London: Routledge.

MacDonald, S. (1991) *All Equal Under the Act?* London: National Institute of Social Work.

Marchant, H. and Wearing, B. (eds) (1986) *Gender Reclaimed,* Sydney: Hale and Iremonger.

Morris, B. (1988) 'Tough talking', *Insight,* 27 May, 17–19.

Morris, J. (1991) *Pride Against Prejudice: Transforming Attitudes to Disability,* London: Women's Press.

Mountain, A. (1988) *Womanpower: a Handbook for Women Working with Young Women in Trouble,* Leicester: National Youth Bureau.

Parton, C. (1990) 'Women, gender oppression and child abuse', in Violence Against Children Study Group, *Taking Child Abuse Seriously,* London: Unwin Hyman.

Segal, L. (1987) *Is the Future Female?,* London: Virago.

Segal, L. (1990) *Slow Motion: Changing Masculinities, Changing Men,* London: Virago.

Shah, N. (1989) 'It's up to you sisters: black women and radical social work', in M. Langan and P.Lee (eds) *Radical Social Work Today,* London: Unwin Hyman.

Sharpe, S. (1987) *Falling for Love: Teenage Mothers Talk,* London: Virago Upstarts.

Social Services Inspectorate (1992a) *Women in Social Services: A Neglected Resource,* London: HMSO.

Social Services Inspectorate (1992b) *Promoting Women,* London: HMSO.

Walby, C. (1987) 'Why are so few women working in senior positions?', *Social Work Today,* 16 February, 10–11.

Ward, D. and Mullender, A. (1991) 'Empowerment and oppression: an indissoluble pairing for contemporary social work', *Critical Social Policy* 32, Autumn, 21–30.