University of Dundee
College of Arts and Social Sciences
School of Education, Social Work and Community Education
Department of Social Work

«Social Work and Social Control»

Christina G. Papantonopoulou
Constantinos J. Dallas

Dundee 2009

University of Dundee
College of Arts and Social Sciences
School of Education, Social Work and Community Education
Department of Social Work

Thesis:
«Social Work and Social Control»

Research Team: **Supervisor:**
Christina Papantonopoulou   *Brian Leslie*
Constantinos Dallas

Thesis to receive the degree in Social Work from the Department of Social Work of the School of Sciences of Health & Care from the Technological Educational Institute of Patras.

August 2009

The Thesis of Christina Papantonopoulou & Constantinos Dallas approved

Signatures

1. Brian Leslie, Programme Director /Lecture
(Supervisor of the Thesis)

Member of the Examine Committee

2. Dr Murray K. Simpson, Senior Lecture

3. Sheila McCallum, Lecture

Περίληψη

Έχει υποθεί πως το πολιτικό, κοινωνικό και ιδεολογικό περιβάλλον της Κοινωνικής Εργασίας δεν συζητηθεί επαρκώς ούτε έχει εξερευνηθεί επαρκώς σαν φορέας κοινωνικού ελέγχου. Σκοπός της πτυχιακή μας και της βιβλιογραφικής ανασκόπησης που κάναμε είναι να δούμε πρώτον αν η Κοινωνική Εργασία σαν επάγγελμα ασκεί κοινωνικό έλεγχο στους πελάτες της και δεύτερον αν αυτό έχει θετικό αντίκτυπο στις ζωές τους ή αρνητικό. Επίσης θέτουμε και ερωτήματα κατά πόσον οι κοινωνικοί λειτουργοί ακολουθούν τις αρχές, την δεοντολογία και τις αξίες της Κοινωνικής Εργασίας και κατά πόσον δρουν ως Κοινωνικοί Λειτουργοί ή ως Κοινωνικοί Ελεγκτές.

Το πρώτο κεφάλαιο ξεκινάει με την ιστορία και την ανάπτυξη της Κοινωνικής Εργασίας, τι σκοπό είχε όταν δημιουργήθηκε και πως με το πέρασμα των χρόνων άλλαξε και τι μορφή έχει πάρει στην σημερινή εποχή. Επιπλέον αναφέρουμε τις βασικές θεωρίες και τα μοντέλα της Κοινωνικής Εργασίας που χρησιμοποιούν σήμερα οι επαγγελματίες. Επιπρόσθετα αναφέρουμε διαφόρους ορισμούς για το τι είναι Κοινωνική Εργασία και τι είναι Κοινωνικός Έλεγχος και ποιες θεωρίες συνδέονται άμεσα με τον Κοινωνικό Έλεγχο.

Στο δεύτερο κεφάλαιο προσπαθούμε να δείξουμε τις μορφές Κοινωνικού Ελέγχου που υπάρχουν σήμερα. Ο Κοινωνικός Έλεγχος είναι παντού. Υπάρχει στην οικογένεια, στην θρησκεία, στην εκπαίδευση, στα μέσα μαζικής ενημέρωσης, στις υπηρεσίες υγείας και πρόνοιας και στην κυβέρνηση. Βέβαια ο σκοπός σε καθένα από τα παραπάνω είναι διαφορετικός αλλά το σίγουρο είναι πώς την μεγαλύτερη ευθύνη την έχει η εκάστοτε κυβέρνηση γιατί είναι αυτή που ελέγχει την κάθε χώρα. Ελέγχει την ανεργία, την οικονομία, την εκπαίδευση, τις υπηρεσίες υγείας και πρόνοιας και συνεπώς την κάθε οικογένεια, αφού η κάθε οικογένεια είναι άμεσα συνδεδεμένη με όλα τα παραπάνω.

Στο τρίτο κεφάλαιο παίρνουμε πέντε υποθέσεις που εργαστήκαμε μαζί τους την περίοδο που ήμασταν Σκωτία και προσπαθούμε να δούμε πως έδρασαν οι κοινωνικοί λειτουργοί, αν έδρασαν για να προάγουν κοινωνική αλλαγή και κοινωνική δικαιοσύνη στην ζωή του κάθε ατόμου και αν έδρασαν προς όφελος του ατόμου ή απλώς προσπάθησαν να καλύψουν την πραγματική αιτία και έδρασαν προς όφελος του Τμήματος Κοινωνικής Εργασίας που εργάζονται. Επίσης μέσα από τις υποθέσεις παρουσιάζουμε επίσης γιατί το κάθε άτομο έχει ανάγκη, τι το οδήγησε να χρειάζεται το Τμήμα Κοινωνικής Εργασίας και επίσης τον καθημερινό αγώνα που δίνουν πολλοί κοινωνικοί λειτουργοί προς συμφέρον τον παιδιών και τις δυσκολίες που αντιμετωπίζουν. Ακόμη σε αυτό το κεφάλαιο παραπέμπουμε και μια συνέντευξη από την εφημερίδα Guardian από μια εργαζόμενη κοινωνική λειτουργό που μας περιγράφει το πόσο άσχημη είναι η κατάσταση αυτή την στιγμή στην Σκωτία στην Κοινωνική Εργασία. Δεν υπάρχουν κοινωνικοί λειτουργοί, οι υποθέσεις δεν δουλεύονται σωστά λόγω έλλειψης προσωπικού και οι μάνατζερ το φορτώνουν με ακόμη περισσότερη δουλεία.

Η πτυχιακή μας τελειώνει με τα συμπεράσματα που καταλήξαμε βάση της βιβλιογραφικής ανασκόπησης και την εμπειρίας που είχαμε για έξι μήνες στην Σκωτία. Στην συζήτηση που παραθέτουμε την προσωπική μας γνώμη για το τι θα έπρεπε να αλλάξει ώστε η Κοινωνική Εργασία να εξυπηρετεί τον σκοπό για τον οποίον δημιουργήθηκε και όχι να διαιωνίζει το εκάστοτε πρόβλημα.

Dedication

This Thesis is dedicated to all the people who resists and to Andre Stander!

Contents

Introduction

It has been said that the political, social and ideological place of Social Work never been satisfactorily discussed, nor has its possible exploitation as an agent of Social Control been taken seriously.

When sociologists and historians look at social work, they tend to see a profession the essence of which is social control. For them the language of therapy, helping or even empowerment disguises a coercive core. Some recent literature of the profession, on the other hand, has challenged the methodology of those researchers who rely on case records as evidence of what social workers actually do in the field. Simon has emphasized empowerment in the history as well as recent theory and practice of social work. For those who embrace empowerment as central good practice, there remains, however, the challenge of reconciling these self-images of empowerment with the undeniable reality that social workers function as agents of social control, usually paid directly or indirectly by the state to do so. This is nowhere more evident that in the fields of child welfare and corrections. In child protection in particular, where social workers are the core profession, are backed by the power of the state, and have enormous power over their clients, the language of empowerment, partnership, and strengths characterizes innovative practices like family group conferences and patch. But can such practices be truly empowering in the bureaucratic, professional, and legal context of state or country child welfare agencies and family courts or even in corrections (Boyes- Watson, 1999)? Social workers offer care or control, empowerment or coercion (Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, March 2004 by Gale Burford, Paul Adams)? (http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0CYZ/is_1_31/ai_n6065937/?tag=content;coll-23/07/09.)

The purpose of this work is to show whether the social work use forms of social control and whether this is right or wrong. Also, within this work have been questions as: social workers work accordance to the principles and values of the profession or function as social controllers?

The first chapter of this work starts with the history and the development of social work, the types of social work and the basic theories and models of social work that are used from the professionals. This chapter continues with some definitions of social work as well as with some definitions of social control and theories that are linked with social control.

Social control has many forms. The second chapter deals analytical with the forms of social control which are: family, religion, education, media, health and welfare services and government.

In the third chapter, five cases from social services are offered and with this way we want to demonstrate how social work services and social workers exercise social control to the clients and whether this has good or bad results and effects to them. Also, an interview from The Guardian is quoted, in which a social worker talks about the situation in social services, how many cases and work the social workers have to do and what this has as a result.

Finally, the dissertation finishes with the results of our work and the discussion in which we want to give our point of view for Social Control and Social Work and we want to compare it with the situation in Greece.

Chapter 1

1.1 What Is Social Work?

History and Development of Social Work

Social work has its roots in the struggle of society to deal with poverty and the resultant problems. Therefore, social work is intricately linked with the idea of charity work; but must be understood in broader terms. The concept of charity goes back to ancient times, and the practice of providing for the poor has roots in all major world religions. Social work, as a profession or pursuit, originated in the 19th century. The movement began primarily in the United States and England. After the end of feudalism, the poor were seen as a more direct threat to the social order,[citation needed] and so the state formed an organized system to care for them. In England, the Poor Law served this purpose. This system of laws sorted the poor into different categories, such as the able bodied poor, the indigent poor, and the idle poor. This system developed different responses to these different groups.

Social work involves ameliorating social problems such as poverty and homelessness.

The 19th century ushered in the Industrial Revolution. There was a great leap in technological and scientific achievement, but there was also a great migration to urban areas throughout the Western world. This led to many social problems, which in turn led to an increase in social activism. Also with the dawn of the 19th century came a great "missionary" push from many Protestant denominations. Some of these mission efforts (urban missions), attempted to resolve the problems inherent in large cities like poverty, prostitution, disease, and other afflictions. In the United States workers known as "friendly visitors", stipended by church and other charitable bodies, worked through direct relief, prayer, and evangelism to alleviate these problems. In Europe, chaplains or almoners were appointed to administrate the church's mission to the poor (Wikipedia).

Charity and help for the poor is a characteristic of all societies, including ancient civilizations. In many civilizations, there was a strong emphasis on authority and social order attained through loyalty to family, community and other traditional structures (Payne, 2005: 14). In the West, when Constantine legalized the Christian Church, the newly legitimised church set up poorhouses, homes for the aged, hospitals, and orphanages. These were often funded, at least in part, from grants from the Empire. By 590 the church had a system for circulating the consumables to the poor: associated with each parish was a diaconium or office of the deacon. As there was no effective bureaucracy below city government that was capable of charitable activities, the clergy served this role in the west up through the 18th century. During the middle Ages, the Christian church had vast influence on European society and charity was considered to be a responsibility and a sign of one's piety. This charity was in the form of direct relief (for example, giving money, food, or other material goods to alleviate a particular need), as opposed to trying to change the root causes of poverty (Wikipedia).

In medieval Europe, grinding poverty in most of the population, together with its consequences, was met by Christian charity, but this was increasingly seen as inadequate and unpredictable.

During the 1600s and 1700s, stimulated by the Renaissance in and Reformation of the Catholic Church and the emergence of Protestantism, provision shifted towards state assistance, mainly to maintain economic development and prevent disorder, particularly during economic and social crises.

During the later 1700s and early 1800s, growing industrializations in agriculture and manufacturing placed strains on traditional forms of welfare and social supports, but the laissez- faire ideas of liberal economics promoted individualistic self-help. Social assistance developed, emphasizing institutional care and efforts at reducing dependence on welfare help.

In the late 1800s and early1900s, developing states increasingly accepted responsibility for social help, and better communication and organization led to the development and spread of ideas for organizing social welfare services and, within them, social work, social pelatology and related professions (Payne,2005: 14). During this time, rescue societies were initiated to find more appropriate means of self-support for women involved in prostitution. Mental asylums grew to assist in taking care of the mentally ill. A new philosophy of "scientific charity" emerged, which stated charity should be "secular, rational and empirical as opposed to sectarian, sentimental, and dogmatic ". In the late 1880s, a new system to provide aid for social ills came in to being, which became known as the settlement movement. The settlement movement focused on the causes of poverty through the "three Rs" - Research, Reform, and Residence. They provided a variety of services including educational, legal, and health services. These programs also advocated changes in social policy. Workers in the settlement movement immersed themselves in the culture of those they were helping (Wikipedia).

In the mid-1900s, the development of welfare states in many Western countries led social welfare services to become widespread, and social work developed as a profession, becoming institutionalized part of public services in many developed countries. Social development and community work methods directed at social change were widely used in developing countries and areas, since individualistic social work seemed inappropriate (Payne, 2005: 14). Even as many schools of social work opened and formalized processes for social work began to be developed, the question lingered. In 1915, at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, Dr. Abraham Flexner spoke on the topic "Is Social Work a Profession?" He contended that it was not because it lacked specialized knowledge and specific application of theoretical and intellectual knowledge to solve human and social problems. This led to the professionalization of social work, concentrating on case work and the scientific method (Wikipedia).

In the late 1900s, economic growth became more variable, and concerns that welfare states could not be supported led to a retrenchment in social services, including social work, and a wider range of welfare regimes. There was a greater concern for critical analysis of and accountability for social work within a managerialist framework. With the collapse of Communist regimes in many parts of the world, social work was initiated for the first time or renewed in many countries. Social development continued its influence in developing countries and other social professions influenced particular countries (Payne, 2005: 14).

1.2 Definitions of Social Work

A lot of definitions have given for Social Work. Trying to define Social Work is complex and controversial. .

- **Goldstein,** (1974: 5) states that Social work is a form of social intervention, that strengthens, preserves and enhances the means that people, individually or collectively resolve aberrations in their social function. The profession recognizes the individual as a unique active organism and social environment as "a force in motion" and in interaction with the person.

- **The National Association of Social Workers (NASW), the largest professional association of social workers in North America,** described social work as: "...the professional activity of helping individual, groups, or communities to enhance or restore their capacity for social functioning and to create societal conditions favorable to this goal. Social work practice consists of the professional application of social work values, principles, and techniques to one or more of the following ends: helping people obtain tangible services; providing counselling and psychotherapy with individuals, families, and groups; helping communities or groups provide or improve social and health services; and participating in relevant legislative processes. The practice of social work requires knowledge of human development and behavior; of social, economic, and cultural institutions; and of the interaction of these factors."(Indiana University of Social Work)

- **Hains** (1975: 1-3) wrote that: «Social Work is a human activity in which certain members of society, paid or voluntary, intervene in the lives of others in order to produce change.. The aims of men in society are also the aims of social work insofar as its central concerns are basic necessities of life and the regulation of behaviour, but the means employed by its practitioners are influenced by their values and beliefs, which tend to place limits on the methods they use, excluding, for example, warfare and repression. Social Work may be said to spring from those means of interaction between human beings designed to bring about change through caring and concern although many of its practitioners do not entirely rule out certain forms of conflict...»

- **Smith** (2002): «Social work is a really practical job. It is about protecting people and changing their lives, not about being able, to give a fluent and theoretical explanation of why they got into difficulties in the first place. New degree courses must ensure that theory and research directly informs and support practice ».

- **International Association of Schools of Social Work and International federation of Social Workers (2001) said**: « The Social Work profession promotes social change, problem solving in human relationships and the empowerment and liberation of people to enhance well-being. Utilizing theories of human behaviour and social systems, social work intervenes at the points where people interact with their environments. Principles of human rights and social justice are fundamental to social work ». (www.basw.co.uk)

1.3 Types of Social Work

The traditional types of social work are three:

- **Social Casework** : Thompson &Thompson(2008: 252)

Social work has a long story of individual case work- that is, interventions geared towards working on a one-to one basis with individual clients. Given that each client is a unique individual in their own right the problems they face will be largely unique to them.

Davidson, (1965): "social casework is a personal service, provided by qualified workers for those who require skilled help in resolving some personal or family problem. Its aim is to relieve stress, both material and emotional, and to help the client to achieve a realistic adjustment to his social circumstances and mutual satisfaction in his personal relationships. The caseworker seeks to do this by means of a careful study of the client in his/her family and social setting, and of his/her problem: by the establishment of a cooperative relationship with him/her, in which his/her own capacity for dealing with his problem is increased, and by the mobilization of such other resources or professional aid as might be appropriate (Horner, 2005-85).

- **Social Work with groups**: Thompson &Thompson(2008: 252)

It is a fact that clients often have much in common in terms of both the problems they encounter and the possible solutions available to them. Group work seems to exploit this in a positive way, by bringing people together to identify shared problems and explore the possibility of shared solutions where the individuals concerned can support one another in making progress. Group work typically involves a series of sessions at fixed intervals (say, weekly) , involving a small number of people who have similar problems or who are in similar circumstances. The sessions are facilitated by one or two staff who will try to:

Ø   Develop a good atmosphere in the groups where people can relax and focus on the important issues.

Ø   Enable people to bond with another as far as possible to create a basis for mutual support.

Ø   Influence the group dynamics in a positive way

Ø   Use the group process as a means of identifying: i) common problems, ii) potential shared solutions, and

Ø   Exploit opportunities to boost confidence and develop skills.

The sessions can vary from being quite structured at one extreme to very free-floating at the other. The theoretical underpinnings can also vary considerably, including psychodynamic, behavioural and task centred. Group work can also vary in terms of the following:

Ø   The purpose of the group: why has the group been set up? What are you hopping to achieve? Is there the scope for negotiation with group members or is the group's purpose pre- defined?

Ø   The size of the group: group can range in size from three or four to over 20, although as the top end of this range, it is unlikely that the groups will get maximum benefit from the process. Six to 12 is normally a good range to aim for.

Ø   <u>Whether it is open or closed</u>: are you restricting membership to those who are part of the group to begin with or will you allow new members to join at a later stage? A lot will depend on the nature and character of the group, and: i) how responsive they are likely to be to new members, ii) whether one or more new members will significantly alter the group dynamics? And, iii) whether the proposed new member is ready for joining the group in terms of where it is up to and likely to be of benefit to him or her.

Ø   <u>The timescales involved</u>: groups can be set up for fixed period of time. Alternatively, they can be ongoing with no finite finishing point.

Ø   <u>Membership of the group</u>: who will be eligible to be a member? What criteria will be used to decide? What difference might it make to the group in terms of its overall composition?

Ø   <u>The range of activities</u>: will it be primarily a discussion group or will there be other activities used? If the latter, what will their purpose be? What form will they take?

Group work is not as widely used it once was, but it is none the less a very valuable approach that can have success. We should not allow the current strong emphasis on individualist approaches to discourage us from considering a group work approach.

- **Social Work with communities:** Thompson &Thompson(2008: 246)
Community work tackles problems at the community level. This involves:

Ø   Developing good working relationships with key players in local communities to identify problems to be solved and strengths to be built on.

Ø   Drawing on the informal resources available by mobilizing community support and interest where possible.

Ø   Identifying, harnessing and utilizing statutory and voluntary sector resources in the area.

Ø   Seeking additional sources of help and funding.

Ø   Making sure that local people have the opportunity to participate in developments, especially individuals or groups who are marginalized and/ or excluded in some way.

Ø   Contributing to local and regional policy making and related political processes and 'capacity building'- that is, helping to promote the knowledge, skills and confidence necessary for people to play an active part in their community, to build on its strengths and help tackle its problems.

In community work the traditional emphasis in social work on individual casework is replaced with a concern for developing schemes and projects that tackle the issues at the broader community level. Community work projects might typically include:

Ø   Campaigning for a welfare rights centre to be established in a particular area with high levels of poverty and deprivation.

Ø   Working with the local education authority to support the development of after –school clubs to ensure that children are safely looked after while giving parents the opportunity to pursue paid employment.

Ø   Supporting the local race equality network to promote anti- racism and provide help for people who experience racial attacks, intimidation or victimization.

Ø   Working with voluntary bodies to develop volunteering schemes.

These are some of the wide range of possibilities that come under the broad heading of community development work.

Unfortunately, community work is not as prevalent as it once was, and is in need of a significant investment of resources if its potential is to be realized. The influence of community development thinking on social work practice varies considerably from area to area. In some settings a community approach is in evidence in a number of ways, while in others there is little or no trace. The development of community social work has been strongly influenced by community development theory and practice, but once again there is considerable variation from area to area in the extent to which this approach can be seen to be evidenced.

There are also other types such as:

- ***Social work with children and families***: rarely involves working with one individual. It will involve working with families that are complex, diverse and constantly changing. The family may consist of one or more parents or carers. It may consist of relative carers such us grandparents, who may be paternal, maternal or by marriage. The family may consist of non- relative carers such us friends. Additionally, it may consist of parents or carers who share the same race, class, culture, religion and sexuality. There may be one or more children in the family, some of whom may share the race, religion and sexuality of their parents and some that do not. To add to the complexity people constantly enter and leave families, by marriage, divorce and death (Jowitt- O'Loughlin, 2005: 3).

- ***Social work with people with disabilities***

- ***Social work with older people***: this type of social work requires a strong core base of generic social work skills and values on which specialist knowledge and skills can be built. Their combination provides a solid foundation for the most stimulating and rewarding of all the fields in which social workers practice (department research programme: effective social work with older people)(www.schotland.gov.uk)

- ***Social work and mental health***: approximately one person in six, at some time in their life, will experience mental health problems that are sufficiently serious for them to seek help from a professional. It is usually the family doctor who is the first port of call and they in turn refer people on to the various agencies whose remit is to provide mental health, social care and social work agencies that are trying to work together to provide a seamless service for the user. Some GP practices have social workers attached to them and this often means that these workers will be doing direct work with service users, working in the community alongside other mental health professionals, or be working in a psychiatric hospital. Social workers also come across mental health problems in addition to the "presenting problem" that led to referral in the first place (Golightley, 2006: 2).

1.4 Theories of Social Work

- *Cognitive –Behavioural approaches:* this approach has its roots in behavioural psychology. The school of behaviourism is premised on the idea that all behaviour is learned and that, therefore, behaviour can be changed through sophisticated programmes of re- learning or " behaviour modification " . At one time this was seen as a useful approach to social work and was widely used, especially in the mental health and learning disabilities fields, although it had many strong critics who were unhappy about the way in which it treated people as entities that could be manipulated. It was thus seen by many as dehumanizing and therefore unethical approach, although these concerns did not prevent it from featuring a great deal, as it was seen to be very effective in promoting behaviour change in many circumstances. In addition to the ethical objections to behaviour modification, there were also theoretical objections. Behavioural psychology denied the significance of subjective processes and concentrated primarily if not exclusively on observable behaviour. There was no room in this theory for subjective factors, such as thoughts or beliefs. Over time, then, behaviourist psychology mellowed and started to adopt a less 'hard line' approach to subjective factors, especially cognitive ones- that is, issues relating to thinking, memory and belief. From this, a 'cognitive- behavioural' approach developed, a theoretical perspective and practice method that still placed significant emphasis on behavioural factors, but also recognized that these are mediated by cognitive factors- that is, it was recognized that how a person behaves depends in part at least on his or her beliefs and understandings and, in order to change behaviour, it is often necessary to change a persons beliefs. Cognitive- behavioural work can be used in a variety of situations, including: depression, anxiety, problems in controlling anger, drug and alcohol problems, behaviour management difficulties with children and offending behaviour. With its roots in 'scientific' psychology, the theoretical perspective is concerned with adopting a rigorous approach. This allows cognitive- behavioural practitioners to be in a strong position to measure the success of the intervention. It has a record of a high success rate and thus often associated with evidence- based practice as it supports the 'what works' agenda that has developed in social work in recent years(Thomson & Thomson,2008: 245).

- *Psychodynamics:* this is a term that originates in a work of Sigmunt Freud, but has been developed over the years by many others- for example, Erikson, Klein and Lacan. To understand what the term means, it is helpful to break it down into its component parts. This is 'psycho' which comes from the Greek word 'pssyche', meaning mind, and 'dynamics' which means the interactions of different elements which influence each other. So, in short, psychodynamics is the study of how different elements within the mind influence on another. Freud's theory was based on the idea of three particular elements within the mind, id, ego and superego. The id is a collection of desires and drives comprising what is know as Eros(or libido) and Thanatos(or destructive urges- sometimes also referred to as the 'death instinct'). Eros is about the translation of sexual energies into everyday activities. The theory behind Eros is that the libido is primarily a sexual force which becomes 'sublimated' into energy directed in other ways. Sublimation is the process of making basically socially unacceptable sexual drives acceptable by redirecting them into work, study, the arts, sport, politics and so on. Thanatos is the other side of the coin, in so far as it refers to

drives that are destructive in nature. The combination of Eros and Thanatos makes up the id. Alongside the id is the superego. This is a term that refers to what is often known as the conscience. It represents the internalization of one's parents and the values and expectations they have instilled in us over the years. As we are brought up, we develop a conscience, as if the voice of our parents and the values and expectations they have instilled in us over the years. As we are brought up, we develop a conscience, as if the voice of our parents were in our head, telling us what we can and cannot do in order to be accepted within society. The superego is therefore in some respects a counterbalance to the id. The id is selfish, in the sense that it is concerned with our own needs and wishes, perhaps at the expense of others. The superego, by contrast, is concerned with ensuring that we are able to live side by side, with one another in society or, as Freud called it 'civilization'. The ego is the balancing mechanism between the id and the superego. That is, if we understand the workings of the human mind as being to some extent a battle between personal and drives and wishes, and the requirements of broader society for other, cooperation and so on. It seeks to produce a balanced individual, someone who is not overly concerned with their owns wishes and feelings, but nor someone who neglects those for the wider concerns of the conscience. A phrase commonly associate with Freud' s work is: " where id was, there shall ego be". This is because Freud felt that many of the problems people encountered in their lives were due to their id being too strong and uncontrolled. Too strong an id can lead to antisocial behaviour due to a lack of self-control and therefore a tendency towards self- indulgence, perhaps at society's expense. This can also be manifested in terms of over – indulgence. According to this theory, psychological problems can also arise where the superego is too strong. This can manifest itself in terms of neurotic, over- anxious behaviour and lack of confidence. Another key part in this theory, is the role of unconscious. By this Freud means that we may be acting on id drives without realizing we are doing so. This has become a very influential notion now often taken for granded and sometimes used uncritically. The basic idea behind the unconscious is that some aspects of the human mind are easily understandable to the individual concerned, whereas other aspects, like the iceberg, remain mellow the surface and can only be accessed with the help of someone who understands how psychodynamics works(Thomson & Thomson,2008:257)

- *Crisis intervention*: A crisis is defined as a turning point in somebody's life, a critical moment where the situation will either get better or get worse, but it will not stay the same. The term is commonly confused with an emergency, a situation that needs to be addressed urgently. However, while the two terms, 'crisis' and 'emergency' can overlap at times, it is important to recognize the significant differences between them. A crisis is the 'point of no return', the pivotal point at which a situation changes. To understand crisis, first is need to understand the opposite, 'homoeostasis'. This refers to the state of psychological equilibrium or balance that characterizes most people most of the time. It is when we are coping with the demands being made upon us without experiencing a significant strain. Homeostasis incorporates a continuum of coping- from a low level to a high level. Provided our level of coping remains within this broad continuum, we can be said to be in 'in homeostasis'. A crisis then, occurs when homeostasis breaks down, when our everyday coping resources are overwhelmed for some reason and we are forced into adopting a new approach. The new approach, hence the idea that a crisis is a turning point, a

situation that is either an improvement on what went before or a worsening. The aim of crisis intervention, is to maximize the positive potential of the situation, to do what professionals reasonably can to help the client(s) involved in the crisis turn it into a point of growth, rather than a diminution of their ability to cope (Thomson & Thomson,2008: 247) .

- **Systems theory**: this is a theoretical approach that has been widely used in social work across a variety of settings and client groups, although it is not without its critics. Its main tenet is that the social world is made up of a set of interconnected systems and subsystems. In order to promote change in one part of the system, it may be necessary to change another part of the system, and so 'systemic' social work is concerned with influencing the workings of systems. The types of systems to be considered are:
  1. Family(current family arrangements and family of origin)
  2. Friends and social contacts
  3. Workplace networks
  4. Community groups, and
  5. Social systems, such as health care, social security and education

The roots of systems theory are in biology and forms of sociology influenced by biological analogies. Problems in one part of the system can have a detrimental effect on another part of the system. The strengths of systems theory are: 1) it broadens the focus beyond the individual and thus moves away from individualistic models that can 'pathologize' clients by assuming that the problems lie within the individual, and 2) it provides a platform for developing a more sociological approach. Its drawbacks, by contrast are: (i) it fails to fulfill its potential for addressing psychological issues- in particular, it does not take account of power relations and related concepts of discrimination and oppression, and (ii) it has a tendency to be dehumanizing- losing track of the people dimension of social work. Since the 1970s systems theory has been enormously influential in social work. In fact, it has over the years been taken for granted in many quarters as a basic foundation of social work thinking. However, its dominance is now clearly waning, as its roots in the inherently conservative model of structural- functionalism make it ill- equipped to respond to the challenges of anti-discriminatory practice. The growth of interest in postmodernist and poststructuralist approaches has also added to the growing dissatisfaction with systems approaches. Despite its shortcomings, the legacy of systems theory is positive one, in so far as it has played a part in helping us move away from the psychodynamic emphasis on the individual towards a more sociology adequate approach (Thomson & Thomson,2008: 262) .

