

SOCIAL WORK DISCOURSES AND THE SOCIAL WORK INTERVIEW

KEVIN STENSON

Thesis submitted in accordance with the regulations for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Human Sciences at
Brunel University, 1989.

To My parents

ABSTRACT

It will be argued that, in order to understand particular exchanges between social workers and clients, it is essential to go beyond the view that sees them simply in terms of interaction between unique persons, and locate them within the wider discursive settings within which they occur. Most of the talk which takes place in these interviews concerns problematic issues within family life, particularly in terms of the relationships between parents and children. Behind these apparently mundane conversations lie agendas of social work issues which have been constructed historically with the rise of the caring professions. The early part of the thesis is concerned with uncovering the historically constructed norms of acceptable motherhood which underpin social work strategies with families and which help set the agendas of interviews.

Then the analysis focuses on how general norms and objectives are translated into operational, professional techniques. This theme is carried forward through a focus on the social settings in which interviews take place, the building up of subject positions within interviews, for social worker and client, and the implications of translating from a predominantly oral to a literate based, professional mode of discourse. Finally, the analysis is concerned with the tentative attempts, marked by ambiguity and resistance, to go beyond the mere monitoring of the life of the client, and draw her/him into a form of discourse which is openly committed to social

work aims, where the client seems to want to present his or her life problems in terms which are intelligible to, and manageable within, the strategies open to the social worker.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the social services department which allowed me to do this study and the social workers and their clients who agreed to cooperate in the research.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Nik Rose, for patient supervision and putting me on the right track.

CONTENTS

PAGE NUMBER

CHAPTER ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER TWO	METHODOLOGY	45
CHAPTER THREE	THE CONSTRUCTION OF MOTHERHOOD	59
CHAPTER FOUR	INSTRUCTIONAL DISCOURSE	95
CHAPTER FIVE	THE POSITIONING OF MOTHERS IN CONVERSATIONAL DISCOURSE	149
CHAPTER SIX	NARRATIVE AND CONVERSATIONAL DISCOURSE	234
CHAPTER SEVEN	ORCHESTRATION TO REGULATION, (The Dynamics of Normalisation)	288
CONCLUSION		390
APPENDIX:	FOOTNOTES	398
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	410
	TRANSCRIPTS	424

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

This thesis grew out of an attempt to investigate what transpires in social work interviews. The original focus of interest was on the role of language as a power resource in interviews. The assumption was that social work, in addition to providing vulnerable and troubled people with material and emotional support, also operates as an agency of control, containing people within social settings in which they can be managed relatively easily. Within this framework, a precondition for controlling the client was considered to be the ability to control the flow of interview talk between social worker and client. Strangely, despite the symbolic centrality for the social work profession of face to face interviewing work between social worker and client, there is a dearth of *direct* research on the phenomenon.

While there is a body of indirect research, which includes a concern with retrospective accounts of interviews by social workers and clients (eg., Mayer and Timms, 1970, Sainsbury et. al. 1982, Rees, 1978, Rees and Wallace, 1982), Baldock and Prior's study of transcripts of interviews conducted by a dozen trained probation officers and social workers (Baldock and Prior, 1981) offers a rare

and useful attempt to explore this hidden zone, albeit employing a different "gaze" to that used here. In order to shed further light on this area, I persuaded a group of trained social workers with at least two years experience, to tape record a selection of their interviews with clients; the details of this research process will be elaborated in the next chapter.

However, my apparently straight forward question about control in the interview, raises very complex questions. A sociological approach to the interview can only be conducted within a chosen theoretical framework; the choice of framework will dictate an agenda of issues for study, with inbuilt priorities of interest. The eventual choice of framework was not made easily, it came through a process of trial and error. Furthermore, the analysis which developed under its auspices, did not neatly flow in a logically deductive fashion from the theoretical framework; rather, the analysis developed in a dialectical relationship with the development of theory.

It is not the intention here to provide a critical summary of possible sociological perspectives on "the interview," but it is worth indicating a sample of approaches and the kinds of conceptualisation they offer. From a Marxist, structural perspective, one may see social work as a means of regulating the effects of the conflicts and contradictions arising from the process of capital accumulation, and assisting in the reproduction of the conditions which make possible that accumulation. In Britain, social

work is largely financed and organised, within a legal and government directed framework, under the auspices of the national and local state (Cockburn, C. 1977, p.51). As Whittington and Holland put it, the process of reproduction is carried out via two key reproductive roles,

"The first is to ensure a relatively healthy, educated, mobile and disciplined labour force. The second is to promote attitudes to work, social responsibility, authority and the definition of roles which are compatible with capitalist relations and accumulation. Related to this is the task of securing in the population acquiescence to or support for the unequal structures of power, wealth and opportunity typical of capitalism." (Whittington, C & Holland, R. 1985, p.32).

But, given the contradictions of the placing of social work within capitalist society, and the fact that radicals are attracted into the profession, Marxists argue that a limited Marxist practice is possible. As Whittington and Holland express it,

"Marxist social work....aims to relieve distress by assisting access to material aid and by providing psychological support. It has only recently begun to formulate a psychological theory and rejects theories that fail to recognise the material source or component of problems (Leonard, 1984). Problems of employees are examined for their sources in working conditions or hierarchical, centralised structures; family problems are explored for their

links with women's domestic dependency or the pressure on men to be dedicated, successful family breadwinners; school attendance problems are considered in terms of the preoccupation of the school system with control rather than education; problems of the elderly are related to the state's neglect of a group that makes little recognisable contribution to production and reproduction, and which is a drain upon capitalism, not a current or a future resource. Great emphasis is placed on promoting among clients and welfare colleagues these alternatives to conventional analysis of problems and upon employing them to transcend the occupational, racial and sexual divisions that separate the working class." (Whittington and Holland, op. cit., p.33. cf. also Corrigan, P. & Leonard, P. 1978, Phillipson, C. 1983).

Thus, within this perspective the interview is a means whereby, in its controlling dimension, client and social worker meet as bearers of different class forces and interests, the interview yields information which is used in monitoring and controlling the lives of clients on behalf of the state. Counselling or other forms of advice are likely to reflect an individualised, ideological account of personal problems, and are likely to offer conservative, small scale solutions which emphasise adjusting to the existing pattern of social relations (Pearson, 1973). Radical practice involves an attempt to subvert this process in the margins and exploit it, to educate clients about the class dimensions of and possible solutions to their troubles.

It is possible to view the social work interview from another structural perspective, that of functionalism. The influence of functionalism, for example through the work of Talcott Parsons (Parsons, T. 1951), has been strongly felt in social work theories in the United States. Kadushin, author of one of the leading texts on social work interviewing, clearly presents the interpersonal dynamics of interviewing as only explicable within a wider social structural framework. It is the deeper, consensual values of the social system which provides the higher purposes of the processes involved in the interview (Kadushin, A., 1983, p.21). Kadushin sees these purposes as instrumental means for achieving more efficient social functioning, both for the individual and the social collectivity. He approvingly quotes professional definitions of social and welfare work in general, together with a range of United Nations and U.S. federal government definitions, which revolve around the same notion. For example, one federal task force defined social welfare as,

"the organised system of functions and services that support and enhance individual and *social* well being and that promote community conditions essential to the harmonious interaction of persons and their *social* environment" (U.S. HEW 1965:7, quoted in Kadushin, op.cit, p.18, italics in original).

Thus, despite the inter-individual, psychological, or psycho-therapeutic flavour of much discourse around interviewing, Kadushin presents the social work interview as part of the technology which

is required for the solution of essentially *social* problems. While experienced individually or in the small primary social grouping, these welfare problems have a social character and repercussions for the social collectivity which warrant the time, energy and expenditure necessary to intervene and attempt to improve individual and collective welfare.

By now, this practical, version of social science functionalism is well established in American social work (cf. Garvin, C. D. and Seabury, B. A., 1984., Pincus, A. and Minahan, A., 1973, Goldstein, H 1973.) and has its powerful advocates in Britain, of whom, Martin Davies, who provides an explicitly functionalist, prescriptive model of social work, is the most notable. He characterises social work by means of an engineering metaphor. For Davies, social workers,

"are the maintenance mechanics oiling the interpersonal wheels of the community. They do so at the end of the spectrum where dysfunctioning has either reached chronic or epidemic proportions or where its effects are spilling over into the lives of vulnerable people. They may use a variety of strategies, directive and non directive, but their underlying aims are to maintain the independence of adults, to protect the short- and long term interests of children, and to contribute towards the creation of a community climate in which all citizens can maximise their potential for personal development. They may use a variety of strategies, directive or non-directive, but their underlying aims are to maintain the independence of adults, to protect the short -

and long-term interests of children, and to contribute towards the hghnb creation of a community climate in which all citizens can maximise their potential for personal development." (Davies 1985 p. 28-29).

Moreover, in a typical swipe at his radical critics, Davies argues that,

"If social workers act as social control agents, they do so because, for some purposes, it is necessary to maintain stability in the social setting, the better to enable the client to thrive" (ibid., p. 29).

Curbing deviant behaviour, for example supervising convicted criminals, compulsorily admitting mentally disturbed people to mental hospital and so on, "are acts ...intended to contribute to the smooth running of society" (ibid., p. 29). In addition, social workers are concerned to ameliorate the conditions of those, like unemployed teenagers, handicapped housewives, the terminally sick and so on, who find it hard to cope without help.

This testifies to the continued appeal of social engineering rhetoric, which has been for long a favourite motif of reformers. The linking of the mechanistic metaphor with the organic metaphors of functionalism make an intriguing mix, which was more clearly articulated by an earlier exponent, Sicard de Plauzoles,

"Human zootechny is the end-stage of hygiene: after private hygiene, which is addressed only to individuals, and public hygiene, which is concerned only with collective spaces, it is the true social hygiene, that which considers the individual only in terms of his social value and utility. Social hygiene is an economic science that has human capital or material as its object, The latter's production or reproduction (eugenics and puericulture), its utilisation (physical and vocational education), and its output (scientific organisation of labour). Social hygiene is a normative sociology: let us think of man as an industrial material, or more precisely, as an animal machine. The hygienist, then, is the engineer of the human machine." (Plauzoles, S. 1920, in Donzelot, J., 1977, p.186.).

From this perspective, the interview is the arena in which competent and incompetent subjects come into interaction. The interview enables the tasks of assessment of the clients' problems (Davies, op. cit. pp.87-94), through to the attempts to change clients so that they may function more effectively as role players within the body of society. It also, as we can see from the foregoing quotes, provides a meeting point between the individual, considered in his or her individual and in his or her social contexts. As we shall argue in a later chapter, recent functionalist social work theorising, represented by Davies' arguments, differs somewhat from earlier forms, in focussing more on the individual and rendering the social work task in a "technical" form, which tends to shift attention away from the wider political frameworks of social intervention.

Rather more complex has been the contribution of interpretive sociologists, and it would be outside the scope of this thesis to provide an exhaustive account of approaches to social work which derive from European phenomenology and American pragmatism (cf. Whittington and Holland, op. cit. pp. 37-40; Howe, D., 1987, pp. 96-

106; Day, 1987, pp. 15-16; Fitzjohn, J., 1974; Day, P, 1985; Knott, B.H., 1974). From these perspectives, there is a skepticism about the existence of a social system which allocates roles and identities. The interview is a context in which social selves, with prior formed definitions and expectations of social work and its possible relevance to them, negotiate working identities, agendas and relationships (Fitzjohn, op. cit.). As Whittington and Holland put it, this general perspective,

"rejects many of the theoretical assumptions of functionalism, treating rules as problematic, objectives as negotiated, and order as socially constructed and subject to change." (Whittington and Holland, op. cit. p.37).

The influence of labelling theories of deviance (cf. Becker, H. 1963, Cohen, S, 1973), which emerged, particularly from this school, have been strongly influential on social work since the late 1960's. In Whittington and Holland's terms,

"Social control agencies and their staff (police, social workers, psychiatrists) are key gatekeepers in shaping who is defined as deviant and,contribute to the knowledgeabout deviant acts and people." (Whittington and Holland, op. cit. p. 39).

This labelling process may propel the client into a spiral, in which he or she is encouraged to identify with the label, thus amplifying the deviance which it was the social worker's task to reduce. The

interview is one of the contexts where this labelling process may take place; alternatively, it may be a setting where the process can be subverted and the integrity of the client's, rather than official definitions be validated. A promise is held out, that alternative construction of identity and reality may be possible and the deleterious effects of official labelling be minimised (ibid. p.39).

Labelling theory was one of the central developments of symbolic interactionism. One of the key figures in the development of the symbolic interactionist school, itself best located within the framework of the American pragmatist philosophical school (cf. Rock, P., 1979), is Erving Goffman. His influence can be seen in one of the more impressive and methodologically rigorous approaches to the study of the interview, although here the focus is specifically on therapeutic interviews, in the work of Labov and Fanshel, who operate in a complex synthesis which derives from the pragmatist tradition, from the work of Erving Goffman (1971), from the conversational analysis of Harvey Sacks et. al. (1974, cf. also, Heritage, J., 1984), and the speech act theory of J.L. Austin (1962) and J. Searle, (1969). They term their approach "discourse analysis," and this is defined in terms of the interaction between subjects.

Therapeutic interviews, while having their own characteristics, are an instance of the genus of conversations, seen in an action context. Labov and Fanshel admit that they,

" follow Goffman in seeing conversation as a form of interaction. The great bulk of human face-to-face interaction is verbal; but unless linguistic interaction is viewed as a subspecies of a larger category it is bound to be misunderstood. We find that actions and utterances are regularly linked together in chains of exchanges. In fact.....one of the basic strategies of the therapist is to break down the common-sense view that actions are one thing and words are another.....A therapeutic interview can be seen as a speech event... a routinised form of behaviour, delineated by well-defined boundaries and well-defined sets of expected behaviours within those boundaries. The largest class of speech events that it falls under is the *interview* in general. We may define an interview as a speech event in which one person, A extracts information from another person, B, which was contained in B's biography.....The distinctive character of the therapeutic interview is that ...help will be given only through further talk" (rather than advice, which may be the purpose in other professional/client interviews) (Labov, W and Fanshel, D. 1977, pp.50-51).

In its sophisticated and insightful way, this "discourse analysis" approach to professional/client talk shares with other interpretive approaches, a view that, essentially, interviews are composed of individual subjects involved in the exchange of talk. "Discourse," as a term, refers to exchange between subjects, who are conceptualised as logically prior to that exchange.

We will not go any further in this brief tour of perspectives, lest it lead to the supposition that we are engaged simply in the traditional task of eliminating a range of "inferior" theories pertaining to the chosen phenomenon for investigation, before choosing the author's favourite. On the contrary, it is questionable whether we can speak of the given "objective" phenomenon of the social work interview, seen as existing independently of the various theories which are brought to bear to explain it. There are two principal reasons for this. Firstly, at least in the realms of theory, we can see that the interview is a very different reality in

the various frameworks, stretching from a component of an essential control/maintenance function working on behalf of the social system, to an interactional reality negotiated between two or more creative, independent, subjects. To what extent, therefore, can one be said to be choosing from different accounts of the "same" phenomenon?

Secondly, and more profoundly, the interview, or, more properly, interviews, are not separable from the various theories used to organise and make sense of them.

Theories of interviewing are implicated in the social production of those interviews and are located in a dense network of institutional procedures which go beyond the purely theoretical realm of "ideas," conveying, as that term does, the possibility of easy change to another set of "ideas," and therefore, other practice. It is, hence, doubtful if the analyst is any more at liberty to choose his or her theoretical perspective for examining the interview, without taking this into account, any more than is the practitioner in choosing one method of social work practice, rather than another, as if choosing products from an intellectual supermarket shelf (Stenson, K. and Gould, N., 1986). This will become apparent in our analysis of instructional discourse on the art of social work interviewing. As we shall shortly explain, knowledge in social work is effective insofar as it is linked to strategies of power. Knowledge drawn from other social science disciplines can be absorbed into social work to the extent that it has affinities with the deeper rationales and practices of the profession.

For example, the role of functionalist approaches in informing social work knowledges, will be explored in chapter three. Dingwall et. al., have argued that interpretive approaches, especially via labelling theory entered, to some extent, the knowledges of social work in the 1960'S and 1970's. In their judgment, this affected social workers' confidence in their authority and expertise in applying standards of normality in their practice - even though this is an inescapable part of that practice - and contributed to an ethos of cultural relativism within the profession (Dingwall, R., et. al.. 1983, pp.82-86). However, as we shall see in chapters four and five, interpretive conceptions of the human subject can be seen as manifestations of deeper patterns of social knowledge, at least in terms of their appropriation within social work knowledge. In a much less direct way, we will explore in chapter six, the relevance of Labov's work for an understanding of social work interviewing. At this stage, it is necessary to explain the location of our particular construction of social work interviewing within a framework based on the work of Foucault. This will be a prelude to the elaboration of our model of the place of social work interviewing within its wider contexts. Without a grounding within a particular structure of knowledge, the term remains a "floating signifier", with no clear referent.

THE FOUCAULTIAN AGENDA

The framework adopted in this thesis constructs social work interviews (and the plural is deliberately preferred here, since we

are not yet in the position to define a genus and the full range of sub-types) as elements of the complex set of practices of social work, considered as part of the apparatuses of normalisation. For Foucault and for Donzelot, who has worked within a Foucaultian agenda, a complex of institutions and practices, located both within and without the formal boundaries of the state, have been engaged, particularly since the nineteenth century, in providing advice, support and control to the families of the poor, within the orbit of educational inspection and welfare, charitable and state social work, medical inspection and advice related to standards of hygiene, and so forth.

This cannot simply be understood as a repressive process, whereby, for example, the bourgeois classes have imposed their standards of normality in health, hygiene, childcare, education and so on, onto the poor. It involved, rather, the creation of new forms of power in society, which create the very conditions of possibility of modern social relations. By contrast, for Foucault, power must be understood in positive terms, power is conceived of in terms of relations, of which human bodies are the bearers, which unleash new social possibilities. These forms of management and control also involve forms of knowledge. Knowledge and power strategies are inextricably intertwined. What sets this theory apart from repressive theories of power, is the view that the human subject is itself transformed through power relations, it cannot be conceived of as existing prior to power relations. The view of the subject as autonomous and free (actually or potentially) and the author of its

actions (a view reflected in the interpretive sociological theories we have discussed), is itself the product of historically produced complexes of power/knowledge.

But, it is important not to exaggerate the centrality of the analysis of power, as an end in itself, in Foucault's work; his interest in power was oriented towards his interest in the formation of human subjectivity. For Foucault, the,

"objective....has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects. My work has dealt with three modes of objectivication which transform human beings into subjects.

The first is the modes of inquiry which try to give themselves the status of sciences; for example, the objectivising of the speaking subject in *grammaire générale*, philology and linguistics. Or again, in this first mode, the objectivizing of the productive subject, the subject who labours, in the analysis of wealth and economics. Or, a third example, the objectivizing of the sheer fact of being alive in natural history or biology.

In the second part of my work, I have studied the objectivizing of the subject in what I shall call "dividing practices." The subject is either divided inside himself or divided from others. This process objectivizes him. Examples are the mad and the sane, the sick and the healthy, the criminals and the "good boys."

Finally, I have sought to study - it is my current work - the way a human being turns him- or herself into a subject, For example, I have chosen the domain of sexuality - how men have learned to recognise themselves as subjects of 'sexuality'" (Foucault, 1982, p.208).

The "dividing practices" to which Foucault refers, embody the disciplinary mode of power, which was analysed particularly in "Discipline and Punish" (Foucault, M., 1977), there are three processes involved in discipline: hierarchical surveillance, a non reciprocal, monitoring gaze, in which the bearers of power are able to create individual knowledge about human bodies over a continuous basis (Foucault, *ibid.* pp.170-176); secondly, it includes normalising judgement, which involves, unlike juridical judgement, a continuous, discretionary evaluation of conduct in the light of floating standards between negative and positive poles, enabling a microeconomy of privileges and impositions to be applied (*ibid.* pp. 177-183); thirdly, it involves the examination. This,

"combines the techniques of an observing hierarchy and those of a normalising judgement. It is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them. That is why, in all the mechanisms of discipline, the examination is highly ritualised. In it are combined the ceremony of power and the form of the experiment, the deployment of force and the establishment of truth.

At the heart of the procedures of discipline, it manifests the subjection of those who are perceived as objects and the objectification of those who are subjected." (ibid., pp.184-185).

The ceremonial aspect of examination, which is conceived of as a repeated regular phenomenon, and which includes, for example the medical inspection and the school examination and the social work case conference, involve considerable documentation and reinforces the production of individuals into "cases" (ibid., p.191). In summary, we can at this stage, express the non-repressive, positive approach to power in these words,

"The individual is no doubt the fictitious atom of an 'ideological' representation of society; but he is also a reality fabricated by this specific technology of power that I have called 'discipline'. We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact, power produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production." (Foucault, M. 1977, p.194).

Aspects of the historical development of these disciplinary forms will be examined in chapter three, but we can argue at this stage that social work interviewing involves a disciplinary component. We shall see in chapters five and seven that the interview is a vehicle for monitoring, for turning the non-reciprocal normalising gaze onto

clients and their families, through the "casework" of the interview, the client is turned into, or stabilised as, a "case", known to the authorities. We will also argue that interviewing may not go much beyond the disciplinary phase.