- **Humanistic/ person –centred approaches**: this is a broad- based approach that draws on a number of theoretical perspectives, including the human potential movement (Herson 2001, Maslow 1961) and the work Carl Rogers (1951,1961). Roger's work has been particularly influential in counseling and psychotherapy as well as in social work. The basic idea underpinning this approach is that people have great potential for growth and development, but that this potential needs to be nurtured and supported if it is to be realized- a process often referred to as 'self- actualization'.

According to humanist or person- centred approaches, the social work role is to help individuals fulfill their potential. Important principles are:

1. *Genuineness:* means not to putting on a an act, allowing one's own personality and values to be the basis of the approach. It involves not being manipulative or 'playing games'.

2. *Empathy:* means being able to recognize, and respond appropriately to, other peoples' feelings. This is contrasted with 'sympathy ', which means actually sharing those feelings.

3. *A non-directive approach:* the role of the social worker involves helping people to realize their potential and this cannot be done by giving directions or instructions. It is a matter of helping people find their own way forward.

4. *Self –determination:* clients need to take responsibility for their own actions and recognize the choices they need to take. This is the other side of the coin to a non-directive approach.

5. *Warmth:* working relationships need to be based on warmth. Cold, clinical relationships are doomed to failure as these will not motivate people to move forward, and so it is important to show warmth- and, linked the comments above, this needs to be genuine warmth.

This approach requires being able to recognize what factors in a situation are holding people back when it comes to solving their own problems or healing their own wounds (Thomson &Thomson, 2008: 253).

- ***Communicative action theory***: this is an approach associated with the work of the social theorist, Jürgen Habermas (1972, 1984 and 1987). His work is in the tradition of the critical theory associated with the Frankfurt School, although he developed their ideas in a number of ways. The Frankfurt School was interested in combining and the narrower concerns of individual- oriented psychology. Habermas shares his interests in linking individual concerns with the wider structural context, but he has shown particular interest in how communication and language bridge the two areas. His thinking is very broad ranging and not all of it is necessarily relevant to social work, although his ideas around 'communicative action' clearly there. Habermas is interested in developing rational social and political systems based on forms of communication free of domination. He argues that communication and knowledge are linked with what he called 'interests'- that is communication and knowledge are not unbiased. Habermas introduced the notion of an 'ideal speech situation', by which he meant a situation in which each participant has an equal chance to take part in an unconstrained and undistorted dialogue. This is a useful concept because, by having such an ideal in mind, we can see how actual communication differs from it, and thus identify any distortions or inequalities involved. Habermas work explores how knowledge 'may not be neutral or value –free but may instead reflect the sectional interests of particular groups and embody relations of unequal power'(Tew, 2002, p. 85). Social work can not be undertaken from a neutral point of view and therefore reflects particular interests and power relations- not without a radical reworking of the rationality on which society is based. Critical reflection is a further aspect of Habermas work that has relevance for social work. Habermas sees critical reflection as an alternative to the positivist notion of uncovering an underlying truth. Instead, critical reflections is considered with the meaning involved in social interactions, identifying

assumptions, the operation of power relations and so on(Thomson & Thomson,2008: 245).

- ***Feminist theory:*** For feminists, classification is an artificial process associated with rational, male ways of organizing knowledge. Feminism comprises fluid, interlocking ways of thinking and reflects relationship between theory and experience- in so doing, developing new perspectives and understandings. Though resistant to classification, feminists realize that it is sometimes necessary to create order, if only to disrupt it by highlighting the paradoxes and contradictions in the way in which the world and women's place in it is explained and understood. The most frequent distinction drawn is between *liberal* (conservative) feminism-associated with epistemological developments- and *Marxist* (socialist, radical) feminism- associated with its political project or praxis. However, neither category is totally distinct or all-embracing and each has differing theories within it (Grey&Webb, 2009: 66).

- ***Structural social work:*** Structural social work has a larger category of approaches that are considered 'progressive', 'radical' or 'transformative' rather than 'conventional'. Conventional approaches emphasize client adaptation and support provision within the dominant social order. Structural social work, however, questions the legitimacy of institutions and economic systems, suggesting that real advances in social welfare cannot be achieved without fundamental changes to the way in which global society organises the distribution of resources and power. The structural approach to social work should not be confused with the broader theoretical concept of 'structuralism'. While structural social work is initially built on structuralist sociological theory, it has since developed an increased emphasis on human agency. Structural social work is grounded in critical sociological theories. Originating in the late 1930s from the Frankfurt School, the ideas of early critical theorists questioned conventional modes of enquiry, which assumed the existing social order to be 'natural'. Max Horkheimer (1937), accused traditional theory of being merely descriptive- seeking to explain how society functions but falling short of exposing and challenging the way in which 'society' itself is constructed. This thinking, along with the contributions of others, emphasizes how cultural, political and moral beliefs and structures were essential aspects of 'hegemony'- that is, unquestioned assumptions about 'the way things are', which function to maintain the existing social order. Critical theories hold that liberation requires recognition of that dominates people or 'imprisons the mind' as persons cannot be free from that about which they are ignorant (Sabia and Wallulis, 1983). Based on this interrogation of the social environment, several elements emerge as key conceptual features of structural social work:
  Ø   A problematization of dominant social and economic structures through adoption of a 'conflict' or 'change' perspective.
  Ø   A focus on multiple, intersecting forms of oppression produced and reinforced by structures.
  Ø   A concentration on the dialectical nature of the interaction between individuals and macro-level structures (Grey&Webb, 2009: 87).

- ***Multiculturalism theory:*** Formal reflections in multiculturalism began to emerge in the late 1800s as intellectuals considered the cultural pluralism resulting from the European colonization of North America and Africa. Writers such as the sociologist W.E.B DuBois and the pragmatist philosopher William James adopted the view that such societies would create opportunities for people to embrace diversity and work towards a humanistic and egalitarian social world. Today, ideas about multiculturalism vary considerably. Most of the debate centre on notions of identity, equality and difference. Multiculturalism presents a unique challenge to contemporary liberal democracies that strive to ensure equality for all members of society, such that they are viewed and treated in the same way, while at the same time making certain that diverse identities are valued and supported(Gutmann, 1994, Rattansi, 2004). The question then is: within multicultural societies, is it possible for people from diverse groups to experience full economic, political, social and educational inclusion(that is to perceived as equals), while at the same time sustaining the traditions and practices unique to their cultural group (that is, to honour their differences) (Abu-Laban, 2002) (Grey&Webb, 2009: 99)

- ***Postmodernism***: Fiona Williams in 1992 memorably referred to postmodernity as a way to referring to the post-modern condition and the postmodernism as a means of understanding the condition. This establishes a helpful distinction between postmodernity and postmodern era and postmodernism, which can be seen to encompass a wide range of theoretical perspectives that both influence and inform the era or condition. In a similar way, 'modernity' can be regarded as a useful means of referring to the modern condition, with modernism being used to denote a range of theoretical orientations that characterize the modern period. In relation to the timeframe , there is a wide- ranging variation and dispute, with arguments and associated terminology veering from modernity to late modernity to postmodernity with the imposition of the 'small certainties' of modernism. The relationship between postmodernism and poststructuralism is also contested, with some writers making a clear distinction between the concepts and others arguing that there are so many similarities that a conceptual blurring has taken place (Grey&Webb, 2009: 119).

- ***Existentialism:*** existentialism is a vey complex philosophy but it can be summed up in one sentence: "existence precedes essence" (Sartre, 1958). Existence refers to human actions, and is therefore fluid and changeable. Essence, by contrast, refers to the idea of an underlying nature and is thus seen as fixed and immutable. The common-sense view tends to be that people actions (existence) are based on their nature (essence). Existentialism reverses this in arguing that people are what they become. This places choice at the heart of human existence. Existentialism argues that choice- that is, the need to choose and the ability to choose- is absolute, in the sense that people can not choose. Another important concept in existentialism is the notion that "we are what we make of what is made of us" (Sartre, 1976). what this means is that:

Ø   Human agency and decision making are to the fore. Human existence is not characterised by determinism. The context shapes and constrains, but it is not the context that decides.

Ø   People need to understand the notion of agency or the ability to choose in the socio-political context that is grounded in sociological reality. While people not only can choose, but also have to choose, what they are able to choose will depend on a wide range of factors, often beyond their control, such as class, race and gender.

Ø   Human existence can be seen as a journey. This can be compared with the famous saying from Marx (1962) - that is, that people make history but not in circumstances of their own choosing.

The 'progressive- regressive method' is a concept emerging from existentialism that can be usefully applied to social work. It draws on the idea that peoples present are not simply the outcome of the past. People's present position is shaped in part by previous experiences and learning, but also by people's future aspirations or intentions. The present then, owns much to the future (progressive) and the past (regressive) and how people make sense of these influences. In order to understand an individual, needs to take account of: (i) future aspirations, (ii) past experiences, (iii) how the individual concerned is interpreting these. A further important element of existence of existentialism is the notion of bad faith. The fact that people have to choose, that they are responsible for their decisions and actions means that many people try to avoid personal responsibility by seeking refuge in determinism- that is they try to deny responsibility for their own actions. Social work from an existentialist point of view can therefore be seen as the attempt to help people overcome bad faith and achieve authenticity. In this respect, it is form of empowerment. It helps people to understand what they have control over, what they must take responsibility for and helps them to carry that responsibility without bad faith. It is a very powerful approach, but unfortunately not one that is widely used (Thomson & Thomson, 2008: 250).

* **_Radical Social Work:_** First generation radical social work developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s. it was a reaction against the highly individualized psychodynamically oriented social work prevalent at the time. Radical social work laid the foundations for anti- discriminatory practice by emphasizing the social roots of many of the difficulties that clients faced. It adopted an explicitly political approach, arguing that social work needed to ally itself with oppressed groups against the forces in society that served to keep them in positions of subservience and relative powerlessness. The term "radical" refers to an approach that seeks to tackle problems at the "roots"-that is, a socio-political level, rather than at the level of the individual casework and set much more store by groupwork and community development- approaches that are basically collective in nature. Informed primarily by Marxist theory, radical social work never became a dominant approach, although it was quite influential in a number of ways. Politicization was one of its main tools and contributing to social change was its major aim. However, the original version of this approach has been heavily criticized for being too simplistic and failing to recognise the subtleties and complexities of the social (work) world. Second generation of radical social work is often referred to as "critical practice", based on the tradition theory which Tew defines in the following terms: the term 'critical theory' has been used in a variety of contexts with different meanings, but always indicating an approach which seeks not to take things at face value, but to probe beneath the surface in order to find what may lie hidden there. In relation to radical social work, what can be seen to lie "beneath the surface" is a complex web of social and political factors that play a significant role in shaping the problems clients experience and which can act as

barriers to dealing with those problems. Although the term 'radical social work' is rarely used these days, second- generation radicalism in the form of anti-discriminatory practice can be seen as a significant development of the earlier approach, incorporating its strengths in terms of the need to draw on political and sociological insights, but without falling into the trap of the reductionism and oversimplification that characterized the first incarnation of this approach (Thomson-Thomson, 2008: 258).

- ***Empowerment:*** the basis of empowerment is helping people gain greater control over their lives. Literally, the term means 'to gives power to', but it can be misleading to interpret it too literally. Power is not normally a gift one person can give to another. Rather, it is a case of helping people develop their own power by increasing the control they have over their lives. Empowerment is not just an individual process- it has significant social roots. Strategies for promoting empowerment would include: personal, cultural, structural. Empowerment can be seen to involve helping people resolve their own difficulties as far as possible, by avoiding dependency creation and by learning how to deal with future problems and challenges. It is important to note that empowerment should be seen in the context of anti-discriminatory practice. This is because discrimination is a major source of disempowerment, and empowerment is a significant way of tackling discrimination and oppression (Thomson &Thomson, 2008: 248).

- ***Social constructionism:*** this refers to an approach to theorizing rather than specific theory itself. It can be characterized by four main themes:

1. Reality is 'socially constructed': Berger and Luckmann(1967) is generally recognised as a classic text of social constructionism. The authors argued that reality is not simply 'given' in any direct sense. Our understanding of reality is something we have to built up('construct'),partly through subjective understandings of the world. However, these subjective perceptions have their roots in society, in so far as they are in large part shaped by culture,
2. Knowledge is historically and culturally specific: what counts for 'knowledge' will vary over time from culture to culture. That means, that people understanding of the world will depend on the historical circumstances that they find their selves in and their cultural background. This means that there can be no definitive understanding of a fixed 'human nature'. Society is constantly changing and our ways of understanding change with it.
3. Knowledge and action are interrelated: what people know influence what they do. What people do influence what they know? This applies both individually and socially. This is important in terms of how people regard social problems- what constitutes a social problem is socially defined. That is, social problems are socially constructed.
4. Language plays a key role: language acts as an intermediary between individuals and society. It is not only a system of communication, but also a system of social representation and, as such, is very influential in shaping how people see the world (Thomson & Thomson, 2008: 259).

- *Solutions-focused therapy:* this is an approach associated primarily with the work of de Shazer (1952, 1985,1991). It has much in common with the strengths perspective and with the narrative approaches. It is concerned with helping people make progress in dealing with their problems by focusing on the 'exceptions'- those times when the problem does not apply, when it could have been present but was not, or when it is experienced less frequently or less intensely. Solution- focused therapy is in large part a reaction to psychodynamically oriented theories that seek solutions from developing a detailed knowledge of the problems and their roots. It focuses on strengths and can therefore be an important part of empowerment, as it is a matter of helping people solves their problems, rather than trying to do it for them. Solution-focused therapy is part of a broader school of 'brief therapy' which is concerned with methods of resolving difficulties and making progress that do not rely on long- term programmes of intervention(Thomson & Thomson, 2008)

- *Task- centred practice:* the basic idea behind task- centred practice is that people can be helped to tackle their problems and achieve their goals through a structured process of identifying the steps that need to be taken to get them to their required destination. It basically involves three stages:

1. What is the current situation? This involves assessing the current set of circumstances and establishing what is problematic about them- that is, being clear about why this situation is unhelpful, undesirable or painful. What is it that is motivating us to want to make changes to the current arrangements?

2. what situation do we want to be in? what is our desired destination? In other words, what situation would we be happy to be in and how doesn't differ from the one we are in? in this way we are mapping out what needs change.

3. what tasks need to be completed to get us from where we are now to where we want to be? What steps do we need to take to make progress from a problematic situation to one that we are happy with?

Effective practice with this method involves:

Ø Being clear about precisely what is problematic; a vague or unfocused approach is unlikely to work.

Ø Similarly, being clear about what is desirable, what outcomes we are working towards.

Ø Identifying specific tasks and being clear about what order they should be carried out in.

Ø Agreeing to share or exchange tasks to develop a clear basis of partnership- this can help to develop a sense of security and again boost confidence and contribute to a sense of momentum.

Ø Making careful use of timescales- too tight a timescale will demotivate and set people up to fail, while too long a timescale may means that momentum is not built up and the situation is allowed to drift.

Ø Well- developed negotiations skills- it would be naïve to assume that there will always be a coincidence of interests between client and worker.

Task centred practice is based on three important factors: motivation, security and partnership. Being clear about what is problematic, what situation is preferable, what needs to change and the specifics of how it can change can stimulate a great deal

of motivation by: i) identifying desirable targets to aim for and a means of achieving them ii) boosting the confidence needed to move forward. This approach also helps to create an important sense of security, often replacing feelings of confusion, uncertainly, isolation and defeatism with a sense of purpose and direction, renewed confidence and feelings of being supported.

Task centred practice is also founded on partnership and empowerment, as the whole process involves working together on the basis of establishing agreement about what needs to be done, who is going to do it, by when and so on. Is therefore provides a basis for empowerment, as effective task- centred practice can boost problem-solving skills and thus give people greater control over their lives.

A common misunderstanding of task- centred practice is that it is simply a matter of 'doing tasks'- a so called 'pragmatic' approach that involves uncritically and non- reflectively doing whatever practical tasks seem to need doing at any given time. This is far removed from the structured and focused approach of task- centred practice which involves providing a framework for motivating and reassuring people in times of difficulty and for building confidence. The appropriate use of the approach also provides a good opportunity for clients to be helped in learning problem- solving skills.

- ***Transactional analysis:*** this approach derives from the work of Berne (1970, 1975). It has its roots in a combination of psychodynamic and humanistic thinking and has proved very useful as a means of promoting effective communication and improving interpersonal relations. A major part of this approach is the attempt to understand interactions between people in terms of three 'ego states': parent(behaviour modelled on one or both of our parents), adult (responding to the here and now) or child (using patterns of behaviour or 'scripts' that we learned in childhood). Depending on what ego state a person adopts at a given time, this gives us various combinations when two people interact- for example:

Ø   Parent-parent: this represents a power struggle, where each participant is trying to dominate the other.

Ø   Parent- child: in this combination, one person 'parents' the other. The person occupying the 'child' ego state leaves responsibility with the 'parent'.

Ø   Adult- adult: this is a positive relationship, based on mutual respect, and is therefore something to aim for.

Ø   Child-child: in this combination neither party is prepared to take (adult) responsibility.

The main difference between psychodynamic and transactional analysis is that psychodynamic is concerned with interactions within the individual, whereas the focus of transactional analysis is interactions between people.

A further aspect of transactional analysis is the use of the concept of 'strokes'. These can be positive (praise encouragement and so on) or negative (criticism, discouragement and so on), and can be very influential in shaping how interactions develop. Positive strokes are seen as an important part of meeting people's needs for recognition and thus self- esteem.

Transactional analysis can be used as a means of making sense of interactions that are going wrong in some way. Also, transactional analysis has much in common with humanistic approaches, in so far as it concerned with human potential and helping clients to develop their abilities by abandoning unhelpful 'child' scripts and adopting more 'adult' ones.

Finally, transactional analysis has good potential for empowerment, given its emphasis on human potential and the development of personal autonomy. However, it has little to say about the influence of broader social structures, culture and so on, although the potential does exists for developing the theory in that direction.

- *User involvement:* User involvement: this is a general approach or underpinning philosophy rather than a specific technique. It fits well with social work's value base, particularly in terms of empowerment and partnership.

Baresford, in discussing user participation in research, makes the following comment on what he sees as the dominant approach to user involvement:

(Baresford,2003: 3): " I'd headline this approach as a managerialist/ consumerist one…it has been presented as a non- political neutral technique for information gathering from service users, to provide a fuller picture on which to base policy and provision. Its role has never been framed in terms of altering the distribution of power or who makes the decisions".

Addressing the power imbalance is something which goes beyond the practice of individuals. That is not to say that individuals cannot play an important part in the progress- indeed, working with people and drawing on their strengths are cornerstones of good practice. Rather, it is to say that this is not enough on its own. For there to be changed at the level of organizational policy, there needs to be a change at the level of organizational culture- that is an acceptance that clients have a right to be involved in decisions which effect the welfare provision that is made available to them. If commitment to user involvement is not a part of the value base of an organization, then it is unlikely that the changes which would allow for user involvement to become an integral part of the organization's philosophy and working practices would be made.

Baresford and Croft highlighted the moral argument for user involvement when they wrote: 'having a say is also important in its own right. It shouldn't need any justifications. It reflects the value an agency or organization places on people' (1993: 19)

While social workers draw on the expertise and strengths of individual clients, this is a major part of what social work is about. This approach would argue that there is also much to be gained from addressing the imbalance at a broader level. Proponents of user involvement would highlight the following types of initiative as indicative of a move away from an 'us and them' mindset:

Ø   Having service user representation on interview panels in the selection process for social work degree courses.

Ø   Inviting service users to take part in skills training on social work courses, rather than simulating through the use of the role play.

Ø   Involving service users at the level of planning and policy making rather than 'after the event', so that consultation is meaningful and the commitment to partnership genuine. While having a service user representative on committees and the like is a step in the right direction, it can be tokenistic, in the sense that it is unlikely to take account of the diversity within client groups.

Ø   Incorporating a service user perspective in the assessment of competence of social work students on placement (Thomson & Thomson, 2008: 265).

- *Systematic practice*: this is an approach to practice that emphasizes the importance of clarity of focus. It recognizes that the pressures of work can lead

practitioners to become unfocused and drift because that has lost sight of the purpose of their intervention. In dealing with the messy, complicated situations that are so common in social work it is not surprising that there is a very real danger for social workers to loose their focus and getting drown into other dynamics that can lead them out of the role.

Social workers have to be very clear about the purpose of their intervention and what exactly their trying to achieve. Also, they have to establish a plan, to be clear about what specific steps need to be taken, by whom, when and so on. Moreover, social workers have to know when they can conclude their involvement. This is important in terms of empowerment, as they should be very careful to ensure that they do not stay involved longer than is necessary and thereby encourage dependency (Thomson & Thomson, 2008: 261).

- ***Anti- discriminatory practice:*** in the early days of anti- discriminatory practice, the major focus was anti- racism. Since then, while anti- racism continues to be a major issue and a central part of anti- discriminatory practice, the focus has been broadened to include discrimination in relation to gender (sexism), age (ageism), disability (disablism), sexual identity (heterosexism) and other such forms of disadvantage. But in reality, anti- discriminatory practice is even broader than a finite list such as this, as it involves challenging unacceptable practices in relation to any group or individual singled out for unfair treatment. Anti-discriminatory practice can been seen to involve:

Ø   Recognizing the significance of discrimination in people's lives- especially in the lives of those disadvantaged groups- and how oppressive this can be. Often what appear to be 'personal' problems will have their roots in wider social issues of discrimination.

Ø   Discrimination is a matter of outcomes, not intentions. That is, if an individual or group is treated unfairly because they are perceived as different, the important issue is the outcome, regardless of the intentions. Anti- discriminatory practice involves a degree of self- awareness and recognizing whether any aspects of the practice unwittingly reinforce discrimination.

Ø   The roots of discrimination are very deep indeed and are to be found in cultural formations and structural power relations as well as personal beliefs and attitudes. In this sense, discrimination can be institutional –that is, built into systems and institutionalized patterns of behaviour or assumptions.

Anti-discriminatory practice is a challenging aspect of social work, but failing to address it can be highly problematic. It is not a specialist approach that only applies in certain circumstances; it is a fundamental building block of good practice. It needs to be incorporated across the board and should not be seen as an 'add on' as and when required.

Some approaches to anti- discriminatory practice have been confrontational, dogmatic and simplistic and have failed to appreciate the complexities involved. They have also alienated many potential supporters of an anti- discriminatory approach. Some writers define anti- discriminatory practice in very narrow, individualistic terms and reserve the term 'anti- oppressive practice' for the wider, more sociologically informed approach to discrimination and oppression (Thomson & Thomson, 2008: 243).

- *Narrative approaches*: the basis of narrative approaches is the idea that social reality is maintained through a set of stories or 'narratives'. These are partly rooted in culture and society around us, but are also partly created in and by our interactions with one another and our own sense of identity. Narratives can be helpful and empowering, but they can also be self- defeating and negative, a barrier to progress. The crux of narrative approaches to helping is working with people to assist them in 'rewriting' negative or problematic narratives and replacing them with positive, life-enhancing ones. Narrative approaches focus very closely on empowerment and partnership through the idea of co- authoring new narratives.

Social work practice arises from the interaction between individuals and the social context. This is just as true in terms of narrative approaches, as the narratives arise partly from a personal interpretation of the circumstances the individual concerned encounters and partly from the cultural formation of the wider society. Social work practice based on a narrative approach would involve helping people to understand their problems in terms of the narratives they have developed and thus to look for ways of 're- authoring' those narratives that are unhelpful and help translate them into more positive, affirming narratives in which they have greater control.

While narratives are deeply personal, they also have their roots in the social sphere. This approach is being used more and more in social work, in particular in mental health, in work with people who have been abused and family therapy. It can be useful basis for empowering forms of practice across wide range of settings.

Narratives approach with their roots in social constructionism, draw on the philosophical discipline of phenomenology and are therefore compatible with existentialism (Thomson & Thomson, 2008: 254).

- *Evidence based practice*: methods used as part of this approach include: cognitive restructuring (helping people change their patterns of thought); skills training (social skills, communication skills, assertiveness and so on); modelling (showing methods of coping, for example); and coaching.

The main strength of the approach is that it is able to demonstrate a high level of success. However, the main criticism it attracts is that it does not address wider issues (Thomson & Thomson, 2008:245).

1.5 What is social control?

The term of social control is not so easy to define. Many sociologists have given views for the concept of the word and because of that, we have many definitions. It is important to take a historic perspective to see all the approaches from the first time that the term used until today.

Vincent (1896) in the first volume of the American Journal of Sociology said that "social control is the art of combining social forces so as to give society at least a trend toward an ideal" (Vincent 1896:490.).

Another sociologist who was interested in social control was E.A. Ross who stated that social control was a way to "find a means of guiding the will or conscience of the individual members of society" (Ross 1901:59). In 1925, George Hebert Mead wrote in the International Journal of Ethics that "social control depends, then, upon the degree to which individual in society are able to assume attitudes of others who are involved with them in common endeavours" (Mead 1925). Albert J. Reiss who was a researcher on juvenile delinquency defined social control as the ability of social groups or institutions to make norms or rules effective (Reiss 1951:196) .

In the early 20th Century in the United States, two major figures Charles Horton Cooley and W. I. Thomas gave centrality to social control and its relation to rational control in their writings. Cooley said "A ripe nationality is favorable to international order for the same reasons that a ripe individuality is favorable to order in a small group. It means that we have coherent, self-conscious and more or less self-controlled elements out of which to build our system [of nations]" (1920). Thomas in the other hand saw the society in institutional terms as consisting of a set of irreducible social groups, from primary groups to complex bureaucratic structures. Social control depends on effective linkage or articulation among these elements. So he had made this statement we are less and less ready to let any social process go on without our active interference and we feel more and more dissatisfied with any active interference based upon a mere whim of an individual or a social body, or upon preconceive philosophical, religious or moral generalization (Thomas 1918-1920).

Also Park and Burgers thought that "social control and the mutual subordination of individual members to the community have their origin in conflict, assume definite organized forms in the process of accommodation and are consolidated and fixed in assimilation". They also believed that every social problem turn out to be a problem of social control (Park and Burgers 1921:785).

G. Duncan Mitchell remarks that the term social control broadly indicates an aspect of sociological discussion concerned with the maintenance of order and stability. It may be used in the narrower sense of denoting the various specialized means employed to maintain order, such as Codes, Courts and Constables, or it may be used to categorize discussion of social institutions and their interrelations in so far as they contribute specifically to social stability, e.g. legal, religious and political institutions. Social control is one of the fundamental subjects of sociological discussion and arises in all arguments about the nature and causes of both stability and change. Among social anthropologists the discussion has centred of late around a comparison of simple societies, some of which display formal means of social control, whilst others betray an almost complete absence of them (G. Duncan Mitchell, 1979).

Nicolas Abercrombie, Stephen Hill and Bryan S. Turner try to explain that the majority of sociologists argue that social control is achieved through a combination of compliance, Coercion and commitment to social values. For example Parsons (1951) defined it as the process by which, through the imposition of sanctions, Deviant

Behaviour is counteracted and social stability maintained. The concept has primarily been encountered in the analysis of deviant behaviour, as an aspect of Labelling Theory. It is argued that, paradoxically, the attempt to increase forms of coercive social control by, for example, increasing police surveillance of particular crimes or social groups tend to amplify deviance rather than diminish it. The implication is that social control depends more on the stability of social groups, community relations and shared values than it does on mere coercion (Nicolas Abercrombie, Stephen Hill, 2000).

David and Julia Jary stated that social control is a phenomenon that exists across all structures and society whether you are rich or poor. Social control is used to enforce or encourage conformity and it is also used to deal with any behaviour which violates accepted norms. Sociologists distinguish two basic processes of social control: a) Internalization of norms and values. The process of socialization is much concerned with learning acceptable ways of acting as taken for granted, unquestioned imperatives or as social routines, b) the use of sanctions with regard to rule breakers and non conforming acts. Sanctions may be positive, rewarding conforming conduct, or negative, punishing non conformity to norms by means ranging from informal sanctions like telling-off, ridiculing or ostracism, to formal sanctions like a yellow card, a prison sentence, or execution (David Jary Julia Jary, 2000).

But the reality is that the solution for the definition of social control was given by Stanley Cohen. Who describes the term of social control as a Mickey Mouse concept. A concept that is appearing in many sociology texts but it used to cover all the social processes to induce conformity ranging from infant socialization through to public execution. In the real life the word hasn't a clear meaning. And the reality is that the meaning of the word depends on the purposes of any definitions and from the point of view that has any person (Stanley Cohen 1985)

So the question is asked whether teachers, priests in churches, warders in prison, psychiatrists in clinics, social workers in welfare agencies, parents in families, journalists in the media, policemen on the streets, even bosses in the factories, and mayors in cities are all, after all, busy doing the same thing. And yes they are doing the same thing not all but many. They produce social control and fear with other theories as well to establish social control in small groups or in huge groups like a town, a country or the whole world.

1.6 Theories that are linked to social control

The theory of social control does not stand alone in that there are many others theories that are linked to or help to influence its central themes. Some of these are *labelling, strain, conflict theory and the social construction social norms*. Other key influences include perspectives from movements like the *feminism, social psychology, the theory of power, Marxist theory, hegemony and normalization*. We will try to analyze the theories or the approaches and make a connection between the theory of social control and these theories and how each perspective uses these theories to control society and every person in it that society.

Strain theory

Strain is the pressure on disadvantaged minority groups and the lower urban populous to take advantage of any effective available means to income and success that they can find even if these means are illegal (Akers, 2000, p. 144).
Strain theory focuses explicitly on negative relationships with others: relationships in which the individual is not treated as he or she wants to be treated. Strain theory has typically focused on relationships in which others prevent the individual from achieving positively valued goals. The three major types of strain are: (1) strain as the actual or anticipated failure to achieve positively valued goals, (2) strain as the actual or anticipated removal of positively valued stimuli, and (3) strain as the actual or anticipated presentation of negatively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992).
1) Strain resulting from failure to achieve positively valued goals or goods, which could seen as the most common form of strain theory used by criminologists in the past. This has once more split into three. The first subgroup arises when aspirations are not achieved. The goals envisaged in this form have generally been middle class aspirations. The second subgroup includes those who feel strain as a result of expectations not materialising into desired ends or goals. The expectation arises when people see others similarly placed achieving the desired goals: as their expectation is based on a realistic assessment, and not just on a vain hope or aspiration, the feeling of strain induced by failure is all the stronger. In the final subgroup strain arises when the outcomes are not seen to be based on just decisions. This type of strain involves comparisons with others similar cases. Each of these assumes that the actors are pursuing some sort of goal. The first subgroup has been most studied by criminologists and yet Agnew notes that it is the other two which are most likely to give rise to anger and frustration: Agnew calls on researchers to include all three in testing strain theory.
2) Strain resulting from the removal of positively valued stimuli. Stack (above) had considered this but was interested mainly in money and employment/unemployment whereas Agnew widens the scope to losing a person through death, divorce, moving away or through argument. All these could be equally traumatic experiences.
3) Strain resulting from negative stimuli. Strain may arise when a person is faced with an unpleasant consequence or likely consequence such as psychological and other effects of child abuse or family break up, threats, physical pain or attack, detection, criminal prosecution, punishment or even just embarrassment. This type of strain may give rise to criminality to escape (driving at speed, drug taking), to seek revenge, or to stop the unpleasant experience. (Williams, Katherine S. 2008)

Labelling Theory

According to Giddens (2009) one of the most important approaches to the understanding of criminality is called labelling theory. Labelling theorists interpret deviance not as a set of characteristics of individuals or groups, but as a process of interaction between deviants and non-deviants. In their view, we must discover why some people come to be tagged with a deviant label in order to understand the nature of deviance itself.

People who represent the forces of law and order, or are able to impose definitions of conventional morality on others, do most of the labelling. The labels that create categories of deviance thus express the power structure of society. Frank Tannenbaum was the first who speaks about labels and in his work Crime and the Community tells: "The process of making the criminal, therefore, is a process of tagging, defining, identifying, segregating, describing, emphasizing, evoking the very traits that are complained of…The person becomes the thing he is described as being… The way out is a refusal to dramatize the evil (Tannenbaum, 1938: 19-20). And Howard Becker establishes the labelling theory as dominant sociological theory of crime. Becker believed that "Social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance and by applying those rules to particular people and labelling them as outsiders… Deviance is not a quality of the act the persons commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an "offender". The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied: deviant behaviour is behaviour that people so label (Becker, 1966: 9). But before an individual develop a strong commitment to deviant behaviour typically acquire a stigma, a powerfully negative social label that radically changes a person's self-concept and social identity. So labelling theory claims that deviance and conformity result, not so much from what people do, but from how others respond to those actions: it highlights social responses to crime and deviance.

Conflict Theory

Conflict theory emphasizes the role of coercion and power, which is the ability of a person or a group to exercise influence and control over others, in producing social order. Functionalism emphasizes coercion within society, but conflict theory emphasizes strife and friction. Derived from the work of Karl Marx, conflict theory pictures society as fragmented into groups that compete for social and economic resources. Social order is maintained by domination, not consensus, with power in the hands of those with the greatest political, economic and social resources. According to conflict theorists, when consensus exists it is because people are united around common interests, often in opposition to other groups.

In the conflict perspective, inequality is unfair but exists when those in control of a disproportionate share of society's resources actively defend their advantages. Coercion and social control, not shared values and conformity, bind people to society. Groups and individuals struggle over control of societal resources, trying to advance their own interests. Those with the most resources exercise power over the others;

inequality is the result. Conflict theory gives great attention to class, race, and gender in society because these are seen as the grounds of the most pertinent and enduring struggles in society. One of the greatest contributions to sociology from conflict theory is its emphasis on class, race, and gender inequality and their influence on all dimensions of social life.

Conflicts theorists see inequality as inherently unfair, unlike functionalists who find inequality benefiting society. The dominance of the most advantaged group even extends to the point of shaping the beliefs of others, by controlling public information and influencing institutions such as education and religion, where beliefs and ideas are produced. From the conflict perspective, power struggles between conflicting groups are also the source of social change.

Again, families provide an example of how conflict theorists analyze social institutions. Whereas functionalists see families as contributing to the stability of society, conflict theorists would be more likely to see families as reflecting systems of power in society. Thus, within families, gender roles are shaped by power relationships between men and women in society at large, resulting in the fact that men tend to have more power in families than women. But as economic and political change occurs in society, the power balance within families also changes-for example, as women become more financially independent. Conflict theorists would also interpret families in terms of their relationship to other systems of inequality. Family stability, for example, is influenced by poverty (Williams Katherine 2008)

Marx Theory

Marxist sociology provides the basic theory of conflict and continuous development which is seen as endemic in society (Leonard 1966:24-31). For Marx their economic power gave the wealthy the authoritative control which enabled them to coerce political power (Marx and Engels 1970:90-1). The classes have different interests at stake which they seek to promote and defend (although the class struggle itself is only one manifestation of change and conflict). Because they occupy different positions in the productive system, the classes come into conflict with each other. The class which owns the means of production is able to secure the surplus product and keep other classes in subordinate positions. The exploited class, however, does not inevitably resist or even question the ruling class's right to rule.

Class consciousness develops in part because the antagonistic parties engage in struggle and find themselves lining up with different allies on different sides. They come to know who is friend and who is enemy, in action. People tend to associate socially with members of their own class which has its own characteristic outlook and sets of ideas about the world. Class is therefore not simply an 'economic phenomenon', but a social one. It permeates all areas of social life. Power, wealth, religious and social prestige and culturally distinctive ways of life tend to cohere and to form a different nation a 'culture of class' for each social class. But the 'weight' of each of these various attributes is not equal, for it was the position of a person in a system of production that was the factor that Marx saw as under-pinning all his other relationships. The 'mode of production' in a society the way it organizes labour and capital, men and instruments to produce goods is the foundation or basis on which are built the other major institutions of social life.

Marx did not say that the antagonistic classes had to come into open and direct conflict. They may be objectively in conflict but subjectively lack consciousness. Marx's theory was not simple economic determinism. For the classes the objective situation of having a common position in the production system needed complementing by subjective class consciousness of their common interests before they could fully become a class. Marx's theory is not an objective theory of class, because for him, a class could never become fully a class without this interplay between their subjective consciousness and their objective life-circumstances which he called a dialectical interplay. Subjective consciousness is not an automatic concomitant of exploitation; it is something that develops and emerges over time. Poor people have been very passive throughout history.

For Marx, the relationship between economic power and political power was clear; the capitalists were not simply an owning class; they were a ruling class too. Their decisive control over the key type of property (capital) was the basis for control over the society's political life, whether parliamentary democracy existed or not. In the economic sphere they would push production towards its technical limits and were thus agents of economic progress. But when the productive capacity of a state came into contradiction with the owner's interests they would become regressive. They would not give up their wealth and power easily and would have to be removed by revolution (Marx & Engels 1970: 103-05).

Patriarchy

Patriarchy is a historic creation formed by men and women in a process which took nearly 2500 years to its completion. In its wider definition means the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general. It implies that men hold power in all the important institutions of society and that women are deprived of access to such power (Lerner 1986). So feminists believe that patriarchy is a form of control in their live. A feminist theorization of the social control inherent in the welfare system was the notion of a public or state patriarchy as opposed to private, familial patriarchy. Carol Brown tells us that patriarchy is an umbrella system in which there are public aspects, controlled by men collectively, and private aspects, run by men individually. Since male-headed families are no longer needed to maintain the overall patriarchy, men's individual powers in familial matters have been increasingly delegated, so to speak, to the state.

Another theorist Zillah Eisenstein has conceptualized a 'capitalist patriarchal state.' States are patriarchal, she argues, because the 'distinction between public (male) and private (female) life has been inherent in the formation of states societies.' She too describes a transition from husband/father control to state control but sees the nature of the social control of women as continuous and essentially similar.

The 'state patriarchy' analysis was extremely useful in pointing to the growing independence of some women from fathers and husbands. Patriarchy explains us why men control women but it has a huge gap to what happened to women with power. But this gap will fill it Foucault and the theory of power (Gordon Linda 1990).

Power

The central figure in the development of this approach to the study of social control and social order is Michel Foucault. In an effort to circumvent the problems associated with the concept of social control, resulting from some of the issues reviewed earlier, Foucault only rarely used the term itself. Rather in his work he makes use of a range of concepts such as discipline, panoptic surveillance, governmentality and bio-power, in an effort to understand the different dimensions of how power is enacted and control exercised in different setting, in respect of different problems. Nevertheless, one of the abiding themes underpinning much of his work is an attempt to unmask the varied range of controlling technologies and practices that societies use in respect of deviants acts and to include conformity. Indeed, for Foucault, perhaps the defining quality of modern societies was the development of powerful disciplinary technologies, that sought to control both the body and the mind of all subjects. In this sense, he was interested in the production and reproduction of what in relation to the pragmatist perspective I labelled 'collective self control'. For Foucault collective self control resulted from the strategic deployment of specific 'technologies of the self,' which were themselves generative of and generated by a particular rationality of government, or what he termed 'governmentality'. The 'art of government' as Foucault saw it, especially in his later works, was the development of mechanisms of security that regulated relations between citizens, between sovereign state and citizens and between sovereign states.

Foucault saw control efforts as being directed ultimately by a concern to effect 'normalization' over different forms of deviance. His discussion of the practices of incarceration illustrates this theme. But importantly, Foucault argues that projects of normalization were themselves dispersed throughout the operations of a range of social institutions, founded upon bodies of knowledge that facilitated classification and definition of different forms of deviance. He thus implicates human sciences in the development of the apparatus of modern forms of social control. It was knowledge generated by disciplines such as psychology and criminology that was intrinsic to the refinement of the methods that identifying, classifying and responding to different types of deviant behaviour, thereby creating the possibility of a rationalization of the imposition of power and control(Innes 2003).

Also Foucault in his book Discipline and Punish radically renewed the analysis of modes of exercising power. He distinguished between two forms of social control 'discipline-blockade'. Made up of prohibitions, bans, barriers, hierarchies and separations and breaks in communication and 'discipline-mechanism', made up of multiple, intersecting surveillance techniques, flexible procedures of control and systems or apparatuses that exercise discipline by causing individuals to internalise their constant exposure to a watchful eye. From the notion of power as the preserve of macro-subjects, for example the state, social classes and the dominant ideology, Foucault shifted towards a relational conception of power. Power cannot be held or transferred like a thing. This power is not exercised simply as an obligation or a prohibitive on those who do not have it, it invests them, is transmitted by and through them; it exerts pressure on them, just as they themselves, in their struggle against it, resist the grip it has on them. The effects of power should no longer be described in negative terms (exclusion, censorship, repression, masking hiding) in fact power produces reality. It produces domains of objects and rituals of truth (Foucault 1975).

Norms

The study of norms is a difficult undertaking, as is the evaluation of existing work, in part because scholars disagree about what norms are. To complicate matters, they use a variety of terms–customs, convention, role, identify, institution, culture, and so forth–to refer to concepts that are similar to overlap with notions about norms. Furthermore, the word has various meanings depending on the focus of the researcher. On some occasions it is used as an umbrella term that refers to a variety of controls, including formal organizational rules and laws as well as informal social controls, whereas at other times it is used more narrowly.

Even when viewed simply as informal social controls, definitions vary. For some, norms are a system of meaning. According to Gary Alan Fine, they "constitute a 'frame' within which individuals interpret a given situation and from which the take direction for their responsibilities as actors in the domain." For these scholars, the problem of order is solved by mutual understanding which norms provide. For others, norms are patterns of action. Game theorists, for example, view cooperative behaviour as a general equivalent to any norm. Self-interested individuals act in their own interests rather than those of others. Norms encourage them to behave prosocially instead of merely for themselves. Therefore, cooperative behaviour is normative, and by studying the emergence of patterns of cooperative behaviour, scholars explain how norms emerge.

Norms are not, however, simply rules. Without some means of enforcement, rules serve merely as assertions of ideals. Scholars differ in their views on exactly what is that makes norms effective. For some, norms must be internalized. Individuals apply sanctions to their own behaviour and respond to these internally generated rewards or punishments. Norms also may be internalized when individuals come to value the behaviour specified by a norm for its own sake: that is, they follow social norms because they want to. When seen in this way, the concept of internalized norms is consistent with the term "values" as used by others.

Whereas some focus on internalization as an enforcement mechanism, the majority of scholars emphasize the role of external sanctions. On this view norms are ordinarily enforced by sanctions, which are either rewards for carrying out those actions regarded as correct or punishments for carrying out those actions regarded as incorrect. Even those who rely heavily on the idea of internalization still recognize the importance of additional sources of enforcement, Talcott Parsons for example, typically is associated with the view that social norms are internalized and once internalized, control individual behaviour. Yet he also acknowledges the role of external sanctions.

"There is always a double aspect of the expectation system…On the one hand there are the expectations which concern and in part set standards for the behaviour of the actor, ego, who is taken as the point of reference…on the other hand there is a set of expectations relative to the contingently probable reactions of others ("alters") these will be called sanctions, which in turn may be subdivided into positive and negative according to whether they are felt by ego to be gratification-promoting or depriving. The relation between role-expectations and sanctions then is clearly reciprocal". (Parsons 1952:38)

For Parsons social enforcement is an essential component of norms. In addition to enforcement, for a norm to exist there must be agreement among group members regarding the validity of the rule and the right of group members to enforce it. A rule advocated only by an individual is not a norm at all but merely a personal idiosyncrasy. Although the amount of acceptance is unspecified, it is generally argued that at least some level of consensus is necessary. So norms are cultural phenomena that prescribe and proscribe behaviour in specific circumstances (M. Hechter 2001).

Hegemony

Though there exists no fully developed theory of hegemony, the starting point for studying the concept has to begin with the work of Antonio Gramsci. Writing in the wake of economic upheavals, revolutionary struggles, and the rise of fascism in the early decades of the twentieth century in Italy, Gramsci attempted to redefine and redirect the central tenets of Marxist theory. Rejecting the orthodox Marxist faith in objective economic forces and scientific laws, Gramsci turned his attention to the voluntarist side of Marxist theory. He strongly argued that the domination of capital could not be explained by simply pointing to the rule of force and coercion exercised by the capitalist state. Similarly, he argued that revolutionary struggle could not be relegated to a faith in the inevitable breakdown and self destruction of capitalism's inner logic and laws. For Gramsci the historical materialism of orthodox Marxism was blinded by its own wooden metaphors and paralyzed by its economistic straitjacket. Neither political force nor the logic of capitalist development provided the theoretical basis for fully understanding of changing the nature of capitalist society. Gramsci believed that a more suitable approach would have been to take the notion of consciousness more seriously. That is, the assumption that human beings become political actors as they move through and create the 'terrain on which men move,[and] acquire consciousness of their position, struggle. It is this link between struggle, domination and liberation, on the one side and Gramsci's view of the power of consciousness and ideology on the other, that establishes the problematic for understanding his notion of hegemony.

Hegemony as it is used by Gramsci appears to have two meanings. First, it refers to a process within civil society whereby a fundamental class exercises control though its moral and intellectual leadership over allied classes. In this perspective an alliance is formed among ruling groups as a result of the power and 'ability of one class to articulate the interest of other social groups to its own.' Gramsci appears very clear in pointing out that the intellectual and moral leadership exercised by the dominant class does not consist of the imposition of its own ideology upon allied groups. Instead, it represents a pedagogic and politically transformative process whereby the dominant class articulates a hegemonic principle that brings together common elements drawn from the world views and interests of allied groups. The second use of the term takes on a much more dynamic chapter. Hegemony, as it is used in this case, points to the relationship between the dominant and dominated classes. In this case, hegemony refers to the successful attempt of a dominant class to utilize its control over the resources of state and civil society, particularly through the use of the mass media and the educational system, to establish its view of the world as all inclusive and universal. Through the dual use of force and consent, with consent prevailing, the dominant class uses its political, moral and intellectual leadership to

shape and incorporate the 'taken-for-granted' views, needs, and concerns of subordinate groups. In doing so, the dominant class not only attempts to influence the interests and needs of such groups, it also contains radical opportunities by placing limits on oppositional discourse and practice. As Douglas Kellner observes, 'hegemonic ideologies attempt to define the limits of discourse, by setting the political agenda, by defining the issues and terms of debate, and excluding oppositional ideas'.

One important feature of hegemonic rule is that it refers to more than the institutionalization and framing of specific modes of discourse; it also includes the messages inscribed in material practices. Put another way, hegemony is rooted in both the meanings and symbols that legitimate dominant interests as well as in the practices the structure daily experience. That hegemony functions, for example, through the significations embedded in school texts, films, and 'official' teacher discourse is clear enough. What is less obvious is that it also functions in such as schools as instances of both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic struggles. Gramsci's notion that hegemony represents a pedagogical relationship through which the legitimacy of meaning and practice is struggled over makes it imperative that a theory of radical pedagogy takes as its central task an analysis of how both hegemony functions in schools and how various forms of resistance and opposition either challenge or help to sustain it.

Hegemony and ideology represent important concepts in educational theory and practise because they expose the political nature of schooling and point to possibilities for developing alternative modes of pedagogy. However helpful as these concepts are in the end, they are incomplete because they do not provide the theoretical framework for developing a notion of totality that reveals how society reproduces and mediates the wide range of conflicting social formation, ideologies and structures that either give it a specific historical location or expose its underlying determinations (H. Giroux. 1981)

Deviance

Since 1940 a sizable portion of the traditional subject matter of social problems, such as crime, delinquency, prostitution, drug addiction and physical handicaps, has been categorized as deviance, deviation or deviant behaviour. The amoral, statistical or descriptive implications of the terms carry a strong appeal, although they tend to acquire morally invidious connotations. Generally, deviance is defined as violations of norms or departures from social expectancies, but beyond this minimal agreement the ideas projected for its analysis differ considerably.
One group of sociologists, following Durkheim, Parsons and Merton has been primarily concerned with the etiology of deviance and its different rates of occurrence between or within societies. They have sought to locate the sources of deviation in discontinuities, anomie or strain within the structure of a society that is assumed to be more or less an integrated system. The analysis of deviation originates from permutations of choice by individuals motivated by culturally given ends and confronted with means of varying accessibility. The most cogent statement of theoretical design derived from these ideas appeared in Merton's widely influential article "Social Structure and Anomie". Critical assessment of the structural or "anomie" interpretations of deviation was slow to crystallize but was finally made by a symposium of sociologists qualified by extensive research in areas of deviation. In this volume, Anomie and Deviant Behaviour edited by Marshall B. Clinard, they raised

serious doubts as to whether Merton's effort to design an embracing theory of deviation was sufficient for the complexities of the data. The end–means distinction is not an easy one to maintain with concrete data and the individual motivational base of structural sociology is barren ground for the production of a theory of group-related deviation in any but reactional terms. The heavy accent on conditions of social order in works of Parsons reduces social control to a negative mechanism for repressing deviation; the recognition of deviation as a creative necessity for social change is absent from structural theories or appears only in revised afterthoughts (Edwin M. Lemert 1967).

To reveal the great shift in conceptions of deviance that took place we will present you the several definitions that sociologists gave for this subject.

Erikson (1962:308) "Deviance is not a property inherent in certain forms of behaviour; it is a property conferred upon these forms by the audiences which directly or indirectly witness them."

Kitsuse (1962:253) "Forms of behaviour per se do not differentiate deviants from non-deviants; it is the responses of the conventional and conforming members of the society who identify and interpret behaviour as deviant which sociologically transform persons into deviants."

Becker (1963:9) "The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behaviour is behaviour that people so label."

Merton (1966:805) "…deviant behaviour refers to conduct that departs significantly from the norms set for people in their social statuses."

Lofland (1969:23) "… deviant is here defined with reference to public definitions embodied in civil rulings and detection and apprehension procedures – not with reference to any human bodies that actually get detected and apprehended. Definition hinges upon the possibility of detection and apprehension, not upon actual detection and apprehension. The domain of deviance is all that behaviour that could become an object of defensible apprehension, processing and punishment were the activity known to civil authorities and should they choose to act".

Bell (1971:11) "Basically the ultimate measurement of whether or not an act is deviant depends on how others who are socially significant in power and influence define the act… One could commit any act, but it is not deviant in its social consequences if no elements of society react to it".

Schur (1971:24) "Human behaviour is deviant to the extend that it comes to be viewed as involving a personally discreditable departure from a group's normative expectations and it elicits interpersonal or collective reactions that serve to 'isolate,' 'treat', 'correct', or 'punish' individuals engaged in such behaviour".

Scott (1972:11-12) "… there are few natives who actually use the term 'social deviant' as such; most of them, when they confer this property on others, use labels such as 'nut', 'queer', 'weirdo', 'rascal', 'pervert', or 'loony'. I employ the generic term

'deviance' to refer to that property that is conferred upon persons whenever labels such as these are used."

Denisoff and McCaghy (1973:26) "Deviance is the name of the conflict game in which individuals or loosely organized small groups with little power are strongly feared by a well-organized, sizable minority or majority who have a large amount of power".

Steffensmeier & Terry (1975:4) "Deviance consists of differentially valued phenomena".

Kaplan (1975:4) "Deviant behaviour… is the failure of a person to conform to the specified normative expectations of one or more of the specified groups in which the individual holds membership.

Davis (1975:227) Deviance: "Any form of opposition to established rules, standards, or practices of elites; deviance may be a political label, a popular stereotype, or a form of sanctioned behaviour. In conflict theory, deviance is political opposition to coercive control".

Birenbaum and Sagarin (1976:37) "If one wishes to make this definition [Schur(1971:24)] more precise, one might expand it to human beings as well as human behaviour, so as to include those deviance comes from what they are and not from what they do. Lepers, for example, may elicit the types of reaction that Schur spells out for conduct. We would also add, to cover the fact that some socially condemned behaviour, because of secrecy, never comes to elicit those interpersonal and collective reactions, that the behaviour would elicit them if it came to be known. It is difficult to locate a single word that covers all the persons and behaviour that are usually encompassed by this theme, but we believe that the concept of disvalued persons and behaviour is close to it as any."

Black (1976:9) "Deviant behaviour is conduct that is subject to social control."

Akers (1977:11) "We consider here only behaviour which deviates in a disapproved direction. More specifically, attention is directed primarily to instances of disapproved behaviour considered serious enough to warrant major societal efforts to control them, using strong negative sanctions or treatment-corrective techniques."

Cullen and Cullen (1978:8) "… acts and actors violating the norms of society will be termed 'rule-breaking behavior' and 'rule breakers,' while the terms 'deviant behavior' and 'deviant' will be reserved for acts and actors labelled as deviant by a social audience."

Feldman (1978:5) "Deviance is… the violation of a norm that somebody believes is important."

Clinard and Meier (1979:14) "… deviance constitutes only those deviations from norms which are in a disapproved direction and of sufficient degree to exceed the tolerance limits of a social group such that the deviation elicits, or is likely to elicit if detected, a negative sanction".

Thio (1998:13) "… we may define deviant behaviour in terms of public consensus. We may define it as any behaviour considered deviant by public consensus that may range from the maximum to the minimum".

According to Thio (1998) deviant behaviour is divided in specific forms. These forms are physical violence, forcible rape, family violence, suicide, mental disorder, heterosexual deviance, homophobia and its targets, illegal drug use, drinking and alcoholism, White-Collar and governmental deviance and finally disreputable economic deviance. The reality is that society is focused in the first forms and not so to White-Collar and governmental deviance and disreputable economic deviance. It's obvious why.

We perceive and understand the physical and social world based on a shared sense of order (predictability): the meanings we attach to people, things, and actions. "Otherness" (differentness) challenges our assumptions, our taken-for-granted sense of normalcy and naturalness.
At a basic "gut" level it calls into question our basic beliefs and ideas: It threatens us.
At a social level it challenges the social order: the existing web of relationships, values, reality and meaning

Some form of Control is necessary to help maintain Order:
Internal: socialization.
External: a system of norms, sanctions and enforcement.

Deviance is problematic, yet essential and intrinsic to any conception of Social Order. It is problematic because it disrupts; it is essential because it defines the confines of our shared reality; and it is intrinsic to a conception of order in that defining what is real and expected, defining what is acceptable, and defining who we are- always is done in opposition to what is unreal, unexpected, unacceptable, and who we are not ("We defines They"). If we can accept the reality of change, then designations of deviance are crucial in locating the shifting boundaries of our socially structured reality.

And, when we define someone or some group as deviant- we strengthen our own position and simplify our response to the "other": ignore, expunge, destroy, or rehabilitate them. We convince ourselves of our own normalcy by condemning and controlling those who disagree. Deviance is a phenomenon situated in power: Winners are the good and the normal; Losers are the sick, the crazy, the evil (and they often accept the "label").

Deviance, therefore, exists in opposition to those who attempt to control it-- to those who have: Power.

Winners: Organize social life
Losers: Are controlled (executed, shamed, jailed, hospitalized, cared for). They are just not treated as NORMAL. They are STIGMATIZED.
Deviance is not a matter of the cost or consequences of a particular behaviour, or the behaviour itself. Deviance is a label (PROCESS) used to maintain the power, control, and position of a dominant group.

Deviance is a negotiated order. Deviance violates some groups assumptions about reality (social order). It violates expectations. The definition of deviance defines the threat and allows for containment and control of the threat. The definition of deviance preserves, protects, and defines group interests and in doing so maintains a sense of normalcy. Deviance is a product of Social Interaction (Stephen Phofl 1994).

Chapter 2

Where do we see social control?

Social control has many forms. I will construct an argument that states it can be found in the family, in religion, in education, in media, in health and welfare services and the government. I will also try to demonstrate how governments use the construct of social control. In the next lines we will try to analyze various forms of social control and how it affects people's lives.