Yet the goal of much social work is to go beyond the disciplinary phase, to the processes which were Foucault's main concerns in his later work, more precisely the concern with the way a human being turns him- or herself into a subject. Bird and Short argue that in the *History of Sexuality* (Foucault, M., 1979), the concern with discipline shifts towards regulation (though Foucault did not consistently use the term to refer, in effect, to subjectification). Bird and Short provide a useful clarification of this distinction, -

"It is made clear in the histories of sexuality that sexuality contains a set of discourses which, for the first time, deal with the object *and* the subject, with political anatomies of the body *and* bio-politics of populations; that is with the individual *and* the population. Foucault demonstrates that sexuality is especially ripe for exercising relationships between social groups and individuals: relationships between men and women, parents and children, the politically powerful and the weak. The resulting theory of bio-power, of power and the body, elaborates these mechanisms of discipline and regulation. Discipline..... is modelled on the gaze, and based on the examination, the normalising judgement and observation which is hidden and hierarchial, the model for which is the panopticon (*Bentham's utopian model of the*

prison, where all are visible to the gaze of the guards).

Regulation- yielding bio-politics of populations- operates through interiorisation, and is founded on the confession, on talking. Disciplines produce knowledge by producing people as objects of scientific discourse, whereas regulation provides knowledge of subjects in their subjectivity. Both seek a more correct and truer understanding of individuals and groups, through the medium of experts in objective and interpretive sciences" (Bird, J. and Short, S., 1984, p. 8. Italicised quote added by this author.).

Chapter three will explore the implications of Foucault's notion of bio-power for our understanding of the socially constructed ideals of motherhood, the "social mother," but let us note at this stage, that the sphere of bio-power (or, bio-politics) could be seen as giving rise to, or perhaps is coterminous with, what Foucault refers to as "Governmentality" (Foucault, 1979). This is not reducible to the activities of the formally constituted State, as in the Marxist approaches to social work. As Miller and Rose extend the notion,

"Government here embraces all those programmes which seek to to secure desired socio-political objectives through the regulation of the activities and relations of individuals and populations.

Government, understood in this sense, draws our attention to the ways in which the conduct of personal life has become a crucial mechanism in the exercise of political power, including the active promotion of social well being and the public good through initiatives and programmes ranging from the remodelling of urban

architecture and sewage systems, through the control of vagrancy and pauperism, to the ordering of family life." (Miller, P. and Rose, N., 1988, p.174, cf also Minson, J., 1985, pp.105-106).

The sphere of government is complex, includes the unintended, as well as intended, effects of policy programmes, and the degree to which it can be orchestrated by particular groupings in any one direction is an open question, going beyond our brief. But, social work strategies form small strands within it, and it is our contention that the link between the social worker and the client must be understood as part of the attempt to draw clients and their families into this sphere of government, not through repression, "but through the promotion of subjectivity, through investments in individual lives, and the forging of alignments between the personal projects of citizens and images of the social order." (ibid. p.172). This process of alignment is also complex, but as we shall see in chapters five and seven, one of its dimensions lies in the particular operation of forms of linguistic discourse, which create a sense of a shared community of interests between social worker and client. This is one of the preconditions of the invited entry of clients into "educative discourse," which must be seen as one of the discursive forms of government.

More deeply, in chapter three, we will examine the background to the professional agendas of social work practice with mothers, in the development of discourses of the social mother. Our argument, beginning with a particular reading of Donzelot, is that the various

constructions of the social mother, including Winnicott's post-war construction of "the good enough mother," and more broadly, of citizenship, must be seen as signifiers, not simply of the linkages of the individual to the State, in its narrowly political sense, but rather to the wider, biopolitical sphere of government. The social mother provides the bridge between the pole representing the individual body and the family and the pole of biopolitics representing the collective dimensions of government. The role of educative discourse, then, is to attempt to consolidate these links by encouraging clients to enter the discursive world in which these realities and subject positions, are given some recognition; even though in the modern era, this recognition may rarely take the form of ringing declarations of the importance of good motherhood for the well being of the nation. As we will see, in chapters three and five, in recent, post-war history, the professional discourses of social work have tended to shift towards "technical" forms, in which clients' problems and solutions are phrased in terms of the conditions close to the immediate lives of clients. Thus an improvement in the life of the client as a result of social work intervention is represented as a service to the client rather than as a gain to the social collectivity.

In educative discourse, the client is encouraged to speak with the voices of the "good social work subject," who perceives her or his identity and life problems in ways which are considered rational and intelligible to the normalising agencies. While the normalising agencies, in relation with other agencies of control/administration,

do not speak with one voice, and have different priorities, the social worker is a relay between them and the particular versions of educative discourse, of which she/he is the bearer, is often a compromise constructed in the biopolitical connections drawn through the relations between social worker and client. It is this dimension of the process of regulation, and the halting, often tentative stages on the paths between discipline and regulation in social work practice, which is the principal concern of the latter part of this study.

It is important to note at this point that there are parallels between the analysis in chapter seven and Silverman's analysis of professional/client relations in clinical practice between doctors and diabetic patients and their parents (Silverman, D., 1987, pp. 205-232). One of the key clinical goals is to encourage young patients with diabetes to monitor and regulate their own bodily processes and general lifestyles, and administer their own medication. In this way they can, hopefully, move beyond a childhood dependency on parents and doctors. He examines, using Foucaultian concepts, how attempts are made to move beyond the mode of professional practice which simply sees people as objects of the clinical gaze, towards a position in which we are, "turned into *subjects* whose freedom includes the obligation to survey ourselves." (Silverman, 1987, p. 225).

That study, while making innovative use of Foucaultian concepts, seems to begin from a point more clearly rooted in the interpretive

schools of ethnomethodology and conversation analysis than does this thesis. It points to fruitful possibilities for a rapprochement between forms of discourse theory which have derived from very different theoretical traditions. However, one should not underestimate the theoretical problems involved in trying to combine concepts drawn from interpretive approaches, with their broadly humanist view of the individual subject and the post-structuralist anti-humanism of Foucault's theories (Stenson, K. 1986). This thesis will not attempt to solve the great theoretical problems involved in trying to effect a synthesis between these divergent forms of discourse theory.

Yet, it could be argued that very useful advances can be made in advance of grand theoretical syntheses. While the latter sections of the thesis make selective use of insightful work within the interpretive schools of discourse analysis, the agenda of this thesis is rooted more clearly in the work of Foucault and Donzelot and does not attempt to make a systematic contribution to the analysis of speech exchange systems in general (cf. Atkinson, J.M. 1982 and Dingwall, R., 1980). Our concerns are more confined to the biopolitical discursive practices of the normalising professions.

Thus, we can, at this stage, begin to see the key difference between the perspective we are developing here and the otherwise varied perspectives we discussed earlier. In their different ways, they posit the social worker/client relationship, within which the interview plays a central role, as a relationship between subjects,

whether or not those subjects are seen as more or less creative, determined, or bearers of the interests and needs of the "social system," or class forces. Rather, in this study, we will sidestep the search for the "true" nature of the subjectivity of the individual human being (Cf. Hirst, P. and Woolley, P. 1982; Carrithers, M. et. al., 1985). Here, we are more concerned with how, in the discourses we are examining, attributions of subjectivity are made (Rabinow, P. 1984, p.7) and how they are gradually built up, accepted and resisted.

THE CONTEXT OF INTERVIEWING, DISCURSIVE FORMATION OR STRATEGY?

In locating the context of social work interviewing within its surrounding field of practices, we are concerned with two main features of this location: synchronic and diachronic. The synchronic contexts of these practices are the relatively enduring pattern of relationships, within and across time, which characterise the elements of social work practice and link it with other forms of normalising and control practices. While at various places in the analysis, we refer to the relationships between social work and other agencies, for example the debt reclamation departments of the public utilities, to housing departments and departments of social security, it is beyond the scope of this project to provide a detailed institutional analysis of those linkages; considerable work remains to be done in this area, particularly given the increasing pressures to develop "multi-agency" work. Rather, we note the importance of those linkages within the sphere of government, as we

have been using the term, and begin by locating the synchronic linkages *within* social work practice.

In uncovering these synchronic elements, we draw on the work of Philp, which though programmatic, has proved to be very insightful. He is influenced by the work of G. Pearson (1975) and the Foucault of *The Archeology of Knowledge* (1972). Essentially, Philp conceives of social work as a form of knowledge/power, seen as a "discursive formation". But, before discussing Philp, what does Foucault mean by this term? For Foucault, forms of knowledge are rarely marked simply by inclusiveness or logical consistency, rather they are systems of dispersion, where gaps, contradictions and lacunae are regularly co-present,

"Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with a *discursive formation* - thus avoiding words that are already overladen with conditions and consequences, and in any case inadequate to the task of designating such a dispersion, such as 'science, 'ideology', 'theory', or 'domain of objectivity'. The conditions to which the elements of this division (objects, mode of statement, concepts, thematic choices) are subjected we shall call the *rules of formation*. The rules of formation are conditions of existence (but also of co-existence, maintenance, modification, and

disappearance) in a given discursive division". (Foucault, 1972, p. 38).

Despite the careful wording of this definition, which assiduously seeks to avoid any simplistic reduction of discourse to ideas or language, as Brown and Cousins have argued, Foucault, at this early stage, did not fully succeed in avoiding the structuralist tendency to assimilate sociality to a rule governed linguistic model, where even non-discursive elements are recognised mainly in terms of their status as honorary linguistic elements (Brown and Cousins, 1980). And as Foucault himself later remarked, "What was missing from my work was the problem of 'discursive regime', the effects of power properly on the enunciative play. I confused it too much with systematicity, the theoretical form or something like a paradigm. Between *The History of Madness* and *The Order of Things*, there was under two different aspects, the problem of power which had not been well located" (Foucault/Gordon, 1980, p. 105).

Now we have no intention here of claiming that there was an epistemological split in Foucault's work, between *The Archeology* and his later work, nor of entering into that debate here. Rather we would concur with Minson (Minson, J., 1985, pp. 114-141) that, at a fundamental level, there remains substantial continuity over time. Yet the "genealogical" methods of his later work do place a greater premium on examining the close inter-relationship of power and knowledge, with a corresponding departure from the view that

discourse, in its linguistic and propositional senses, forms a systemic sphere, separable from the play of institutional forces.

SOCIAL WORK DISCOURSES: -SYNCHRONY, The Creation of Subject Forms

Philp, in trying to uncover the more enduring synchronic relations and elements of social work, errs towards a systematic, "archeological" view. He argues that forms of knowledge in social work, in Foucault's terms, produce a regime of truth. He argues that there are three key distinguishing practices in social work. Firstly social work produces a subject who is both social and subjective. In this discourse, while the human subject may not fully realise his or her full potential, s/he has the capacity for compassionate, rational, self directive, morally responsible action in a social setting in which the subject, as a good citizen, acknowledges the existence and needs of other subjects like him or herself.

We will indicate, in chapter five, the ideographic, individualising tendency of social work knowledge. In other words, social workers tend to be reluctant to fall in with the tendency in social science discourse to subsume individual cases into general categories of behaviour and personality; preferring to emphasise the uniqueness of each case. There is, furthermore, the assumption that the only effective way to build up knowledge and skills in social work practice is through extensive practice experience of individuals and families. Yet, ironically, the search for the good social work subject, embodies a set of very abstract assumptions about the

nature of the subject, or at least what the subject could, with appropriate help, become. Behind the apparently banal and practical conversations about life's problems, lies an essentially Kantian image of the potential capacities of the human subject as a moral agent, able through self mastery, to achieve greater control over his or her life.

This abstract form of the social work subject excludes those whose objective circumstances, life history or perhaps horrendously deviant actions could be seen to overwhelm their subjectivities. Social workers can only work, with a credible licence, with those who are considered promising material (Philp, M, 1979, p.97). The second and related feature is that potentially determining or constraining objective characteristics like old age, crime, physical handicap and so on, are integrated with the individuals' emotional subjective states, in such a way that the subject can act effectively and sociably. Constraints may become a bridge to constructive relationships with other people (ibid, p92).

Thirdly, social workers, whose work operates within the gap between normal social functioning on the one hand and poverty, inability to cope with children and other forms of curable deviance on the other hand, speak for the incapacitated subject until such time that the subject can speak for him or herself (ibid, p.97). Intervention may hopefully lead to a return of the subject/citizen to full discursive rights. We may be skeptical about the degree to which it is possible, under conditions of general constraint in social work, to

go beyond the provision of what Davies (1985) calls the maintenance of clients' coping mechanisms. For many clients this may mean that they remain in a state which falls somewhat short of full citizen-subjectivity.

In chapter five, we link these formulations of Philp's with an analysis of the organisational forms within which social work knowledge/practices operates. We identify aspects of the strategic environment in which front line conversational discourse operates between social workers and clients. At this stage, this analysis is, of necessity, partial. To uncover the full range of particular environments within which social work practice, with a wide range of clients, takes place, is a major task for future research. We can only point to some of the more general features in this thesis, as they are relevant to our argument. It will be argued that the organisational and other discursive practices which provide a context for social work practice, provide space for the discursively central practice of casework. In turn, this is viewed as an instance of the operation of what Foucault calls "the confession," a secularised form of the old religious confession, which has become appropriated as a technology, and transformed by psychiatry and the normalising professions (Foucault, 1978, pp.53-70).

In the same chapter, we argue that the space of the confession is the site of the operation of two forms of discourse, normalising discourse and citizen exchange discourse. The former is a general term to describe the disciplinary and regulative basis of the social

worker's agenda within interviews. In short, the disciplinary character of social work interviews refers to the concerns, often backed up by legal powers and requirements, with monitoring the lives of clients and their families, in the light of normative standards set within the historically produced agendas of professional social work discourses. In the interview case studies we examine, these concerns include, for example: attempts to assess the suitability of prospective adoptive parents; the material and emotional environments of families whose children are considered to be in various ways "at risk", or in need of support where family relationships are under strain; evaluating the extent a family's "needs" warrant a very scarce nursery place; and assessing how well a client is coping with family budgeting. Normalisation involves a complex range of practices, including the writing of reports, the holding of case conferences with other normalising agents, giving evidence before the courts and so on. The analysis of these related practices is largely beyond the scope of this thesis, but we would argue that the examination of interview practices must be seen within this wider context.

Sometimes, however, interviews may go beyond the monitoring concerns of discipline and reach the regulative, or educative dimension of discourse, which is favoured in professional training. For this to work, the client must "voluntarily" participate in discussions about her/his life, within the terms encouraged by professional discourses. The "good social work subject" in regulative discourse, is one who wants to discuss her/his life problems in ways which are

considered by the social worker to be planful, rational and socially acceptable. This "voluntary" character of the relation between social worker and client is one of its distinguishing features, which sets it apart, for example, from relationships between poor people and some other agents of authority, notably social security officers and the police.

Given the voluntary character of the ideal social worker/client relationship and the frequently fragile nature of the relationship, even where interviews rarely go much beyond the disciplinary function of monitoring, interviews tend to take on a friendly, egalitarian style, where the social worker is presented as a sort of "friend" to the client. This is what we characterise as "citizen exchange discourse". It would be false to depict this form as simply a velvet glove which masks the iron fist of social work's juridical authority. While the social workers' juridical powers are considerable, for example in recommending to the court that children be removed from a family, there are considerable costs, fiscal and professional, in using these powers. In a sense, the use of draconian legal sanctions can be seen as a mark of the failure of the specific authority invested in the social worker. Thus citizen exchange is not simply an ideological veil concealing the true function of interviews, it is a necessary component of them.

At a deeper level, the discourse of citizen exchange, of which the social worker is a bearer, with its egalitarian, neighbourly flavour, together with the service/contractual model of the modern

social worker/client relationship, must be seen as a part of the ongoing bio-political construction of "citizenship" in the sphere of government. Though here, as we have emphasised, this construction of the individual is not reducible to the narrow terms of the relationship between the individual and the State.

Chapter five raises most of the central issues concerning the construction of particular subject positions in interviews, in particular the constitution of the client as a storyteller subject and the attempts to draw clients into regulative, educative discourse. However, its concerns remain broadly synchronic and thus incomplete. The remaining chapters take the concerns of the synchronic analysis further, by focusing on the more historically particular and contingent features of social work discourses.

ORALITY AND LITERACY

However, there is another synchronic dimension of conversational discourse, which is examined in chapter six. This refers to the distinction drawn by Walter Ong, with impressive scholarship, between orality and literacy. These are, he argues key dimensions of discourse, which are often neglected. He argues that Foucault's analysis of discourse is principally focussed on written and printed texts; he is in that sense a "textualist" (Ong, W. 1982, pp165-166). The assumption is that for Foucault, the primordial form of discourse is textual, or at least there is no essential difference between textual and oral discourses. This is not altogether fair to

Foucault, since he clearly sees discourse, in its linguistic dimension, as indicative, or the embodiment of living practices and not separated into a detached, ethereal linguistic sphere. Yet, it is true that he paid scant and passing attention to the specific characteristics of oral discourse (Foucault, 1972, pp.82-84).

Two points are worth making here. First, his scant interest in specifically oral forms of discourse, may account for the relative lack of attention given to oral forms of discourse by those who have tried to extend his intellectual agenda. Secondly, this has allowed the study of this sphere of discourse to be dominated by conversational analysts, interpretive sociologists and pragmatist, speech act theorists, as we discussed earlier. In consequence, the very definitions of conversational discourse have been constituted within the academic "regimes of truth" created within these disciplines. To investigate this sphere of discourse, is to risk being drawn into a well trodden field, within which the protocols for analysis have already been constructed by the pioneers. The result would then be the juxtaposition of two theoretically alien forms of discourse analysis.

The use made of Ong's work in chapter five, therefore, is not a full endorsement of that work, or a simple attempt at a synthesis of Ong with Foucault. It should, rather, be seen as an attempt to extend the Foucault-based school of discourse analysis into the field of conversational discourse, so that one may better understand the

linkages between those discourses in the social work setting and their environing discourses.

Without anticipating, in full, the analysis in chapters six and seven, in essence Ong argues that there are not only fundamental differences between oral and literate discourses, but that there are also basic differences between forms of oral discourse more firmly rooted in the skills of literacy and those more firmly rooted in the skills of primary, or residually, oral cultures. Now, while there are no systematic studies of the literacy levels of the client population, and it would be foolish to claim that all clients are semi-literate, or illiterate, we do know that even today, the client population is disproportionately drawn from the poorer sections of the population (Becker, S. and Macpherson, S., 1986; Parton, N, 1985). It is currently estimated that there are over two million adult illiterates in Britain today (Honey, J. 1988, p.186). It is not unreasonable to assume, until later corrected, that the client population is still disproportionately drawn from those sections of the population who have gained little from the education system, in the form of literacy skills, and whose discourses, therefore, still bear some of the characteristics of orality. In addition, it is likely that even literate based conversational discourse may bear traces of the characteristics of orality.

This chapter introduces the key distinction, which is used in the substantive analyses of transcripts in chapter seven, between thematic and rhapsodic discourse. Here we can only give a brief

indication, but thematic discourse, for example in the forms of story telling, uses complex tense manipulation and subordinate clauses to construct tightly sequenced narrative structures, which keep to a "point" and can be seen to illustrate abstract propositions. These "points" can be held to have an existence prior to the recounting of a particular narrative. Rhapsodic discourse, by contrast, consists of a series of episodes which may be individually connected, but which are stitched together in clusters, perhaps tied to a recurrent motif, as in an impressionistic musical composition. The functions of rhapsodic discourse are less to express propositions than to paint morally tinged pictures of social scenes, often involving the narrator. Tense manipulation is usually simpler in form than in thematic discourse, and there is not the same emphasis on the tight, sequential calibration of units of time and events.

While many conversations may take a rhapsodic surface form, there may still be an underlying, thematically structured agenda, which can act as a base for orchestrating the flow of talk. Social work discourses provide such thematic agendas, and, perhaps, for its propositional themes to become operative in the discourse, requires some connection to be made between thematic and rhapsodic forms. Social work interviews may have to deal with the clashes between the rhapsodic and the thematic. These differences cannot be understood simply in terms of the individual use of language, but are probably deeply rooted in culture.

Significantly, in the 1960's and the early 1970's, Bernstein (1964) and Mayer and Timms (1970), albeit within different theoretical frameworks to those adopted here, raised questions about the implications of cultural/discursive differences between the forms of counselling discourse of social work and psychiatry, and the characteristic "language" styles of the lower working class. These questions were largely displaced by changing intellectual fashions. While the larger demographic questions about literacy and the client population are beyond the brief of this study, we have developed methods of analysis which take the dimensions of orality and literacy into account. But that takes us into the field of diachronic analysis.

SOCIAL WORK STRATEGIES, THE DIACHRONIC DIMENSION

We earlier noted that chapter five is primarily concerned with synchronic analysis and that, following Minson, we are attempting to combine the synchronic analysis of the discursive formation of social work as developed by Philp, with diachronic analysis. But what are the implications of these issues for our analysis? It means that, while Philp's programmatic model of the discursive formation of social work remains useful, by itself, it is insufficient for the understanding of changes in social work over time, the diachronic analysis of shifts in social work strategies, the particular complexes of power/knowledge which have shifted within the general synchronic framework of the discursive formation of social work. For example, we may cite the shifts of the psycho-social strategy and

other processes of normalisation (cf. Garland, 1985, and Rose, 1985), which we describe in chapter three. It also means that the broad synchronic analysis is insufficient for an understanding of the sequential, unfolding characteristics of conversational discourse.