2.1 Religion

All socially constructed worlds are inherently precarious. Supported by human activity, they are constantly threatened by the human facts of self-interest and stupidity. The institutional programmes are sabotaged by individuals with conflicting interests. Frequently individuals simply forget them or are incapable of learning them in the first place. The fundamental process of socialization and social control, to the extent that they are successful, serve to mitigate these threats. Socialization seeks to ensure a continuing consensus concerning to the most important features of the social world. Social control seeks to contain individual or group resistances within tolerable limits. There is yet another centrally important process that serves to support the swaying edifice of social order. This is the process of legitimation**. (Peter L. Berger, 1967).

By legitimation, is meant socially objectivated 'knowledge' that serves to explain and justify the social order. Put differently, legitimations are answers to any questions about the 'why' of institutional arrangements. So religion has been the first historically most widespread and effective instrumentality of legitimation. All legitimation maintains socially defined reality. Religion legitimates so effectively because it relates the precarious reality constructions of empirical societies with ultimate reality. The tenuous realities of social world are grounded in the sacred realissimum, which by definition is beyond the contingencies of human meanings and human activity.

The efficacy of religious legitimation can be brought home by asking an, as it were, recipe question on the construction of worlds. If one imagines oneself as a fully aware founder of a society, a kind of combination of Moses and Machiavelli, one could ask oneself the following question: How can the future continuation of the institutional order, now established ex nihilo, be best ensured? There is an obvious answer to the question in terms of power. But let it be assumed that all the means of power have been effectively employed – all opponents have been destroyed, all means of coercion are in one's own hands, reasonably safe provisions have been made for the transmission of power to one's designated successors. There still remains the problem of legitimation, all the more urgent because of the novelty and thus highly conscious precariousness of the new order. The problem would best be solved by applying the following recipe: Let the institutional order be so interpreted as to hide as much as possible, its constructed character. Let that which has been stamped out of the ground

ex nihilo appear as the manifestation of something that has been existent from the beginning of time, or at least from the beginning of this group. Let the people forget that this order was established by men and continues to be dependent upon the consent of men. Let them believe that, in acting out the institutional programmes that have been imposed upon them, they are but realizing the deepest aspirations of their own being and putting themselves in harmony with the fundamental order of the universe. In sum: Set up religious legitimations. There are, of course, wide historical variations in the manner in which this has been done. In one way or another, the basic recipe was followed throughout most of human history. And actually the example of the Moses – Machiavelli figuring the whole thing out with cool deliberation may not be as fanciful as all that. There have been very cool minds indeed in the history of religion (Peter L. Berger, 1967).

Religion legitimates social institutions by bestowing upon them an ultimately valid ontological status, that is, by locating them within a sacred and cosmic frame of reference. The historical constructions of human activity are viewed from a vantage -point that, in its own self–definition, transcends both history and man. This can be done in different ways. Probably the most ancient form of this legitimation is the conception of the institutional order as directly reflecting or manifesting the divine structure of the cosmos, that is, the conception of the relationship between society and cosmos as one between microcosm and macrocosm. Everything 'here below' has its analogue 'up above'. By participating in the institutional order men, ipso facto, participate in the divine cosmos. The kinship structure, for example, extends beyond the human realm, with all being (including the being of the gods) conceived of in the structures of kinship as given in the society. Thus there may be not only a totemic 'sociology' but a totemic 'cosmology' as well. The social institutions of kinship then merely reflect the great 'family' of all being, in which the gods participate on a higher level. Human sexuality reflects divine creativity. Every human family reflects the structure the cosmos, not only in the sense of representing but of embodying it. Or, for another crucial case, the political structure simply extends into the human sphere the power of the divine cosmos. The political authority is conceived of as the agent of the gods, or ideally even as a divine incarnation. Human power, government, and punishment thus become sacramental phenomena, that is, channels by which divine forces are made to impinge upon the lives of men. The ruler speaks for the gods, or is a god, and to obey him is to be in a right relationship with the world of the gods.

And what happened to people who are against this ruler in society or in religion. To go against the order of society is always to risk plunging into anomy. To go against the order of society as religiously legitimated, however, is to make a compact with the primeval forces of darkness. To deny reality as it has been socially defined is to risk falling into irreality, because it is well–nigh impossible in the long run to keep up alone and without social support one's own counter definitions of world. When the socially defined reality has come to be identified with the ultimate reality of the universe, then its denial takes on the quality of evil as well as madness. The denier then risks moving into what may be called a negative reality–if one wishes, the reality of the devil. So people forget and deny. They must, therefore, be reminded over and over again. Indeed, it may be argued that one of the oldest and most important prerequisites for the establishment of is the institution of such 'reminders', the terribleness of which for many centuries is perfectly logical in view of the 'forgetfulness' that they were designed to combat. Religious ritual has been a crucial instrument of this process of 'reminding'. Again and again it 'makes present' to those

who participate in it the fundamental reality–definitions and their appropriate legitimations (Peter L. Berger, 1967).

Marx also believed that religion is an instrument of control. His opinion was that man makes religion, religion does not make man. Religion is indeed the self-consciousness and self-esteem of man who has either not yet won through to himself or has already lost himself again. But man is no abstract being squatting outside the world. Man is the world of man, state, society. This state and this society produce religion, which is an inverted consciousness of the world, because they are an inverted world. Religion is the general theory of this world, its encyclopedic compendium, its logic in popular form, its spiritual point d'honneur, its enthusiasm, its moral sanction, its solemn complement and its universal basis of consolation and justification. It is the fantastic realization of the human essence since the human essence has not acquired any true reality. The struggle against religion is therefore indirectly the struggle against that world whose spiritual aroma is religion. Religious suffering is at one and the same time the expression of real suffering and a protest against real suffering. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people.

The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is the demand for their real happiness. To call on them to give up their illusions about their condition is to call on them to give up a condition that requires illusions. The criticism of religion is therefore in embryo the criticism of that vale of tear of which religion is the halo.

Criticism has plucked the imaginary flowers on the chain not in order that man shall continue to bear that chain without fantasy or consolation but so that he shall throw off the chain and pluck the living flower. The criticism of religion disillusions man, so that he will think, act, and fashion his reality like a man who has discarded his illusions and regained his senses, so that he will move around himself as his own true san. Religion is only the illusory sun which revolves around man as long as he does not revolve around himself.

It is therefore the task of history, once the other-world of truth has vanished, to establish the truth of this world. It is the immediate task of philosophy, which is in the service of history, to unmask self-estrangement in its unholy forms once the holy form of human self-estrangement has been unmasked. Thus the criticism of heaven turns into the criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into the criticism of law and the criticism of theology into the criticism of politics (Karl Marx, 2002).

2.2 Family

The demographic character of family life has been changing quite dramatically over the last 30 years. There have been significant increases in the number of people living alone, in the number of same- sex relationships, in the number of divorces occurring, in the numbers of people cohabiting, in the numbers of births to single women, and in the number of stepfamilies formed. At the same time, marriage rates have been declining and average age at marriage has been increasing. Overall it is evident that people are now choosing to construct their sexual, domestic and familial lives in far more varied and flexible ways than was common for much of the altered so that now far greater personal freedom is being exercised in patterns of family household formation and dissolution (Davies, 2008: 11).

If we want to start talking about family and social control, we have to start from Feminism approach.

The issue at the heart of feminist work on family life is the failure of existing theoretical perspectives to adopt a normative stance on the inequalities of power and control which shore up the institution of the family. Against systems theories which stress concepts of circular causality, feminist analysis will focus on the linear direction of power and control in family life from men over women and children breakdown and distress through child abuse and domestic violence. Against post- structuralism, which appears to hold to a neutral view of power, stressing its dispersal through all social relationships and accentuating its positive and productive capacities, feminist analysis will tend to focus on the hierarchical nature of gender relationships and, as some feminists would have it, the 'class –like relationships' characterizing the marriage relationship. As Fraser (1989) in Rodger's book has argued, there are 'good' forms of power, but there are also 'bad' forms of power.

From the perspective of feminist social work, the broader social context of the domestic division of labour provides the backcloth to the tensions which give rise to family problems. Feminist social work practice and family therapy will unavoidably reorientate strategies of family intervention so that they more adequately appraise the needs of women rather than the family system. It is the imposition of patriarchal forms of control over women's loves which becomes problematic. By briefly considering the broader analysis of patriarchal power, an insight into the feminist viewpoint can be illustrated. Delphy and Leonard (1992), argue that men and women should be conceptualized as two socially differentiated categories: two genders, one of which dominates the other. Sexual relationships, and our understanding of emotion fulfillment through marriage relationship, are socially constructed and not biologically based mechanisms for relating men and women together. They advance this perspective by developing a materialist analysis of marriage in terms of the 'class like-relationships' between men and women. This idea was prepared in an earlier work by Delphy (1977) where she argued that relations between husband and wife are actually exploitative rather than just unequal because they involve the exploitation of women's labour. Within households social categorysations determine works tasks 'flexibly by age but more fixedly by gender'; the obligation for women to undertake household labour is lifelong. Children are exploited not because of their gender. The problem for women when compared with workers under capitalist mode of production is that they cannot change their husbands as workers can theoretically change their employer; it is this entrapment in exploitative labour within the marriage or cohabiting relationship which constitutes the core of the domestic mode of production. A further feature of the marriage relationship is that its exploitative character does not cease with divorce because women continue to perform domestic labour in the form of childcare for their ex- husbands. So, by examining the conditions of performance, remuneration and status of household work, Delphy and Leonard reveal the relations of production shaping family and marriage relationships. The important insight of this work is its insistence that household tasks should not be extracted from their relations of production; they argue that 'we are moving towards an understanding of the gender constitution of classes and the class constitution of gender' (p.60).

Patriarchal authority, which anchors the relations of household productions, is stable because it is a form of what Weber understood as traditional authority: like master and servant or officer and soldier, marriage appears to be a natural coupling. Underlying this popular conception of the 'natural' division between the saxes is what Delphy maintains is a common misunderstanding that gender, or socially constructed

differences between men and women, is grafted on to basic biological distinctions. This notion is rejected by Delphi (1980, 1984); patriarchal forms of domination bring about gender divisions rather emerging as epiphenomena of pre- existing differences between the sexes. The relationship between the sexes is class-like because, like Marx's notion of the differences between bourgeois and proletarian, the social roles of men and women presuppose one another. Oakley (1974) provided an earlier analysis of domestic labour, stressing as 'work'. The central features of domestic work and the housewife role were their association with economic dependency; the common perception of it as not being 'real' work, that is, productive work for a wage or salary; and its almost exclusive allocation to women. Oakley's analysis was particularly interesting for the description of the ways in which the association of the housewife role as being essentially 'feminine' pressurized women to identify with it.

Family life consists, therefore, of class-like differences which give rise to differences in consumption based on differential status and power. Patriarchy is, therefore, to be understood as a form of hegemonic control of a one social group by another. Not all practitioners will subscribe to the materialist version of feminism described in Delphy and Leonard's work.

The line of continuity running through the analysis of the domestic division of labour and the analysis of its impact on the health and well- being of women and children is patriarchy. Feminist perspectives on family life vary with respect to the degree to which they focus on the interior or exterior of family relationships, but they share a common interest in the inequality of power inherent in gender relationships. The systematic control over the routines of family living which lies in the hands of men gives rise to a more widespread system of patriarchal power. For instance, the explanation for violence against women and children within the family follows from the analysis of patriarchy rather than other bases of control and authority in society. There are a number of competing explanations for male aggression and violence, and many of them could be used to support a general feminist perspective in social work practice. The main critical measures, however, for delineating what is or is not compatible with a feminist perspective must be, first, whether the account relies on an underlying conception of human nature and so explains male violence and aggression in terms of some 'natural' animal instinct beyond human control and adjustment; and, second, whether the account effectively treats women as being culpable, contributing to their own victimization through the way they have related to their male partner. Feminism which identifies patriarchal power as the problem will invariably stress the social construction of violent male attitudes, ultimately concentrating attention on the wider institutional and cultural supports for male aggression rather than on 'abnormal' individuals who are somehow outside of the influence of social processes: it is the social construction of masculinity which becomes problematic. It follows, therefore, that feminist social work or family therapy will treat women's rejection of conventional domestic responsibilities as attempt at renegotiating inequitable gender relationships rather than as being a manifestation of 'pathology' (Rodger, 1996: 21-25).

Dean Jolly believes that the family as a social institute is our first port of call that each of us was taught the norms and values deemed acceptable by the standards of wider society. Straight from the off we are immediately bombarded with social control, with the aim of making us act in a certain way, to view certain things as good, right, acceptable, to be encouraged, to be awarded, and to see other things as wrong, immoral, evil, unnatural, different, to be shunned, to be avoided, to be curbed and ultimately be eliminated for the greater good. This is the vey backbone of social

control. People thoughts, and their sense of what is right and what is wrong, what is good and what is bad is established here (http://www.helium.com/items/1232363-social-control, 25/06/09).

S.D. Bills say that the family is hands- down the most effective means of social control, negative or positive. People are products of their home. They are products of their mothers, fathers, grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins. People are products of generations of legacy. They are products of values, standards, cultural mores, beliefs (religious and otherwise) that parents teach and pass on to them. people begin in a family before they become members of any other institution or organization. The home is the beginning chapter of life's book. Social control must begin at infancy. Governments attempt to 'cure' the societal ills of life by welfare spending and implementation of social programs to benefit those who weren't fortunate to have a family who cared. These means of social control are well-meaning and effective to a point, but real change must take place in the walls of homes. Mothers and fathers need to be educated and re- wired on how to be good parents. Moms need to learn that they need to teach their children how to be useful and respectful. Dads need to teach children order and discipline. Moms and dads share in responsibility of rearing children to be productive members of a society by teaching them to be an essential part of a family (means of social control, http://www.helium.com/items/228240-means -of-social-control. 25/06/09).

According to Thompson, the family is the basic cell in the machinery of social control, the institution which socializes (or when broken, or defective, fails to socialize) children into the manners and mores of the segment of society which they inhabit. This implies that the mechanisms of social control may have profoundly traditional, conservative, and conformist purposes, being designed to sustain and reproduce the beliefs and behaviour which the controlling authority (parent, teacher, priest) deems to be acceptable and normal (htpp://www.ehs.org.uk/society/pdfs/Thompson 5a.pdf, 25/06/09).

Moreover, families develop repetitive patterns for regulating change within the system (Jackson, 1965). These rules are designed to protect the family from being disrupted by chaotic or unplanned change. However, some families develop rules that become so inflexible that they not only restrict change but also interfere with the growth of its members. Ironically, the more that a family relies on rules to control change, the more "out of control" the family becomes (Constantine, 1986). Family therapy provokes changes within the family in order to reduce the harm that occurs from the family operating out of control (Cornill- http://resources.metapress.com/pdf-preview.axd?code=t110842058224744&size=largest).

Many texts say that social control in the family has as a result, delinquent behaviour.

Criminologists have recently exhibited renewed interest in studying the influence of family factors on delinquent behaviour (Cernkovich & Gioradano, 1987). One of the most enduring theories which attempt to explain why some young people become delinquent focuses on the role of family structure. This theory suggests that children who are raised in homes where one or both of their biological parents are missing are significantly more likely to become involved in delinquency than children who are raised in families where both biological parents are present (past authors have often referred to this as the broken homes hypothesis) (A social control explanation of the relationship between structure and delinquent behaviour, 25/06/09).

Wells and Rankin (1991) conducted a meta-analysis of the impact of single-parent households, in which they assess the existing research on its relationship to

delinquency. They found that any impact of family structure or juvenile delinquency remains stable, and '"the effect of intact versus single-parent families is a consistent and real pattern of association" where the prevalence of delinquency in broken homes is about 10 to 15% higher that in intact homes. They also found that the impact of conintact families was consistent among males and females, and black and white youth.

According to Hirschi (1969), the critical family concept for the control theory is the attachment between parent and child, noting a negative relationship. Hirschi argues that "the essence of internalization of norms, conscience, or superego thus lies in the attachment of the individual to others".

Wiatrowski, Griswold& Roberts (1981) write that "the family environment is the source of attachment because parents act as controls and teach their children socially acceptable bahaviour". They also note that parental attachment has a strong negative relationship with delinquency. Needle (1988) found that family instability, lack of family cohesion, and lower quality of relationships between parent and children were associated with adolescent drug use (Family structure versus parental attachment in controlling adolescent deviant behaviour: a social control model, 09/06/09).

The basic premise of social control theory is that humans engage in deviant bahaviour because norm violation is attractive and exciting. It is natural for youths to strive to meet their needs in the easiest, most direct manner, and they are free to engage in deviant behaviour when social controls are either ineffective or absent. According to Elliot, Huizinga & Ageton (1985), weak social control may be due to 1) "the failure to develop internal controls during childhood; 2) the breakdown or reawakening of previously established internal controls, particularly during adolescence; 3) social disorganization, in particular social units (like family) that results in weak external controls". Thus, the family is an important source of both internal and external control. Not only is it important in defining norms for conventional behaviour, but family relationships providing an external source of social control (Hirschi, 1968; Nye 1958).

There are many ways the family can restrain deviant behaviours. According to Umberson (1987), it can discourage risk-taking bahaviours. The lack of family roles and relationships implies an absence of control which increases the probability of engaging in compromising bahaviours. Hirschi (1969) and Nye (1958) state that the role of family ties contributes to the internalization of norms for conventional bahaviour. Gottfredson and Hirschy (1990)note that adolescents who become offenders appear to have little control over their desires, and that this lack is largely rooted in family child- rearing practices. In fact, they use this notion as the basis of their general theory of crime. Wells (1978) describes this phenomenon as a type of "socialization- control" where self- control develops with the internalization of social constraints. Further, persons involved in relationships such as the family are more likely to conform to norms because deviation threatens the relationship. Thus, the structure of family life and the quality of parental attachment determines the likelihood of adolescent engagement in deviant behaviour (Family structure versus parental attachment in controlling adolescent deviant bahaviour: a social control model, 09/06/09).

Finally, in Family Relationships and Delinquent Behaviour (1958), F. Ivan Nye not only elaborated social control theory of delinquency, but specified ways to "operationalize" (measure) control mechanisms and related them to self-report of delinquent behaviour. Like Reiss, he focused on the family as a source of control. Moreover, Nye specified different types of control, differentiating between internal,

direct and indirect controls. Youth may be directly controlled through constraints imposed by parents, limiting the opportunity for delinquency, as well as through parental rewards and punishments. However, they may be constrained when free from direct control by their anticipation of parental disapproval (indirect control), or through the development of a conscience, an internal constraint on behaviour. The focus on the family as a source of control was in marked contrast to the emphasis on economic circumstances as a source of criminogenic motivation at the time. Although he acknowledged motivational forces by stating that "some delinquent behaviour results from a combination of positive learning and weak and ineffective social control" (1958: 4), he adopts a control- theory position when he proposes that "most delinquent behaviour is the result of insufficient social control..." Hirschi was critical of Nye's use of concepts such as internal control, but (together with Gottfredson) proposed "self-control" as a key explanatory variable over thirty years later. Nye's work was the first major presentation of research from a social control perspective and most of his findings are quite consistent with subsequent research (http://sitemason.vanderbilt.edu/files/l/l3Bguk/soccon.pdf, 23/06/09).

2.3 Education

I would like to begin with the following words from Norman Douglas : "Education is a state-controlled manufactory of echoes" (http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/eduquote.htm).
        Education is the more or less systematic pursuit of normalcy in all societies which practice it. It always involves making people more similar as well as more different, but which people, in what degree and to what ends depends upon the nature of a particular society's hierarchy. This and the society's key values or ideologies can be regarded as always being refracted through its educational system. Education is deeply implicated in the processes of generating and transmitting key messages as to knowledge, personal and social realities. Its complexity is largely derivative in relation to these. The combination of new and long standing approaches has had striking effects upon the sociology of the school. Work was characterized by a range of incompletely examined assumptions about such matters as ability, opportunity and social class. Sociologists asked how working-class school-children could achieve like middle-class schoolchildren. They also asked how a social system defines concepts such as class, opportunities and achievement. Such concepts and many others subjects, the curriculum and even schools themselves, are seem to be products of the social system in which they exist. One of the few things that sociologists of various persuasions seem to agree in general is the 'importance of education'. Everret said that " education is perhaps the most useful tool of social control but it works for militarists and class conscious snobs as well as for humanitarians and men of vision" (Everret,1937:347). Everret describes education as potentially more useful than families or firms or other groups. In a world of rapid technical and economic changes which had led to the widespread breakdown of 'individualist assumptions', education is seen as the one public experience through which all must pass. In a world much given to 'economists, engineers and technicians', Everret would have delivered education largely into the hands of 'prophets, poets and artists', in the hope of

combating what she saw as the growingly wrong balance between individuals and society (Davies ,1976).

Much of what goes on in schools and other educational- specialist establishments also go everywhere. A great deal of formal and informal learning takes place in the family, among peers, in religious and leisure organizations and so on. Ordinary-language philosophers of education tell that the pursuit of any conception of the worthwhile may count as 'education' so long as certain procedural grounds, like indoctrination- avoidance and emphasis on intrinsicality are respected. They translate the worthwhile as the 'acquisition of certain fundamental forms of… public modes of experience, understanding and knowledge' (Hirst & Peters, 1970- 60), of which 'some seven areas can be distinguished, each of which necessarily involves the use of concepts of a particular kind and distinctive type of test for its objective claims.

Education is not merely socialization, except on a hopelessly extended view of that concept. But neither is it, as practice, necessarily predominantly 'about' acquisition of currently conceived fundamental forms of knowledge. Schools also transmit- and not as some rather suspect and contingent part of their task- beliefs, values and evaluations which have to do with broad aspects of social structural relationships. Pupils 'learn' in schools a significant portion of what they know about their own 'worth', their relation to others and to the political, economic and stratificational systems. They gather this form the explicit messages of the curricular content presented to them and the manner of its presentation and evaluation, as well as from the more general 'noise' surrounding these communications. Pupils are treated as well as taught by adults who may be highly conscious of a great deal of their activity, but who also are themselves shaped by history and structure and who cannot know what pressures play out via them in total.

The education system has a complex, historically evolved position in relation to other aspects of social structure and process. It is talked about as being determined by rather than being determinative of these structures and processes. Technically, the relationship in some degree must be reciprocal (Davies, 1976).
Durkheim's inspiration for education lay buried for sixty years and Marx has only just been re- born. The modern sub- discipline came into being to explore the education, economy, class relation- ship in Weber's world. As he described it, in the first quarter of this century, modern capitalism was characterized by rationality- indeed 'rationality' was a forma of domination, of social control. Its spirit, archetypically represented in science, had spread to suffuse the whole of culture and structure. No element, including music, was exempt from it. Its embodiment in human organization came to flower in bureaucracy; differential access was afforded to it by the educational system. The struggle between specialism and cultivation lay behind educational as with all other cultural questions. This struggle conjoined with the democratic tension vis- a- vis merit and organization whose focus in the educational system lay in certification (Davies, 1976).

For sociology of education at the time 'took colouration' rather than 'had a hue', Weber's problems were also those of the post -1945 era. Practitioners at the time would have been most conscious that Weber told them something about 'life chances' (access to economic, political and cultural goods); that Marx's concept of class required expanding to include prestige and party as well as economic (work and market situation) factors; and that chances affected and were affected by education. Access to more or less stylized and specialized curricula meant routes, via 'cultivation' in arts or 'specialization' in science, to qualification (or not) and differential job allocation (Davies, 1976).

From the point of view of social control what matters is that every society need to maintain 'loyalty to its social system', achieved partly through norms and values, some of which are culture wide, some class specific. ' The most conspicuous control problem is that of ensuring loyalty in the disadvantaged classes toward a system under which they receive less than a proportional share of society's goods'. Future orientation, widespread ambition and 'fellow feeling with the elite', kept open until attitudes, are firmly established in individuals, combined with a 'delay in clear recognition of realities', until commitment has gone too far for radical change, mark contest mobility. The unambitious are deviants and organized deviance attacks the moral rather that the class system.

Schools in the so- called open and free societies face formidable paradoxical tensions. On the one hand, they are charged with the responsibility of teaching the virtues of democracy, and, on the other hand, they are complicit with the inherent hypocrisy of contemporary democracies, where Noam Chomsky, the term democracy "refers to a system of government in which elite elements based in the business community control the state by virtue of their dominance of the private society, while the population observes quietly. So understood, democracy is a system of elite decision and public ratification, as in the United States itself. Correspondingly, popular involvement in the formation of public policy is considered a serious threat" (Chomsky, 2000).

Whereas the ruling class makes no apologies for the undemocratic role of schools, cultural middle management composed of teachers, professionals, and experts is expected, through a reward system, to propagate the myth that schools are democratic sites where democratic values are learned. As cultural middle managers, teachers support "theological truths" (or unquestioned truths) so as to legitimate the institutional role schools play "in a system of control and coercion".

Nowhere is this more evident than an example of David Spitzler, a twelve- year-old student from Boston Latin School, faced a disciplinary action for his refusal to recite the Pledge Of Allegiance, which he considered "a hypocritical exhortation to patriotism" in that there is not "liberty and justice for all". According to Splitzler, the Pledge is an attempt to unite the "oppressed and the oppressors. You have people to drive nice cars, live in nice houses and don't have to worry about money. Then you have the poor people, living in bad neighborhoods and going to bad schools. Somehow the Pledge makes it seem that everybody's equal when that's not happening. There's no justice for anybody" (Chomsky, 2000)?

Far from the democratic education that Chomsky claims about, what Americans really have in place is sophisticated colonial model of education designed primarily to train teachers in ways in which the intellectual dimension of teaching is often devalued. The major objective of a colonial education is to further de- skill teachers and students to walk unreflectively through a labyrinth of procedures and techniques. It follows, then, that what U.S. have in place is not a system that encourages independent though and critical thinking. On the contrary, U.S., so-called democratic schools are based on an instrumental skills- banking approach that often prevents the development of the kind of thinking that enables one to "read the world" critically and to understand the reasons and linkages behind facts. By and large this instrumentalist approach to education is characterized by mindless, meaningless drills and exercises given "in preparation for multiple choice exams" and by teachers "writing gobbledygook in imitation of the psycho- babble that surrounds them". As State Departments of Education reassert their control over the curriculum via mandated standardized tests, this form of mindless skills- based education is gaining more

currency as tests guide teaching while "learning that address the relationship of the self to public life, social responsibility to the broader demands of citizenship", is sidelined. In the process, teachers emphasize the mechanical learning and memorization of facts while sacrificing the critical analysis of the social end political order that generates the need of education in the first place. Seldom do teachers require students to analyse the political and social structures that inform their realities. Rarely are students allowed to engage in discovery and "to find the truth of themselves". Instead, students are expected to learn (and this never happens) "by a mere transfer of knowledge, consume through road memorization and later regurgitated" in state- mandated standardized tests. As society allows the corporate cultures to reduce the priorities of education to the pragmatic requirements of the market, whereby students are trained to become "compliant workers, spectorial consumers, and passive citizens", it necessarily has to create educational structures that anesthetize student's critical abilities. In order to domesticate social order of its self-preservation. Accordingly, it must create educational structures that involve "practices by which one strives domesticate consciousness, transforming it into an empty receptacle. Education in cultural action for domination is reduced to a situation in with the educator as 'the one who knows' transfers existing knowledge to the learner as 'the one who does not know'" (Chomsky, 2000).

More and more as the corporate culture exercises more control over schools, teachers are reduced to the role of imposing " an official truth" predetermined by " a small group of people who analyze, execute, make decisions, and run things in the political, economic and ideological system". In order to achieve this teaching task (which ironically, is a form of dumbness), teachers must treat students as empty vessels to be field with predetermined bodies of knowledge, which are often disconnected from student's social realities and from issues of equity, responsibility, and democracy. This type of education for domestication, which borders on stupidification, provides no pedagogical spaces for students, as Chomsky argues, " not to be seen merely as an audience but as part of a community of common concern in which one hopes to participate constructively". Instead, students are rewarded to the degree that they become complicit with their own stupidification and become the "so called good student who repeats, who renounces critical thinking, who adjusts to models, who should do nothing other than receive contents that are impregnated with the ideological character vital to the interests of the sacred order".