This is significant at two levels, both in terms of the unfolding conversational discourse of interviews and secondly, within the terms of instructional discourse on interviewing, which provides prescriptive exemplars for doing social work interviews (the topic of chapter four). Instructional discourse is centrally concerned with the diachronic flow of talk in interviews and in the developing relationship between social worker and client over time. In particular, it focusses on the problem of retaining some sense of planfulness, of theme, over time; even though in social work interviews, the social worker must always be prepared to ditch plans and change tack in the face of contingencies. We have to abandon a view of instructional discourse as consisting of "ideas", which are subsequentially made flesh in the thinking and practices of social workers' interviews.

As Cousins and Hussain elegantly express it, Foucault's,

"use of the term discourse may be taken to be tactical. It may be thought of as an attempt to avoid treating knowledge in terms of 'ideas'. The reason for avoiding the term 'ideas' is that it brings in its train a series of propositions which Foucault hopes to

abandon. We will mention only three. The first is that an 'idea' is knowledge by virtue of being a proposition, a proposition being the logical form of an idea. Knowledge consists of ideas as they present themselves for validation. The second presupposes that an 'idea' is a mental representation and is thus tied to the apparatus of production of thought by a human subject. Although these two presuppositions do not have to go together with any logical necessity, they frequently do so in historical investigations, especially in the sense of ideas being treated as propositions and at the same time having an 'author'. The third presupposition is that 'ideas' are expressed or have their existence in language. In this case the identity of an idea is its meaning and its basic units are sentences. ...this trinity of proposition-subject-meaning which hovers over the idea is one from which Foucault tries to turn away in his analysis of knowledge". (Cousins and Hussain, 1984, pp. 78-79).

It is, thus, important to take account of instructional discourses, not because they are "ideas", or "theories" made flesh in practice, but, partly because they are an important element in the professional discourses of social work training, and also because, even though not used as a detailed guide to professional practice, some of the themes can be found operating within interview practice.

Finally, one of the key bridges, or, perhaps, homologies, between instructional discourse and the practice of social workers in interviews is in the construction of client subject positions. A

central theme of instructional discourse is the search for- whatever her or his cultural characteristics- the client's unique qualities, the search for the *true person*. But as we argue, this "search" is in fact a construction of the individual subject and is a central feature of the construction of "citizenship" within the sphere of government. This is the subjectivity described by Philp as lying at the core of the discursive formation of social work, but its roots are deeper and more pervasive. It is founded, to use Minson's terms, on a deep rooted "personalist" moral ontology of human personality (Minson, J, 1985, p.3) an ontology which exists not merely, or mainly, in the realm of "ideas," but in a web of institutional practices. This moral ontology lies at the core of liberal forms of government.

THE UNFOLDING OF INTERVIEW DISCOURSE

We have argued that social work interviewing operates within the frame of what Foucault calls the confession. But his discussion of the confession remains general, rather mechanistic and incomplete. It is through the confession that the client "turns her/his-self into a subject," acceptable to the discourses of the normalising agencies. It offers a space within which the the disciplinary mode of power, involving the examination, normalising judgement and hierarchical surveillance, can be extended to include the process of regulation, or subjectification. However, this process is complex, tentative, uneven and often involves resistance. Given his scant interest in oral discourse, Foucault seems to assume that the

insertion of confession in the whole architecture of normalisation is enough for subjectification to work,

"the agency of domination does not reside in the one who speaks (for it is he who is constrained), but in the one who listens and says nothing; not in the one who knows and answers, but in the one who questions and is not supposed to know. And this discourse of truth finally takes effect, not in the one who receives it, but in the one from whom it is wrested." (Foucault, 1979, p.62).

By contrast, we show, in the analysis of one interview in particular, that disciplinary monitoring may take place while the social worker's role is passive, but for regulation to operate requires more. Essentially, extending Foucault's analysis of the confession requires an acknowledgement of the role of *exchange* in discourse. *It is not sufficient for the social worker to lend a mute's ear.* But the process of exchange cannot be understood, solely, as in the other approaches to discourse we have discussed, in terms of inter-individual relations. More deeply, it involves exchange, whether conflictual or cooperative, between forms of discourse, of which individual participants in the interview, are the bearers.

In a series of contrasting analyses of particular stretches of interview transcript, in chapter seven, we develop a battery of concepts and methodological procedures for examining conversational discourse, within the framework of normalisation. We explore, for

example, the use, in resistance, that can be made of the subject position of the story teller subject (whose constitution we examine in chapter five), by the experienced client. We show the ways in which the tension between citizen exchange and hierarchical, normalising modes of discourse are managed in interviews and We then focus on the processes of orchestration in interviews, how the orchestrator's "baton" consists of a range of skills in raising, suppressing or redirecting topics, in rephrasing the other participant's utterances and, perhaps, drawing the client into educative discourse.

The orchestrator's "baton" can pass from participant to participant, but it is misleading to identify orchestration, in the narrow sense, with power, considered as a resource "held" by individuals. We show how power, in the Foucaultian sense, can operate even though, on the surface, the client may have the orchestrator's baton. In particular, in a variety of ways, contrasts are drawn between interviews in which there is a gulf between the thematic social work agendas and the surface, often rhapsodic, forms of the interview discourse, and on the other hand those interviews in which there is more harmony between social work themes and the surface of the interview discourse. In the former cases, interview discourse is characterised by degrees of indirection, where challenges to veracity and so forth take on cautious, ambiguous forms. This is particularly characteristic of interviews within fragile social worker/client relationships. Invitations to enter subject positioning can take on subtle forms, for example, the client can be

addressed, or referred to in the discourse, as if she were already the good social work subject.

In the latter cases, the client assumes the client position of "good social work subject," and truly enters the confessional mode. This is satisfying for the social worker because it confirms her/his professional subject positioning as counsellor, one who can go beyond the mere advocate's role, merely supporting or maintaining the client, and perhaps assisting the client to achieve some change towards the thematic, rational and self directing subject. While in her/his disciplinary mode, the social worker acts as an important relay between the client, the public utilities, housing, social security and a variety of normalising and other official agencies, more subtly, in regulative discourse, the client is provided with a form of discourse which offers her/him an opportunity to reflect on her/himself as a "relay" between the various subject positions which she/he adopts and which may be in considerable tension. The client who can become an effective "relay" between the various subject positions in her/his own life, may come to resemble the rational, self activating "unitary subject", the master and not the servant of one's fate.

It is important to stress that I make no exaggerated claims for this analysis. The sample of interviews is narrowly drawn and at best, I am simply pointing the way for other researchers to extend and revise the use of these methods and concepts in conducting further research.

Thus, in brief, chapter two will explain the methods adopted in this study and the wider implications of adopting them. Chapter three, on the basis of our reading of the work of Donzelot, explains some of the key strategic shifts in the historical construction of motherhood, which help to set the agenda for contemporary social work practice. Against that context, chapter four, in exploring the themes of instructional discourse about social work interviewing, examines how the general norms and objectives of social work strategies can be deployed into operational techniques. Chapter five narrows the focus of the analysis by examining the characteristics of the bureaucratic and more immediate social contexts in which interviewing takes place. It also investigates the positioning and distribution of subject positions within interviews, in particular the constitution of the client as a confessional storyteller, a *sine qua non* for disciplinary monitoring.

Chapter six, in examining the role of different styles of narrative in interviews, provides important conceptual tools for helping us to understand the relation between social workers' and clients' forms of discourse. In particular, the differences between orally and literate based forms of narrative are stressed, and the implications this has for the possible move towards regulative discourse. Chapter seven draws upon the full range of analytical techniques developed in the preceding chapters, in a series of case study accounts of interviews which exemplify contrastive processes in the tentative attempts, on both sides, to orchestrate the course of interviews, and on the social workers' side, to move towards regulative

discourse proper.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

The point was made in the last chapter, that the only serious attempt so far, to study the "linguistic data" of social work interviews, is a small study by Baldock and Prior(1981), of a range of social work interviews. It used a rather simple and largely descriptive theoretical framework which though insightful, hardly touched on the issues which concern us here. In fact, as was, indicated, it is, in the terms of this analysis, misleading to abstract purely linguistic elements from the wider discursive processes, of which they are a part. Having made this point, given limited time, energy and resources, it is impossible for any one researcher to study all aspects of social process at once. Thus, there is indeed a focus on what may look like "linguistic data," in the present study; one must, though, bear in mind that the status of this linguistic data is different, in the terms of this form of discourse analysis, from that in other forms of discourse analysis. The utterances which are analysed here are not considered to be part of the universal process of conducting conversations, as in the conversational analysis of Sacks, Schegloff, Jefferson et. al. (cf, Heritage, J. 1984), nor as the expressions of individual subjects in interaction, as in the interactionist/pragmatist approaches of Goffman (1981),

Stubbs (1983), Labov and Fanshel (1977) and others (cf, Silverman, D. 1985, and Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P. 1983).

Like, Baldock and Prior, I also gathered tape recordings of interviews between social workers and their clients. As will be argued in chapter five, in the beleaguered profession of social work, which is subject to much vitriolic criticism in the mass media about its alleged failings, and within which individual social workers have little room for autonomous professional practice in an increasingly bureaucratised framework, the space of "casework", in which social workers spend time in face-to-face contact with clients, is highly prized. The presence of researchers, within that general context, is likely to be viewed with suspicion and hostility by many social workers and social work managers, anxious not to expose even more of their professional "failings" to public scrutiny.

I decided, therefore, not to try an official approach. My "in" to the social services department was through a friend who worked as a research officer in the borough. He introduced me and a colleague, who at that time was intending to share the project with me (he later withdrew to pursue another research project), to the area director of the team which was to collaborate in the project.

Since, the concern of the research was, at that stage, the methods of control operating within the interviews and hence

"difficult," or "fragile" interviews should be included, after discussion with the social workers, it was decided that the presence of an outside observer may have been likely to be too inhibiting for both social worker and for client. The social workers, in the area team which had agreed to cooperate, were provided with small, portable cassette tape recorders and a tapes. They were simply asked to record, with the client's knowledge and permission, interviews as they came up, over a period of a month. Since the focus was to be on control procedures, which it was hypothesised, would probably operate in different kinds of interview setting, even with a small number of cases, it was felt better to seek out indications of similar processes at work in a range of cases, covering different types of client and types of problem- however that was defined- rather than attempting to focus on a narrower range of interviews with particular clients.

In order to determine if there were any links between the type of control procedures operating in interviews and particular characteristics of clients, the social workers were asked to fill in brief forms, indicating where the interview had taken place, the sex, age category, marital status, occupation and nationality of the client, whether the interview was an "initial" interview, or whether it was part of a sequence. Also, the social workers were asked to provide brief comments on the nature of the client, reasons, as they saw them, for referral and any comments they had about the interview itself.

With other commitments, the time available to gather the data was limited, and I was also conscious of not wanting to stretch the patience of the busy social workers, who, though initially enthusiastic, would I thought (correctly as it turned out), after the novelty had worn off, be less diligent about recording, especially with the same clients. Thus, it was decided not to attempt to record, on a longitudinal basis, a series of interviews with the same client. In addition, on an informal basis, the social workers were interviewed about their reactions to the interview. This was done partly to maintain personal contact with the social workers and it revealed useful feedback. I then decided to hold a general, extended group discussion about their experiences of recording the interviews and the views on interviewing in general. This was conducted at the end of the period of interview collection. Some of the transcribed group discussion is discussed in chapter seven.

I collected eighteen tapes of interviews, the durations of which varied between twenty five and sixty five minutes, the median duration was about half an hour. This is comparable with the interviews analysed by Baldock and Prior (1981).

Analytic Description and Theoretical Sampling

I mentioned that, initially, the concern of the project was with control procedures operating in the interviews. At that stage, my theoretical framework was based in symbolic interactionism. I

was, thus, concerned with power as a function of the relationship between selves in interaction. It was assumed that the interview would be a terrain for the politics of reality, each participant bringing their definitions of the situation, identities and expectations of what to expect in the interview and what to expect of the role performance of the other and themselves. This would produce a negotiation of reality (Scheff, T. 1968). While I drew ideas from Scheff and other interactionists within the tradition, I did not formulate them into tight hypotheses, which would then be tested within the research.

My concerns then, as now, were with doing qualitative research. Given that this particular area of social work was unexplored, a simple hypothesis testing model was considered inappropriate and inadequate for collecting and analysing the kind of qualitative data with which this sort of research was concerned. Even though my theoretical framework and, hence, lines of interest in the data, changed, I was still more oriented to qualitative, rather than quantitative research. In this limited sense, despite the differences between interpretive sociological approaches and the Foucaultian framework adopted in this thesis, there is a point of continuity, which enabled me to use the same tape recordings, gathered for other purposes, for a Foucaultian discourse analysis. Being committed to a positivist model of research which operates with strict stages of hypothesis formation, sample design and collation, and the analysis of the data in the light of the explanatory hypotheses already outlined, would have made my

shifts midstream very difficult, perhaps impossible. It seems clear, from my experience, that the analysts of qualitative data share a need to formulate the links between concept and theory formation and the collection and analysis of data, in a more fluid and dialectical fashion than is the case with work done within positivist frameworks.

This is hardly an original comment. In the field of qualitative research, the emphasis tends to be placed more on a theoretically informed description of phenomena rather than on explanation in the more traditional positivist sense. Moreover, this description can be of small numbers of cases, or one case which is held to illustrate key features of phenomena which one might be able to find in other instances. Silverman points out that a wide range of researchers, including Lindesmith (1952), Denzin (1970), Hammersley and Atkinson (1983), and Mitchell (1983), have used analytic induction as a way of trying to formulate generalisations which hold across all one's case study data (Silverman, D. 1985, p.112).

The key is the attempt to find negative cases; these will lead to a reformulation of ones concepts and theories, a characteristically dialectical relationship between theory and analysis,

"this procedure of examining cases, redefining the phenomenon, and reformulating the hypotheses is continued until a universal

relationship is established, each negative case calling for a redefinition, or a reformulation." (Denzin, 1970 ,p.195).

This build up of formulations from analytic induction is based not on statistical sampling but on a theoretical sampling (Silverman, op.cit., p.113). This is a method advocated by Glaser and Strauss (1967), which involves choosing a sample which may give particular insights into whatever one is trying to study. Here one gathers suggestive and rich data which can be used to, refine and develop theoretical categories which can then be further elaborated in the examination of further data. In other words, one can focus on what for good stated reasons are key processes which can be identified at work in the interviews. The broader relevance of these analyses can be established in so far as those processes can be identified as operating in a range of interviews and also if other researchers find them a useful starting point for analysis. The speech act theorist Stubbs argues that it is better to use this type of sampling when handling linguistic data, because of the difficulty of its handling and the need to analyse sufficiently long stretches of discourse (Stubbs, 1983, pp.230-231).

I would claim that, in a sense, there are analytic inductivist features of my research, since, especially in the detailed analyses of transcripts in chapter seven, I tried not to be crudely deductive, applying neat pre-packaged formulations. The analysis of transcripts involves lengthy, tedious and often

arduous and frustrating immersion within the discourse. Space must be allowed for theoretical reformulation. Thus, the introduction of the good social work subject theme in chapter four was conducted mainly within a synchronic framework. At this point, I was looking at the operation of mother subject positions in the discourse from the framework of social work as a discursive formation, drawing on Philp's formulations. Here, the chain between the identification of subject positioning and the historical analysis of discourse in the previous chapter, was relatively short. By chapter seven, and with the development of a diachronic method of analysis, the analysis was able to go beyond, but retain the previous formulations. Yet the chain between the wider formulations of discursive practice and the unfolding discourse is, at this stage, longer.

I also attempted to follow the recommendation by Glaser and Strauss (op. cit., p.59) to look at both similar and contrastive cases. For example, this can be seen in the contrasts between orchestration with and without baton, developed in chapter seven. The search for contrasts and negative cases inspired the identification in tape five side one, of two types of discourse; on the one hand in relation to the gas bill, this client had entered educative discourse, but in relation to other bills she had not. This contradiction caused much puzzlement and reformulation at the time, which, I feel gave rise to an illumination of the tensions and resistances, within

conversational discourse, which operate largely in an indirect mode.

My interviews clearly did not constitute a "homogeneous" sample of interviews, or a sufficient spread to constitute a representative sample of types of interview across a range of client groups and types of case. Several of the interviews that were recorded were unuseable for research because of excessive distorting noise, tapes getting mangled in machines and so on. In addition, in the group interview, social workers admitted that they had exercised self-censorship, in not recording interviews in some cases, where they felt that it may have been met by a hostile response. This was worrying, but as one social worker admitted, this self-censorship was based sometimes on undue anxiety. Where she had taken a chance with a client, she found them surprisingly willing to allow the taping to go ahead. Despite self-censorship, there were at least two interviews which could be said to be markedly conflictual in tone. With two exceptions, of the interviews which were taped, the social workers claimed that they were not unusual, and didn't seem, obviously, to be affecting the client's performance. But clearly, because of the small number of interviews, the loss of some through technical mishaps and because of self-selection, there are probably many discursive features of interviews which are not analysed here.

Still, at this early stage, there is so little research-based information about the processes involved in interviews with clients that it is not at all clear on what basis one could draw up a picture of the total population of interviews in order to identify what a representative sample may look like, even if one were trying to conform to positivist rubrics. At some stage in the future when more is known about the distinguishing features of such interviews it may be possible to conduct such an exercise. This is a common problem in research which focusses on the linguistic dimension of discourse and if the criteria for selection of data and methods were to be made on strictly positivist criteria it is doubtful if much research in this area would be done at all.

While, clearly, the method of analytic induction emerges from the interpretive sociological tradition, it does have much to offer a Foucaultian methodology. The inductive dimension, however, must be treated with care. From our perspective, the environment of discursive practices, historically built up, and those synchronically related to social work interviews, for example, in the practices of other normalising agencies, creates agendas which provide the conditions of possibility for the interview. While I would certainly not claim that the analyses of those environing discursive practices are comprehensive (they are at best indicative), they do narrow down the range of inductive possibilities. Few would now claim that a presuppositionless inductivist approach is possible any way. On the other hand,

there is a danger in Foucaultian discourse analysis, of lapsing into a simple determinism with regard to oral discursive processes, in that one simply, deductively, "reads off" what happens at that level from what is happening in other discursive settings.

Silverman provides a useful discussion of the implications of Foucault's methods for research. His project is not the same as ours, since he approaches Foucault essentially from within the interpretive sociological tradition. But he does make the useful point that Foucault's method is at odds with structural accounts of, for example, power, which read it off as a function of structural forces. It is, hence, a commitment to detailed empirical research, and by implication, the development of concepts through the process of research, as in the use of theoretical sampling and analytic induction (Silverman, 1985, p.88-89). This could be restated as a "bottom up" approach to concept and theory formation, "One must rather conduct an *ascending* analysis of power, starting... from its infinitesimal mechanisms, which each have their own history, their own trajectory, their own techniques and tactics, and then see how these mechanisms... have been...invested, colonised, utilised, involuted transformed, displaced, extended etc, by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination" (Foucault, 1980, p.99, quoted in Silverman, 1985, p.90).

The Confessional Strategic Environment

A key concept employed in this study, is the notion of the confessional strategic environment. A concept bearing this title was introduced first by Goffman (1981, p.20). It refers to the culturally codified obligations on interactants in particular "strategic " settings. These obligations and responses to them can take both linguistic and non-linguistic forms, but the strategic environment provides interactants with a framework for interpreting what is expected of them.

My use of this term is different, in that, firstly, the strategy refers to the discursive strategies of the normalising professions, not to a general property of social interaction, and secondly, subjects are not seen as the producers, but as the bearers of discourse. The strategic environment is the context within which discourses come into contact via speaking subjects.

In this new sense, the strategic environment refers to a particular site of the intersection of discursive practices. The discursive practices take place within this setting, which is often termed within professional social work discourse, casework (in its its broad rather than precise psycho-social meaning).

Even though the public discursive positioning and legitimation of social work as a profession is not as clearly formulated as it is with some of the other professions, nevertheless, in this context, are included, given the historically developed agendas of the professional social work discourses: instructional discourse about interviewing; the environing discursive practices

of the other normalising agencies, with whom the social worker is a relay; and the micro-culture built up within the social worker/client relationship.

This discussion of methodology has been brief, as a body of research on the micro-settings of discursive practices accumulates, it is important that there should be a more systematic reflection on the more general problems encountered in trying to do this kind of work.

Transcripts

The appendix includes three sample transcripts of interviews, which are analysed in this study. The transcription symbols used in the text (though not necessarily in the appendix) are as follows:--

Numbers inside brackets denote timed pauses, eg. (1.5).

/ denotes overlapping speech.

() denotes a brief passage which was impossible to transcribe.

= between two words indicates that there is no gap between the words, usually between the utterances of two speakers. (cf. Heritage, J. 1984, pp. 312-314).

Lines are numbered for each transcript in the order in which they appear in the text.

In the appendix transcripts only, < between two words indicates that speech runs on continuously without pause, usually denotes a self interruption or quick change of topic.