This education for domestication perspective, a good student is the one who piously recites the fossilized slogans contained in the Pledge of Allegiance. A good student is the one who wilfully and unreflectively accepts big lies.

Central to a pedagogy of lies promoted by the dominant ideology to prevent the development of a "critical comprehension of reality" is the creation of "necessary illusions and emotionally potent oversimplifications…to keep the bewildered herd- the naïve simpleton- from being bothered with the complexity of real problems that they couldn't solve anyway". That is why schools and universities try to block the development of a more critical education along the lines suggested by Chomsky, Paulo Freire and Henry Giroux, whereby, "as knowing subjects (sometimes of existing knowledge, sometimes of projects cannot be reduced to the objects themselves. We need to reach a level of comprehension of the complex of relations among objects" (Chomsky. 2000).

In an era in which we are more controlled by ever increasing "manufacturing of consent" through technological wizardry used by the media- ephemeral sound bites, metaphorical manipulations of language, and prepackaged ideas void of substance- it

becomes that much more urgent to adhere to Chomsky's proposal to develop a critical approach to education that would serve "the general public by providing people with techniques of self- defense". Given the tendency for humans to construct "satisfying and often advantage themselves and their groups", particularly when these deceptive stories are rewarded by the dominant social order, the development of a critical comprehension between the meaning of the world is a prerequisite to achieving clarity of reality (Chomsky, 2000). As Freire suggests, it is only " through political practice that the less coherent sensibility of the world begins to be surpassed and more rigorous intellectual pursuits give rise to a more coherent comprehension of the world".

Thus, in order to go beyond a mere world- level reading of reality, people must develop a critical comprehension of psychological entities such as " memories, beliefs, values, meanings and so forth… which are actually out in the social world of action and interaction". People must first read the world- the cultural, social and political practices that constitute it- before they can make sense of the world- level description of reality. The reading of the world must precede the reading of the world, as Freire suggests. That is to say, to access the true and total meaning of an entire, people must resort to the cultural and political practices that mediate their access to the world's semantic field and its interaction with the world's semantic features.

Chomsky, not only urges all those who yearn to live democratically to adopt a more critical attitude toward the world, but he also provides insightful tools to unpack the social (dis) order so as to reveal the hypocritical and dehumanizing practices of our so-called-democracies- an " this would mean teaching the truth about the world and society". Chomsky, not only urges readers to embrace a language of critique necessary in unveiling obfuscated and ideologically manipulating realities, but, along the lines of Giroux and Freire, he embraces a pedagogy of hope whereby "students are invited to discover for themselves the nature of democracy and its functioning", whereby students move from their object positions as they become agents of history in a constant quest for the truth. As he energetically stresses, teachers need to sever their complicity with a technocratic training that de- intellectualizes them so they "work primarily to reproduce, legitimate and maintain the dominant social order from which they reap benefits".

Teachers need to reject becoming prey to the status of "commissars". They should become real intellectuals who "have the obligation to serve and tell the truth about things that are important, things that matter". As Chomsky so accurately stated, " This point is not lost on western intellectuals, who have no problem applying elementary moral principles in cases that involve official enemies". In this sense, Chomsky urges all those who want to live democratically to join the chorus of real intellectuals. As real intellectuals, teachers need to appropriate a language of critique so as to denounce the hypocricy, the social injustices, and the human misery. They need to also understand that "schools both dominant ideology and the possibility of resistance and struggle and they defended by diverse groups as fundamental for preparing students to assume the responsibilities for expanding the horizons of democracy and critical citizenship". It is within the spirit of both critique and possibility that Chomsky urges to take seriously the challenge of becoming agents of history so as to make this world resonate loudly with the pronouncements of another yearn to humanize the world that "to think of history as possibility is to recognize education as possibility. It is to recognize that if education cannot do everything, it can achieve some things…One of challenges for educators is to discover what historically is possible in the sense of contributing toward the transformation of the world, giving rise to a world that is rounder, less angular, and more humane" (Chomsky, 2000).

Paulo Freire, in his book "Pedagogy of the oppressed", says that the teachers-student relationship at any level, inside or outside the school, reveals its fundamentally narrative character. This relationship involves a narrating subject (the teachers) and patient, listening objects (the students). The contents, whether values or empirical dimensions of reality, tend in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified. Education is suffering from narration sickness. The teacher talks about reality as if it were motionless, static, compartmentalized and predictable. Or else he expounds on a topic completely alien to the existential experience of the students. His task is to 'fill' the students with the contents of his narration- contents which are retouched from reality, disconnected from the totality that engendered them and could give the significance. Worlds are emptied of their concreteness and become a hollow, alienated and alienating verbosity. The outside characteristic of this narrative education, then, is the sonority of words, not their transforming power. Narration (with the teacher as narrator) leads the students to memorize mechanically the narrated content. Worse still, it turns them into 'containers', into receptacles to be filled by the teacher. The more completely teacher fills the receptacles, the better a teacher he is. The more meekly the receptacles permit themselves to be filled, the better students they are (Freire, 1972).

Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories, and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues …. And 'makes deposits' which the students patiently receive, memorize, and repeat. This is the 'banking' concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filling, and storing the deposits. They have the opportunity to become collectors or cataloguers of the things they store. (Freire, 1972).

In the banking concept of education, knowledge is a gift bestowed by those who consider themselves knowledgeable upon those whom they consider to know nothing. Projecting an absolute ignorance onto others, a characteristic of the ideology of oppression, negates education and knowledge as processes of inquiry. The teacher presents himself to his students as their necessary opposite; by considering their ignorance absolute, he justifies his own existence. The students, alienated like slaves, accept their ignorance as justifying the teacher's existence- but, unlike slaves, they never discover that they educate the teacher (Freire, 1972).

On the other hand, the reason that libertarian education exists, lies in its drive towards reconciliation. Education must begin with the solution of the teacher –student contradiction, by reconciling the poles of the contradiction so that both are simultaneously teachers and students. This solution is not found in the banking concept. On the contrary, banking education maintains and even stimulates the contradiction through the following attitudes and practices, which mirror oppressive society as a whole:
1.   The teacher teaches and the students are taught.
2.   The teacher knows everything and the students know nothing.
3.   The teacher thinks and the students are though about.
4.   The teacher talks and the students listen- meekly.
5.   The teacher disciplines and the students are disciplined.
6.   The teacher chooses and enforces his choice, and the students comply.
7.   The teacher acts and the students have the illusion of acting through the action of the teacher.
8.   The teacher chooses the programme content, and the students (who were not consulted) adapt to it.

9.   The teacher confuses the authority of knowledge with his own professional authority, which he sets in opposition to the freedom of the students.

10.   The teacher is the subject of the learning process, while the pupils are mere objects.

The banking concept of education regards men as adaptable, manageable beings. The more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less they develop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in the world as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them. The capacity of banking education to minimize or annul the student's creative power and to stimulate their credulity serves the interests of the oppressors, who care neither to have the world revealed nor to see it transformed. The oppressors use their 'humanitarianism' to preserve a profitable situation. Thus they react almost instinctively against any experiment in education which stimulates the critical faculties and is not content with a partial view of reality but is always seeking out the ties which link one point to another and one problem to another.

Indeed, the interests of the oppressors lie in 'changing the consciousness of the oppressed, not the situation which oppresses them' for the more the oppressed can be led to adapt to that situation, the more easily they can be dominated. To achieve this end, the oppressors use the banking concept of education in conjunction, within a paternalistic social action apparatus, within which the oppressed receive the euphemistic title of 'welfare recipients'. They are treated as individual cases, as marginal men who deviate from the general configuration of a 'good, organized, and just' society. The oppressed are regarded as the pathology of the healthy society, which must therefore adjust these 'incompetent and lazy' folk to its own patterns by changing their mentality. These marginal's need to be 'incorporated' into the healthy society that they have 'forsaken' (Freire, 1972).

However, the truth is that the oppressed are not marginals, are not men living 'outside' society. They have always been inside- inside the structure which made them 'beings for others'. The solution is not to 'integrate' them into the structure of oppression, but to transform that structure so that they can become 'beings for themselves'. Such transformation would undermine the oppressor's proposes; hence their utilization of the banking concept of education to avoid the threat of student conscientization (Freire, 1972).

Those who use the banking approach, knowingly or unknowingly (for there are innumerable well- intentioned bank-clerk teachers who do not realize that they are serving only dehumanize), fail to perceive that the deposits themselves contain contradictions about reality. But, these contradictions may lead formerly passive students to turn against their domestication and the attempt to domesticate reality. They may discover through existential experience that their present way of life is irreconcilable with their vocation to become fully human. They may perceive through their relations with reality, that reality is really a process, undergoing constant transformation. If men are searchers and their ontological vocation is humanization, sooner or later they may perceive the contradiction in which banking education seeks to maintain them, and then engage themselves in the struggle for the liberation.

But the humanist, revolutionary educator cannot wait for this possibility to materialize. From the outset, his efforts must coincide with those of the students to engage in critical thinking and the quest for mutual humanization. His efforts must be imbued with a profound trust in men and their creative power. To achieve this, he must

be a partner of the students in his relations with them (Freire, 1972: 49). The theory and the practice of banking education serve that the more completely the majority adapt to the purposes which the dominant minority prescribe for them, the more easily the minority can continue to prescribe. Verbalistic lessons, reading requirements, the methods for evaluating 'knowledge', the distance between the teacher and the taught, the criteria for promotion: everything in this ready to wear approach serves to obviate thinking. The bank- clerk educator does not realize that there is no true security in his hypertrophied role that one must seek to live with others in solidarity. One cannot impose oneself, nor even merely co-exist with one's students solidarity requires true communication, and the concept by which such an educator is guided fears and proscribes communication. Yet, only through communication can human life hold meaning. The teacher's thinking is authenticated only by the authenticity of the student's thinking. The teacher cannot this for his students, nor can he impose his though on them. Authentic thinking, thinking that is concerned about reality, does not take place in ivory- tower isolation, but only in communication. If it is true that thought has meaning only when generated by action upon the world, the subordination of students to teachers becomes impossible (Freire, 1972: 50).

Moreover, Freire says that oppression- overwhelming control- is necrophilic; it is nourished by love of death, not life. The banking concept of education, which serves the interests of oppression, is also necrophilic. Based on a mechanistic, static, naturalistic, spetialized view of consciousness, it transforms students into receiving objects. It attempts to control thinking and action, leads people to adjust to the world, and inhibits their creative power (Freire, 1972: 50).

Education as the exercise of domination stimulates the credulity of students, with the ideological intent of indoctrinating them to adapt to the world of oppression. This accusation is not made in the naïve hope that the dominant elites will thereby simply abandon the practice. Its objective is to call the attention of true humanists to the fact that they cannot use the methods of banking education in the pursuit of liberation, as they would only negate that pursuit itself. Nor may a revolutionary society inherit these methods from an oppressor society. The revolutionary society which practices banking education is either misguided or mistrustful of people. In either event, it is threatened by the specter of reaction.

Liberation is praxis: the action and reflection of people upon their world in order to transform it. Those truly committed to the cause of liberation can accept neither the mechanistic concept of consciousness as an empty vessel to be filled, nor the use of banking methods of domination (propaganda, slogans- deposits) in the name of liberation.

The truly committed must adopt a concept of persons as conscious beings, and consciousness as consciousness directed toward the world. 'Problem – posing' education, responding to the essence of consciousness- intentionality- rejects and embodies communication (Freire, 1972: 52). Liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transferrals of information. It is a learning situation in which the cognizable object intermediates the cognitive actors- teacher on the one hand and students on the other. Accordingly, the practice of problem- posing education first of all demands a resolution of the teacher- student contradiction. Dialogical relations- indispensable to the capacity of cognitive actors to cooperate in perceiving the same cognizable object – are otherwise impossible (Freire, 1972: 53).

Furthermore, through dialogue, the teacher of-the-students and the students-of-the-teacher cease to exist and a new term emerges: teacher-student with students-teachers. The teacher is no longer merely the one who teaches, but one who is himself

taught in dialogue with the students, who in their turn while being taught also teach. In this way, the problem- posing educator constantly re-forms his reflections in the reflection of the students. The students, no longer docile listeners, are now critical co-investigators in dialogue with the teacher (Freire, 1972: 54).

According to Freire, only dialogue, which requires critical thinking, is also capable of generating critical thinking. Without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education. The important thing, from the point of view of libertarian education, if for people to come to feel like masters of their thinking by discussing the thinking and views of the world explicitly or implicitly manifest in their own suggestions and those of their comrades. Because this view of education starts with the conviction that it cannot present its own programme but must search for this programme dialogically with the people, it serves to introduce the pedagogy of the oppressed, in the development of which the oppressed, in the development of which the oppressed must participate (Freire, 1972).

Freire also spoke about the cultural synthesis. In cultural synthesis it is possible to resolve the contradiction between the world view of the leaders and that of the people, to the enrichment of both. Cultural synthesis does not deny the differences between the two views; indeed, it is based on these differences it does deny the invasion of one by the other, but affirms the undeniable support each gives to the other. Revolutionary leaders must avoid organizing themselves apart from the people; whatever contradiction to the people may occur fortuitously, due to certain historical conditions, must be solved- not augmented by the cultural invasion of an imposed relationship. Cultural synthesis is the only way (Freire, 1972: 149).

The solution lies in synthesis: the leaders must on the one hand identify with the people's demand for higher salaries, while on the other they must set the meaning of that very demand as a problem. By doing this, the leaders pose as a problem a real, concrete, historical situation of which the salary demand is one dimension. It will thereby become clear that salary demands alone cannot comprise a definitive solution. To achieve critical consciousness of the facts that is necessary to be the 'owner of one's own labour', that labour 'constitutes part of the human person', and that 'a human being can neither be sold nor can he sell himself', is to go a step beyond the deception of palliative solutions. It is to engage in authentic transformation of reality in order, by humanizing that reality, to humanize men.

In the antidialogical theory of action, cultural invasion serves the ends of manipulation, which in turns serves the ends of conquest, and conquest serves the ends of domination. Cultural synthesis serves the ends of organization; organization serves the ends of liberation. This work deals with a very obvious truth: just as the oppressor, in order to oppress, needs a theory of oppressive action, so the oppressed, in order to become free, also need a theory of action.

The oppressor elaborates his theory of action without the people, for he stands against them. Nor can the people- as long as they are crushed and oppressed, internalizing the image of the oppressor- constructs by themselves the theory of their liberation action. Only in the encounter of the people with the revolutionary leaders- in their communion, in their praxis, can this theory be built (Freire, 1972: 150).

Durkheim in Davies book said that social control and society's existence are joined in the necessity of imposing knowledge categories- both form and substance- upon individuals. Indeed, individuality and change are predicated upon commonality and normality. There can be no difference without similarity, but this does not entail 'subservience' to the cultural. The term itself builds upon a misunderstanding, an inadequacy. Any possibility of apprehending let alone transcending the 'real' depends

upon prior input of knowledge. Knowledge forms contain within themselves terms capable of expansion and realignment so as to provide for their own and mutual critique and change. Moreover, he said that it is the general fate of slaves that the form and content of their education shall be oriented towards faith, simplicity and practical accomplishment. According to Durkheim, no society as yet has dispensed with their control and that those that suggest that the contrary is instantly possible are merely advocating a switch to their control preferences (Davies, 1976: 98).

Davies in his book says that, "there is a complex agenda of questions and problems for research in connection with the school and social control. Perhaps what we most need to grasp is that so many of our problems of educating en masse are new that looking for good solutions from historical or other contemporary cultural practice is bound to prove depressing. Perhaps we currently assume all too readily that as well as at the level of the superficies of control, for example of time and space and physical order, educational systems are doomed to transmit knowledge itself differentially and exploitatively, either by type or recipient. I would contend that there is real but not inevitable foundation for the latter belief. It is drawn from the joint experience of pluralist societies not yet mature and human enough to regard differentiated truth as capable of feasible universal access and from the present prospect of the subjugation of difference in one- legitimate- belief systems. Neither have yet taken the prospect of human knowing to where it might go. Even if we believe that historically social control has rested either on the version of mass ignorance which gives to few a highly differentiated all and to the many little, or the one that gives to everyone the same commonly interpreted something, we know that yet else is possible, not just because it has been said but because it has the potential power of being in a universal interest. Knowledge is power because it is good and the good is not singular" (Davies, 1976: 175).

Finally, I would like to conclude this section with this comments about education:

"Education … has produced a vast population able to read but unable to distinguish what is worth reading" {G. M. Trevelyan (1876-1962) British historian}. (http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/eduquote.htm, 14/06/09).

"Education does not mean teaching people to know what they do not know; it means teaching them to behave as they do not behave" {John Ruskin (1819-1900) English critic}. (http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/eduquote.htm, 14/06/09).

2.4 Media

For better understanding the terms of media and social control, we first have to define the origin of 'Propaganda': **Definition of Propaganda**
Propaganda, simply put, is the manipulation of public opinion. It is generally carried out through media that is capable of reaching a large amount of people and effectively persuading them for or against a cause. The exact meaning of propaganda is constantly debated, however, and no specific definition is completely true. Some argue that any persuasive communication is propaganda, while others hold that propaganda specifically alters political opinions. However, it is doubtless that propaganda is material which is meant to persuade or change public opinion, and though it often

varies in form and technique it always serves the same purpose. Propaganda is communication for the purpose of persuasion.

Propaganda, although it has existed almost indefinitely, has grown immensely during the past few centuries. Although evidence of intentional propaganda can be traced back as far as ancient Greece, the advent of communication media on a larger scale has exponentially increased its usage. After the invention of the printing press, it became possible to quickly and easily produce posters and books. Prior to this development, however, the majority of propaganda was spread by word of mouth. The printing press enabled the propagandist to quickly produce mass amounts of posters with one intended effect, a form of propaganda much less risky and difficult than oral communication.

More recently, propaganda was again bolstered by the invention of the radio. The ability to communicate orally with large amounts of people in a very small amount of time also helped the development of propaganda. Also, the beginning of radio also saw the beginning of advertising as we know it today, which is another form of propaganda. Before radio, it was almost impossible to communicate directly with many people in such a short amount of time. Admittedly, direct communication through print was possible, but very few people actually read ads. Radio opened up a whole new world of advertising. The invention that has impacted propaganda the most, however, is the television. The ability to visually communicate over long distances rapidly increased both the amount and the effectiveness of propaganda. Advertising as well as political propaganda was rapidly accelerated for this new medium.

Also, in more recent years, the introduction of the Internet and long-distance communication as enabled further increases in propaganda. In an age where we are increasingly bombarded by propaganda from a variety of media, it is increasingly important to recognize and understand propaganda and its effects.

Although the word propaganda has a negative connotation, propaganda itself is not necessarily bad. Propaganda is an attempt to change opinions by persuasively presenting new ones. The propagandist attempts to alter the opinions of his subjects or viewers by convincing them of the validity of their own. In order of accomplish this, he or she uses a variety of methods and techniques. It is important to recognize these techniques and examine the purpose of the propaganda before making decisions based on it. The purpose of propaganda is to change opinions, but more importantly to influence your decisions. By understanding the purpose of the propaganda and the method being used, one can go a long way toward making effective independent decisions (http://library.thinkquest.org/C0111500/whatis.htm- 30/04/09). Government, corporate and mass media power is dependent upon mass media ability to manipulate the truth. Cable companies, television and radio stations, newspapers and magazines are corporate institutions founded with the intent of generating profits and/or manipulating public opinion with the hopes of generating future profits. Mass media, corporations and governments are amoral; without morals. They can not, by definition, as they are not living sentient beings. Rules or laws may be in place to define the boundaries of acts than can and cannot be committed by mass media; corporations and governments but these rules do not give a conscience to a non- living institution. In truth mass media is independent only in generating advertising money by selling the products of the corporations that employ with the corporate advertising money. Popular culture, as presented through mass media, works to control the population through ignorance as the truth is presented as fallacy and fallacy is presented as truth (http://www.unique-design.net/library/control.html- 30/04/09).

Herman and Chomsky talked about 'Propaganda Model'. From their point of view, among their other functions, the media serve, and propagandize on behalf of, the powerful societal interests that control and finance them. The representatives of these interests have important agendas and principles that they want to advance, and they are all well positioned to shape and constrain media policy. This is normally not accomplished by crude intervention, but by selection of right- thinking personnel and by the editors and working journalists internalization of priorities and definitions of news- worthiness that conform to the institution's policy. Structural factors are those such as ownership and control, dependence on other major funding sources (notably, advertisers), and mutual interests and relationships between the media and those who make the news and have the power to define it and explain what it means. The propaganda model also incorporates other closely related factors such as the ability to complain about the media's treatment of news (that is, produce "flak"), to provide "experts" to confirm the official slant on the news, and to fix the basic principles and ideologies that are taken for granted by media personnel and the elite, but are often resisted by the general population. From their view, the same underlying power sources that own the media and fund them advertisers, that serve as primary definers of the news, and that produce flak and proper- thinking experts, also play a key role in fixing basic principles and the dominant ideologies. They believe that what journalists do, what they see as newsworthy, and what they take for granted as premises of their work are frequently well explained by the incentives, pressures, and constraints incorporated into such a structural analysis. These structural factors that dominate media operations are not all-controlling and do not always produce simple and homogeneous results. It is well recognized, and may even be said to constitute a part of an institutional critique such as we present in this volume, that the various parts of media organizations have some limited autonomy, that individual and professional values influence media work, that policy is imperfectly enforced, and that media policy itself may allow some measure of dissent and reporting that calls into question the accepted viewpoint. These considerations all work to assure some dissent and coverage of inconvenient facts. The beauty of the system, however, is that such dissent and inconvenient information are kept within bounds and at the margins, so that while their presence shows that the system is not monolithic, they are not large enough to interfere unduly with the domination of the official agenda. It should also be noted that they are talking about media structure and performance, not the effects of the media on the public. Certainly, the media's adherence to an official agenda with little dissent is likely to influence public opinion in the desired direction, but this is a matter of degree, and where the public's interests diverge sharply from that of the elite, and where they have their own independent sources of information, the official line may be widely doubted. However that the propaganda model describes forces that shape what the media does, it does not imply that any propaganda emanating from the media is always effective (Herman & Chomsky, 1998).

Herman and Chomsky do not accept that freedom of expression must be defended in instrumental terms, by virtue of its contribution to some higher good; rather, it is a value in itself. But that apart, these ringing declarations express valid aspirations, and the beyond that, they surely express the self- image of the American media. Their concern in their book has been to inquire into the relation between the image and the reality. In contrast to the standard conception of the media as serving a 'societal purpose', but not that of enabling the public to assert meaningful control over the political process by providing them with the information needed for the intelligent discharge of political responsibilities. On the contrary, the propaganda model suggests

that the 'societal purpose' of the media is to insolate and defend the economic, social and political agenda of privileged groups that dominate the domestic society and the state. The media serve this purpose in many ways: through selections of topics, distribution of concerns, framing of issues, filtering of information, emphasis and tone, and by keeping debate within the bounds of acceptable premises. It is frequently asserted that the media were not always as independent, vigilant, and defiant of authority as they allegedly are today; rather, the experiences of the past generation are held to have taught the media to exercise 'the power to root about in the national life, exposing what they deem right for exposure', without regard to external pressures or the dictates of authority. The authors say that contrary to the usual image of an "adversary press" boldly attacking a pitiful executive giant, the media's lack of interest, investigative zeal, and basic news reporting on the accumulating illegalities of the executive branch have regularly permitted and even encouraged ever larger violations of law, whose ultimate exposure when elite interests were threatened is offered as a demonstration of media service "on behalf of the polity".

The media in the U.S. do not function in the manner of the propaganda system of a totalitarian state. Rather, they permit- indeed, encourage-spirited debate, criticism and dissent, as long as these remain faithfully within the system of presuppositions and principles that constitute an elite consensus , a system so powerful as to be internalized largely without awareness. Furthermore, the media provide neither facts nor analyses that would enabled the public to understand the issues or the bases of the government policies, so the public could not exert any meaningful influence on the decisions that are made. This is quite typical of the actual "societal purpose" of the media on matters that are a significance for established power; not "enabling the public to assert meaningful control over the political process", bur rather averting any such danger. In many cases, the public was managed and mobilized from above, by means of the media's highly selective messages and evasions. A media analyst W.Lance Bennet noted:

"The public is exposed to powerful persuasive messages from above and is unable to communicate meaningfully through the media in response to these messages… Leaders have usurped enormous amounts of political system by using the media to generate support, compliance, and just plain confusion among the public".

The mass media in the U.S. are effective and powerful ideological institutions that carry out a system- supportive propaganda function by reliance on market forces, internalized assumptions, and self- censorship, and without significant overt coercion. This propaganda system has become even more efficient in recent decades with the rise of the national television networks, greater mass-media concentration, right-wing pressures on public radio and television, and the growth in scope and sophistication of public relations and news management (Herman & Chomsky, 1998).

Noam Chomsky says that the role of the media in contemporary politics forces people to ask what kind of a world and what kind of a society people want to live in, and in particular in what sense of democracy do they want this to be a democratic society. He speaks about two different conceptions of democracy. One conception of democracy has it that democratic society is one in which the public has the means to participate in some meaningful way in the management of their own affairs and the means of information are open and free. An alternative conception of democracy is that the public must be barred from managing of their own affairs and the means of information must be kept narrowly and rigidly controlled.

Chomsky underlines that the United States pioneered the public relations industry. Its commitment was to 'control the public mind', as its leaders put it. They learned a lot from the successes of the Crell Commission and the successes in creating the Red Scare and its aftermath. The public relations industry underwent a huge expansion as that time. It succeeds for some time in creating almost total subordination of the public to business rule through the 1920s. This was so extreme that Congressional committees began to investigate it as we moved into the 1930s. That's where a lot of our information about it comes from. Public relations are a huge industry. They're spending by now something on the order of a billion dollars. All along its commitment was to controlling the public mind (Chomsky, 2002)

News content comes from a number of sources: TV, radio, newspapers, magazines, and friends. What people know and believe they know about the world is related to the nature and extent of media sources with which they are involved. It is this connection that has given rise to the claim that the media play a role in 'agenda setting' for its various audiences, including politicians, officials, scholars, and other professionals and lay persons as well. According to Altheide D., the relationships are quite complex: the officials may 'react' to news coverage of some event on the basis of what impact they believe the message will have on their constituents and significant others. In this sense, politicians and officials do a lot of anticipating about media effects, make a number of presumptions, and in the process often contribute to the vary effects they feared in the first place. All of this is about media power, albeit in an indirect sort of way, but there are some other dimensions of the problems to be considered (Altheide, 1985).

The mass media of communication are organized in such a way that a small number of people produce messages that are then broadcast via technology to a large number of people. Based on the assumption that 'knowledge is power', along with its correlate, 'people who control information as knowledge can exercise power', numerous studies have focused on: 1) the way news messages are produced and constructed; 2) the political, economic, and ideological factors that directly or indirectly shape information; 3) the nature and content of the various messages; 4) the ownership and control of the technology and related dimensions of physical process for reception and broadcast of messages; 5) the impact and the consequences of one or more of the above on behaviour, policy politics, and change (Altheide, 1985).

Despite the apparent diversity of these topics, two assumptions join them together: 1) the most important thing about news reports is its content; and 2) news content is a feature of external influences on the new process; e.g., politics, ideology, and in some instances, the bureaucratic process of producing the news .the upshot is that news messages are biased, but presumably could be less biased if the news process changed to free itself of external influences on the content (Altheide, 1985-53).

As far as an audience is concerned, information is derived from a medium at particular times and places. If the radio is the source, for example, competent listeners know that certain music situations take regular news breaks that may last from thirty seconds to five minutes. If a report is missed, it can be caught the next hour. Indeed, the rotating feature of radio reporting on most stations- not to mention the 'all news' stations- essentially insures against a report being missed. Not surprisingly, it is radio that provides the most instantaneous information often informing the majority of a population of some event within a matter of ours (Altheide, 1985).

TV news is less frequent than radio reports, although the frequency has markedly increased during the last decade in the United States. Regular network morning news and talk shows, noon briefs, evening newscasts ranging from thirty

minutes to two hours, and late night news summaries provide numerous opportunities for news reports to be received. When the rapidly expanding service of news sources available on cable is also considered, it is clear that TV news time pervades the day (Altheide, 1985).

Although, the time for news is not exactly stringent for hearers or viewers, there are nevertheless some practical limitations. Whether is due to habit, convenience, or a mood of receptiveness, most TV viewers continue to be found around the dinner hour. That is, TV news viewing occurs in the home and, more specifically, in the living room or family room (also known to many people as 'TV room'). Atheide speaks about the context in which messages are received in particular and the general situations and scenarios within which people actually make use of information media do have some rather important considerations for the format used in producing these messages (Altheide, 1985).

A major question seldom addressed in the plethora of research that has been conducted on media messages, and especially TV news, is what must be done to package a message in order to make it appropriate for a medium and the temporal and spatial contexts in which audience members receive information. Interestingly enough, the concern of the audience- including trying to just get a lot of them to watch- is a key feature of the overall news process; if the news workers throughout the world were not concerned whether or not anyone watched, the way news reports are produced would probably be much different, albeit difficult to imagine. Now, it is certainly true that news producers throughout the world who want their audiences to 'watch and listen' may be motivated by different reasons; e.g., to make money, to exert political power and control, to save the world. Nevertheless, the TV- news- communication- process is like all communications processes in one very important regard: it is interested in having an audience (Altheide, 1985).

Format is important for the information order because of the necessity of providing an interactional interface or connection between at least four elements: 1) the event or topic that is presented; 2) the scheduling and bureaucratic, or practical, considerations of the new workers; 3) the technology of information collection, processing, editing and presentation; and 4) the audience members temporal and spatial context for receiving the information. The author does not mean that these are the only features that influence the nature of news context and presentation, but he wants to emphasize the relevance of these four considerations for format: the format of any medium is designed, and emerges, to join a message that can be scheduled for coverage and presentation via a medium (commonly electronic) to an expectantly familiar audience. In brief, then, format is the constructive spatial and temporal glue that fits the temporal and spatial character of a source of message. e.g., an event to the temporal and spatial situation of an audience (Seeger, 1983).

The most prevalent version of the relevance of format is media hegemony. Hegemony initially articulated by Antonio Gramsci (1971) and refers to the way in which a "certain way of life and though is dominant, in which one concept of reality is diffused throughout public society in all its institutions and private manifestations". According to critical theorists, the specific connections between the mass media and the economic structures responsible for the hegemonic order to differ from one society to another, but in general they include: 1) corporate monopoly ownership and control; and 2) governmental regulation and licensing largely influenced by the perspectives, interest, and personnel who own and operate the major media (Tuchman, 1978). More specifically, the economic elite who serve as owners and on boards of directors are claimed to share the interests and perspectives of the politically powerful individuals

who make decisions that not only affect, for example, the broadcast industry, but all segments of the economic order (Altheide, 1985).

According to Altheide, a basic awareness and understanding of media logic is central to its competent use, but it also provides a common ground for media to join two situations and to render one unique situation much like another. Not only do media transmit information, but they also define and limit what will be communicated about those situations. It is the way a situation is made to adjust to the media requirements of time and space that a medium has its major impact. The adjustment of one activity to the requirements of another activity- or technology- constitutes change. If a large number of adjustments occur we can speak of social change. What is significant about the modern age is that the mass media are a major form that mediates between situations and activities. Thus, the temporal and spatial boundaries of a number of activities are being influenced by the mass media. In this sense, the members of contemporary society are media sophisticates; they understand the essential features of, say, TV as a medium, they know how to use it, and they make the appropriate assumptions that allow TV to mediate and present an event in the world to the viewer in his or her living room. In short, most individuals in industrialized societies and an increasing number throughout the rest of the world are media- wise. The media logic that essentially molds the temporal and spatial character of events to its own format and technological requirements is now a taken for granted feature of everyday life. This is why it is so profound, and has had such an impact on other social forms (Altheide, 1985- 35).

Media competence is one of the most basic features of social life. It cuts across all class, religious and radical boundaries. Poor and reach people know how to use a telephone, turn on and tune the radios, TV sets and increasingly, video games, video recorders and microcomputers. People understand the skill and play involved with media. Access to these various media does vary, but not nearly as much as access to and use of literary classics, libraries and even newspapers. However, the significant point is not just that these media are widespread, but, rather that the knowledge and skill at using these media have come to be an essential part of age-related competence in particular and active societal participation in general. This change has profound implications for the interaction order, the information order, the personal order, and the international order (Altheide, 1985).

Media are differentially available in a society because cultural understandings define, select, and therefore limit media use. Media come to be purposive over time, although through acts of power, significant actors can attempt to restrict media availability to selected membership groups. People are most familiar with this situation with the print and electronic media in which powerful groups endeavor to promote their own ideological and experiential views and interests by restricting access to others. However, the same general point about limited accessibility holds for all media, but in varying degrees and with varying consequences. Nevertheless, the perception of media dominance in a society will lead to the focus on restricting some media more than others. This suggests that there is grave concern in any social quarter about the wrong people transferring meaning from one situation to another, thereby making some invisible points quite visible. This raises the issue of perspective and joins it to the nature of power in a society. The mass media are changing people's lives because they can bring an image of one moment into another. This is particularly crucial when electronic media rapidly link one place with another; we, in our living rooms, see people in their living rooms, on battlefields, on the moon, and at work. These images make little sense unless we can locate them within our own stock of knowledge and

taken for granted routines. And because a key feature of our ability to internet events is our own position in time and place, we will incorporate this event- occurring in its own time, place, and manner- within our prospective. Thus, the event we are experiencing is essentially interpreted as not fundamentally different, after all, but simply a different version of an already familiar order (Altheide, 1985).

The mass media serve resources and agents of social interaction. Horton and Wohl in Altheide have sown how audience members can engage in 'parasocial interaction' with media persons. However, in the private context in which parasocial interaction usually occurs, individual selves are involved in the action but are not necessarily being reflected on, molded, and presented for legitimation. In this sense, the media are being used as resources for social interaction, but not self- awareness. Self- awareness is an issue when individuals are presented to an audience via the mass media. Mass media, as distinctively public phenomena, have implications for and can directly affect individuals by adding a dimension of anticipation, focus, and reflection to their conception of self. In ordinary day to day affairs most people seldom reflect on their self because such understandings are grounded in routines that would have to be either breached or significantly altered for a shift of attention to these taken for granted features of social life. But when people are presented with someone's interpretation and presentation of who they are, what they stand for, or an assertion of some characterological- and status- related statement of self, then self becomes potentially problematic. The raising of self to consciousness is one consequence of media presentations. Although aspects of the self remain private and seldom reflected on, the growth of the mass media have added a public arena of recognition of and socialization for significant performances, styles, and reactions. Media logic is significant for the experience of public life because the role the media play in the process, including the use of formats and visual emphasis, is seldom acknowledged by media subjects and media workers. Therefore, the viewing, hearing, and reading audiences cannot meaningfully discount or hold in abeyance the 'real life' images and scenarios they behold. The issue here is not whether or not people 'believe' everything they see, here, or read, but, rather, how familiar they become with the individuals and scenarios presented (Altheide, 1985).

Defending the media against the charge that they have become too independent and too powerful for the public good, Anthony Lewis of the New York Times writes that 'the press is protected not for its own sake but to enable a free political system to operate. In the end, the concern is not for the reporter or the editor but for the citizen-critic of government'. What is at stake when we speak about freedom of the press 'is the freedom to perform a function on behalf of the polity'. Lewis cites Supreme Court Justice Powell, who observed: 'no individual can obtain for himself the information needed for the intelligent discharge of his political responsibilities… By enabling the public to assert meaningful control over the political process, the press performs a crucial function in effecting the societal purpose of the First Amendment (Herman & Chomsky, 1998).

Finally, Barbara Trent has spent most of the last 14 years using video and film as a means of community organizing and as a tool for social change. From her point of view, there is a terrific need to support independent media and independent analysis and news reporting and people to continue working with persons from all over the world. She thinks that independent media can change people' s minds and ways of thinking, so people would be less influenced from media and they react (Jameson & Masao, 1998).

2.5 Health and Social Services

Etzioni (1969) said that organizations could be analyzed in terms of their control methods. Social work is carried out in organizations which are publicly sponsored, controlled and financed (Brown 1975). The discretion which social workers exercise has been delegated to them and their positions are therefore exposed to public criticism. The social worker is in the position of being accountable and is in a structure of authority – a hierarchy, which may be felt to be simply a form of bureaucratic control. An alternative view is that the hierarchy may be seen as one through which authority and discretion are delegated and accountability is concentrated. In itself the existence of a hierarchy conveys little of the style of management of an agency. Social worker in a Social Service Department is not individually and directly accountable to his employers for his work with particular clients. His immediate accountability is to his team leader. They are both part of a system which has the problem of maintaining appropriate balances between control as an instrument of accountability and the delegation of authority as an instrument of an individual social worker's autonomy in a professional capacity.

Among many factors affecting organizational control is the organizational environment itself. If an organization is to employ coercive measures it will need tangible support from other social groups. In framing legislation, for example, the state usually specifies the limits of coercive power it delegates to psychiatric hospitals or local authorities. The conditions for exercising coercive power are spelled out. The environmental conditions affecting an organization's normative power are not so clear, and little seems to be known about the effect of the organizational environment on control. First, it should be noted that there are marked differences between organizations in the pervasiveness of the norms which set standards of performance. For example hospitals are very pervasive in that the try to control most of the activities which go on in them. They make greater efforts to maintain control and highly pervasive organizations (some schools for example) may set norms for activities carried on outside organization. A factor related to pervasiveness is an an organization's scope, which is determined by the number of activities carried out jointly by its members. High scope enhances normative control because it separates participants from social groups other than the organization. In modern societies people tend to move constantly among different social groups. Relatively high separation and the low scope of many groups allows for the management of tension: for example, tension may be reduced by a separation of work and leisure groupings. Thus sometimes you hear social workers saying that they 'try not to (or do not) take people's problems home with them'.

The kinds of control used in organizations depend on the nature of each kind of organization and how leadership is distributed within it. It is then necessary to analyze the kind of power used and the degree of commitment of members of the organization (Etzioni 1964). In front line organizations the dilemma of those who occupy control positions is that they are responsible for making policy and maintaining standards of performance for the organization as a whole, while occupying positions from which this responsibility can least effectively be exercised (Smith 1965). The statistical returns and written records of organizations constitute a form of bureaucratic control. They are thought to increase speed of work and facilitate relations between supervisors and subordinates. But they may suffer from the disadvantage that they do not indicate changes in service to clients. The problem of demonstrating social work performance

is not necessarily resolved by meeting bureaucratic norms. It is possible that the managerial and developmental aspects of supervision in social agencies can be confused or abused. Supervision is often seen as an educational process by which a social worker or trainee is helped to learn by reviewing his work with the supervisor. But this could be a subtle form of manipulation or control used by senior social workers who do not want to be seen as using authority directly. Thus Blau and Scott (1963) said that workers whose judgment frequently differed from their supervisor's might be regarded as being 'unable to accept supervision.'

Using this form of control a senior social worker (the supervisor) may assume that a junior social worker's non-conformity to agency procedures is due to unconscious motives. At first sight this seems to be a non-bureaucratic form of control but it can be used to enforce agency requirements. Conflict may be avoided by the professional's adaptation to tasks which originate in the bureaucracy. For example, such task may be redefined in terms of professional practice. Or organizational rules which appear harmful to clients may be placed in theoretical context in which they are justified in terms of client welfare. The practice of questioning the worker's unconscious motives tends to elevate the superior into an omniscient power. Workers find that they cannot be right in any disagreement because their ideas are not accepted at their face value but dismissed as rationalizations to conceal unconscious resistance. However, typically in the bureaucratic setting, staff supervision has normally involved control and the direct use of authority. It has involved the checking of rules and laid down procedures. Strict authoritarian supervision has tended to decrease workers' job satisfaction and to foster a narrow concern with clients' eligibility for services and reluctance to exercise initiative in interpreting needs. Such rigid authoritarianism tends to cause resentment among workers. The quality usually most appreciated in supervisors seems to be the ability to study a client and his situation in a calm way so as to encourage the worker to be constructive and able to learn from his experience (Peter R. Day 1981).

Another issue is the way that social workers use their power and how they treat their clients. French and Raven have made a description of the power structure within personal relationships that can be applied to social work. Reward Power: The social worker has this power over the client and can use it to reward behaviour he or she wishes to encourage. The use of certain allowances for clients, offers of holidays and intermediate treatment activities could all be construed as reward power. Coercive Power: The client is punished if he or she does not behave in the required way. This is the converse of reward power. It is illustrated by allowing attendance center orders to be used for breach of a supervision order. Legitimate Power: This exists when the controlled person has an internalized system of attitudes or beliefs which includes recognizing the right of the controller to control. A number of clients will accept that the social worker may legitimately order their lives. Other professionals apparently have far greater legitimate power, for example doctors in giving orders about diet. Referent Power: Operates when the controlled person identifies closely with the controller and this is seen as the basis of much of social work. Expert Power: The controlled person accepts the greater knowledge of the controller and consequently accepts his or her control. Although closely connected with legitimate power it is different. For example a client may accept a social worker's advice on how to claim benefits because of the social worker's greater knowledge rather than because the client sees the social worker's power as legitimate (French & Raven 1959).

As a treatment method the use of control and direction has frequently been disapproved of by the helping professions. This may be because of associations

(assumed or realistic) with damage suffered by clients or helpers. This has tended to divert the attention of social workers from the personal and social controls operating in the process of treatment. There has also been a tendency to see treatment and control measures as opposed. The possible usefulness of controls for some clients may have gone unrecognized as a result. It has been argued that to protect people's dignity social casework should deal only with the voluntary client and social workers still sometimes dislike the idea that they are to produce social competence in clients for the good of society. But whenever anyone – parent, teacher, or social worker – is involved in setting limits on behaviour according to social norms, that person is involved in social control. Control is implicit in such goals as strengthening family life, improving interpersonal relationships and building community life. Verbs such as 'better,' 'relieve,' 'develop,' 'assist,' 'help,' and 'encourage,' are repeatedly used in social reports. The social agency is an institution which is evaluative and judgmental.

Procedures of direct influence include the various ways in which the caseworker tries to promote a specific kind of behaviour on the client's part such as consulting a doctor, or managing his money in a certain way. There are many situations in which techniques of influence are thought for himself or strong cultural influences upon his expectations of the worker may lead him to interpret refusal to give advice as indicating incompetence or lack of concern. The very anxious person also sometimes needs direction. When a strenghtening of a client's control of his impulses is a casework aim direct influence often involves urging the client to control his behaviour better. Conversely, when a client demonstrates too much control or rigidity in his behaviour the social worker's influence may help him to relax the controls. It is often difficult to disentangle these procedures of influence but the following distinctions can be made. Advice can be given in the form of information, for example about services or resources available. Advice can be given about courses of action. It needs to be remembered that requests for other kinds of help, such as giving an opinion about someone's actual or proposed behaviour. Suggestions or orders can be made on the social worker's initiative. When social workers help clients to find jobs, apply for financial aid, control their impulses, or manage their use of alcohol or other drugs they are engaging in the process of social control. The aim of all these activities is to help clients to get along better in society, that is by conforming to social norms rather than by deviating from them (Peter R. Day 1981: 45-46).

Another form of social control is the health services. The involvement of medicine in the management of society is new. It did not appear full-blown one day in the mid-twentieth century. As Sigerist has aptly claimed, medicine at base was always not only a social science but an occupation whose very practice was inextricably interwoven into society. This interdependence is perhaps best seen in two branches of medicine which have had a built-in social emphasis from the very start–psychiatry and public health/preventive medicine. Public health was always committed to changing social aspects of life–from sanitary to housing to working conditions– and often used the arm of the state (i.e. through laws and legal power) to gain its ends (e.g. quarantines, vaccinations). Psychiatry's involvement in society is a bit more difficult to trace, but talking the histories of psychiatry as data, then one notes the almost universal reference to one of the early pioneers, a physician named Johan Weyer. His , and thus psychiatry's involvement in social problems lay in the objection that witches ought not be burned; for they were not possessed by the devil, but rather bedeviled by their problems–namely they were insane. From its early concern with the issue of insanity as a defence in criminal proceedings, psychiatry has grown to become the most dominant rehabilitative perspective in dealing with society's 'legal' deviants.

Psychiatry, like public health, has also used the legal powers of the state in the accomplishment of its goals (i.e. the cure of the patient) through the legal proceedings of involuntary commitment and its concomitant removal of certain rights and privileges.

This is not to say, however, that the rest of medicine has been 'socially' uninvolved. For a rereading of history makes it seems a matter of degree. Medicine has long had both a 'de jure' and a 'de facto' relation to institutions of social control. The 'de jure' relationship is seen in the idea of reportable diseases, wherein, if certain phenomena occur in his practice, the physician is required to report them to the appropriate authorities. While this seems somewhat straightforward and even functional where certain highly contagious diseases are concerned, it is less clear where the possible spread of infection is not the primary issue (e.g. with gunshot wounds, attempted suicide, drug use and what is now called child abuse). The 'de facto' relation to social control can be argued through a brief look at disruptions of the last two or three American Medical Association Conventions. For there the American Medical Association members–and really all ancillary health professions–were accused of practicing social control (the term used by the accusers was genocide) in first, whom they have treated–a more subtle form of discrimination in that, with limited resources, by focusing on some disease others are neglected. Here the accusation was that medicine has focused on the diseases of the rich and the established–cancer, heart disease, stroke–and ignored the diseases of the poor, such as malnutrition and still high infant mortality. C.S. Lewis warned us more than a quarter of a century ago that "man's power over Nature is really the power of some men over other men, with Nature as their instrument" (C.S. Lewis 1978). The same could be said regarding man's power over health and illness, for the labels health and illness are remarkable 'depoliticizers' of an issue. By locating the source and the treatment of problems in an individual, other levels of intervention are effectively closed. By the very acceptance of a specific behaviour as an 'illness' and the definition of illness as an undesirable state, the issue becomes not whether to deal with a particular problem, but who and when (Irving Kenneth Zola 1972).

Peter Conrad has also told us that there are a number of types of medical control of deviance. The most common forms of medical social control include medicalizing deviant behavior – i.e. defining the behavior as an illness or a symptom of an illness or underlying disease – and subsequent direct medical intervention. This medical social control takes three general forms medical technology, medical collaboration and medical ideology.

The growth of specialized and technological medicine and the concomitant development of medical technology has produced an armamentarium of medical controls. Psychotechnologies, which include various forms of medical and behavioral technologies, are the most common types of medical control of deviance. Since the emergence of phenothiazine medications in the early 1950s for the treatment and control of mental disorder, there has been a virtual explosion in the development and use of psychoactive medications that control behavioral deviance: tranquilizers like Librium and Valium for anxiety, nervousness and general malaise: stimulant medications for hyperactive children: amphetamines for overeating and obesity; Antabuse for alcoholism: Methadone for heroin and many others. These pharmaceutical discoveries, aggressively promoted by a highly profitable and powerful drug industry, often become the treatment of choice for deviant behavior. They are easily administered, under professional medical control, quite potent in their effects (i.e.. controlling, modifying and even eliminating behavior), and are generally less

expensive than other treatments and controls (e.g. hospitalization, altering environments, long-term psychotherapy).

Psychosurgery, surgical procedures meant to correct certain 'brain dysfunctions' alleged to cause deviant behavior, was developed first in the early 1930s as prefrontal lobotomy as a treatment for mental illness. Early forms of psychosurgery fell into disrepute in the early 1950s because the 'side effects' (general passivity, difficulty with abstract thinking) were deemed too undesirable and many patients remained institutionalized (and besides, new psychoactive medications were becoming available to control the mentally ill). During this period, however, approximately 40.000 to 50.000 such operations were performed in the United States. In the late 1960s a new technologically more sophisticated variant of psycho-surgery (including laser technology and brain implants) emerged and was heralded by some as a treatment of uncontrollable violent outbursts. While psychosurgery for violence has been criticized from both within the medical profession and without and relatively few operations have actually been performed. In 1976 a blue-ribbon national commission reporting to the US Department of Health, Education and Welfare endorsed the use of psychosurgery as having 'potential merit' and judged its risks 'not excessive'. This may encourage an increased utilization of this form of medical control.

Behavior modification, a psychotechnology based on B.F. Skinner and other behaviorist learning theories, has been adopted by some medical professionals as a treatment modality. A variety of types and variations of behavior modification exist (token economies, positive reinforcement schedules, aversive conditioning, operant conditioning, etc.). While they are not medical technologies per se, these have been used by physicians for the treatment of mental illness, mental retardation, homosexuality, violence, hyperactive children, autism, phobias, alcoholism, drug addiction and other disorders. An irony of the medical model (that behavior is a symptom of illness) and adopts an environmental, albeit still individual, solution to the problem. This has not, however, hindered its adoption by medical professionals, perhaps because physicians frequently have been only able to treat 'symptoms' rather than causes, anyway.

Human genetics is one of the most exciting and rapidly expanding areas of medical knowledge. Genetic screening and genetic counseling are becoming more commonplace. Genetic causes are proposed for such a variety of human problems as alcoholism, hyperactivity, learning disabilities, schizophrenia, mania-depressive psychosis, homosexuality and medical retardation. At this point in time, apart from specific genetic disorders such as pheylketonuria (PKU) and certain forms of retardation, genetic explanations tend to be general theories, with only minimal (if any) empirical support and are not the level at which medical intervention occurs. The most well published genetic theory of deviant behavior is that an XYY chromosome arrangement is a determinant factor in 'criminal tendencies'. While this XYY research has been severely questioned the controversy surrounding it may be a harbinger of things to come. Genetic anomalies may be discovered to have a correlation with deviant behavior and may become a causal explanation for this behavior. Medical control, in the form of genetic counseling, may discourage parents from having offspring with a high risk of genetic impairment. Clearly, the potentials for medical control go far beyond present use; one could imagine the possibility of licensing selected parents (with proper genes) to have children and further manipulating gene arrangements to produce or eliminate certain traits.

Medicine acts only as an independent agent of social control (as above) but frequently medical collaboration with other authorities serves social control functions.

Such collaboration includes roles as information provider, gatekeeper, institutional agent, and technician. These interdependent medical control functions highlight the interwoven position of medicine in the fabric of society. Historically, medical personnel have reported information on gunshot wounds and venereal disease to state authorities. More recently, these have been extended to reporting 'child abuse' to child welfare or law enforcement agencies.

The medical profession's status as official designator of the 'sick role', which imbues the physician with authority to define particular kinds of deviance as illness and exempt the patient from certain role obligations, is a general gatekeeping and social control task. In some instances the physician functions as a specific gatekeeper for special exemptions from conventional norms: here the exemptions are authorized due illness, disease or disability. The classic example is the so-called 'insanity defense' in capital crime cases. Other more commonplace example include: medical deferment from the draft or a medical discharge from the military; requiring doctors notes to legitimize missing an examination or excessive absences in school and before abortion was legalized, obtaining two psychiatrists letters testifying to the therapeutic necessity of the abortion. Halleck has termed this 'the power of medical excuse'. In a slightly different vein, but still forms of gatekeeping and medical excuse, are medical examinations for disability of workman's compensation benefits. Medical reports required for insurance coverage and employment, or medical certification of an epileptic as seizure-free to obtain a driver's license, are also gatekeeping activities.

Physicians in total institutions have one or two roles. In some institutions, such as schools for the retarded or mental hospitals, they are usually the administrative authority: in others, such as military or prisons, they are employees of the administration. In total institutions, medicine's roles, as an agent of social control, for the institution is more apparent. In both the military and prisons, physicians have the power to confer the sick role and to offer medical excuse for deviance. For example, medical discharges and sick call are available designations for deviant behavior. As physicians are in the hire of and paid by the institution, it is difficult for them to be fully an agent of the patient, engendering built-in role strains. An extreme example is in wartime conflict when the physician's mandate is to return the soldier to combat duty as soon as possible. Under some circumstances, physicians act as direct agents of control by prescribing medications to control unruly or disorderly inmates or to help a 'neurotic' adjust to the conditions of total institution. In such cases, 'captive professionals' are more likely to become the agent of the institution than the agent of the individual patient.

Under rather rare circumstances, physicians may become 'mere technicians', applying the sanctions of another authority who hires their medical skills. An extreme, although more complex, example would be the behavior of the experimental and death physicians in Nazi Germany. A more mundane example is physicians who performed court ordered sterilizations. Perhaps one could imagine sometime in the future, if the death penalty becomes commonplace again, physicians administering drugs as the 'humanitarian' and painless executioner.

Medical ideology is a type of social control that involves defining a behavior or condition as an illness accrued by conceptualizing it in medical terms. It includes adopting medical or quasi-medical imagery or vocabulary in conceptualizing and treating the problem. Medical ideology uses medical authority by way of language. The latent functions of medical ideology may benefit the individual or the dominant interests in society or both, but are quite separate from any organic basis for illness or any available treatment. Waitzkin and Waterman call one latent function of

medicalization 'secondary gain', arguing that assumption of the sick role can fulfill personality and individual needs (e.g. gaining nurturance or attention) or legitimize personal failure. One of the most important functions of the disease model of alcoholism and to a lesser extend drug addiction is the secondary gain of removing blame from, and constructing a shield against condemnation of individuals for their deviant behavior. Alcoholics Anonymous, a non-medical quasi-religious self-help organization, adopted a variant of the medical model of alcoholism quite independently from the medical profession. One suspects the secondary gain serves their purposes well.

Disease designations can support social interests and institutions. A poignant example is prominent New Orleans physician S.W. Cartwright's antebellum conceptualization of the disease drapetomania, a condition that only affected slaves. Its major symptom was running away from their masters. Medical conceptions and controls often support dominant social values and morality: the 19th-century Victorian conceptualization of the illness of and addiction to masturbation and the medical treatments developed to control this disease make chilling reading in the 1970s. The recent Soviet labeling of political dissidents as mentally ill is a further example of the manipulation of illness designations to support dominant political and social institutions. These examples highlight the socio-political nature of illness designations in general.

In actual operation, the types of medical social control described above do not necessarily exist as discrete entities, but are found in combination with one another. For example, court-ordered sterilization or medical prescribing of drugs to unruly nursing home patients combines both technological and collaborative aspects of medical control; legitimating disability status both ideological and collaborative: and treating Soviet dissidents with drugs for their mental illness combines all three aspects of medical social control. We treat them as analytically separate to explicate and clarify the various faces of medical social control (Peter Conrad 1979).

2.6 Government

In his classic novel, 1984, George Orwell described a totalitarian society in which the government, referred to as the Party, had almost total control over the people. The supreme ruler of the Party was Big Brother. Posters announced that "Big Brother is Watching You". Telescreens droned endlessly with brainwashing propaganda about wondrous government programs. Coins, stamps, books, films, and banners proclaimed the three slogans of the Party: War is Peace, Freedom is Slavery, Ignorance is Strength. Police Patrol helicopters darted among the roofs of the buildings, allowing police to snoop in people's windows. As insidious as the Police Patrol was, the government agents most feared were the Thought Police. Telescreens not only transmitted in the homes governmental policies, they also transmitted back to the Thought Police both sounds and pictures from inside the homes. Distinctions between people were reduced through referring to them as "Comrade" rather than as "Mr." or "Mrs.". People were taught to hate their enemies through thought-control from the telescreens that drove the people into frenzied displays of rage and hate. Neighbors were enlisted by the Thought Police to spy on each other to root out unorthodoxy from society. People lived by rigid schedules dictated by the Thought

Police. Loud alarms were transmitted from the telescreens to announce when people should be doing the tasks that were specified by the Party, such as their daily exercises. We will not tell if we are near or far from the world that George Orwell imagined but we will try to show the government control nowadays.

Government has many forces to protect the interests of dominant groups; it has military, police, education, media and the law.