The interviews referred to in this thesis are the following:--

Tape two, side one, "The Adoption Interview".

Tape five, side one, "The Hostile Client".

Tape two, side two, "The Mother's Socializing Responsibility".

Tape twelve, side one, "The Good Social Work Subject".

Tape four, side one, "The Passive Client".

Tape five, side two, "Mr. Y".

Tape nine, side two, Mrs. W, "The Orchestrating Client".

CHAPTER THREE

THE CONSTRUCTION OF MOTHERHOOD

Introduction

This chapter will examine four main areas of discourse in relation to mothers and the family, in order to provide a basis for the analysis of conversational discourse between social workers and their clients in the following chapters.

Firstly, it will examine Donzelot's theory of the new positioning of relations between "the family" and the normalising agencies (1). This helps to provide a general basis for the understanding of particular discursive shifts as they have affected social work strategies.

Secondly, it will locate this analysis more deeply in the framework of strategies of intervention in social life that Foucault calls biopower. It is necessary to do this because there is, unfortunately, no innocent general reading that can be given to the work of Foucault and Donzelot. As will be made clear, this whole analysis is based upon a particular use of their theories which, in sociological terms could be termed methodologically collectivist. The discursive representations of motherhood and the rationale for intervention with mothers and families has been based on the discursive links between the mother and the social

collectivity. These linkages are often obscured but take on a variety of significations, in particular the signifier of the citizen.

Thirdly, it will trace some of the key shifts in the construction of normalising strategies, in their social context, which can help us to understand more precisely the agendas of contemporary social work practice with clients. In particular we should note a growing recognition of the complexities of motherhood especially in recent times.

While the idealised images of motherhood, which emphasise the paramount importance of the mother child relation have not disappeared, they coexist with a recognition within academic, social policy and social work discourses of these complexities. Clearly, intervention with clients has had to adjust somewhat to the recognition that mothers cannot be exclusively mothers. This is particularly true for poor women, who are disproportionately likely to be social work clients and who so often have to combine the competences of motherhood with paid work outside the home and a range of other competences related to being household managers, wives and so on.

Clearly, this broad analysis of discourse is not intended to be comprehensive, it is limited to our present analytical purposes. In particular, the analysis of shifts in social work strategies since Beveridge is an important task which awaits completion. It

is clearly not in our brief or capacity to provide such an analysis here. Yet it is important to provide an indication of some of the key issues involved, insofar as they relate to our present concerns.

Finally, and in conclusion, this chapter points to the development of general strategies of "maintenance", in which along with a recognition of the complexities of the position of the modern mother, social work strategies have recognised the sober limits to the scope or effectiveness of their interventions with mothers and families. Some of the grander aims and ways of conceptualising the function of the mother on behalf of the wider social collectivity have given way to focus on a narrower range of professionally framed objects and interests. This provides a stepping stone for the further exploration of these issues in the following chapter.

1) Donzelot, "The Family" and the Normalising Agents

Donzelot (Donzelot 1980) describes, in the French context, the processes whereby the form of disciplinary power/knowledge strategies which Foucault (1977) had identified in the factories, asylums and new model prisons of the nineteenth century were dispersed through philanthropic and state welfare agencies. In his view these agencies, developed by feminist and other social reformers, constructed an alliance with mothers and their children which functioned to undermine the patriarchal authority

of men in the home. While these changes provided the preconditions for the general social advance of women, they did not in any simple way replace traditional patriarchy with a matriarchy in the home; since by opening up the family to monitoring by outside agencies, the "family" of the poor became a field of interaction which increasingly included those empowered to assist and regulate its activities.

The new normative standards of the monitoring (or normalising) agencies enabled them to identify "pathologies" within the workings of families, which not only warranted interventions within them but also created a rationale for the differentiation of roles between mother, husband, child, male and female. The very identification of pathologies demonstrated the operation of knowledge/power and helped to clarify the unfolding standards expected of family members.

For Donzelot, unlike the more familiar histories and sociological accounts of the family, the latter is not taken for granted as an institutional point of departure, a bounded field of interaction which undergoes a variety of transformations. To escape the dangers in such a formulation, he posits the family,

"not as a point of departure, as a manifest reality, but as a moving resultant, an uncertain form whose intelligibility can only come from studying the system of relations it maintains with the sociopolitical level. This requires us to detect all

the political mediations that exist between the two registers, to identify the lines of transformation that are situated in that space of intersections". (Donzelot, op.cit. p. xxv.).

While he argues that the male centred family in the pre-modern era was reasonably self governing and could be an active source of political action, in the working class (if not bourgeois) family from the mid 19 th. century increasingly, the family was no longer an institution apart from established powers in society, "a force of the same nature as itself; it became a relay, an obligatory or voluntary support for social imperatives". (ibid. p. 92). Thus what emerged was a transition from a "government of families to a government through the family". (ibid. p.92). In the process, these developments produced a new realm of social relations, a new social space which Donzelot terms "the social"; a realm which we now take for granted and which operates between what at one time would have been termed the institutions of the state and on the other hand the institutions of civil society.

Donzelot clearly emphasises that the social should not be thought of simply in repressive terms or just in terms of the regulation of the poor. That would be a serious misinterpretation. Rather the social is a humanising and integrating force within the whole society. It does not simply repress, it unleashes social forces, impossible before its inception,

"It would appear to be...the set of means which allow social life to escape material pressures and politico-moral uncertainties; the entire range of methods which make the members of a society relatively safe from the effects of economic fluctuations by providing a certain security". (ibid. p. xxvi-xxvii, also pp. 88-89).

Using an organic analogy, he argues that,

" from being the plexus of a complex of relations of dependance and allegiance, the family became the nexus of nerve endings of machinery that was exterior to it. These new mechanisms... On one hand...penetrated it (the family) directly, turning family members with the help of the norm, against patriarchal authority, organising-in the name of the hygienic and educative protection of these members- the depletion of parental authority in general, and placing the family under an economico-moral tutelage" (ibid. p. 91).

This double movement is important to note, since it would be wrong-to reinforce the point already made- to bowdlerise Donzelot's argument by reducing it to the view that the burgeoning of welfare agencies constitutes a progressive tightening of control by agencies of the state over the reformed working class family. As Minson notes (Minson, 1985, pp, 184-208), this is precisely the central issue. Conventional sociological and historical accounts of the family tend to be

based on the assumption that there has always been a kernel of the family and its members, independently of how it is organised in any one time and place. Rather, in discourse theory accounts, the method is genealogical rather than teleological (ibid. pp. 114-141), historical shifts are as likely to represent discontinuities as much as continuities and what the family and its members consists of has no historical status outside the particular conditions under which it emerges. (2)

Let us see how Donzelot's theory of the social mother unfolds. While in bourgeois or better off families, the old monolithic power of the father gave way to a contractually based set of relations, in the poor family it gave way to one of tutelage. In both cases the role of the mother was socially transformed and crucial. In the former, the mother becomes a conduit for the voluntary extension of norms of familialism, the ever progressing standards of education and hygiene at every level, not just for the family as a corporate venture but for its individual members also, their individuality gaining ever greater recognition.

As Donzelot puts it,

"Here, norms are joined... to a liberal law that fluidifies the family.....they bring into play both familial ambition and the divisions, conflicts, and rivalries that exist inside the family, all of which sets in motion an upward dynamic (real or imagined, but effective in any case) operating between the

working class family pole and the bourgeois pole". (Donzelot 1980, pxxi).

This point is important to emphasise because it is wrong to present the contractual mode as confined to the bourgeois family. Clearly, Donzelot sees the class divisions more as a continuum (perhaps in a Weberian sense) rather than as an antagonistic split, as in the cruder forms of Marxism. The contractual norm is not a fixed set of behavioural standards, but remains a floating normative point of reference for the tutelary model. In this model, a tutelary (or educative) complex of "experts", drawn from first philanthropic then state agencies, in hygiene, health, diet, the discipline of children and other aspects of the new norms of family functioning, confront the families of the poor. The latter, Donzelot defines as those "that combine a difficulty in supplying their own needs with resistances to the new medical and educative norms" (ibid. p. xxi and pp.90-93).

This confrontation, as we have emphasised, was not just repressive in the negative sense. In France as in Britain, early welfare intervention was connected with campaigns to restore marriage among the poor (ibid. pp.31-33), and with moves to replace the traditional marriage with its dowry system (impossible for the rootless, propertyless poor) with a functional replacement in a system which recognised housekeeping as a payment for domestic labour (ibid p.35). Through such a mechanism, nudged along with varying degrees of success by

philanthropic and state agents, a new position for women emerged among the poor which could provide an escape from prostitution and the risks of brief and possibly violent relationships with men; men, who could from a philanthropic perspective, be seen as a risk to the health and material and spiritual well-being of women and their children. Rather more to the point, such improvements could be presented as benefiting the well-being of the whole society, and hence would be a worthy charitable cause or charge upon the public purse.

In the utopian version of this discourse, in the publications of reformers in the early years of the century in France, the "responsibilisation" or empowerment of the poor woman took on an extreme feminist form. It was envisaged that the community would replace the father's role to ensure the survival of the mother and children. Supported by her tutelary allies, the mother would now be the head of family and such authority as a man possessed in the home would derive not from any institutional or legally based rights but from the love and loyalty he inspired in his wife by his ongoing good behaviour (ibid. pp. 180-181). Thus would the wife perform an important disciplining function over her man. She would be an effective reminder of his social responsibilities, drawing him away from the feckless and dangerous world of the alehouse and perhaps more politically threatening world of street politics.

These fantasies of course were never realised, because of one of the central dilemmas to condition the subsequent development of welfare strategies in the liberal democracies, or, possibly, in any complex industrialised society which could not be regulated effectively through crudely authoritarian methods of control:

"How could the family be divested of a part of its ancient powers-over the social destiny of its children, in particular-yet without disabling it to a point where it could not be furnished with new educative and health-promoting tasks"?(ibid. p.199, original italics).

In social work this is manifested in the discourses surrounding how to help people without trapping them within a stultifying dependency, even if in psycho-analytic terms it may be a necessary phase in the short term. (cf. Howe, D. 1987, p.74). How can the family be assisted to work on its own and continue to provide a bulwark of support for its members and also a defence against authoritarian state control? Even for a State with authoritarian leanings, there are heavy financial costs to be borne when opting for the more directive methods of control. To remove children too readily from the home, to imprison a mother, a son or even a father too readily, adds enormously to the fiscal burdens of the state.

Dingwall et. al., in their interpretation and use of Donzelot, express this problem for social work in terms of a theory of the state. As they put it,

"If we are to understand the modern family and the status of children, we must take the liberal social order as an object of study rather than of criticism." (Dingwall et. al. 1983, p.212).

As they see it, despite the individual freedoms accorded within the liberal state, most liberal theorists, from Mill to Hayek, acknowledge a legitimate collective interest in, and responsibility for, the proper socialisation of children, since, if adequately cared for and civilised individuals are not produced by families, then the very framework of liberal society is threatened (ibid., chap. 10). This provides a moral and functional legitimation for the rather soft and educative social work and community health interventions in families.

The basic assumption underlying intervention in the child care practice they studied, given the conflicting pressures on normalising agencies, is what they call the "rule of optimism" (ibid. pp78-102). Whereby, contrary to the claims of many right and left wing libertarian critics of intervention, there is an assumption that pathological family functioning is temporary and remediable unless there is strong evidence to the contrary. Thus it is assumed that mothers, who are still deemed to have primary responsibility, are usually the best of all possible socialising agents. It is their competences which require strengthening and support. (3)

It is important to recognise that these social policy concerns cannot be understood just in terms either of the individual needs of the mother and children on the one hand, or of the state on the other.

It is suggested here that we should, following Foucault, regard them as aspects of what he called biopower, the attempts to foster and control the conditions of life, an enterprise which had its roots in the seventeenth century in Europe. Modern societies began to take an interest in the wellbeing of individuals and the whole "body" of society. The latter became both a recognisable symbolic object within public discourse and a focus for social action. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries the precursor of this modality of power was signified in the term police, which had wider, less repressive and more welfare oriented connotations than it has today. It is important not to identify policing, in this sense, as automatically a repressive function of state power in the institutional sense, or even, narrowly, in terms of the workings of the institutions given that label.

Even in the *ancien regime* of Louis XIV, police, according to Foucault, could not be adequately understood just in terms of the top down power of the central state. Rather,

"It is an apparatus that must be coextensive with the entire social body and not only the extreme limits that it embraces,

but by the minuteness of the details it is concerned with. Police power must bear 'over everything': it is not however the totality of the state nor of the kingdom as visible and invisible body of the monarch; it is the dust of events, actions, behavior, opinions, 'everything that happens'." (Foucault, 1977, p.213).

The police, in the narrow sense as maintainers of order, could also respond from solicitations from below. Families and other civil institutions would call on the police to assist them in settling disputes and imposing order in their "private" territories (ibid., p.214, cf also Foucault 1978 pp.24-25, Cousins and Hussain 1984 pp.205-206).

In this sense, the policing of family life could be seen not simply as part of a repressive operation in defence of established power blocs or structural interests, which could be seen to have some pre-existing reality. Rather, this "welfare" operation of power could be viewed as part of a broad range of interventions in social and economic life by both state and non state agencies which provide the conditions of possibility for a recognisably modern social order.

Foucault is quite clear that these interventions are not simply the effects of a particular macro economic order and that in fact industrial production itself is made possible through a

particularly intense pattern of supervision in the labour process (Foucault 1977 p. 174).

Commentators on Foucault's work have remarked on the ambiguities surrounding the notions of biopower and the social body. Cousins and Hussain note the paradox that, as an ant-humanist, Foucault insists on the logical priority of social relations in any understanding of the production of knowledge and human conduct. Individuals are seen as effects, not the source of ideas and action. Yet unlike Durkheimians or Marxists, "Foucault's position is not linked to establishing that social relations form a totality simple or complex (Cousins and Hussain op.cit., p. 253).

Furthermore, Cousins and Hussain argue,

"that the concern with welfare refers to disparate series of concerns with specific problems and not to a coherent strategy emanating from one source". (ibid. p. 205).

In a late commentary, Foucault seemed quite clear in rejecting any attempt to assemble the disciplinary strategies into an overall totality,

"I believe the great fantasy is the idea the idea of the social body constituted by the universality of wills. Now the phenomenon of the social body is the effect not of a consensus

but of the materiality of power operating on the very bodies of individuals" (Foucault 1980, p.55).

David Garland, in his analysis of welfare strategies in the Edwardian period, seems, in similar spirit, to favour a dispersed and relativist use of Foucaultian concepts. He gave a number of reasons for not using the notion of biopower or related Foucaultian concepts like anatomo-discipline or micro-power. These reasons included the charge that the terms were too vague and unspecific for the purposes of his analysis, that they did not correspond to the discursive terms routinely used in public debates, that they referred more to what strategies had in common than the crucial differences between them and that they did not allow distinctions to be drawn between the political forms (public or private) between strategies (Garland 1985, p.114).

While there is force in these points, it could still be argued that it is useful to retain the use of the term biopower for analytical purposes, for to abandon its use is to risk our analysis lapsing into a simple empirical description of welfare strategies. In addition, any attempt to stay Talmudically true to Foucault's theoretical intentions would founder on the rock of the ambiguities so mentioned. Unfortunately there is no innocent reading of Foucault and Donzelot's texts so the analyst must make clear in which way he or she uses the central concepts and methods. As we shall see, this reading has profound implications

for how we make sense of the historical construction of motherhood.

Let us explore these points further. In places, Foucault does seem to present biopower strategies as operating in the form of general master strategies which take on a form which is redolent of functionalist theorising in sociology. However, rather than viewing this apparently totalising notion of society as identical to the Parsonian notion of a social system, with its built in consensualist assumptions, it is more productive to view it in Minson's terms as a sphere of "liberal... 'government', where this implies both political and non political modes of regulation.." (Minson, op.cit. p.106, cf, Miller, P. and Rose, N. 1988).

Moreover, in Minson's interpretation of Foucault, personal categories are the product of this form of liberal government as a pervasive force in society. (Minson, op.cit. p.106). Even resistances to the modern family and the "social mother", for example by feminist movements, are founded on liberal governmentality, which provides its conditions of possibility and its arena of struggle (ibid, pp.208-218).

James Donald, who also makes use of the notion of biopower in a holistic sense, reminds us that while Foucault and Donzelot's provide useful starting points, there are important differences in the timing of historical transitions between Britain and France. While the French theorists are preoccupied with the break

between the *ancien regime* and post-revolutionary society, in Britain, the growth of urbanism and industrialisation were more central, and the "focusing of political concern on the population seems to have developed later." (Donald, 1985, p.221). Quoting the work of Lucy Bland and Frank Mort (1984), he points to the first phase of social interventionism, roughly from 1839 to 1860, as ascribing pathology (presumably both individual and social) to environmental factors, thus legitimating a restructuring of the environment itself. The knowledge which accompanied the social interventions into the lives of the poor and the general environment was conditioned by the texts of the great Victorian social investigators like Booth and Kay-Shuttleworth (ibid., pp. 220-221).

This provided warrant for the increasing reordering of the population to facilitate its monitoring, in the school the dwelling place and so on (ibid, p.220). The subsequent development of interventions by health and social work agents (Younghusband, 1981, Garland, 1985, Rose, 1985 and Miller and Rose, 1986) with individuals and families, particularly with mothers and children, marked the inception of biopolitical strategies proper.

Biopolitical Metaphors and Signifiers of the Social Collectivity.

Now let us consider more precisely Foucault's concept of biopower. He sees it as hinging around two poles. The first pole:

"centred on the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimising of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls, all this was ensured by the procedures of power that characterised the disciplines: an anatomo-politics of the human body. The second... focused on the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological process: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity.... Their supervision was affected through an entire system of interventions and regulatory controls: a biopolitics of the population" (Foucault, 1978, p. 139).

Note the terms of Foucault's definition. It revolves around two metaphors, a) the body as a machine and b) the aggregate population as a body. We can go further and note that the metaphors are not just colourful signifiers of a concept in the abstract sense. Rather, the metaphorical structure goes deeper. Metaphors, unlike concepts, which assemble experience into general abstract classes, are devices in human discourse which link the particular with the general in one linguistic act. This lies at the heart of poetic imagery, and perhaps at the heart of language itself (Ricoeur, 1978).

The central material thread in Foucault's analyses is the action of power on bodies. However, we can never know bodies in their

raw state, only through the metaphorical link between particular bodies and the general; in this instance, not the general concept of a body but the biopolitical image of the collective body.

Here is the key to the puzzle. In a biopolitical sphere, an advanced form of liberal governmentality, the realisation of the general strategies of regulation work through particular objects, or to be precise, humanly constructed subjects. And one of the key subjects in biopolitics is the mother, in this sense a biopolitical metaphor. For it is she, not just as a symbol but as an acting, flesh and blood being, who is the principal conduit of power and empowerment.

To put this another way, in the terms of the normalising strategies of social workers, health visitors, educational welfare officers and so on, mothers can no longer be seen simply in terms of the relations between themselves and their families, considered as enclosed spheres. Rather, the whole survival of the nation, considered as a collectivity which rises above the mere sum of its parts, depends on the work of individual mothers. They are the key to the health, hygiene, morality and fitness for work and warfare of the whole nation. As such, in a modern society in grave competition with other rapidly advancing nations, mothers cannot be simply allowed to continue in inefficient practices.

A central problem in grasping this point lies in the fact that the metaphorical link between the social collectivity and the

individual has been represented by a range of signifiers. Since the rise of republican democratic movements since the eighteenth century, a key motif in public representations of the individual has been the concept of the citizen. Clearly there were echoes in European Enlightenment discourses of classical Roman legal notions of citizenship and the person (cf. Mauss, 1985). The modern notions of citizenship, while changing, were still dominated by the images of the rights and duties of the citizen as a member of the polity. (4)

It is beyond our brief here to provide a detailed examination of notions of citizenship but it worth noting that there have been a range of critiques of the notion that universal suffrage and social insurance have created a new solidarity which overcomes social divisions. For example, a conventional Marxist thesis has emerged which argues that the extension of formal democracy and a welfare safety net to the working class was functionally necessary for the emerging needs of the capitalist state in the late nineteenth century, in order to win the loyalty of the workers in an increasingly competitive imperial age (Thane, P., p. 290) .

The ideological - in the concealing and mystifying sense - function of the notion of an equal citizenship is easily revealed in the fact that many people, the poor and ill organised, are excluded from full citizenship for want of the power resources to realise the "rights of the citizen." Wilson (1977) exposes the

profound differences in the citizenship position of males and females and recently Paul Gilroy has argued that citizenship has a powerful racial component which effectively excludes the non-white population from the possibility of full membership (Gilroy 1987).

Now while these attempts to expose the functions of citizenship ideologies in terms of the structural domination of class, gender or racial interests is a legitimate quest in itself, it is again beyond our brief here. And to draw on Dingwall et. al's point about the need to view the liberal state as an object of analysis rather than just as an object for criticism, it is suggested here that it is possible to view citizenship not simply, on face value, as the embodiment of welfare state values or on the other hand as an ideological fiction.