According to E. Kamenka & Alice Erh-Soon Tay the University of Chicago Law School has made an analysis about the economic perspective of law, putting the law in the service of economic man. But its central message is that law is a form of social control, a way of achieving social effects rather than proclaiming a morality and that that achieving of social effects should be subjected to cost-benefit analysis. Social insurance may simply be cheaper than a system of litigation to determine fault; frustration in contract should be looked in terms of business assumption of risk; the task of law is simply to spread loss in the most acceptable way or to create economic disincentives in the pursuit of market rationality. Law in short, is a form of economic management, allegedly superior in this refurbished form to the traditional principles just as aversion therapy is allegedly superior to sermonizing or costly forms of imprisonment. And because nowadays only government creates law you can do the connection by yourselves for how he controls the society(E. Kamenka & Alice Erh-Soon Tay, 1980).

Another area that government controls is the education. A song which was Top of the Pops in 1979 gave expression to the view of social control as a sinister and dirty word for a wholly unacceptable aspect of education as an instrument of public policy. 'We don't need no education' (although grammatically an affirmation of establishment or right-wing ideology the lyric was plainly intended to point to its opposite) continue 'we don't need no thought control' and 'teacher, leave them kids alone'. The film accompanying the song was rich in imagery, large hammers descending on groups of children and a high brick wall encircling them as the lyric continued. The most powerful sequences though were shots of the school children who were singing the doleful words to an appropriately menacing tune. It was a particularly interesting example of a protest song about the manipulation of school children – and it aimed to manipulate children. It thus raised ethical questions about influence and control. Paul Meredith in his book 'Government, Schools and the Law', has show as that in the recent years education has become the scene of some of the government's most radical reforms. The principles of the freedom of choice, accountability and 'market forces' all came into play a role in education. He continues telling that education has become a central instrument of political and social reform and that government using it as a vehicle for the application of a range of principles which lie at the heart of the government's political philosophy. Among the most important of these principles are the enhancement of individualism and freedom of choice, seen particularly in measures to secure greater parental choice of school, though this often operates at the expense of the collective interest of the community as a whole. A second principle is that of accountability on the part of the providers of education to their 'consumers', represented in this context chiefly by parents, seen partly through increasing parental representation on school governing bodies and an enhancement of their powers, but perhaps more significantly through the application of a further principle central to government philosophy, namely the subjection of schools as far as practicable to competitive markets forces. This is achieved through the linking of more effective parental choice of school with the funding of individual schools on the basis of a formula which treats the number of registered pupils as the predominant factor. Again,

this may be beneficial to individual parents or individual institutions, but be highly detrimental to the collective community interest. Education has also been used as a vehicle for the implementation of policies seeking to reverse what the government perceives as a decline in moral standards, encouraging more traditional family orientated values, seen in the inclusion of certain important provisions in legislation concerning the school curriculum. And very importantly, the government has used education along with several other important areas of governmental activity as a vehicle for achieving a fundamental shift in the balance of power between central and local government, seen in the erosion of LEAs' responsibilities over the management of schools, in the creation of new categories of school outside LEA control and most graphically, in the massive centralization of power effected by the centralized prescription of curricular content under the national curriculum (Paul Meredith, 1992)

It is platitude that government obtains its justification from its capacity to keep order. There is a lack of capacity for agreement and cooperation in modern society (and this becomes clearer the more developed society is). This requires the maintenance of institutions which will keep the peace between different interests and provide for sharing of resources. Government is also the means whereby interests compete for the satisfaction of their demands and is the source of recognition of their diversity: this is a further justification for its indispensability. Fortes and Evans-Pritchard (1940) in defying the study of political organization wrote that "we have to deal with maintenance or establishment of social order, within a territorial framework, by the organized exercise of coercive authority through the use or the possibility of the use, of physical force." Their definition thus comprehends the extreme sanction of coercive authority and its role in social order. From the point of view of external observation a society can be seen to consist of a framework of associations, groups and institutions. Here the emphasis is on society as essentially a regulated (or moral) order. Underlying this are the values and sanctions which are simultaneously (a) the core of regulations in the framework of social institutions itself and (b) the core of regulation in the experience and behaviour of individuals. These values and sanctions are easily seen as parts of the pattern of social control. But this is not to say that social order and society are entirely synonymous. Political dissent is said to be tolerated in Britain but a strong argument can be made out for regarding tolerance as very unstable. The open discussion of dissident views is tolerated while the dominant groups in society feel that their material interests are secure and while they feel that these views carry little weight. But when established norms are seriously threatened freedom of expression is quickly sacrificed to the demands of order (Arblaster 1974:24).

As well as being aided by the agencies of force control in society is maintained through the production of ideas which embody and project the social structure. This aspect of legitimation is referred to as ideology. The term ideology has been used in a variety of ways by social scientists and has been given a number of meanings: clarification is difficult. Zijderweld (1974:143) wrote: "Emotions are not kept under rational control exclusively. They may also rationalise themselves into symbolic systems. Rationalised emotions are usually called ideologies. An ideology is a rational defence of certain interests that are based on emotionally and irrationally adhered to positions. Asked for his logical rationale the ideologist, pressed hard enough, can only point at some emotionally held 'convictions', 'beliefs' or 'dreams.' This point is quite important, since ideologies are often institutionally disguised, functioning as semi-rational but fundamentally irrational legitimations of the actions undertaken by certain interest groups. Institutions are … models of rationality, but they often hide an ideological and thus irrational content. For that reason, an age of institutional crisis in

which man turns inward to his irrational subjectivity has to be an age of flourishing ideologies.'

Berger, Berger and Kellner (1974:143) discussed ideologies in their analysis of modernization and its institutions. They analysed how modernization, particularly technology, far from liberating human beings, had increased their feelings of helplessness, frustration and alienation. One level of deliberate and systematic reflection they referred to as ideology, nothing the number of meanings given to it in the social sciences referred to above. They distinguished three different types of ideological response to modernization. "First there are ideologies that directly endorse or legitimate modernization. Next there are ideologies developed in opposition or resistance to modernization: these might be called counter-modernization ideologies. Third and most important of all today, there are ideologies that seek to control or contain modernization in the name of values that are conceived to be independent of that process". The quotations given illustrate points made by Nisbet (1967:16, 22) who sees ideologies as "seedbeds of doctrinal and conceptual issues". Nisbet also notes that "the relation between events and ideas is never direct: it is always mediated by conceptions of the events. The role of moral evaluation of political; the may be conservative or revolutionary in character and concerned to maintain or change the status quo.

Ideology was important in Marx's analysis of capitalist social organization; it implied a distortion in beliefs, a separation of so called 'real' and actual interests. It represented one distorted from of class consciousness and was part of the 'superstructure' of society. Aron (1968:177) wrote that: 'In general Marx understood by "ideology" the false consciousness or the false image a social class has of its own situation and of society as a whole. To a large extent, he regarded the theories of the bourgeois economists as a class ideology.' Writing on the process of alienation Bottomore and Rubel (1963:21) referred to ideology as a system of beliefs: 'Marx concept of "false consciousness" and "ideology" are related to the concept of "alienation." False consciousness is the consciousness of individuals in a condition of alienation and ideology is the system of beliefs produced by such a false consciousness.' Geertz (in Apter 1964:47-76) discussed how the contents of ideologies are formulated and wrote: 'the form ideologies take cannot be explained simply in terms of the functions they perform…the link between the causes of an ideology and its consequences too often seems adventitious because the connecting element, the autonomous process of symbolic formulation is neglected'. He analyzed two main approaches to the study of the social determinants of ideology which he referred to as the 'interest theory' which regarded ideology as a symptom and a remedy.

In times of economic and social crisis or considerable change there are strong pressures on government to exercise discipline and regulations so that freedom of actions is more constrained. Those in power are likely to make greater use of the communication media in relating to the public in order to shape public opinion towards supporting the 'law and order' ideology. This may be illustrated by considering the relationship between government and the police during the late 1970s. examples of regulation by other bodies could be found of course but the police force clearly has a role in law enforcement, itself a controversial topic. Demands for 'more law and order' and the move towards more discipline and stronger authority are reflected in the increase in relevant legislation during 1978-1980. The factors in the return of this ideology are complex but it is partly rooted in the increased power and intervention by the state and it finds its rationale in a return to a traditionalist morality and an unqualified respect for authority as ways of resolving social tensions. For the police it

is increasingly the 'public order' role which receives publicity and most clearly aligns them with the interests of the state and the status quo. A distinction is not always made between the functions of government in law making and the functions of organizations responsible for implementing legislation and carrying out duties placed on them by society. The police, of course, are inevitably implicated in debates about law and order but their contribution needs to be clearly defined. They have views about how to carry out their responsibilities and government ministers consult them about their work. But the police are one example of a potentially powerful ideological force. In taking part in public debate about law and order, senior policemen have the opportunity to influence the legislators and public opinion.

So the issue is that policemen have conservative views on issues that arise concerning law and order such as methods of policing and methods of dealing with offenders. Senior police officers rightly have views about sentencing policies as well as police practices. What is questionable is whether it is altogether right that their personal, often conservative opinions, and their views as professionals, should be blurred. The problem then is whether it is desirable for the police to be an active law and order lobby, or an ideological force which mobilizes public opinion. This role seems to have been assumed by the Police Federation which functions as a professional body giving expert help on policing problems but in addition acts as a militant law and order campaigning force. It is in exercising this influence that the distinction between social and political impartiality in law enforcement and public involvement in shaping opinion becomes ill defined and it is not entirely clear to whom the police are accountable. The function of the Special Patrol Group for example seems to have changed considerably since they were reorganized in 1972, from being an anti-crime squad to being a highly equipped force to maintain public order. This is the point made by Miller (1965:14) who wrote: 'The essence of a political situation, as opposed to one of agreement and routine, is that someone is trying to do something about which there is not agreement and is trying to use some form of government as a means and as protection. Political situations arise out of disagreement … Government is routine up to the point where someone questions it and tries to change it; then it ceases to be routine and becomes a political situation. The questioner may be silenced or he may prevail or some way may be found of satisfying him by a change in procedure. Whatever happens, political activity will have begun at the point where he objected and ceased when quiet is resumed. Politics is about policy, first and foremost and policy is a matter of either the desire for change or the desire to protect something against change. But it need not be …the policy of some party or set of ministers or mass movement; it may be the policy of a small group in or out of the government or even of a single man… Nor need it be some policy which embraces the whole life of the country; it can be the wish for the smallest change in a regulation or even in the administration of a regulation'.

Although attempts to define the term 'State' or to discover a theory which can comprehend the obscure and mysterious processes of government appear rather unfruitful (Poulantzas in Blackburn 1976:238-41) it is possible to describe some of their features. One is obviously the mystique of authority: the assumption that the citizen cannot understand how public affairs are ordered, since they are so complex. But Miller (1965:131-34) points out some of the opportunities open to the state which 'is less limited in the exercise of power than any other institution'. It can make war and peace with other states, it can levy taxes on its citizens, make laws to regulate their lives, educate them; it has more power over persons and groups than any other body. In society you find a plurality of opinions and a range of interests which he describes

as a kaleidoscope of shifting purposes which may fall into recognizable patterns for time but which are subject to change as the basic inequalities in society alter. He continues 'it seems to me irrefutable that governments by virtue of their special position as the preservers of public order and the only authorities which can make binding laws, are besieged by a variety of interests, all demanding more than, in total, the government can provide. It is inevitable, in these conditions, that governments will try to find, at the very least, principles of rationing what there is to go round.'

Chapter 3

Social Workers or Social Controllers

In this chapter we examine how Social Work intervenes in people's lives, what power Social Work has and if in anyway Social Workers control their clients. In the pages which follow some cases will be discussed outlining how the Social Worker or Social Work Department intervened. Each case has been anonymised and consent has been given.

In order to show both sides of the coin an article from The Guardian (26/11/2008) is included, written by a case-holding Social Worker, which outlines the conditions, caseloads and stresses faced by Social Workers.

3.1 Bruce's case

Bruce's family was known to the Social Work Department for many years. His mother had been always in violent relationships and his three older sisters had all been taken into care. When Grace, Bruce's mother met Ian, Bruce's father and got married their relationship again could be violent and Ian had also a drink problem. To avoid social work intervention the family was constantly moved. When the boys reach school age there were concerns from education about their behaviour and their appearance. Every day they were going to the school dirty and their behaviour was aggressive. But they weren't aggressive only in school they were aggressive also at home; there is one incident that Bruce wanted to stab his dad because he did something bad to mum. When Grace was asked from the police she said that it wasn't anything. Social Work became involved with the boys because of these care and welfare issues. Mother said that she couldn't cope because of the father so she also starts drinking. Both boys were placed on the Child Protection Register. But they were not placed on compulsory measures because the family was working voluntarily with the department.

This was the ideal time for the Social Work Department to place control on the family but it didn't do it. The reality is that the father was very aware of the system and he used it to achieve what he wanted. That's why he was working on a voluntary base with the Department. The result of that was that the children were constantly placed on and off the Child Protection Register over the years. Things got worse when Bruce mother died in 2005 and the boys were placed by the Children's Panel on section 70 "at home". This decision was made because to remove the boys from home would have cause them trauma and place them at more risk because they were both saying very clearly they will run away from wherever they were to go back to dad. Also that time Ian promised that he will attend alcohol counselling and he applied to get decent accommodation and work with the department to improve his parenting. The reality is that for one more time Ian played with the system. The parenting didn't improve and both boys ended up offending in the community not receiving education and being out of parental control as their father was unable to supervise them. Just before his 16 birthday Bruce was removed from the Child Protection Register although

his circumstances had not improved. This wasn't a unanimous decision but the case holding team made the decision. The social worker didn't do anything to change the decision only the resource workers argued, but they didn't succeed.

The resource worker for Bruce used Rogerian humanistic approach to help him fulfil his potential. She also uses Empowerment to teach Bruce how to gain control to his life. And because Bruce environment was mixed up she also use Task- Centred practice to show him what he has to do to change life and how is going to do this step by step.

The case holding social worker felt overwhelmed by the family and felt they were unable to change. However she did make referrals to others to carry out therapeutic work.

Bruce case is a remarkable example to show how control can be used from a person, Bruce father Ian and from a system. First of all Strain Theory exists in this case. The child experienced emotional abuse from his father; he was a witness of several incidents of domestic violence. So from the beginning according to Strain Theory it shows us that it's only a matter of time before Bruce develops deviant behaviour. Other theories are Patriarchy and Conflict Theory how Ian manipulates his family for his own benefit and why he has the total power in his family. His wife was afraid of him and she keep listen and follow him because of this fear. But because at some point the situation became worse Grace break the chain and leave him. It was a male dominion over a wife and two helpless children. Bruce believed that the things that he is doing in school is natural or to smoke cannabis or drink alcohol. All that because his family, the way of living, and the norms in which he didn't know but still followed them make him to do that. His social worker used label theory to say that Bruce is a child with no future because of his family environment. She preferred to label him and see the next case, they others workers fought for him and now he is a safe place. Social Work Department is clear that have the total power against Bruce as Marx will say their economic power gave them authoritative control.

The control that Social Work Department has is that even though he is seventeen he remains on a supervision order because of his vulnerability. The department is looking for guardianship in order that his father can no longer take his money and dissemble.

Comment

It's clear that Social Work Department has great power but the issue with this power is how it used. In Bruce case it used to destroy his life. The social worker could not use family social work to succeed great change; she didn't use anything the only thing that she used was label as a person with no future. The Social Work Department wanted to get rid off him so when he became 16 he was removed from the Child Protection Register even though he was in a great need. But before Bruce became 16 there was plenty of reasons that the Department could take him into care but he didn't bother because his father was changing constantly address and the social worker avoid seeing the family. But the workers who were working with him fought and win a place of safety for him even though that the Department wanted to erase him as a client.

3.2 Alice's Case

Alice is a fifteen year old girl who came to the notice of the Social Work Department because it became clear that she had been videoed carrying out a sexual act with an adult female. This video was made by an adult male and put on the internet. Both adults were charged and convicted by the police. But what happened before this video get known to public, how were those adults able to find Alice. The reality is that no one knew Alice before this incident, but because this happened the Social Work Department noticed her. An Assessment was undertaken of the current situation and what was going on to her life. They found that Alice was living with grandparents. Mother and father separated and she has no contact with the father. She has also a very poor relationship with the mother. Mother always put her own needs first and every time she has a partner she put Alice to stay with grandparents. Alice is also out of education for two years. School only investigated her absence and tried to ensure she attended regularly. No one investigated the reasons why she was absent or what she was doing when she should have been at school. She is misusing substances. Her uncle and her aunt they are also drug users and their living with the grandparents. It's obvious that because of her environment the norms that she follows were to start also drug use; she believed that is natural to take drugs. Strain theory helps us to understand her, emotional abuse from father and mother no one cared about her. Alice believed that if she uses sex people will love her; it was the only way to feel some love. No one cared about her. Once the assessment was completed there was a recommendation that Alice should be referred to the Reporter and with a view to being made subject to compulsory measures. Just before the hearing took place workers realised that Alice risk taking behaviour has escalated and the Children's Panel would probably recommend a Place of Safety Order with secure liability. Workers went to the hearing to argue that an intensive package of support be put in place to enable Alice to stay in the community. This package included drug workers, education workers, social workers and through care worker. Unfortunately the panel decide to secure Alice. Only the department can change for the decision that children hearing made for Alice, but in Alice case it didn't bothered.

The resource worker and social worker work together to create a relationship with her. They used Rogerian Humanistic approach and after that Task Centred approach and in some occasions when her behaviour escalated crisis intervention. The drug worker use cognitive behaviour approach to stop her substances.

Comment

Even though the people who worked with Alice were recommending an intensive package of support the Children's Hearing didn't listen. They believed that to lock her in a Place of Safety it will be better. However this will not teach her how to react in the community and when she will be out of there she will fall again to the vicious circle of drugs and exploitation. The Children's Hearing System had more control than the Social Work Department. It prefers to prison her to be safe. What a tragedy for a young girl to oppress her even more after all the things that she has passed.

3.3 Samantha's Case

Samantha is a fifteen year old girl. The Social Work Department was interested in her because the school contacted the Reporter after she had been involved in two incidents. The first incident was that Samantha had a physical fight with another classmate and the second was that she asked a boy to videoed her while she was undressing and after that she continue dancing with her underwear the film was circulated in school and put on YouTube. Social Work department believed that because of her behaviour, is put herself at risk from sexual harm. The department made a referral to Samantha to go to FACE is an organization created to Fight Against Child Exploitation. When Samantha started to working with FACE a lot of different things start to come into surface. First they learn that Samantha is living with her mother and her two little brothers. Then that the family changed a lot of addresses because the mother wanted to avoid domestic abuse by her partner. Not of Samantha's father but of the two boys, Samantha has another father. Samantha also told that her stepfather raped her mother and she has seen that incident. The mother didn't do anything because she was afraid of him. This had an impact on Samantha's behaviour in school and at home. We can see now that Samantha lived in an environment of constant strain. She was afraid of the power the stepfather have so we can se also and patriarchy. When Social Work Department learn all this they placed her on Section 70 Supervision Order. Christmas came and there was a physical fight between Samantha and her mum. After that she took the decision to go and live with her grandfather. While she was living with her grandpa her uncle Chris started to confuse her and mixing up that her mother wasn't a nice person and us time passes by he always come more close to manipulate her. After that there is an incident of self harm and when they ask her she told that it's wasn't something strange it's natural and her uncle Chris is doing the same. One month after this incident Samantha was missing, police bring her home and she was under the influence of alcohol granddad said that he can't cope anymore. After that there was a meeting with the Social Work Department and granddad, at which he agreed to continue to care for her. Everyone believed that things had settled down with Samantha but in 16/06/09 she goes missing with her uncle Chris. Later handed herself into Immigration at Sydney Australia and they returned home by International Office for Immigrants at 29/06/09. When she returned she claimed that she was pregnant. No one knows if it's true.

Comment

The power that Social Work Department has is that it can bring Samantha from Australia to Scotland. For one more time is clear that the social work didn't work with the family it worked only with the person. It's impossible to make changes when you working only with the person and not with the person and the family. This family is relatively unknown to Social Work Department. It is only just over one year since Social Work Department became involved and a full assessment of what help is needed is required. The Social Work Department can ask for Supervision Order to be renewed. They can ask that a condition be attached to the Order that Samantha has no contact with Uncle Chris. This will help to protect her.

3.4 Nathaniel's Case

Nathaniel is a 13 year old boy. Social Work Department was interested about him because he has been charged with 2 offences since January 2008. He also was made a subject to a section 70 at home supervision requirement. But before start to analyze Nathaniel's case let's say some things about his family environment. Nathaniel's mother and father are both drug users. His mother is continuing to abuse substances but father has stopped using them. Nathaniel has two brothers and one sister. Nathaniel's father also self harm no one knows the reasons why. Mother and father split up after an incident of physical abuse. Father assaulted Nathaniel we don't know the reasons. After that incident mother has taken the kids and move to another house at December 2002. The circumstance in which he was living with his mother was terrible. She didn't look after them proper and she continued to take more drugs and had a relationship with a drug dealer. The school in which the kids attended started worrying about what was going on. There weren't properly looked after. In February 2008 Nathaniel began to see his father again. Then suddenly a house fire makes the family moved again to a Homeless accommodation. Nathaniel couldn't cope staying with his mother and moved to his dad with all brothers and sister. But even though he stayed with dad he didn't feel safe in his own house. He was worried that his dad will hit him again and he said that no social worker can do anything because if his dad learned his situation will be worst. After this historic family analysis let's return to the offences that Nathaniel did. The first one was an assault to another boy but the second one was more serious. He has gone to the zoo with another boy and he stabbed a lot of animal. We only suppose why he did that because he wanted to cry for help. Social Work department started to work with him for all that reason. When the Department has made the assessment has found that Nathaniel self harm. In Nathaniel case we can see Strain Theory the environment that he lives cause him so much strain that he couldn't cope and he reacts with the worst way. Because of the incident in the zoo a lot of the workers label him. Another Theory is Patriarchy and Power is clear that Nathaniel's father has the total power into his family and he uses it as he wants. Nathaniel continues the norms of his family and especially of his father, he self harm his self and be aggressive against others. Again the workers used empowerment, Rogerian Humanistic approach and after that Task Centred approach but with Nathaniel it wasn't so easy. This boy is closed in his shell and he is bleeding, he doesn't allow anyone to get in. For that reasons the workers ask for guidance from a psychiatrist. Now they are waiting for his assessment. Even that the Social Work Department has the power to take Nathaniel to a safe place far away from his father it doesn't do it, but on the other hand Social Work Department doesn't want to break the family.

Comment
When was the right time for the Social Work Department to act it didn't act. Even it has the power to take Nathaniel into a safe place it doesn't do it because is worrying that with this way it will destroy their family. The issue is why the Department didn't use Family Social Work to work with all the family.

3.5 Katrina's Case

Katrina is 25 years old. Katrina was physically abused as a child and had also other kind of abuse like emotional abuse, failure to thrive and neglect. Also, Katrina according to her file had an inappropriate lifestyle and she always had a number of adults' males within the household. Moreover, there was an incident of family abuse when Katrina's brother had assaulted her.

Katrina has three children. The three children are from different fathers. Jamey is 7 years old. From the time he was born there were concerns about poor parenting from his mother and also concern regards her alcohol use. When Jamey was 2 years old, had a black eye, bruising to the forehead and both sides of face. That was inflected by the mother's partner. From that time, Jamey's name was placed on Child Protection Register under category of Physical Abuse. Also Social Work investigation to the initial incident leading to the removal of Jamey to Foster Care for a few months, under Voluntary Section 25.

Connor is 4 years old and Ann is some months old. Connor and Ann were both registered on Child Protection under category of Physical abuse (concerns only) and Physical Neglect. Ann's name placed on child Protection Register before she was born. The boys had a poor attendance at school; most of the times were dirty and hungry and they also display aggressive and an inappropriate behaviour. This family had a few Social Workers. The social workers were changing all the time.

One theory that it can be connected with this case is patriarchy. We can see that Jamey had been abused by mother's partner and mother didn't do anything. She was afraid of him. The partner exercised more power than her even if Jamey was not his own child. When the health visitor saw Jamey with the black eye and the bruises, mother tried to say a different story than it had actually happened. Also, mother was assaulted from his brother who used to live in her house. We can see that men in this house had more power than she had and they could manipulate her. She always wanted to have at least one man in the house. She was feeling more protected.

The norms in this family are being recurred. Mother used to live and grow up in a violent environment and now the same things happen to her and her children.

According to strain theory, because Katrina had grown up into a violent environment and because she had been abused like a child, this made her to drink alcohol. Because she was not treated like the way she wanted to be treated, she resorted to alcohol.

Also, Connor and especially Ann were registered on Child Protection with concerns only. That can be explained with Labeling Theory. Because Jamey had at least one incident of physical abuse, his brother and sister were registered on Child Protection too. We can see that Social Work had a prejudice with Katrina so SW workers registered both children under concerns of physical abuse only.

Moreover, Social Work had the power to exercise social control to Katrina or Social Work could help her. At first, Social Work removed Jamey from Katrina but it could help her to make the environment better rather than get to the point to remove the child from her. Social work could prevent the abuse of Jamey since they knew that the environment within the house was inappropriate. After this incident, they worked with Katrina and they managed to help her to make things better. That time Katrina had contacts in the family centre to learn new ways of behaviour and new ways to approach her child.

The models and theories of social work which the social workers used to this case are first Crisis Intervention. The Social worker wanted to help Katrina be involved in the crisis, turn it into a point of growth, rather than a diminution of her ability to cope. She wanted to stabilize the situation. The social worker used Task-Centred Approach because she tried to help Katrina to tackle her problems and achieve her goals through a structured process of identifying the steps that need to be taken to get her to their required destination. Also, the social worker used Solution Focused Approach and she tried to help Katrina make a progress in dealing with her problems by focusing on the 'exceptions'- those times when the problem was not applied, when it could have been present but was not, or when it was experienced less frequently or less intensely. Another model was Empowerment. Social Worker tried to help Katrina to gain greater control over her life. She wanted to help Katrina develop her own power by increasing the control she had over Katrina's life. Finally, she used Anti-discriminatory practice. Social Worker tried to see Katrina as a person, as an individual. She tried not to feel any racism or have any kind of prejudice for her. She had to treat her like a normal person and not like something different because she had problems.

3.6 Interview [The Guardian (26/11/2008)]

It's Friday. I drop my own child off at school early, so I can arrive at a foster carer's home on time at 8.20am to collect a child in care and transport him to school. The foster carer has three children to take to different schools, so she can't help us out. We're short-staffed, and no one else is available to do this today. It's the third time this week.

Following this, I rush back to the office. I attend two child protection case conferences. Then four home visits and a joint investigative interview with the Police Family Protection Unit – a coordinated interview conducted by a police officer and a social worker to gather evidence for criminal proceedings and to determine the immediate level of risk in relation to a child's safety and protection.

I also take 16 phone calls from clients, foster carers, criminal justice workers, health visitors and schools. One client is due to be evicted. A domestic incident. A family with no money for the weekend. A child exhibiting sexualised behavior in the school playground. Some are worrying, but I can't respond. I have to focus on the task at hand. I quickly inform my line manager. "No one available", he tells me. "They'll have to wait until next week." There are not enough hours in the day. It's dangerous practice. "Prioritising" is a buzzword. "Crisis" is another. A daily occurrence in my line of work. Every day my office is the same. A metropolis of chaos. Things are deteriorating. Extreme stress predominates. Tempers flare. We complain incessantly on behalf of our clients, for our sanity. "There will be no new social workers employed. Live with it." The writing's on the wall. We all know it. Cutting budgets. Cutting corners. The child, who was interviewed by me and the Police Family Protection Unit, is 11 and alleges that his father assaulted him. He shows me extensive bruising across his back. It looks suspect. I'm concerned.

I know the drill. After brief discussions with senior management, a variety of decisions are made. The child cannot return home. He needs to be examined medically for a professional opinion. A police photographer is required. We need to determine if parents agree to voluntary accommodation. They do, fortunately, or it would have

included a late-night trip to apply for a child protection order. After two hours in a busy children's hospital, the pediatrician provides his diagnosis: non-accidental injury; child hit with an unknown implement. We place a distressed child in foster care, an hour's drive away. I get home at 11.15pm. Exhausted. My daughter is asleep. Procedurally, I have generated massive amounts of repetitive paperwork. Every day impacts upon the next.