Rather it is also possible to view citizenship as one of the signifying poles of biopower, as long as one accepts that the sphere of liberal governmentality may indeed be weighted in favour of particular sections of the population. It must be recognised that with the shift to this new form of sociality, whatever the discursive representations of the relation of the individual to the social collectivity, a new set of relationships emerged. As Donald puts it, the shift is,

"away from a consideration of subjects only in terms of their rights and duties viz a viz the state to this new concern with the growth and care of the population as a whole and then,

increasingly, the monitoring and welfare of individuals" (Donald, op. cit. p. 221).

In the late nineteenth century and the Edwardian period, the key signifiers of the social body or collectivity were eugenicist, nationalist, imperialist and often racist. As Donald argues, a concern for the welfare of the poor shifted, in the last decades of the century "from fears about the fitness of the population to the aspiration to breed-and educate- an "imperial race" (Donald, op.cit. p. 223). A central floating signifier was the term "national efficiency,"

"a floating term which integrated a number of discourses.....in a programme for reorganising the existing power bloc and extending the powers of the state. In the sphere of education, campaigns were launched for a broader curriculum which would not only beat the nationalist drum, through newly established subjects like history and geography, but would also provide training for citizenship...physical exercise and military style drill for boys, and instruction in the responsibilities and *techniques of domesticity and motherhood for girls.*" (Ibid., p. 223, emphasis added.).

Moreover, as Donald emphasises, these conceptions of the social totality were, with some modifications, shared by the leading political progressives of the day,

"One of the most interesting formulations of the strategy, in that it also displays clearly a new conception of the organic state(a state which would penetrate into all areas of social life) can be found in the 'social imperialism' of the Fabian leaders Sidney and Beatrice Webb... (who)..argued that in the new century the primary duty of government would be considered to be

'the prevention of disease and the building up of the nervous and muscular vitality of the race'". (ibid. p.224).

While eugenicist discourse was later discredited by its association with national socialism in Germany, the other signifiers were to retain an enduring force in the liberal and socialist discourses through which twentieth century welfare strategies were constructed.

The nub of this argument is that instead of simply discrediting these signifiers of the social collectivity as nominalist, fantastic constructions, through an ideological decoding; rather we can profitably view them in a realist sense as indicators and generators of biopower. This will become clearer when we discuss the Beveridge and post-Beveridge period.

3) SHIFTS IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF NORMALISING STRATEGIES AND THE SOCIAL CONDITIONS OF MOTHERHOOD

Let us focus now on how these strategies developed, with particular reference to the construction of motherhood.

In the British context David Garland (Garland 1985, chap. 4) has examined how the development of early forms of casework (not to be confused with more recent psychoanalytically based strategies) and their accompanying theories of interpretation in social work, in the late nineteenth century were eventually incorporated into

into a series of control strategies, connected by a variety of relays, in the fields of welfare, penalty and social insurance. These were crystallised during the period of the 1906 Liberal government.

In Garland's thesis, these new forms of control offered the prospect of integrating the poor into a national citizenship which cut across class divisions (ibid. p. 231). This, however raises the question of how far this citizenship extended or still extends to women and to mothers in particular. We will return to this issue shortly since more recent work helps to shed light on it.

Rose (1985 and 1986) has extended the analysis of normalising technologies; identifying a series of strategies, from the eugenic and social hygiene strategies of the nineteenth century which involved the monitoring of domestic standards. The bleak views of the hereditarian eugenicists gave way to the more optimistic approach of the neo-hygienists, particularly after the first world war. In this early phase, the prevention of social ills, it was envisaged, would be effected by an alliance of mothers and medicine (Rose 1985 p.84). To this was later added the prospect of improving the mental health of the social collectivity.

The inter-war period saw the growing "recognition" of psychological factors in family behaviour, and here the

groundwork was laid for the development of the psychoanalytically based casework methods pioneered at the Tavistock Institute. Whereas the old "welfare" normalising technologies of the neo-hygienists principally involved monitoring the lives of families and the attempt to identify and enforce behavioral norms of socially desirable behavior, as well as providing (usually means tested) material assistance, the new psycho-social strategies created different objects of concern.

As Rose puts it,

"Social work was becoming less concerned with recording social circumstances and events, and more with interpreting the unconscious wishes which gave those events a meaning for participants. The terms of analysis were far from those entailed in the psycho-eugenic conception of character, or the neo hygenist conception of welfare. What were salient now were not sobriety, diligence and thrift, nor cleanliness, healthy diet and hygiene. They were fears, early experiences, anxieties, attitudes, relationships, conflicts, feelings of persecution and guilt. The way of resolving problems was not segregation or sterilisation, nor moralisation by instruction in virtue and technique. It involved 'becoming aware of the conflicts', 'learning to handle the problem', 'coming to understand oneself', 'sorting out one's real needs'. This was the psychosocial strategy, through which psychological knowledge would provide the rationale for a complex and expanding system

of social regulation of personal life in the post-war period."
(Rose, 1985, p. 208).

The new Freudian emphasis on the inner and unconscious life of the individual rendered problematic the older assumptions and in particular, loosened the bonds between "conformity to the requirements of social and moral standards, personal happiness and psychological health." (ibid. p.218). Moreover, the new emphasis on less tangible phenomenological properties of individuals and relationships created new problems in the identification of behavioural norms and transgressions of standards of motherhood. If good motherhood could not simply be identified in terms of diet, hygiene and so on, then in what terms could it be so recognised?

While it would be misleading to suggest that the newer approaches ever wholly displaced the older welfare strategies, a new emphasis on the affective dimension particularly as disseminated in the work of writers like Bowlby and the Winnicots (Winnicott D.W. 1957, and Winnicott C. 1964) and in the training literature of the social work profession (eg. Pugh 1968, Adcock M. & White R. 1985), prioritises the mother as a locus of affect in the family. In the event of family breakdown or of children failing to thrive, a moralising attempt to instruct women in the canons of mothercraft may prove dangerously counterproductive. For Clare Winnicott social workers must deal with parents' problems as well the child's and,

"our acceptance of the parents can be in itself a therapeutic experience for them" (Winnicott C. 1964 p.25).

A new minimal notion of the "good enough mother" evolved, especially in the work of Winnicott, a charismatic post-war influence, which emphasised the nurturing love bond between mother and child. He argued that the contribution of the largely unrecognised and underappreciated ordinary loving mother is immense; not simply to maintain the health and stability of children but more profoundly, this was seen as the foundation of a democratic, non authoritarian social order.

With the father providing a protective shield,

"the ordinary good mother makes this central contribution to her child and to the social collectivity ...in a period from just before birth to the first few months of baby's life...and which she does *simply through being devoted to her infant*" (italics in original) (Winnicott 1957 p. 142).

To echo Garland's argument, this could be seen as an extension of the strategy to construct new forms of citizenship in the welfare state. At a deeper level it could be seen as a transformation of the status of the social mother in biopower, during the phase of the psychosocial strategy.

Unlike some more recent social work discourse, which treat the problems of the mother as a product of family dynamics or the particular pathological manifestations of poverty, in Winnicott's discourse, the twin poles of the link between the social collectivity and the mother are retained as a unity.

The socialist feminist writer Elizabeth Wilson (1977) has argued that the forms of nationally integrating citizenship identified and eulogised by social democratic writers like

T. H. Marshall (1965) and Titmuss (1963, 1968) tend to be gender blind on the surface but functionally differ for men and women.

We can emphasise two main points here. First, as Garland argues, citizenship rights are legitimated by the ideology of social insurance (Garland, op. cit. pp. 231-232). But as Julia Parker argues, the rights to benefits, the vote and so on are more clearly intelligible for the great mass of men who are more likely to be principal wage earners in a household than are their wives. Hence citizenship rights are recognised in part through the contributions of the husband/father (Parker J. 1979) and also in part in terms of the mother's role as mother/nurturer of children. The latter is given nominal recognition by the state through direct child allowance payments to the mother.

Secondly, a man's status as citizen subject is relatively independent of his links to the family; if he works he is recognisable as an atomic citizen element of the polity. On the

other hand, for the woman whose primary role is that of mother/homemaker (still the majority), whether or not she takes paid work outside the home, her status as citizen/subject is constructed primarily through the family.

In addition to the linkage to the state through the right to child allowance, mothers, particularly the poor and those without stable relationships with a male breadwinner, are connected to the state and at a deeper level, biopower, via a range of normalising agencies from social services and social security departments, health agencies to public utilities to whom they may be chronically and permanently in debt and who directly or circuitously through social work intervention attempt to regulate their behaviour.

Thus the sub text to Winnicott's affectionate salute to the mother as the producer of democratic and civilised citizens is that this role for the woman is not an atomic element of the polity but is constructed within the family; and it is the family which is the fundamental nexus of biopower rather than the isolated citizen. The competent citizen can only be such through the ongoing socialising labour of mothers, whose own public role is by implication limited by this crucial social duty.

Thus we can see the particular characteristics of the social mother. *Her special characteristics as a subject are that she is the core nurturant and relay for the production of further*

subjects.. Thus, in the name of the social mother, the coordination between the various normalising strategies was placed on the political agenda.

In their way the Keynesian, social democratic theorists, like T.H. Marshall, R.M. Titmuss and A.H. Halsey, who fuelled the power knowledge strategies of the post-Beveridge welfare state, did give recognition to a welfarist conception of the social collectivity and thus helped to produce a higher level of coordination between strategies and a degree of general integration and consensus in the post-war era.

One of the key discursive elements in this complex of social democratic knowledge/power strategies was the enriched conception of citizenship; with rights to health care, unemployment pay, education etc., added to the Romano-bourgeois conception of the citizen in terms of legal and formal political rights (cf. Room, 1979, and Halsey, 1982).

In Donzelot's terms, these strategies were family and mother focussed. As Wilson argued, "Beveridge's Report throughout stressed the importance of the family as an economic unit; man and wife really are one person." (Wilson op. cit p.150). These assumptions underlie the whole of the report and much of the subsequent social policy in the post-war era which followed it. The idealised status of the mother was for her to be married and dependent on a man as the principal breadwinner, "...the Plan for

Social Security treats married women as a special insurance class of occupied persons and treats man and wife as a team."

(Beveridge 1942, p. 49, quoted in Wilson, op. cit.).

As a citizen, a woman's function as mother was seen as primary and as a worker, her mothering function would inevitably be disabling. The echoes of Edwardian discursive signifiers of the social collectivity, particularly the themes of nation, race and national efficiency are clearly visible in Beveridge,

"..In the next thirty years housewives as mothers have vital work to do in ensuring the adequate continuance of the British Race and of British Ideals in the world" (Beveridge 1942, p. 42, quoted in Wilson, op. cit. pp. 151-152).

The role of social work strategies, despite the complexities introduced by the psycho-social schools, emphasised the need to reconstruct family life after the considerable disruptions of wartime separations and what were popularly seen as hasty wartime marriages, "social workers after the war were anxious to help in the rebuilding of family life." (Wilson, op. cit. p. 157, cf. also Astbury, 1946).

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to chart in detail the shifts in social policies and social work strategies with respect to motherhood. That is an important task which needs to be undertaken in its own right. We will simply note that there was a

growing complexity in the general constructions of motherhood which emphasised the growing involvement of mothers in the labour market, the growth of one parent families, reconstituted families and other household forms (cf, Rapaport and Rappaport (eds), 1982). Through this process, social policy conceptions of the family began to recognise working mothers, reconstituted families after divorce and so on, as compatible with modern economic and social requirements and not therefore, necessarily pathological.

These social changes mark a significant shift away from the idealised images of motherhood in the early post-war discourses, in part represented in the work of Bowlby, emphasising as they did the desirability of the "stay at home mum" for whom child care was a full time occupation and by that token rendering suspect and perhaps socially deviant those mothers who failed to provide undivided attention to their young children.

In the wake of post war social changes and social policy shifts, social work intervention with families was concerned to monitor and support mothers, not in order to reinstate a traditional family order with rigid gender divisions, but to provide what Martin Davies, one of its most influential and leading voices calls in his characteristically functionalist mode, maintenance to mothers and families in the complex social conditions which actually prevail. For Davies, social workers,

"are the maintenance mechanics oiling the interpersonal wheels of the community. They do so at the end of the spectrum where dysfunctioning has either reached chronic or epidemic proportions or where its effects are spilling over into the lives of vulnerable people. They may use a variety of strategies, directive and non directive, but their underlying aims are to maintain the independence of adults, to protect the short- and long term interests of children, and to contribute towards the creation of a community climate in which all citizens can maximise their potential for personal development." (Davies 1985 p.28-29).

However, note the technical discourse used to convey this notion of maintenance. Perhaps we can see here a significant shift in the discourse of the heirs to Beveridge; it is relatively depoliticised and has fewer obvious ringing rhetorical references to the nation or other biopolitical signifiers. In part this may be a product of the professionalisation and bureaucratisation of social work and hence of its forms of discourse. The next chapter will examine these issues in more detail, when looking at the more local social contexts of social work intervention with mothers.

It should also be noted here that the term maintenance is broadly defined. In Davies' framework, it is probably best understood in contrast with more radical approaches to social work, which envisage it being used as a vehicle of radical consciousness

raising among clients or possibly even a vehicle of large scale community action. Within its own terrain therefore, maintenance could incorporate a range of different strategies of intervention, on a continuum from approaches which are concerned simply to monitor and stabilise problematic family situations, through to strategies which attempt a more ambitious programme of change; although change at the level of shifts in family dynamics, for example, rather than wider forms of political and economic change.

While a detailed examination of the discursive shifts involved in social work strategies in the post-Beveridge period is an important task which needs to be done and is beyond our present scope, it is important to emphasise that there have been variations and shifts in what Rose has called the psycho-social strategy of intervention; variations in professional knowledge and practical techniques which are related to changes in social work organisation, and related changes in paediatrics.

To give a brief indication of this, the paediatric "discovery" of the battered baby syndrome in the work of Kempe in the U. S. A. in the 1960's made a considerable impact on paediatric and social work forms of knowledge and treatment strategies from the late 1960's (Kempe et. al. 1962, and Parton, 1985, ch. 3). This body of knowledge, with its, at root, psychoanalytic understanding of the dynamics of child abuse, shifts attention away from the wider biopolitical rationale of intervention and

focuses on the dynamics of parent-child relations, with a causal emphasis on the roots of the problems in the early childhood experiences of the parents. Where mothers had themselves lacked a loving dependency relation with their own parents they were, within this framework, unable to provide it for their own children. This led to strategies which, to echo Winnicott's approach, emphasised the provision of remedial parenting for damaged parents (Dale, 1986, p. 9).

Critics of this approach have argued that, given the real conditions of social work intervention, this approach has, in practice meant that social workers have not provided enough effective protection for children since the early 1970's.

Intervention has involved a low level of maintenance which does not attempt to effect radical change in family functioning. This has been exacerbated since the long series of child abuse tragedies since the Maria Colwell case in the early 1970's; the resultant anxiety of social workers has restricted work to monitoring. Alternative strategies based on more active and directive strategies of family therapy have been pursued in the margins of the psycho-social strategy (Dale, 1986, chap. 1).

Chapters five and seven will examine, against the environment of these discursive practices, front line social work practice with clients. But before we do that, it is necessary to examine how instructional discourse, the "how to do it" guides to social work interviewing, permit a move from the general norms and objectives

set by the social work discourses we have been examining, into operational techniques of social work practice.

CHAPTER 4

INSTRUCTIONAL DISCOURSE

INTRODUCTION

As was argued in chapter three, the usually hidden links in the chain of biopolitical practices in the sphere of what Foucault calls liberal governmentality (Foucault, 1979b), provide a rationale for a great deal of social work practice, as normalising judgement, in concert with other normalising practices.

In the following chapters, we will be examining in more detail the processes involved in interviewing within the framework we have been developing. In addition to the general synchronic features of the interview, it is also important to recognise the interview in its more immediate, temporal, diachronic flow. As we shall see, it has an unfolding, creative and somewhat unpredictable character, which lies at odds with the professional demand that the interview, as a symbolically central technique for producing what counts as professionally accredited knowledge and for doing work with clients, is controlled by the social worker and conforms to the rubrics of professional practice.

But as well as producing knowledge, in the form of the oral and written accounts of interviews which are produced by

socialworkers, interviews are themselves objects of theorising. While there is as yet scant *direct* social scientific research on what goes on in interviews, there is a body of literature employed in social work training, which to a greater or lesser degree, has crystallized into a set of loose criteria for evaluating the professional expertise of workers. To some extent, this body of largely *prescriptive* or instructional work has entered into what Curnock and Hardiker) call the practice wisdom of social workers (Curnock, K and hardiker, P., 1979, p.ix). The main burden of this chapter will be show how instructional discourse about social work interviewing helps to provide a bridge between the norms and objectives within the general, historically produced social work discourses, which were examined in chapter three, and the operational techniques actually deployed in interview settings. The latter will be the subject of analysis in subsequent chapters.

Philp, in his useful discussion of the basic and distinguishing forms of knowledge in social work, argues that,

"the characteristic tools of the social worker, his hearing and speaking, are acts common to every individual, and yet it is because these exist at the level of 'tools' (the activity of producing words, written spoken and otherwise, and the activity of receiving words, written, spoken and otherwise) that the social worker can be located within a complex system of distribution of rights to discourse. These 'tools' are not pure

and free acts but are governed by a system of rules which define the areas within which the individual social worker can bring them into use. Because social work is involved in the processing and production of statements about, and descriptions of, individuals, groups and communities, it also takes its stance within this organisation and distribution of rights to speak and be heard". (Philp, 1979, pp. 89-90).

In other words, social work should be seen as a "discursive formation", which operates in mutual interdependence with other normalising agencies and which, like them, must establish its rights to produce its own distinguishing forms of knowledge and working practices. As with doctors and lawyers, these techniques and knowledge forms are the key to the wider legitimacy of social work. Hence we will examine some ideal typical or exemplary, prescriptive forms of knowledge, in relation to the production of social work interviews, as a prelude to the examination of social worker/client conversational discourse, seen as an unfolding accomplishment.

While the technical, instructional discourse of training texts is more concerned with how to conduct interviews rather than with the knowledges produced within them, nevertheless, they are implicated in the production of those knowledges. We will be exploring the forms of instructional discourse, as exemplified in texts.

THE FORMATIONS OF INSTRUCTIONAL DISCOURSE

Discursive Formation and Strategy

However, as we argued in chapter one, in examining the diachronic aspects of interviewing, we must go beyond the formulations of Philp and recognise that as a discursive formation, social work is not fully crystallized and that we must recognise the shifts in power/knowledge strategies. These include a recognition of the role of instructional discourse as involving more than just "ideas" or propositions made flesh in professional practice.

The chapter on narrative, will make the point that a proposition cannot simply be seen as a universal, supra discursive, philosophical tool of analysis. For example, a proposition cannot simply be discovered in oral discourse. Rather, propositions, as the logical forms of ideas, are a particular product of literate discourses. Thus, in looking at how "ideas" about interviews work, it is important to see them as part of the (literate based) power/knowledge strategies of social work - in relay with other normalising agencies - which attempt to claim a moral and political legitimacy for its special branch of knowledge and professional expertise. What is produced in training texts and the other professional literature of social work used on training courses, must be seen as a complex of discursive strategies operating in particular, academic and professional, social work institutional contexts.

That the discursive formation of social work has not crystallized into clear, stable and publically recognised legitimations, that the power/knowledge strategies are not yet successfully established, is clear in the recurrent findings by reseachers into clients' reactions to social work that clients, although becoming more familiar with the business of social work over the years, are often very unclear about what an interview is likely to consist of and what it is meant to achieve. This, perhaps, springs as much from a widespread ignorance in the wider culture about the profession than as from a simple ignorance in lower working class subcultures. In their study of a series of social work and probation work interviews, Baldock and Prior argued that,

"it was clear that (clients) rarely had any idea of when the job of the interview was done. This was probably because they were rather hazy about the principal object (of social work intervention) in the first place". (Baldock and Prior, 1981, p. 33).

In their path-breaking analysis of clients' reactions to social work, Mayer and Timms found that, in general, even clients who were satisfied with their contacts with social workers had expected that contact to be a different kind of experience from what emerged. Clients seeking material assistance had perceptions and expectations of social workers, based on their own experiences of other official agencies and discourses extant in

the wider culture, which tended to be negative. Their experience of social work often led to a revised opinion of the nature and purpose of social work practice. For example,

"Mrs. Wood was impressed that the worker at the FWA (Family Welfare Agency), unlike the one at the one at the Ministry of Social Security, asked her to sit down and talk with her rather than remaining standing. Other clients were impressed with the 'nice' manner in which questions were asked and the fact that the workers did not hurry them. 'It's nice talking to them', Mr. Peel told us. 'You could sit there and talk to them for two or three hours. But at the social security, you don't want to know them and they don't want to know you'." (Mayer and Timms, 1972, p. 108).

The idea that what may seem like general conversation could be considered as a part of professional practice, was met with surprise,

This talking business really surprised me, because I didn't go there for that. I only went for the electric-to see if they could give me an advance. I didn't know such things went on as this chatting business. No, not at all. Surprised me that did. (Mr. Forest), (ibid., p. 107, cf. also Rees, 1978, Rees and Wallace, 1982, Robinson, 1978).

Using the conceptual language of American functionalism, Mayer and Timms argue that the clients they studied were either unaware of, or did not agree with the professional norms that had developed within social work about how professional/client relations should be structured, for example, the norm that the social worker should be selfless, subordinating personal and commercial interests to the clients' needs. This professional neutrality was sometimes seen as indicating that social workers were not really interested in the clients (Mayer and Timms, *op. cit.*, p. 156).

Another norm prescribes that professional and client are bound by a contract which requires that in order to provide effective help, the social worker needs the client to disclose any personal information necessary. In return the social worker promises not to abuse the trust so created, by divulging the information without permission, or using it for private gain. This was not always taken for granted by clients and so the social worker could be seen as "nosy", interested in spreading gossip, or simply was seen as lacking the right to ask what seemed to be highly personal questions about sexual and other matters, which would not normally even be discussed with a close friend or relative (*ibid.*, p156). We have already indicated that this kind of asymmetrical disclosure, or the expectation of it, constitutes an aspect of hierarchical surveillance, in turn, one of the dimensions of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1977, p.170).

Thirdly, Mayer and Timms argue that a key professional norm states that professional/client interaction should, in Parsonian terms, be functionally specific rather than diffuse. That is that the parties should focus specifically on the clients' problems. Thus the making of rapport is limited to what is technically necessary to solve the clients' problems; it should not stray over into the more open-ended, diffuse, affective bonds of friendship proper. There were, however, argued Mayer and Timms, clients who did not have such a restricted view of the relationship and described the relationships with their social workers in terms of friendship; they used various significations of reciprocity, that they should repay the social worker for what he or she had done for them, just as one would have to with a friend who had helped out in a crisis (ibid., p.157, cf also Sainsbury et al. 1982).

This could affect deeply their view of the interview process. "For example, clients sometimes referred to their interviews as 'chats'; one client explicitly likened them to 'gabbing with someone in a pub'. (Mayer and Timms, op.cit., 157). As we shall see, the instructional discourse about interviewing presents the distinction between the talk of friendship and interviewing as a major professional issue.

This lack of clarity in the publically institutionalised definitions of social work indicates a problem in establishing what Foucault called the authorities of delimitation. In this

sense, as we have already intimated, a contrast can be drawn with medicine,

"in the nineteenth century, medicine (as an institution possessing its own rules, as a group of individuals constituting the medical profession, as a body of knowledge and practice, as an authority recognised by public opinion, the law and government) became the major authority in society that delimited, designated, named, and established madness as an object..." (Foucault, 1972, p. 42).

While often operating within reified, or overly institutionally bounded views of medicine, sociological discourse has partially recognised the broad, institutionalised discursive framework, within which doctor/patient interaction takes place. In this view, there is a clearer set of expectations extant in the wider culture about the relative roles of patient and doctor. This prior knowledge is brought to the consultation setting (Mayer and Timms, op. cit. p.190). While this view clearly underestimates the potential for confusion, or lack of congruence in expectations, nevertheless, it is clear, as Byrne and Long argued in their study of doctor/patient talk, that patients seem to acquiesce more readily to a doctor defined agenda and doctor structured interview process. Most consultations conformed to a repetitive structure, usually involving a sequence of stages from: initial greeting; establishing the reason for the consultation; verbal or physical examination; diagnosis (or some

consideration of it); decision about treatment and termination (Byrne and Long, 1976). As we shall see, both Baldock and Prior's and this analysis suggest that social work interviews are less *obviously* ritualised or professionally directed than are doctor/patient interviews.

Thus, having tried to show the problem for social work in establishing its authorities of delimitation, which intensifies the pressure to establish the legitimacy of the knowledges and techniques of social work, we will explore some of the key structures of instructional discourse, which attempt to provide disciplinary controls over the use of, perhaps the profession's most sacred tool of operation.

THE INTERVIEW AND INSTRUCTIONAL DISCOURSE

This section will not attempt to provide an exhaustive and comprehensive critique of instructional texts about interviewing in social work. That would be a large and important task in its own right. Rather, it will attempt to identify some of the key themes of influential, ideal typical literature in this area, which is widely used on training courses both in Britain and in the United States, insofar as they relate to the attempt to clarify and sustain the authorities of delimitation of the profession and to the processes of normalising judgement. In turn, this will help to provide a context for the analysis of interviewing practice.

Thus, this section will: first, examine what is meant by the notion of instructional in this discursive context; secondly, it will examine the analytic/cum normative distinctions drawn within this discourse between, on the one hand, counselling interviews and on the other hand other kinds of interviews and conversations, which are not institutionally set by clear agendas, as in conversations between friends; thirdly, it will, within the instructional discourse, examine the concern with structure or "shape" in the interview, and how it can be produced as a result of applying professional skills; fourthly, and following on from the last point, it will examine the prescriptive models which specify how to exercise control within the interview, and its accompanying goals. We will examine how at

the core of this attempt at control is "the search" for aspects of the subjectivity of clients which might otherwise be seen as hidden. Within the terms of this analysis, this "search", of course, involves not a search but an attribution of forms of subjectivity within instructional discourse.

1) Instructional Discourse.

We have already pointed out that, while there is a gap between the formal theoretical models specified in the professional literature and working professional practices, nevertheless, in part, professional knowledge does enter into the working knowledge of social workers (Curnock and Hardiker, 1979 and Black et. al. 1983). This issue is usually presented in terms of the problem of the relation between theory and practice (cf. Curnock and Hardiker, chap. 1). A recent American text expresses the point in this way:

"Social work professional practice...consists of 1) a body of knowledge, 2) a set of values, and 3) a series of actions that are related to knowledge and values. These actions are referred to as the interventive repertoire of the profession" (Garvin and Seabury, 1984, p. 13).

Garvin and Seabury draw a distinction between, on the one hand, propositional knowledge, consisting of factual, descriptive and theoretical propositions, largely culled from the social sciences

and not produced essentially for the detailed guidance of practical action, and on the other hand procedural or "how to" knowledge which is defined as technology, as consisting of skills and trained capacities (ibid, p. 14).

The latter form of knowledge has rarely been given sufficient recognition and they emphasise the importance (as characterised by the efforts in their own text) of "defining procedural knowledge in specific ways so that it can be reported to others, tested for effectiveness, and incorporated in practice theories and models." (ibid., pp. 14-15). Now, we have already pointed to the ideographic, or individualising tendencies in the forms of knowledge favoured by practising professionals; there is a general unhappiness within the professional discourses about slotting the characteristics of clients and their problems into the generalising categories of social science, and hence a "case study" or clinical style of discourse is often preferred. The attempt by texts like that of Garvin and Seabury to systematise and publicise "how to" or procedural knowledge can be seen as an attempt to recover for the professional, academic, instructional discourses a vital form of knowledge which operates in the relatively private, professional space of the interview setting and in informal contacts between professional and trainee workers.

It is important to note, however, that the attempt to recover this hidden knowledge, is not simply based on an attempt to

differentiate procedural knowledge from propositional, social science knowledge, but is also an assault on an approach to knowledge which is essentially un-academic and hence problematic for the professionalising process (cf. Gould, N., 1989). In Foucault's terms, this hidden knowledge, passed on, at best, in the oral discourse of individual professionals, is required in order to help set the authorities of delimitation of social work. This can be seen as representing a perceived tension between the roles of academic, professional trainers and fieldwork supervisors, responsible for trainees in the practical locations of agency placements. This is clearly represented in the comments made about supervisors in Crispin Cross's text on interviewing, which has, as part of the Library of Social Work series, been one of the most widely used texts on interviewing in Britain:-

"Generations of social workers have been taught by many casework supervisors. The ideas of these interviewers become...part of the students' conception of the method or technique of interviewing. Elements of the practical experience of these supervisors are taken over by such students and made part of their own interviewing principles and practice.....such close identification between students and supervisors has the effect of reinforcing the impression that every supervisor has his or her own particular method of interviewing, thus contributingto the tendency to think of interviewing as an operation which involves a multiplicity of techniques.....(this) completely ignores the

fact that, despite the unique and individual idiosyncrasy which every supervisor would bring to bear on his work with students, there are, nevertheless, common elements of skill which such a supervisor would reflect. The unity of the technique of interviewing is not thereby denied but, on the contrary, is reinforced. Our use of the notion of 'technique' or 'method' is directed towards this common body of skills and their attendant operational considerations". (Cross(ed.), 1974. pp. 98-99).

We can see here an attempt to create a respectable middle ground of professional, instructional, or "how to" knowledge, which is nomothetic, accumuleable and communicable and hence not just the ideographic, traditional knowledge of the craftsperson, that can only be learned by "sitting with Nellie". This kind of knowledge, presented in text form, can be bemusing for an orthodox social scientist, since it both draws on analytic social science knowledge, to describe the processes involved in interviews and also, and more fundamentally, it sets exemplary standards which should be kept within the profession. Despite the marshalling of a great deal of wide ranging social science knowledge, Cross stresses the minimal use of social science jargon because he acknowledges "the instructional nature of the book" (ibid. p. 21).

Perhaps this indicates a dovetailing of the power/knowledge strategies of academic trainers as formulators and guardians of professional standards and those of social work managers, who

need to make the most economical use of scarce, trained, professional workers and thus need to produce criteria which identify good professional practice in terms of clearly defined and set goals and objectives. This point will be elaborated further at later stages.

2) Defining the Interview

In a recent text on the observation and analysis of natural language, the sociolinguist Peter Milroy defines the interview as a speech event in the following terms,

"An interview in western society is a clearly defined and quite common speech event to which a formal speech style is appropriate. It generally involves dyadic interaction between strangers, with the roles of the participants being quite clearly defined. *Turn taking* rights are not equally distributed as they are in conversational interaction between peers. Rather, one participant (the interviewer) controls the discourse in the sense of both selecting topics and choosing the form of questions. The interviewee on the other hand, by agreeing to be interviewed, has contracted to answer these questions cooperatively. From the interviewee's point of view, a cooperative response is often one which is maximally brief and relevant.

Once the interviewer has obtained a response, the obligation rests upon him to follow it up with a further question. People are generally quite well aware of the behaviour appropriate to these roles, and of their implications in terms of unequal distribution of rights to talk". (Milroy, 1987, p.41).

The implication of this definition is that modern discourses are by now so institutionalised in advanced societies, that the appropriate subject positionings are largely taken for granted by participants. But what Milroy is referring to here are speech events like job interviews, market research interviews and interviews with a range of official agencies like social security officials, the police, hospital consultants and so on. However, we have seen that social work interviews are not so clearly institutionalised in the wider culture in this way, and that clients can have difficulty distinguishing them from informal "chats". Given this ambiguity, it is not surprising that instructional discourse puts great emphasis on providing clear prescriptive guidelines for distinguishing between social work interviews and conversations or other types of interview. The great problem for professionalising knowledge is to create collective representations of a speech event which lies somewhere between what in conventional cultural terms could be recognised as an interview and what would be recognised as conversation.

A leading American text on social work interviewing, by Alfred Kadushin, now in its second edition, and with Cross's text

possibly the most widely used source for training, devotes fifteen pages to distinguishing between conversations and interviews and between social work interviews and other types of interview. It is not our task to provide an exhaustive account or critique of Kadushin's arguments, but we will provide some highlights which are relevant to the argument presented here. Kadushin's characterisation of the interview, as contrasted with conversations is not significantly different from that of Milroy.

For Kadushin,

"The crucial characteristic which distinguishes an interview from a conversation is that the interaction is designed to achieve a consciously selected purpose. The purpose may be to establish a purpose for the interview... (Kadushin, 1983, p. 13). And, "the interview differs from a conversation in that it involves interpersonal interaction for a conscious, mutually accepted purpose. Following on from this premise, the interview, as contrasted with a conversation, involves a more formal structure, a clearly defined allocation of roles, and a different set of norms regulating the process of interaction". (ibid., p. 17).

Among the norms which Kadushin specifies are the following :-

"Since the interview has a definite purpose, *its content is chosen to facilitate achievement of the purpose*. Any content, however interesting, that will not contribute to the purposes of the interview is excluded. On the other hand, the agenda of a conversation may include unrelated and diffuse content. Where there are no boundaries, nothing is extraneous" (ibid. p. 14).

To achieve the purpose of the interview, it needs one person to take responsibility for conducting the interview, steering topics towards the centrally relevant ones and away from the irrelevant. By contrast, in a conversation, there is no such need for a clear, and non reciprocal division of role responsibilities, and participants have a mutual responsibility for maintaining conversational flow. Moreover, in an interview, both parties are concerned with the problems of one of them whereas in conversations, normally, there are shifts of interest between one party and another (ibid. pp. 14-15);--

"Although the behaviour of all parties to a conversation may be spontaneous and unplanned, *the actions of the interviewer must be planned, deliberate, and unconsciously selected to further the purpose of the interview*" (ibid., p.15, italics original).

Similarly, Crispin Cross is at pains to differentiate interviews in general from conversations,

"....the conversation which takes place within the interview is of a specific character. Its specific character is determined by the two sets of persons who are involved in the act of communication, their relation to each other both before and during the course of the interview, and the inherent assumptions which underlie the roles of interviewer and interviewee.....the interview can be regarded as a technical instrument which is concerned with communication, and its use

can be evaluated in terms of the practical extent to which it enhances communication in specific contexts". (Cross, op. cit. pp. 10-11).

Now, having distinguished the interview, as a genus, from conversations, instructional discourse makes further prescriptive definitions of the social work interview, as a particular category of interview.

Cross identifies the social work interview as a form of counselling, which differs from other types of interview, while, he admits, not all social work interviews need to be centrally concerned with counselling. Counselling differs from other forms of interview in three main ways, in that counselling connotes firstly,

"an implicit intention to help those being counselled; (secondly) it implies that the interest of those being counselled is a paramount consideration in the encounter (and thirdly implies) that the role of the counsellor is concerned with facilitating the adjustment of those being counselled". (ibid., p. 8).

He further constructs a social psychological model of the structural components which the social work interview does/should consist of. These elements include: the participants; their mutual role expectations; the communication flow between them and the social and cultural pressures which influence the behaviour of the participants, by for example the factors of class, sex race

and so on (ibid., p.12). As a sociologist, Cross emphasises that both client and social worker come to the interview "'drenched' in social and cultural factors" (p.56), which have a profound effect on the behaviour of each participant.

While he admits that there may be some interchanging of roles, in general, the social worker as interviewer, should be in control of the flow of talk. As Cross puts it,

"..a complete transformation of the roles of interviewer and interviewee would lead to a breakdown of the interview and would considerably distort the results. This, in fact, is one of the characteristics of a bad interview. 'Turning the tables' on the interviewer is the best way to frustrate his efforts.....a minimal degree of role separation between interviewer and interviewee remains essential to any interview. Certain skill elements employed by the interviewer can help to reinforce role allocation in the interview situation". (ibid., p.13).

As well as having clear and stable structural elements, social work interviews should, within the terms of instructional discourse, have teleogy. For Cross, there are three major goals of social work interviews: the procurement of information for the social worker, in which case the focus is on the client and so his needs and interests are paramount; secondly, provision of information by the social worker to the the client, for example, in relation to the management of debts or the provision of information about welfare right (this would involve the social

worker in a proactive, talkative role); thirdly the provision of therapy, which is often "aimed at influencing the attitude of the client to his own behaviour and to the behaviour of other people". (ibid., p. 15).

Kadushin provides an almost exact echo of Cross on these purposes (Kadushin, op.cit. p.21). Moreover, in a functionalist sociological mode, as we indicated in chapter one, Kadushin sees these purposes as instrumental means for achieving more efficient social functioning, both for the individual and the social collectivity.

Thus, for Kadushin, "the social work interview.....differs from other kinds of interviews in that it is concerned with problems relating to the interface between clients and their social environment", (Kadushin, op.cit. p.21). However (and here he seems to adjust his definition, in part, in consideration of Baldock and Prior's research), he introduces a more circumspect and cautious view of what the technology may consist of. As he puts it,

"Compared with many other kinds of interviews the social work interview is apt to be diffuse, unstandardised, nonscheduled, interviewee-controlled, focused on affective material, and concerned with interpersonal interaction of participants. As a consequence the social work interviewer has a difficult assignment. Much of what she generally has to do in the

interview cannot be determined in advance but must be a response to the situation as it develops. The interviewer has to have considerable discretion to do almost anything she thinks might be advisable, under highly individualised circumstances, to achieve the purpose of the interview. The content, the sequence in which it is introduced and how it is introduced, the interpersonal context in which it is explored—all these matters of strategy and tactics in interview management need to be the prerogative and responsibility of the interviewer". (ibid. p. 21).

We can see here a dilemma within instructional discourse, in that there seems to be an unavoidable tension between the attempt to lay down clear, prescriptive standards governing the conduct of interviews and the considerable and inevitably broad range of unpredictability and improvisation involved in this kind of talk. Cross had already recognised this point in noting that one cannot predict in fine detail the nature of the information required before, because the communication processes occurring within the interview arise spontaneously. Nevertheless,

"broad outlines of the information required are usually envisaged before the actual encounter between the participants in an interview, these outlines are extended, elaborated and, indeed, changed. But it is because of this element of predetermination that control can be exercised over the flow of communication. The prior determination of these broad outlines

is often referred to as the 'planning' aspect of the interview". (Cross, op.cit. pp. 7-8).

In order to plan effectively, the social worker must have, in advance, a clear conception of the purpose of an interview since, "No interview can be expected to reveal its own purpose, otherwise it would devolve into a rambling, aimless, conversation which does not succeed in touching on anything other than the superficial aspects of the client's life". Clarity of purpose enables the social worker to improvise effectively; this is necessary because, "the interview is not a 'cold' instrument but develops its own momentum and can take both interviewer and interviewee along a number of different paths as it develops". (ibid., pp. 104-106).

It is precisely because of this dilemma that so much attention is devoted to the development of professional skills which can enhance the social workers' standards of judgement and their ability to "think on their feet". This, after all, is a hallmark of the process of normalising, as opposed to juridical, or instantaneous judgement. The social worker both interprets and applies "floating standards" to conduct, between the poles of good and bad. What is at issue is not so much the identification of specific infractions, so much as establishing, broadly, whether the individual is able to carry out his or her tasks in an acceptable way (Foucault, 1977, p. 179). Thus normalising judgement is performed in an ongoing and provisional basis, in

assessing the social performance of clients. We can see here, in instructional discourse, that there is, at a meta level, a corresponding attempt to normalise the technology of normalisation itself. Hard and fast rules about the exercise of professional skills are difficult to come by; so the *virtuous* (in the Aristotelian sense) exercise of professional skill must remain the key guarantor of the judicious use of professional authority.

3) Shape In The Interview

By shape, in instructional discourse, we mean both the attempt to prescribe a planful, diachronic structure within a particular interview, and also a planful structure to a series of interviews between social worker and client. More simply, we mean the attempt to offer prescriptive guidelines to social workers, which enable them to recognise when they are conducting rationally ordered social work interviews and sequences of interviews. This is done, not so much in terms of strict and inflexible rules of operation, as in terms of the offering of exemplary and anecdotal guides for good conduct (Gould, N. 1989). This simultaneously draws attention to the outer boundaries of acceptable conduct, to where improvisation slides into a planless series of ad hoc reactions to clients utterances and life events. Such deviant practice amounts to a very damaging and dangerous rhetoric for social work, since one of its central messages is the possibility it holds out to people, who seem to drift helplessly, reacting

without any life-plans to contingent circumstances, of a way of life which is amenable to rational and future oriented action, and therefore a life which offers hope.

For Cross, shape in interviews is conceptualised in terms of phases, the beginning phase, the body of the interview and the termination. While useful analytic distinctions, "These phases merge into each other as the interview progresses" (Cross, op.cit., p.13). The four structural elements he identified are seen as operating in all the phases of the interview; and "an interview can be thought of as a complex of dynamic forces which constantly interact with each other as an interview progresses". (ibid. p.13).

The beginning phase, particularly during an initial assessment interview, involves the establishment, and later re-establishment of rapport with the client; upon this depends the course of the subsequent phases. This phase Cross likens to a salesman's softening up of the resistance of a potential buyer (ibid. p. 106). However, following Bogardus's classic (1936) theory of the interview, Cross emphasises that the phases are not separable entities, but are only possible as elements within an emergent whole. One cannot, for example, do a beginning during one interview, a middle part at the next interview and so on; so, "every interview is seen as a whole and 'survives' as such, or is disrupted and fails". (ibid., p.118).

The Bogardus model is based on behaviourist principles. The interview is seen in terms of a developing field of mutual stimuli and responses between participants. The early pattern of responses is seen as crucial in laying a foundation for a subsequent and cumulative upward, virtuous spiral into agreeableness or a downward, vicious spiral into antagonism. Where there is a virtuous spiral, this leads to a progression to higher levels of knowledge (ibid., p.119). Cross tries to develop this behaviourist model further into a humanistic social psychological framework, by recasting the model within the holistic discourse of Lewin's field theory (Lewin, 1951). Cross develops the argument in this way,

"Each participant can be seen as possessing a field of psychological forces around him-call it his social space or his life space. An interview involves the conjunction of the life spaces with their inherent psychological forces, of interviewer and client. The initiation of an encounter between the participants will create a disruption of each field of forces. The progression of the interview will then involve a 'restructuring' of the life spaces of both participants. During the course of the interview, each participant will attempt to 'defend' his life space in order to resist the possibility of disruption. But the termination of a successful interview must see the participants 'back' with their 'restructured' life spaces intact once more". (ibid., pp.118-119).