Managing risk

On Monday, I'll be expected to meticulously record my four home visits, detailing concerns and/or any progress made. It's all about managing risk. The days of preventive social work are long gone. If it's not child protection, you've no chance of receiving a service. We know that before you walk through the door or lift a telephone. If you've forced a service by talking to your MP or someone with influence, it will be wholly inadequate. Complaints are commonplace. As a result of my two child protection case conferences, I'll have to facilitate and implement intricate child protection plans. This involves letters to professionals, phone calls, lengthy written referrals to various agencies, and specialized resources – a parenting group, perhaps, addiction services, mental health – recording it all on our computer system so I can provide evidence I have completed these tasks. I know as I write these referrals that in most cases my clients will wait for months for a service – if they receive one at all. These "resources" we rely on have been reduced to a bare minimum and are still diminishing rapidly. I'm frustrated. My clients are frustrated. I bear the brunt of it. If funding is required, another few weeks are likely to pass as bureaucrats make decisions about people they know nothing about. I've become accustomed to the word "no". I'll have to complete a 30-page child protection report for the joint investigative interview I conducted and include all relevant information from all relevant professionals; I'll need to complete extensive LAAC (looked-after and accommodated children) paperwork for my newly placed child in care; organize a planning meeting; arrange a review to set up a care plan; ensure he has everything he needs; visit to see how he is and discuss what will happen; provide money to his foster carer to purchase things he might need; make plans to get him to and from school for the duration of his placement; talk to his irate parents in detail about our concerns; contact all those involved with him as part of my assessment; arrange and supervise contact with his parents, if appropriate; let the children's reporter know so that he or she can arrange a children's panel, which will require a long and very detailed report at a later date. And all this will have to be meticulously recorded on our computer system. Oh, and there's the matter of dealing with the other 43 cases I have. The only problem I have is this: on Monday, I have two children's hearings scheduled (four hours gone, travel time included). I have two child protection visits planned (I have to visit children on the Child Protection Register once weekly and I have 13 children in total who are registered, most of whom can only been seen after school), and have to supervise a two-hour contact between a mother and her three children, adhering to decisions made by a children's panel. This doesn't include transport time and collecting/dropping off the children from their respective placements.

Firing Line

This family is lucky. Some children's panel decisions are ignored. Not enough staff. I'll be in the firing line at these children's hearings, explaining – as we do until we're blue in the face – that there are not enough resources or social workers to enable us to do the job effectively. Panel members should cite senior management to explain these difficulties. We have no control over such matters. Monday will be another late finish. No doubt about it. I'll have clients on the phone, too, tearfully telling me they can't cope, demanding to see me, asking for money, requesting support, abusive and threatening calls from angry parents, solicitors requesting information, police, advocacy workers, health visitors, schools, nurseries, psychologists and therapists, criminal justice workers, housing officers, doctors, medical specialists, and a range of other professionals trying to elicit or provide pertinent information. And it all needs to be recorded on "the system". Tuesday looks pretty much the same. How do I cope? I don't, I'm struggling, big time. But this is social work today. My caseload is high. I'm feeling the pressure. My manager is burned out. He observes me through vacant eyes, offering tokenistic support. It's November. I've not had supervision since June. He keeps cancelling. I've told him repeatedly I'm sinking, I've told him I have clients I haven't seen for months. No offer to reduce my caseload is forthcoming. Instead, I am allocated another two. "Sorry, but there's no one else." They'd rather have a serious case that cannot be dealt with on my caseload than a managerial waiting list of unallocated cases. That way, I can take the flak if anything goes wrong. That's the way it works. They know you cannot work all your cases. My clients cannot possibly receive an acceptable level of service. My overtime is reaching the limit allowed, mostly through writing reports at home at night in order to get through part of the work. I look around and my colleagues are all feeling the pressure too. Several of them are off on long-term sick leave and some have left in the last few months for less pressurized jobs. They will not be replaced. Budget deficit, we're told. My daughter's going mad because she never sees me. I'm reading about vulnerable children like Baby P in the papers. I listen to the debates. People are angry and rightly so. It hurts. It could have been avoided. It could have been prevented. Another life lost unnecessarily. I know it's going to happen in my local authority soon. It's only matter of time. The warning signs are evident. We complain, loudly and incessantly. The writing is on the wall. we all know it. Cutting budgets. Cutting corners.

Tragic Mistakes

Where such tragic mistakes are made, inquiries are vital, but not always helpful. They rarely tell us anything we don't already know. Lack of inter-agency communication. Lack of multi-agency communication. Lack of training (no time). Lack of supervision (no time). Unqualified social work staff undertaking complex assessments. Believe me, it happens. Regularly. We are "ordered" to organize files fastidiously for inspections – overtime if necessary in order to improve our image. So boxes can be ticked. A pat on the back for the bureaucrats. Inspections are planned well in advance. We're "encouraged" to portray the authority in a positive light when talking to inspectors. There should be regular independent ad hoc inspections, with inspectors walking in without any prior notice, demanding to see files, checking the

systems, talking to clients, talking to frontline staff. They should be spending extended periods of time analyzing and carefully examining practice. The system is immobilised. Flawed. The system has failed. Again. In my local authority, senior management ignore our pleas. They are ineffective and lack vision. They fail to act. Bureaucrats completely out of touch with frontline workers and the demands we face. Middle management are completely powerless, incapable of bringing about the changes necessary. Frontline managers juggle impossible conflicting demands. A few of these keep fighting on, avoiding the inevitable meltdown. For the rest, apathy grows. They have become unproductive. These are dangerous, dangerous times in child protection. I'm a very experienced social worker, working for one of the largest and busiest social work departments in Scotland. I am responsible for enhancing and improving the quality of life for the families with whom I work, accountable for protecting the children on my caseload. I'm deeply concerned. My colleagues are deeply concerned. We have raised these issues consistently. All the way up the ladder. Cutting budgets. Cutting corners. We all know it. It's only a matter of time until another child dies.

CONCLUSION

After the bibliographical survey and the case study, we conclude that in every form of society there exists social control. Social Control emerges in government, media, health and social services, in education, in family and in religion. All these forms exercise social control in people's life with different ways but all they link each others. Government is the one which manipulate media, health and welfare services and education. Another form of social control there is within the family which from one hand is instigated from government but from the other hand it has to do with person's values. Religion formerly had the same power as government and was not independent but nowadays these two forms of control are separated. This doesn't mean that religion can not exercise social control any more to people's life.

Social Control in relation with Social Work has provoked big changes at her structure. While Social Work's purpose is to promote social change, solve problems in human relationships, empower and liberate people to enhance well- being, nowadays looks more bureaucratic.

Government's intention is money. Councils are failing to understand the services they run and rejecting the values of social work. The culture of managerialism and creeping privatization have had an enormous impact on social work practice. Also, a council cabinet of an elite group of managers has no understanding of the realities of social work and feels no obligation to support good practice. Its concerns are essentially about service delivery and performance and the aspect of management concerned with staff care is completely missing. Management is subjecting social workers to ever closer scrutiny and control but does nothing to simplify the social work task or make the job more manageable. A complex job is actually being made more difficult through ever increasing bureaucracy and paperwork. Organizational changes, new performance assessments, new procedures and practices, aimed at improving the delivery of services, are actually working to undermine good social work practice. Part of the problem is the move to 'business management' processes within councils and the constant pressure on social workers to justify their existence and explain what they are doing, while those at the top do the 'important thinking', provide 'leadership' and Social Control.

They want more profits and for this reason there are less posts for Social Workers, they give smaller salaries to the workers and the work they have to do is huge. That has as a result Social workers (not all of them) function as controllers and observers with their cases and give more time to their assessments. Their work has been more bureaucratic, more oppressing because of the number of the cases. That means that Social Workers can't give the necessary time to the clients so they can't essentially help them. The cases that one social worker has, overcome the 15.

Social Control is clear in our cases. Social Control can be used for bad purposes and for good purposes; is not necessary bad. The thing that matters is the person who has the power must know how to use it. Power and Social Control in Social Work can be used for client's advantage.

In Bruce case it's clear that Social Work Department has great power. The Social Work Department wanted to get rid off him so when he became 16 he was removed from the Child Protection Register even though he was in a great need. But before Bruce became 16 there was plenty of reasons that the Department could take him into care but he didn't bother because his father was changing constantly address and the social worker avoid seeing the family. But the workers who were working with

him fought and win a place of safety for him even though that the Department wanted to erase him as a client. The reality is that because the workers fight for him he is still working with the Social Work Department on a Supervision order. But a lot of the workers they will not fight for their clients. Why? Because they don't have the time, because they don't use and they don't believe in their Code of Practice.

Alice case is one of that the Social Workers lost. Even though the people who worked with Alice were recommending an intensive package of support the Children's Hearing didn't listen. They believed that to lock her in a Place of Safety it will be better. The Children's Hearing System had more control than the Social Work Department. It prefers to prison her to be safe. What a tragedy for a young girl to oppress her even more after all the things that she has passed. The Department could change the decision but it didn't bother it has financial problems to solve more interested than Alice life.

Samantha's case shows us the power that Social Work Department has to bring her from Australia to Scotland. For one more time is clear that the social work didn't work with the family it worked only with the person. It's impossible to make changes when you working only with the person and not with the person and the family. All this is happened because the department wants to work on one to one with their clients it doesn't want to work with families or with the community and all that because the managers don't see the need to work with families or with the community the only see the need to make more profit.

In Nathaniel's case nothing happened because the Social Work Department didn't act. The Department could act but it chooses not too.

The social worker in Katrina's case could have tried to make her environment and the relations with the other members of the family better instead of removing Jamey from the house because was assaulted from Katrina's partner. Social Worker used only three models but she could use Family Therapy from the start. She worked only with Katrina like an individual and then with Jamey as an individual. She worked with both of them only for a few months. She had the power to handle this case better but she used her power and Jamey was removed.

One common theme in each of these cases is the fact that Children's Services exist primarily to work with children and young people. The parents are seen only because the children live with them or are to be rehabilitated home to the parents. There is little point in trying to empower children if the parents remain abusive. The family situation as a whole needs to be explored and changed and sometimes this even means that the community the family live in needs to be worked with.

But the thing that illustrate with the best way the situation in the Social Work is the interview from The Guardian. The Social Worker breaks its silence and tells us the whole truth. No practice, no time, no workers, no supervision just cases that run and no one sees it. The system failed and none admitted. Apathy reigns. They don't act they become the Pontius Pilatus of their time. They just wash their hands and watch the show and when something gone wrong someone else takes the blame. All cases depended in bureaucrats. The bureaucrats make decisions for people that they know anything about them. The Social Workers are sinking in their work they are constantly taken new cases even though they can not cope with the cases they have already. The issue is that no one reacts, the Social Workers who have to fight for their clients stay in apathy. They don't fight for their rights. It's like they are hypnotized and they act mechanically. They don't try for a better social work the just follow their leaders and when something bad happened no one knows who will take the blame.

Discussion

Something is wrong and no one does something to change it. What happened to social work? It became more managerial and bureaucratic. The social workers became sheep and follow the Shepherd. They don't act for the clients benefits. They stay in apathy. Social Workers are feeling de-skilled and demotivated and many of them want to leave the profession. What happened to their Codes of Practise? The Codes of Practice say:

- As a social service worker, you must protect the rights and promote the interests of service users and carers.
- As a social service worker, you must strive to establish and maintain the trust and confidence of service users and carers.
- As a social service worker, you must promote the independence of service users while protecting them as far as possible from danger or harm.
- As a social service worker, you must respect the rights of service users while seeking to ensure that their behaviour does not harm themselves or other people.
- As a social service worker, you must uphold public trust and confidence in social services.
- As a social service worker, you must be accountable for the quality of your work and take responsibility for maintaining and improving your knowledge and skills.

Why the majority doesn't use these codes? The first things that social work students learn are the Codes of Practice. But by the time the students become professionals, they don't use them. They don't protect the rights of their clients, they don't give them opportunities for a better quality of life, and they don't make their clients independent because they constantly control their actions and their choices. They don't show dignity and they don't respect their clients. They treat them like children of a lesser god and that has as an effect not to help them solve their problems. We think that there is a gap between theory and practice. This thing happens because politicians, policy makers and senior managers are incapable of grasping the realities of the human experience that underline social work practice. They are not interested in the inner worlds of the emotions and relationships and assume that the surface of life is all that really exists. They operate skilfully in the external world, especially in the formal world of work and public life, but they lack a deeper understanding of the personal and private world and the paradoxes and contradictions of every day life. They have developed a way of thinking and use of the language that is outside the practices and ways of knowing of social workers. More importantly, their policies are not informed by the practice experience of the social workers and are impossible to put into practice.

At present social work performs a function for the state in managing and controlling the disadvantaged and distressed. Social workers may not like this but they should face up to this reality. The majority of the Social Workers don't react to the constantly strain that senior managers put them. As horrible as the things may look, there is always a hope for change. Maybe with the introduction of G.I.R.F.E.C. will make things better. Getting it right for every child is a national programme that is changing the way adults think and act to help all children and young people grow, develop and reach their full potential. Children and young people are central to Getting

it right for every child. The involvement and contribution of children, young people and families is a fundamental principle of the programme. The overarching concept of Getting it right for every child is a common, coordinated approach across all agencies that supports the delivery of appropriate, proportionate and timely help to all children as they need it. The core components of the Getting it right for every child approach Getting it right for every child is founded on 10 core components which can be applied in any setting and in any circumstance. They are at the heart of the Getting it right for every child approach in practice and provide a benchmark from which practitioners may apply the approach to their areas of work. A focus on improving outcomes for children, young people and their families based on a shared understanding of well-being

A common approach to gaining consent and to sharing information where appropriate

An integral role for children, young people and families in assessment, planning and intervention

A co-ordinated and unified approach to identifying concerns, assessing needs, agreeing actions and outcomes, based on the Well-being Indicators

Streamlined planning, assessment and decision-making processes that lead to the right help at the right time

Consistent high standards of co-operation, joint working and communication where more than one agency needs to be involved, locally and across Scotland

A Lead Professional to co-ordinate and monitor multi-agency activity where necessary

Maximising the skilled workforce within universal services to address needs and risks at the earliest possible time

A confident and competent workforce across all services for children, young people and their families

The capacity to share demographic, assessment, and planning information electronically within and across agency boundaries through the national eCare programme where appropriate

Together the Well-being Indicators and the core components make up the Getting it right for every child approach to meeting the needs of children and young people.(http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Young-People/childrensservices/girfec)(5/8/2009)

The situation that we described about social work in Scotland is terrible but when it's compared with Greece its perfect. First of all Social Work in Greece has been remained like a charity profession especially in welfare services in which they don't provide any other support except financial support. But the benefits that they provide don't allow people to live properly. Our Child Protection System is worthless, not because we don't have the legislation but because we don't have the right structure of services. In the reality we don't have any structure. For example in a case of child domestic or sexual abuse, even though there is legislation to protect the child there aren't many places of safety to accommodate the child. So the child will be returned to the family and the abuse will continue. The same happens to all the clients of social work. There is legislation to support client's needs and rights but there are not any structures or services to make the things that legislation demand. That has as a result all things stay in theory and nothing happens in practice. It is a resource led rather than needs-led system.

Also, the issue is that the Greek social work students don't have the appropriate education and knowledge background. Moreover, they don't learn to act for the benefits of their clients. They are passive in a work that they have to be active. It's exactly the same thing that happens in Scotland. The only difference is that in Greece

someone can become a social worker just because he/she passed to the university even if he/she doesn't want to do this work, but in Scotland the people can choose this profession maybe because they like it, or because of the money.

We think that Social Work is a science that can make people's lives better. For this to happen social work needs some changes. First, the education that social work students get has a great range of knowledge, but teachers must teach their students to become more active. Second, social work departments have to change their direction which is bureaucratic and managerial and focus more to the needs of the clients. Third, because social workers have forgotten to use the Codes of Practice, must start to use them again. Fourth, they must learn to use the power they have for advantage of their clients and not for the government or the system. Fifth, system should give more freedom, respect and recognition to the social workers and allowed them to use their professional judgment. Finally, we believe that education in Social Work is the first thing that has to be changed in order to succeed Social Change and Social Justice.

Social Workers should not be afraid of their managers. Managers should be afraid of the Social Workers!

This dissertation is a product of social control. Even in the writing of this dissertation we have had to stick to guidelines and procedures. We have not been able to fully express our innermost thoughts and opinions. We have had to have a basis of fact.

Bibliography

Abercrombie, Nicolas. Stephen Hill. Bryan S. Turner (2000) 'The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology' .Fourth Edition .

Agnew, Robert. 1992. '*CRIMINOLOGY VOLUME 30 NUMBER 1*'. (http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/cgi-bin/fulltext/119317143/PDFSTART) (24/4/2009).

Akers, R. (2000). '*Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application*'. Los Angeles: Roxbury. :139-188.

Akers, Ronald L. (1977). '*Deviant Behavior*', 2nd ed. Belmont, CA:Wadsworth

Altheide, D.L. (1985) '*Media Power*', Sage Publications ,Inc.

Andersen, L. Margaret & Taylor F. Howard. 2005. '*Sociology Understanding a Diverse Society.*' Fourth Edition. Cengage Learning.

Arblaster, A. (1974). '*Academic Freedom*'. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Aron, R. (1968). '*Main Currents in Sociological Thought*'. *Vol.1*. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Becker, Howard S. 1966 '*Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*'. New York: Free Press

Becker, Howard S. (1963). '*Outsiders*'. New York: Free Press

Bell, Robert R, (1971). '*Social Deviance*'. Homewood, IL: Dorsey

Bennet L.W. (1988) '*News: The Politics of Illusion*', New York: Longman

Berger, L. Peter. 1967 '*The social reality of religion*,' Faber & Faber

Berger, L.P., Berger, B. & Kellner, H. (1974). '*The Homeless Mind*'. Harmondsworth: Penguin

Binerbaum, Arnold and Edward Sagarin (1976). '*Norms and Human Behavior*'. New York: Praeger.

Black, Donald (1976). '*The Behavior of Law*'. New York: Academic Press

Blau, P. & Scott, W. (1963). '*Formal Organizations*'. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bottomore, T.B. & Rubel, M. (1963). '*Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy*'. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Brown, R.G.S. (1975). *'The Management of Welfare'*. Glasgow: Fontana – Collins.

Chomsky N. (2000) *"Chomsky on misEducation",* edited and introduced by Donaldo Macedo

Chomsky, N. (2002) *'Media Control'*- The spectacular achievements of propaganda, New York

Clinard, Marshall B. and Robert F. Meier. (1979) *'Sociology of Deviant Behavior'*. 5th ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cohen, Stanley. (1985) . *'Visions of Social Control: Crime, Punishment and Classification.'* Wiley- Blackwell.

Conrad, Peter (1979), *'Types of Medical Social Control'*, Sociology and Illness Vol.1

Cooley, Charles H. (1909). '*Social Organization: A Study of the Larger Mind*'. New York: Scribner.

Cullen, Francis T. and John B. Cullen (1978). *'Toward a Paradigm of Labeling Theory'*. New Series, no 58. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Studies

Davies B. (1976) *"Social control and Education*", London: Methven

Davies M. (2008), *" The Blackwell Companion To Social Work",* Blackwell Publishing

Davis, Nanette J. (1975). *'Social Constructions of Deviance'*. Dubuque, IA: Wm.C.Brown

Denisoff, R. Serge and Charles H. McCaghy (1973). *'Deviance, Conflict and Criminality'*. Chicago: Rand McNally

Erikson, Kai T. (1962). *'Notes on the Sociology of Deviance, Social Problems'*. 9:307-314. New York: Wiley

Etzioni, A. (1964) *'Modern Organizations'*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Etzioni, A. (1969) *'The Semi-Professions and Their Organization: Teachers, Nurses and Social Workers'*. New York: Free Press.

Feldman, Saul D. (1978). *'Deciphering Deviance'*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Fortes, M. & Evans, Pritchard, E.E. (1940). *'African Political Systems.'* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Foucault, Michel (1975). *'Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison'*. Alan Sheridan 1979. Penguin Books Ltd.

Freire P. (1972) *"The pedagogy of the oppressed"*, Harmondsworth: Penguin

French J.R.P. & Raven, B. 1959 *'Studies of Social Power'*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan; Institute for Social Research.

Geertz, C. (1964). *'Ideology as a Cultural System'*. In D. Apter (ed.) *'Ideology and Discontent'*. New York: Free Press.

Giddens, Anthony. (2009) *'Sociology',* 6th Edition, Polity Press

Giroux, A. Henry. 1981. *'Ideology Culture & the Process of Schooling.'* Publishers Routledge.

Goldstein, H. (1974) *'Social Work Practice: A Unitary Approach'*, University Of South Carolina Press, Columbia.

Golightley, M. (2006) *'Social Work and Mental Health'*, Learning Matters Ltd.

Gordon, Linda. 1990. '*Women, the state and welfare.'* The University of Wisconsin Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Prison Notebooks*, New York: International Publishers

Gray, M.- Webb, S.A. (2009) *'Social Work- Theories And Methods'*, SAGE Publications Ltd.

Haines, J. (1975) *'Skills and Methods in Social Work',* London: Constable.

Hechter, Michael & Karl-Dieter Opp. 2001 *'Social Norms'*. Russell Sage Foundation.

Herman, S.E & Chomsky, N. (1998) *'Manufacturing constent'* - The political economy of the Mass Media, New York, (copyright 2002)

Horner, N. (2005) *'What is Social Work',* Learning Matters Ltd.

Innes, Martin (2003). *'Understanding Social Control :Deviance, Crime and Social Order.'* McGraw-Hill International

Jameson, F. & Miyoshi, Masao. (1998) *'The cultures of Globalization'*, Duke University Press

Jary, David & Julia.(2000) *'Collins Dictionary of Sociology'*. Third Edition 2000, Haper Collins Publishers.

Jowitt, M. O' Loughlin S. (2005) *'Social Work with Children and Families'*, Learning Matters Ltd.

Kamenka, Eugene & Alice Erh-Soon Tay, (1980), *'Law And Social Control'*. Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd 1980

Kaplan, Howard B. (1975). *'Self-Attitudes and Deviant Behavior'*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear.

Kitsuse, John I. (1962). *'Societal reaction to deviant behavior, Social Problems'*. 9:247-256.

Lemert, M. Edwin, 1967, *'Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control',* By Prentice-Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.

Leonard, P. (1966) *'Sociology in Social Work'*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Lerner, Gerda. 1986. *'The creation of Patriarchy'*. Oxford University Press Inc.

Lewis A. (1987) *'Freedom of the Press- Antony Lewis Distinguishes Between Britain and America',* London Review of Books

Lewis, C.S. (1978). *'The Abolition of Man.'* New York: Macmillan.

Lofland, John. (1969). *'Deviance and Identity'*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Marx, Karl. 2002 *'Marx on religion: edit by John C. Raines,'* Temple University Press.

Marx, K. & Engels, F. (introduced by A.J.P. Taylor) (1970). *'The Communist Manifesto'*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mead, George Herbert. 1925. *"The Genesis of Self and Social Control."* International Journal of Ethics 35 (3): 251-89.

Meredith, Paul (1992). '*Government, Schools and the Law'*. Routledge.

Merton, Robert K. (1966) Social problems and sociological theory, pp. 775-823 in Robert K. Merton and Robert Nisbet (eds.). *'Contemporary Social Problems'*. 2nd ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World

Miller, J.D.B. (1965). *'The Nature of Politics'*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Mitchell, G. Duncan (1979). '*A New Dictionary Of Sociology'*. Publishers Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Nisbet, R.A. (1967) *'The Sociological Tradition'*. London: Heinemann.

Park, Robert E. & Ernest W. Burgess. 1921. *Introduction to the Science of Sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Parsons, Talcott, (1952). *'The social System'*. London, Tavistock Publications, Glencoe, The Free Press.

Payne, M. (2005) *'The Origins Of Social Work',* Palgrave Macmillan.

Phofl, Stephen. (1994). *'Images of Deviance and Social Control: A Sociological History'*. McGraw-Hill

Poulantzas, N. (1976). *'The Problem of the Capitalist State'*. In R. Blackburn (ed.)

Reiss, Albert, Jr. 1951 *"Delinquency as the Failure of Personal and Social Control."* American Sociological Review 16, no.2 (April): 196-206.

Rodger J.J. (1996), *"Family Life and Social Control"*- A sociological Perspective, Macmillan

Ross, E. A. 1901. *Social Control: A Survey of the Foundations of Order*. New York: Macmillan.

Schur, Edwin M. (1971). *'Labeling Deviant Behavior'*. New York: Harper and Row.

Scott, Robert A. (1972). A proposed framework for analyzing deviance as a property of social order, pp. 9-35 in Robert A. Scott and Jack D. Douglas (eds.), *'Theoretical Perspectives on Deviance'*. New York: Basic Books.

Seeger, A.A. (1983) *'The Berkeley Barb: Social Control of an Underground Newsroom'*, New York

Sigerist, H. (1943). *'Civilization and Disease'*. Cornell University Press, New York

Smith, D. (1965). *'Front Line Organization of the State Mental Hospital'*. *'Administrative Science Quarterly'*10: 381-99.

Steffensmeier, Darrell J. and Robert M. Terry, eds. (1975). *'Examining Deviance Experimentally'*. Port Washington, NY: Alfred.

Tannenbaum, Frank. 1938. *'Crime and the Community'* Boston, MA: Ginn & Co.

Thio, Alex. (1998). *'Deviant Behavior'*. 5th edition. Longman

Thomas, W. I. & Florian Znaniecki. 1918-1920.*'The Polish Peasant in Europe and America'*. 5vols. Boston Badger.

Thomson, N.- Thomson, S. (2008) *' The Social Work Companion'*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Vincent, George. 1896. *"The province of Sociology"*. American Journal of Sociology 1, no.4 (January): 473-91.

Williams, Katherine S. 2008. *'Textbook on Criminology'*. 6th Edition ,Oxford University Press.

Zijderweld, A.C. (1974). *'The Abstract Society'*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Zola, Irving Kenneth (1972). *'Medicine as an Institution of Social Control'*, Sociological Review, 20, pp. 487-504.

Internet - Articles

A social control explanation of the relationship between family structure and delinquent behaviour.(Canada),htpp://www.accessmylibrary.com/coms2/summary_0286-9142218_ITM, (25/06/09)

British Association Of Social Workers,
http://www.basw.co.uk/Default.aspx?tabit=64, (11/03/2009)

Cornill-http://resources.metapress.com/pdf-preview.axd?code=t110842058224744&size=largest , (25/06/09)

Family structure versus parental attachment in controlling adolescent deviant behaviour: a social control model,
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2248/is_n125_v32/ai_19417327/?tag=content;c...(09/06/09),
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m2248/is_n125_v32/ai_19417327/pg_2/?tag=con...(09/06/09)

GIRFEC
(http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/People/Young-People/childrensservices/girfec)
(5/8/2009)

G. M. Trevelyan (1876-1962) British historian.
(http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/eduquote.htm, (14/06/09).

Indiana University School of Social Work,
http://socialwork.iu.edu/snav/116/page.htm, (25/04/09)

John Ruskin (1819-1900) English critic.
(http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/eduquote.htm, (14/06/09).

Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, March 2004 by Gale Burford, Paul Adams
http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0CYZ/is_1_31/ai_n6065937/?tag=content;coll-(23/07/09).

Means of social control, http://www.helium.com/items/228240-means -of-social-control. 25/06/09, http://www.helium.com/items/1232363-social-control, 25/06/09).

Norman Douglas,
 http://www.lhup.edu/~dsimanek/eduquote.htm, (14/06/09).

Research Findings- Educational Department Research Programme: Effective S.W with older people, www.schotland.gov.uk, Publications 2005/12, (24/04/09)

Social control in modern Britain- htpp://www.ehs.org.uk/society/pdfs/Thompson 5a.pdf, (25/06/09)

Social Control Theories in Encyclopedia of Criminology,
http://sitemason.vanderbilt.edu/files/l/l3Bguk/soccon.pdf, (23/06/09)

Social Control through Popular Culture and Mass Media,
http://www.unique-design.net/library/control.html , (30/04/09)

The Guardian (26/11/08)

What is Propaganda? ,
http://library.thinkquest.org/C0111500/whatis.htm , (30/04/09)

Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_social_work , (11/03/09)

Regards