Now the importance of this recasting lies in its prescriptive emphasis on a base of humanistic and personalist values (Minson, op. cit.) and concepts, which resist the reduction of human behaviour to a mechanistic and therefore easily manipulable set of responses to visible stimuli. Cross emphasises that "an interview is more than just a superficial encounter between persons" (ibid., p.119). While behaviourist and other positivist approaches have long had their adherents within social work (cf. Brewer and Lait, 1980), nevertheless, the incursion of their discourses into social work knowledge has been fiercely resisted (cf. Halmos, P. 1966). As we shall see, this is not simply a matter of theoretical fashion, but has been a key element of the subjectifying practices of social work.

It must be stressed that within instructional discourse, a planful diachrony extends beyond the particular interview and, prescriptively, should apply to a series of interviews in the unfolding relationship between social worker and client. Strutt, in the same volume edited by Cross, argues that there should be a series of phases in the counselling relationship, manifested in shifting emphases in interviews over time. The first phase involves the development of rapport and of the client's confidence. In the second phase, there is the assessment and evaluation of the problem. The third phase involves the restructuring of the client's behaviour, or at a deeper level, personality. Here the interviewer, "Aims to enable the client to

become self sufficient both as an individual and in relation to his group affiliation". (Strutt, 1974. p.125).

Kadushin, similarly, sees particular interviews as links in a chain which extends from the introductory phase, to the development phase, to the termination phase; his text is narratively structured to take the reader step by temporal step through these stages. The sequence of activities which should take place in the progression of interviews is part of the problem-solving process which defines the very heart of social work. This includes "study, diagnosis, and treatment (or data collection, data assessment, and intervention)" (Kadushin, op.cit., p.123). Moreover, and most tellingly, just as in a given interview the phases are not clearly demarcated, so this is the case in the sequence of interviews. Interestingly, in view of the argument about narrative and the debate about oral and literate discourses which will be presented in chapter six, Kadushin describes the social work process in terms of a musical analogy,

"Process is somewhat like a symphony. Although at any particular time, one phase, one theme, may be dominant, the other steps in the process can be heard, muted in the background. For the purposes of more explicit analysis, we will artificially separate the steps in the process and discuss each in turn". (ibid., p.123).

This presents us with a clear example of how metaphor (here used as a metonym for analogical extension in general) in explanation operates both at the level of the scientific observer and also within discursive practice itself. Its main function in Kadushin's discourse is to act as a rhetorical stimulus to social workers, to encourage them to see shape in a classical, sequential, literate, narrative form, as a subtext to the surface of discourse, which can often appear to be the very reverse. More simply, despite that which a naive observer may see, what seems to be random conversational chat, drifting tangentially from topic to topic, in fact can have shape, direction and function.

Kadushin uses another metaphor, that of a funnel, to describe the unfolding form of an individual interview, and by implication, of a sequence of interviews. Early stages are broad and discursive, and are characterised by "nondirective, open-ended questions....more detailed explication and discussion of specific areas of content later". (ibid., p. 154). Similarly,

"Early interviews in the contact are apt to have a greater component of exploration of the client's situation, more communication concerned with socializing the interviewee to her role in the interview, and greater use of techniques which maximise development of the worker-client relationship. The worker is likely to be more active and directive.

In later interviews there is likely to be less small talk, and participants move toward the start of formal interview interaction more quickly. Generally speaking, later interviews focus more on treatment rather than on exploration, are less concerned with socialization since the interviewee by now knows how she is expected to act, and evidence more risk taking interventions such as confrontation and interpretation. In the balance between being responsive and intrusive the interviewer is more responsive and less intrusive in early interviews, with a shift in balance toward greater intrusiveness in later interviews" (ibid.; p. 155).

Garvin and Seabury operate with a similar logic to that of Kadushin. They extend the phase model to include five phases over the period of social worker/client contact. These include: engagement; assessment, planning and preparation; implementation and termination and evaluation phases (Garvin and Seabury, 1984, p. 30). They admit that the point of constructing this phasic model is "to emphasise the changes that takes place over time in the service process. There are some fundamental differences in how worker and client will interact and what their responsibilities are to each other in beginning phase as compared with successive later phases" (ibid., p. 30). Moreover, these authors come near to stating the rhetorical, instructional, or "as if" quality of phase models, in admitting that empirical research does not provide strong support for such a model and that phases do not occur in neat temporal sequence (they can

occur simultaneously) (ibid. p.30). While they, "acknowledge that social work practice is not a lock step sequence of unique phases".... (nevertheless)... "we still believe a phasic construction is essential to any practice model. Writers who state that practice cannot be so conceptualised are giving up prematurely in the face of complexity." (ibid., p.30).

At the heart of this phasic process, within the terms of instructional discourse, is a series of desired shifts in subjectivity, that is, in the subject positioning of both social worker and client, and in the relation between social worker and client subjects. In the next section we will explore how the possibility of control within the interview, in order to realise these goals, is discursively presented.

CONTROL IN THE INTERVIEW

Given the problems that social work has had in establishing its authorities of delimitation, and thus in distinguishing the interview from more ad hoc conversational forms, the skills social workers should develop or acquire in order to increase their control over the shape and direction of the interview, remains a vital issue. It would, however, be misleading, in presenting a condensed ideal typical picture of instructional discourse, to convey the impression that all instructional texts bear the same messages. While there is indeed considerable congruence, it must be noted that there is also disagreement, or variation in emphasis. To some extent prescriptive models of interviews differ in terms of the priority they place on the social worker being overtly directive, that is explicit about the purposes of the interviews and open in offering advice about how clients may go about dealing with their problems.

Strutt points out that most of the (until recently) dominant psychological approaches favoured within social work, were nondirective in their preferred interviewing style. The Freudian school and the neo-Freudian schools of Sullivan, Horney and the approaches which developed in the Menninger and Tavistock Institutes, were largely non directive. And despite the differences between those operating within the Freudian legacy and the more existential approach associated with Carl Rogers, particularly over the extent to which therapists openly

articulate their therapeutic purposes, and the acceptable degree of involvement of the therapist with the client, they share an emphasis on the client's developing insight into the nature of his or her problems and how he or she contributes to them. (Strutt, 1974, pp. 122-123).

By contrast, directive approaches, as developed, for example, by Glasser (1965), are concerned less with establishing the aetiology of problems and of leading the client towards insight (or in the Rogerian model, developing the insight which the client probably already has). It is presupposed that clients already have insight. Rather, "The important factor for (the directive therapist) is to have the client face up to the problem as it appears at the moment of interaction with the therapist and to plan how to cope with it today, tomorrow and in the future". (ibid., p. 123). Strutt, who strongly favours the directive approach, argues that non-directive approaches are, in effect, irresponsible in cutting off the therapeutic process at the middle, assessment or evaluation phase. It is precisely at this phase, he says, that clients are at their most dependent and vulnerable (ibid., pp. 126-131).

Since the 1960's, there has been an increasing tendency within instructional discourse to promote directive approaches in interviewing, which recommend a more open explanation, to the client, of initial agency purposes for interviews, and a more economical, collaborative and contractual approach to the

formulation and attempted realisation of clients' goals, preferably within set time periods. In part, this must be seen against the backcloth of egalitarian critiques of the alleged elitism and idealism of conventional non-directive approaches. Such approaches were accused of individualising problems, which could be seen to manifest deep rooted social structural conflicts, and exaggerate the affective components of problems at the expense of material deprivation. (Pearson, G. 1973).

In addition, and perhaps, more pertinently, newer approaches have emerged, supported by the school of client studies initiated by Mayer and Timms, which dovetail with the concerns of management with making most effective use of skilled social workers' time. Brewer and Lait (1980), from a radical, New Right perspective, argue that non-directive approaches have been shown to be wasteful of time, ill-monitored and as far as evidence is available, remarkably ineffective in reaching stated aims. Reid and Shyne (1969) offer a model which specifies delimited tasks and contractual commitments on both sides, which, hopefully, should reduce the amount of time spent on broadly based and ill-focussed interviewing.

Garvin and Seabury also note that the research studies of client contact with social workers consistently show that most clients do not stay very long,

"Clients do not expect service to take a long time: about half are gone by the sixth interview, and only about one-third remain in service by the tenth interview. In fact long term services should be selectively offered as few clients (about 1½ per cent who start) make it to the fiftieth interview." (Garvin and Seabury, op. cit., pp. 30-31).

In these circumstances, it is small wonder that there is increasing management and academic based criticism of open ended interview techniques, harking back, as they do, to the exemplar of psychoanalytic interviews, which may continue for years.

Perhaps the neatest way of characterising this newer type of instructional discourse is by emphasising its no nonsense insistence that "actions speak louder than words". Garvin and Seabury express this very clearly,

"A final bias in our model is the importance of action as a primary dimension of interpersonal practice. The worker actively intervenes and actively facilitates the client's participation in the problem-solving process. The worker is not only active but so is the client, 'doing' and 'acting' are essential to the client's sense of mastery and competence. Furthermore, in studies of discontinuance, poor, oppressed clients are turned off by service that primarily emphasises 'talking', 'reflecting', and 'understanding'. Clients from lower socioeconomic groups expect, want, and seek action oriented

solutions to their problems, *not* an elaborate, detailed understanding of the cause and consequences of their present troubles. We are not against a worker being reflective or nondirective, at times, with clients, but our approach firmly emphasises that the worker should actively engage in problem solving actions.

Such an action-oriented stand may be criticised by devotees of nondirective practice as 'impulsive,' 'bullying,' or 'moving too fast.' We are aware of the dangers of acting prematurely and accept it as a potential problem of an action oriented model. We are, however, much more concerned about the inaction and resultant frustration that many clients experience in reflective, nondirective practice. The needs and problems of oppressed clients are so great that a service model cannot afford to frustrate further these clients and thus contribute to their dropping out of service." (Garvin and Seabury, *op.cit.*, pp. 31-32).

However, while acknowledging this shift in discourse, it is important not to exaggerate the significance of the shift, for there remain important continuities. In particular, we would argue that there remain strong similarities between directive and non directive strategies, with respect to the attribution of subjectivities operating within them. We will explore this theme by focussing on the type of controls, or techniques which social workers are encouraged to acquire, develop and apply within

interview settings. Again there is no attempt here to provide a comprehensive, all inclusive examination of these techniques; we will merely focus, selectively, on some symptomatic examples.

Communication Skills.--Encoding and Decoding

Instructional texts, unsurprisingly, put considerable emphasis on social workers' developing communication skills as a basis of good interview practice. We do not here have the space to explore all of the skills specified in their minutiae, but it is important, for our purposes, to uncover the epistemological framework within which this discourse about communication operates. In particular, we argue that the dominant models of communication operate within the terms of what Ong, as we will indicate in chapter six, calls the "pipeline theory" of language. In this model, it is assumed that there is a one to one correspondence between elements in the extra-mental world and spoken or written words. Thus, in the commonsense model, language is seen as a medium for transporting words through to the psyche, and back again to the outside world, and so to other psyches. By contrast, in this approach, we see language and the "psyche" as structurally intertwined; subjects are constructed and reconstructed within discourse, language is not simply a tool used by subjects in their efforts to bridge the gaps between them (Ong, 1982, pp. 166-167).

The pipeline model of language is clearly visible in Kadushin's text; as he puts it,

"The message to be communicated originates as a thought in the mind of one of the participants in an interview. Events and experiences cannot be communicated as such. They have to be translated into words which can 'carry' a symbolic representation of the experience. When received, the experience has to be reconstructed from the words.

The message, as transmitted, is the thought or idea encoded into the overt behaviour of words and gestures." (Kadushin, op.cit. p32).

Cross, drawing on Bernstein's work, argues that clients differ in their coding "ability", that is they differ in the degree to which they are articulate in the expression of thought and feelings, and the extent to which they rely on body language. With the inarticulate,

"differences in the coding activity of different groups of clients place the burden of comprehension in communication firmly on the shoulders of the caseworker, for he must not only interact with the client in such a way that the latter's inarticulateness does not inhibit verbal communication, but he must also handle his questions and comments so that they will be comprehensible to the client. The elements of skill which are

relevant in this context are the *ability to listen, careful observation, clear question formulation and communication control*. The ability to listen is crucial to the execution of the interviewer's role, for he must not only listen to the messages being put across by means of language, he must also be able to distill the additional meanings which inflexions and nuances of speech can convey." (Cross, op.cit. pp.114-115).

Fundamentally, Cross sees language as just one element which has an impact on the form and content of the communication of information between the social worker and the client. While aware of the importance of linguistic considerations, they are seen as qualitatively removed from psychological processes, which are seen, analytically, as central. In Cross's terms,

"... interesting though the discoveries of descriptive linguistics may be, they are of little direct concern to the specialist interested in understanding the interview. Language remains an important means by which communication in the interview can be effected, but the characteristics of the language, its syntactical system, etc., are all standard and independent of the participants in the interview." (ibid., p. 68).

There is an implicit assumption that language and thought are qualitatively different and separate phenomena, that language can

have an effect on thought, but is not seen as coterminous with, or constitutive of it. Rather,

"What is of more crucial concern to the understanding of the interview is the fact that the language used in the interview situation may constrain, or be constrained by the thought processes which go on in the minds of the participants." (ibid., p.68).

Thus in the "pipeline" discourse, subject, language and communication remain separate elements.

Garvin and Seabury operate with a very similar model of encoding/decoding, which they call the Sender/Receiver Exchange Model. The pipeline model is particularly evident here. For them,

"Encoding problems concern the abilities and capacities of the sender to select signals that the receiver will be able to understand. A sender has a wide range of signals from which to choose to communicate with a receiver, and the sender must select that array of signalsthat will best convey the message." (Garvin and Seabury, op. cit. p.67).

As in other instructional discourse, Garvin and Seabury stress the importance of social workers' learning the special codes which operate in families and in various subcultures. A failure

to understand the variety of codes can, they say, generate problems of "referent confusion". As they put it,

"Because signs such as language carry no meaning by their users, a particular sign (word) may have more than one referent in the real world, and a particular referent may have more than one sign or designation in a given signal system (language)... (for example), If a white, suburban, middle class social worker refers to someone as a "punk" (i.e. a troublemaker or wiseacre), and the worker is talking to a black, inner city youth who interprets "punk" as a homosexual, there will be obvious confusion in such an exchange." (ibid. p.67).

Like Garvin and Seabury, Kadushin argues notes that in order to be an effective orchestrator/subject, the social worker must possess among his or her skills, a sensitivity to the great subcultural variety in language use, by, for example, different class or ethnic groups,

"Having decided that a thought is permissible and appropriate to the situation and to the role in which he is engaged at the moment, the interviewer still must find the words to express the message for undistorted reception. The worker needs a vocabulary rich enough to convey the meaning of his thought, and varied enough to adapt to the vocabulary of different clients". (ibid., p. 34). (1)

Clearly, this model of the role of language is not simply "erroneous", nor can it be easily substituted for another, because it operates as a functionally necessary tool within instructional discourse. By necessity, the social worker, as subject, must be presented as one who can, at least potentially, be in control, orchestrating the interview. Hence, it is necessary to present the social worker as a subject who can choose from a range of communication skills and messages, rather than, for example, in the terms of this analysis, present the social worker as an agent of, and constituted within, a range of discursive practices. Rhetorically, such a model operates in too deterministic a mode to be effective for the professional job in hand.

The need to represent the social worker subject as a skilled, orchestrator of interviews is reinforced by the recognition, that is the construction within discourse, of the client/subject as a site of resistance; Kadushin recognises that the social worker does not call all the shots. The social worker is presented as having a range of "power" resources, in the commonsense meaning of the term, at her disposal. These include: the social worker's access to various material resources which the client needs, directly through the agency, or through contact with other agencies; the social worker's therapeutic expertise and ability to confer approval and disapproval, together with the range of legal sanctions with respect to child care and so on. Against this, the client is presented as having a range of passive power resources, for example, the indifferent responses which can

frustrate the accomplishment of the interview, denying the social worker the psychic gratifications which go with that. (ibid., p. 82).

More actively, clients are presented as able to control interviews,

"by being uninterruptible 'super talkers', by reversing roles and asking the interviewers questions, by responding to questions with very spare, ambiguous answers, by talking so that it is difficult to hear, by frequently changing the subject so as to destroy interview coherence, by nonverbal signals which indicate hostility, resistance, unwillingness to cooperate. Interviewees attempt to control interviewers by making deliberate conscious efforts to influence the reactions of the interviewer." (ibid., pp. 82-83).

The use of interactionist concepts, derived probably from Goffman's work, can be seen in depictions of the client as an agent of power, for example,

"Social agency clients have some idea of what is expected of them in playing the role of a client. Accordingly some may manipulate their self-presentation so as to make themselves more acceptable to interviewers." (ibid., p. 83, cf. also Day, 1985).

Constructing The Client

We have indicated the need to supplement and go beyond Philp's programmatic model of the construction of the client subject in social work. For Philp, to recap, social work demonstrates the potential sociability of the subject. It creates a bridge between "internal" states of suffering and need, and social states, like old age, debt, handicap and so on, in such a way that the individual or family can "solve" their problems in a socially constructive way. Therefore, social work cannot work with the seriously deviant, or hopeless cases; its subjects are salvageable. Social work knowledge's ambiguous and ambivalent relationship to determinism in social science stems from the central importance of demonstrating, with compassion and understanding, the individual's "essential humanity", which is basically sociable and self actualising. (Philp, 1979, pp. 92-93).

The micro-technology of the interview, as presented in instructional discourse, constructs client subjects on this theme. In accord with the phase models, controls within the interview are presented in terms of shifts in constructions of the client. At the outset, sociological conceptions of socialization which have become incorporated into social work power/knowledge strategies, are important in depicting a shift from a mere "applicant" to a client; this is particularly important in first interviews. As Kadushin puts it,

"The objective of many first interviews is to help an 'applicant' become a 'client', or...help a 'needer' of services become a user." (Kadushin, op.cit. p.155).

Among the objectives which must be met in order to achieve this aim, are: a clear identification of the primary problem; establishment of a relationship between interviewer and client; telling the client what the agency can do for her and motivating the client to continue attending for interviews (ibid., p.155). But this process of socialization is conceived, in humanist, semi-volanturist, rather than determinist terms. The client must be a knowing, willing participant to some degree, in order to qualify as a client, in contrast, say, to a prisoner. Garvin and Seabury express it in this way,

"Until the individual has determined that he or she has come to the right place for help and wishes to accept such services, and until the worker has reached the same conclusion, the individual is not properly a client." (Garvin and Seabury, op.cit. pp.96-97).

From the outset, the affective qualities of the client subject are stressed. Even during early interviews, when the main concerns are with tentative explorations of the client's situation and the building of rapport (at the broadest point of Kadushin's funnel metaphor), the social worker must be concerned with

"the expressive aspects of interview interaction. It is at this point that the interviewee is apt to be most anxious and most uncomfortable with the newness of the situation. Affect is likely to be high not only with regard to the client's problem but also with regard to bringing the problem for agency help." (Kadushin, op.cit., p.154).

Kadushin had already stressed the affective core of the social work task, that it deals with people's emotional troubles,

"The social work interview generally takes place with troubled people or people in trouble. What is discussed is private and highly emotional. Social work interviews are characterised by a great concern with personal interaction, with considerable emphasis on feelings and attitudes and with less concern for objective factual data." (ibid. p.20).

As we have seen, this is an embodiment of the priorities of the psycho-social strategy in social work.

The form of questions recommended reflects the concern with encouraging the production of signs of affect. Whereas in interrogation or job interviews, pointed, closed questions may be preferred, where rapport and emotional expression are given priority, more open ended forms are encouraged, questions which cannot be simply answered with a yes or a no. For example, characteristically in instructional discourse, Garvin and Seabury

discourage the use of "why" questions, as unnecessarily inquisitorial. Instead they recommend the use of "how" questions. This can avoid making the client feel defensive and encourage elaboration about feelings (Garvin and Seabury, op. cit. p128).

However, as we have briefly mentioned earlier in this chapter, questioning may become rather more focussed later in a particular interview and especially in later interviews in a social worker/client relationship, since, having established the client's subject status as one who has accepted a temporarily dependant and needing state, the participants can go on to discuss problem solving issues. At these later stages, hopefully, there will be a shift towards the more self activating social subject, in Philp's terms, though one whose affective qualities remain acknowledged.

Now let us renew our concern with the biopolitical basis of these subject constructions. As we have argued, the technical discourses of modern social work, by rendering the procedures of social work practice, in this case, interviewing, in terms of the micro context of professional/client relationships, tend to conceal their wider, biopolitical context.

Now a key theme in instructional discourse is that of individualisation. The ideographic, case oriented bias in social work knowledge is manifested in Kadushin's emphasis (following Biestek) on the need to view the client as a unique individual and not as simply a member of a class of persons,

"The orientation towards the interviewee is not 'as a human being' but as *this* human being with his personal differences." (Biestek, 1957, p.25, quoted in Kadushin, op.cit. p.57, italics in original).

Furthermore,

"It involves the personalisation of any generalisation and suspension of its application until there is clear evidence that it is applicable to this particular individual!" (ibid. p.57).

By resisting the ever present tendency to stereotype the client as a "typical case", the social worker, wins the confidence of the client and is rewarded with an increased supply of information about the client's life (ibid. p.58). This is surely the payoff. In terms of our model, the citizen-exchange level of social worker/client discourse renders the client a unique, affectively rich human being under the gaze of the normalising agencies, thus gaining the client's cooperation in the operation of normalising discourse, which can only operate effectively if the client is drawn into the discourse.

Similarly, Cross argues that the emphasis on the unique individuality of the client is one of the central skills of the social worker in conducting interviews. Thus, the social worker must recognise that "the experiences of the client are unique to him as a person". (Cross, op.cit., p.107). For example, the

social worker must not be tempted to reduce the client to professional middle class expectations about how working class values operate, even though it is important that the social worker does understand the socio-cultural backcloth to the client's individuality. Cross goes further, in arguing that the social worker is an intruder on the social space of the client and every thing that happens in that space must be accepted as equally valid by the social worker. (ibid. p.108). He argues that when working with immigrant clients, it is particularly important not to reduce them to stereotypes. For him, clients' social and cultural characteristics,

"provide the context within which the individuals are categorised; but they also provide the context within which the *true individual* can exist; the true self of the person requires these groupings for its existence. The interviewer who is aware of these groupings must therefore work his way through these cultural barriers in order to get to the *true self* and its social space." (ibid. p.108, italics added).

Cross elaborates by claiming that no two individuals are so unlike that rapport and communication are impossible; it is thus worth breaking through the barriers of culture to learn about the individuality of the client (ibid. p.108).

But this affectively rich individuality in social work discourse, which Halmos (1966) struggled to defend against the alien

incursions of the more mechanistic strands of positivism, is not a straight description of human capacities, but is rather a discursive construction. It is founded, to use Minson's terms, on a deep rooted, "personalist" moral ontology of human personality,

"By this is meant the kind of ethical thinking which locates the *fons et origo* of moral value in one or more personal attributes, whose possession is deemed part of the definition of what it is to be human. By dint of possessing a 'free will' or the capacity for conscious reflection, the person—a unity of body and soul — appear as the embodiment of absolute value and the foundation of moral judgement. The ultimate test of any action, law or institution hinges on whether, or to what extent, it respects this human personality, i. e. recognises and permits the unrestricted exercise of these essential human attributes."

(Minson, 1985, p.3).

These ethical conceptions of human individuality, he argues, are not confined to the more obvious ethical rhetoric but are enshrined in the working practices of a range of agencies of government, in Foucault's biopolitical sense, which includes institutions normally conceived of as part of both the "state" and of "civil society."

However, it must be recognised that within the personalist sphere of liberal governmentality, which biopolitical practices make possible, the search for the "true self" in the social work

interview takes place under the auspices of state funding. It therefore involves a service to and government of individual citizens. We have already argued that citizenship functions as a signifier of biopower, but as David Garland has argued, the form of normalising practices, at least in Britain, changed during the watershed period at the turn of the present century,

"..At precisely the same time... (as the extension of male working class suffrage)... a whole series of institutions and regulations are put in place which are designed to identify all those legal citizens (or prospective legal citizens) who lack the normative capacity to participate and exercise their new found rights responsibly. Once identified, these deviants are subjected to a work of normalisation, correction or segregation, which ensures one of two things. Either they become responsible conforming subjects, whose regularity, political stability and industrious performance deems them capable of entering into institutions of representative democracy; or they are supervised and segregated from the normal social realm in a manner that minimises (and individualises) any 'damage' they can do." (Garland, 1985, p. 249).

Garland goes on to argue that the extension of the social realm (what Donzelot calls the "social") makes the preconditions for the full participation in social life more conditional on behaviour and character, and it has been the job of the normalising agencies to perform the necessary monitoring. This

normalising process had already been rendered, in the late Victorian period, in non-political, moral terms, when performed by philanthropic agencies. But the depoliticised "moral duty" was now carried by the new charitable state. The alliance of State and private philanthropy,

"allowed probation officers, social workers and supervisors eventually to become professionalised and to represent their ministrations not as as class-based moralising, but instead as the provision of expert counselling and advice." (*ibid.*, p.250).

Within this process, rather than excluding the recipients of welfare from the rights of citizenship altogether, as in the regime of 19th. century poor law, the new normalising strategies rendered the socially deviant as, "irresponsible, less than rational, less than citizens." (*ibid.*, p.249).

It is within this framework that we must understand the modern, "technical" and depoliticised, instructional discourse of social work interviewing. This is not to impugn the integrity or human concern of individual social workers, but it must be recognised that social work practice cannot be neatly fenced off from other normalising and law enforcement practices. In this sense, therefore, the search for the "true self" within interviews must be seen as part of the transformation of citizenship, within biopower, to embrace, and indeed to extend, the "inner" regions of subjectivity, which the more dry, external and mathematical

appellations of the citizen/subject in official records and so on, cannot reach.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE POSITIONING OF MOTHERS IN CONVERSATIONAL DISCOURSE

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, it will be argued that social work interviews operate in relatively private spaces, where social workers and clients converse about the life problems of clients. Despite the seemingly innocuous subject matter of much of this conversation, it will be argued that to understand what is going on, it is necessary to locate this discourse within a complex series of historically produced social work discourses. In turn, these discourses must be understood in both the diachronic context, that is in terms of how they have shifted over time, and also synchronically, that is in terms of the links between what takes place in this setting and conversations and written and printed communications between social workers, their colleagues and a wide range of other agencies. We cannot assume that the conversational discourse of social workers and clients is merely a logical deduction of the aforementioned discursive practices.

This points to the danger of relying too much on written or printed texts for evidence about the operation of discursive practices. Eliot Freidson, admittedly from a different theoretical perspective, has recently argued against overly deductive applications of Foucaultian analyses and that professional knowledge :-

"..... cannot be treated as some fixed set of ideas or propositions organised into a discipline that is then employed mechanically by its agents... there is no assurance that what knowledge will be used to guide the use of institutional power. No 'one best way' is predictable from the the formal body of knowledge itself." (Freidson 1986,p.217)

Freidson's argument seems overstated and over-generalised to all forms of professional knowledge, but it serves as a warning not to jump too quickly from one level of analysis to another.

This issue is acknowledged partially in the debate within social work over the relationship between theory and practice. Curnock and Hardiker note that though the relation between theoretical knowledge (for example what is learned on college training courses or knowledge enshrined in statutory requirements) and what they call "practice theories", the working knowledge used in practice, is problematic, nevertheless theoretical knowledge is distilled within the practice theories of social workers (Curnock and Hardiker 1979, chap. 1). This point will be explored later. The analysis in this chapter will examine four main areas.---

Firstly, it will examine how biopolitical discourses of citizenship operate in the context of social work intervention practices.

Secondly, it will, following on from the citizenship theme, examine the frame, or strategic environment, within which front line conversational

discourse takes place. While the interaction may appear to consist of informal dyadic or triadic interchanges, it would be misleading to use methods of analysis which focus too exclusively on intersubjective relations, because it is essential to recognise the organisational and other discursive practices which provide a context for social work practice. These provide space for the discursively central practice of casework, understood in its sociological, rather than formal theoretical sense. It will also propose a bipolar model of social work conversational discourse which encapsulates both the citizenship theme and also the hierarchical elements of professional/client relations.

Thirdly, in examining the constitution of subjects within this discourse, it will focus on the forms which that subjectivity takes at different levels: from the attempts to create the general form of the social work subject as a potentially self activating, rational and emotionally mature being; to the more historically particular and fluid forms of mother subject positions. In particular, it will focus initially on the ways in which the subject positions of social worker and client are built up, respectively, in terms of a monitoring, listening position and a confessional, story-teller position. We will examine, firstly, the construction of the new client as a story-teller, through an exploration of the early stages of tape two, side two, "The Adoption Interview". Then, we will examine the construction and operation of the experienced story-teller through an exploration of features of tape five, side one, "The Hostile Client".

Then, we will focus more precisely on the construction of mother positions, in terms of the discussion of mother-child relations. In the first exemplar, we will examine an interview (tape two, side one, "The Mother's Socializing Responsibility") in which the mother, in part, resists her responsibility for the character formation and present behaviour of her difficult, teenage daughter. In the second exemplar, we will take an initial look at an interview (tape twelve, side one, "The Good Social Work Subject"), which will be explored in greater depth later. In this case, the mother subject position colludes with the fundamental themes of social work instructional discourse, accepting her need for professional help and allowing the social worker, as a counsellor/subject to employ her skills with a receptive and promising client. In the latter case, there is a real possibility for the operation of educative discourse proper, in which the process of regulation may take place.

In a third exemplar of the construction of mother positions, we will examine an interview (tape four, side one, "The Passive Client"), in which the mother as a financial manager is highlighted.

..

Fourthly, and in conclusion, we will focus on the relay within discourse between the different subjects of motherhood.

It should be noted that in this chapter, we will not provide an exhaustive analysis of the interviews selected. The final chapter will explore in more detail the problematising of mothering competences.

Rather, in this chapter, the emphasis will be on uncovering the ongoing construction of subject positions.

Citizenship in Context

In exploring the formal contours of the context of social worker/client discourse, we suggest that it is important to locate them as articulations of democratic discourses which, in the framework of British and American social work histories, have played a part in the development of biopolitical, welfare strategies. In particular, we would highlight the themes of equality and fraternity, which have in varying measure, been central to democratic discourses of citizenship since the American and French revolutions. These enter into the theoretical and working knowledges of social work through the "friendship models" of the preferred relationship between professional and client.

Sainsbury et. al., in their analysis of retrospective accounts of their relationships, by social workers and their clients, found strong echoes of the "friendship models" emphasised in social work training and professional ideologies. This entailed an avoidance of what could be seen as "overdirectiveness" in initiating topics for discussion or offering advice, "In general, the social workers seemed to adopt a model of practice which emphasised that issues are raised...as a result of some kind of mutuality in relationships" (Sainsbury et. al. 1982 p.43).

This gives rise to what Timms and Timms, following Whittington(1971), call the problem of reconciling the notion of client self determination, which is the democratic ideal, with certain therapeutic methods, which may assume that the professional should adopt a superior, expert's role, as in psycho-analytically based models (Timms and Timms, op.cit. p.185). The influence of American literature (and perhaps radical democratic culture) and practice on social work in Britain compounded this emphasis on the rights of the citizen/client to self determination. Timms and Timms, note that American social workers in the 1930's "..considered the individual a better judge of his own interests than law, morality or...culture.." (Keith-Lucas, 1963, quoted in Timms and Timms op.cit. p192).

Dingwall et.al. also note that much of the occupational theory and rhetoric borrowed from the U.S.A. must be seen against the context of a much larger private sector in social work there, organised on a professional model (Dingwall et. al. op.cit. p.107). Clearly the function of these discourses in the British context, where most social work is publically funded, organised and accountable, has been very different.

Dingwall et.al. argue that the professional model of service provision, especially as represented in the law and medicine, is rooted in a classical market model. It represents a private contract between individuals, substantially impervious to state intervention. Its impact on the nature of encounters between professional and recipient is to produce an essentially accomodative approach to the recipient, marked

by moral neutrality, a surface courtesy, and an individuation of practice (Dingwall et. al., op.cit. p. 104).

Within this framework, "clients are promised personally tailored treatment by discreet, sensitive, and virtuous fellow citizens" (ibid. p.104). Now while under the charitable system, it was doubtful if recipients often got this treatment, yet "nationalisation of the health services translated this aspiration into *an entitlement of citizenship*" (ibid. p.104., emphasis added).(1)

Dingwall et.al., following Parry and Parry (1979), characterise the organisational context of social work practice as a "bureau-profession". This is a conceptual compromise between the market based professional model and the bureaucratic model, which presents the relation between normalising agent and client in terms of an authority relation between the individual or family and an office holder, who is ultimately an agent of the state and therefore publically accountable. As they put it, "...bureau-professions attempt to reconcile internally the personalisation of professional service with public moral accountability of bureaucracies" (Dingwall et.al.,p.108).

This organisational context, backed by a legislative framework, provided a social space within which professional power/knowledge strategies could develop a "technical" discourse. In such a discourse, the problems of clients could be rendered as issues meaningful to the professional expertise of the normalising agents, with particular reference to the

more immediate "causes" of, for example, family malfunctioning, in the character of relationships between family members, or perhaps in a wider sense, attributable to the effects of local poverty or community breakdown. Whatever the particular "cause" identified, in principle issues are rendered in terms which are relevant to, and technically and politically viable for, social or community work intervention and possible solution; or at the least in Martin Davies' terms, maintenance.

In consequence, these bureau-professional discourses serve to depoliticise social work issues, concealing or at least deflecting attention away from the wider dimensions involved with personal problems (Pearson 1973). Nigel Parton has traced the transformation of "child abuse" into a branch of paediatric theory and practice from the late sixties, in the U.S. with the work of Kempe and his colleagues, and later in Britain. Within this medical discourse, which had a major impact on social work discourse, the issue of problematic parent/ child relations were framed in terms of "the battered baby syndrome", whose characteristics could principally be understood in terms of the immediate characteristics of and relationships between family members (Parton 1985, chap.3, cf. also for British Paediatric working theories articles by Cooper, Bentovim and Bingley in Adcock and White, 1984).

Again, as we have indicated, the growth of professional discourses raises the issue of who is the client? As Dingwall et.al. put it,

"...In child protection, as in the protection of the socially incompetent in general, professionals may find themselves pressed into a much wider role of state service. Rather than minimally limiting the possibilities for disease, crime and deceit, they may be asked to promote public ends at odds with the goals of patients or clients." (Dingwall op. cit. p.120).

Now Dingwall et.al. explain this collective dimension of social work intervention in terms of a particular political framework, the liberal state, as we have already noted. But in our terms it is more useful to view this collective dimension, as we argued in the last chapter, in terms of a deeper biopolitical framework.

Given the contradictory internal pressures of the bureau-professional framework, we must expect to find effects on the kind of talk that takes place between social workers and their clients. The burgeoning statutory powers and responsibilities of social workers, particularly under the Children's Acts, set up a tension between the egalitarian and authoritative elements of social work practice with "clients", and clearly, the problems of exercising authority in social work have been a major concern of a succession of official reports on child abuse tragedies and in the training literature (cf. Timms and Timms, op. cit. chap. 8). But the implications for the prescriptions for how to conduct client/citizen and professional talk are profound. Within the friendship model, despite the contradictions and difficulties, as Timms and Timms

put it, "social work in any setting is a process of communication between equal persons engaged in attempting to resolve problems of loss and change" (ibid. p.150).

THE FRAME OF CONVERSATIONAL DISCOURSE

The chapter on normalising judgement will examine in some detail the effects of this contradictory structure on the characteristic discursive exchanges within interviews. At this stage, however, the emphasis will be on establishing the forms which help to shape the interactions involved.

We can identify a correspondence between, on the one hand the general conflicts embedded in the the wider bureau-professional context of social work, affecting the whole range of relationships within the social work bureaucracy and its dealings with other normalising, disciplinary and legal agencies; and on the other hand social work/client conversational discourse.

We can characterise the surface level of exchange, particularly as embodied in Timms and Timms' definition of social work, as "citizens' exchange", or "model one".

In addition to this surface model one, we can distinguish a second model of conversational discourse: model two, the normalising model, which operates as a sub text to the first model. Here there are

hierarchical elements which derive from the normalising and legal authoritative functions of the social worker; in this case deriving from the assessment of and encouragement of the the good enough mother/subject.

Again, the complex discourse exchanges involved in this model will be examined in the chapter on normalising judgement, but we can distinguish three main features at this stage.

The first element we can distinguish is the asymmetrical exchange of information. Asymmetrical disclosure could be seen as an echo of Foucault's notion of hierarchical surveillance.

This is illustrated in Sainsbury et. al.'s research into client and social workers' reactions to their relationships. The lack of symmetry in disclosure was expressed by one client in this way, " How can you like a social worker? I don't know him but he knows me inside out.".. . and.."I get on with him extremely well, but it's difficult to like him. To like someone, you've got to know about them." (Sainsbury et. al. 1981, p.127).

In contrast to doctor/patient discourse, which tends to be doctor centred and directed (Byrne and Long,1976), Baldock and Prior, in their analysis of transcripts of social worker/client talk, found that the talk was client centred and many topics were initiated by the client (Baldock and Prior, 1981). However, this is not the same as open citizen

exchange, since it would surely involve mutual disclosure. In social work/client discourse this is rare, and as we shall see, in the interviews considered here, this is confirmed.

Now the asymmetrical disclosure of information is not in itself necessarily considered to be deviant. The conversational analysts Jefferson and Lee have made a useful distinction between conversational settings which are characterised as "troubles telling" and "advice giving/receiving" (Jefferson, G. and Lee, J. 1981). In the former, the participants meet as relative equals. The teller of troubles is accepted as,

"a 'person' (who) is one among others, one who participates in the ongoing everyday activities of the community; one who goes to work, gets together with his or her friends, listens to their stories, rejoices in their good times, tells them of his or her own good times, etc etc." (ibid. p.416).

Against this backdrop, in any one troubles telling setting, the focus is on the trouble teller and his or her experiences; rather than on the trouble itself (ibid. p. 416). In this context, there can be resistance to premature or intrusive advice giving by the recipient of the troubles (ibid. p.408). This is because the trouble telling setting risks turning into something that resembles a "service encounter", involving more impersonal contact with emergency ambulance services, or a variety of other bureaucratic services which involve the proffering of advice,

or provision of a repair or maintenance service, after the provision of personal information about a problem. In those settings the focus is not on the person, but rather on the problem; the trouble teller is seen only as the bearer of information about the trouble. In fact, for trouble recipients in the service encounter, to start proffering personal information, or too much personal sympathy, can itself be deviant or disruptive in that setting (ibid. p.420).

Atkinson, in similar vein, argues that in doctor-patient and other professional-client interaction, this type of behaviour would be considered to be deviant. If professionals provided next turns which would be normal in mundane conversations, like following up a story with one of one's own, "their specialist competenced or expertise might be seriously put in doubt, with the interaction thereby becoming so "informal" as to be more or less indistinguishable from any other conversational encounter." (Atkinson, J.M., 1982, p.113). Rather, the discursive environment seems to require the recipient to remain essentially indifferent to the troubles teller, in order to focus on the problem and its solution.

Jefferson and Lee seem to accept that the normative rules governing the distribution of speaking rights and appropriate behaviour within these two conversational settings are widely institutionalised within human culture. This may have some force, at least within modern, bureaucratically organised societies, and it indicates the problem for social work in establishing what Foucault calls its "authorities of

delimitation" (Foucault, 1982, p.42), that is, establishing the legitimacy of its knowledge forms and professional operations, in relation to the boundaries with other professions and more broadly, within the wider culture. This is because the social work interview embodies elements of both the troubles telling encounter between friends, meeting more or less as equals, and on the other hand the more impersonal, problem-focussed service encounter.

As we will shortly argue, in social casework, the focus is on *both* the problem *and* the client as an individual. In fact, the interview is a crucial medium for the biopolitical construction of the individual, considered, at least at one level, as a unique individual, a theme strongly emphasised in instructional discourse. Whatever the features of other service encounters, in social work, there should be an attempt to address the individual in her or his "uniqueness".

But let us here turn to the hierarchical dimension of interview talk. The hierarchical nature of asymmetrical exchange is rarely acknowledged openly in speech. Yet in the following opening exchange of an initial *guardian ad litem* interview with a prospective adoptive mother we can see such an acknowledgement, which is quickly transformed into an egalitarian representation through the use of the metaphor of a referee.

1 SW: I always think of this not as an interview really but as a sort
2 of hello.

3 CL: Mm.

4 SW: You know, I'm me you're you and what are we doing here.

5 CL: (laughs)

6 SW: What do you think I'm doing here.

7 CL: Hm, checking up on me.

8 SW: Thank you very much (1.3) In a way I suppose I am aren't I?

9 Cl: Well I see your point 'cause I wouldn't like to put a baby in
10 somebody's care if they wouldn't look after it.

11 SW: I think I see myself more as a referee.

12 CL: Yes.

13 SW: Im very unbiased, I don't know you and I don't know the other
14 family/or anything.

15 CL: / But I don't really know what yes.

16 SW: So it's refereeing really isn't it to make sure it's fair for
17 both sides.

18 CL: Yes.

('The Adoption Interview', Tape two side two).

The second feature of the second model is the operation of normalising tactics, which involve the attempt to educate the client with the assumptions of counselling discourses. We can see an element of this already in the foregoing exchange. Also, in his research, Rees claims to have found some evidence of clients adopting elements of social work discourse,

"...the most common change was in these clients' reinterpretation of social work and their associated reappraisal of themselves. As one man put it, 'When I first went to Mr. Sawyer, I thought I was begging. After a time I realised I wasn't....Given that the clients had no other people or places to withdraw to, the worker was likely to gain converts to his idea that they would benefit from continued as well as immediate support.' (Rees, 1978, p94).

The third feature is a general structural characteristic which encompasses the others in the same way that the largest Russian babushka doll encloses the smaller ones. At a deeper level the elements of asymmetrical disclosure and the educative transformation in speech of the life problems of clients in the social worker/client conversational discourse could be seen as characteristics of what Foucault calls the confession. This is a secularised form of the old religious confession which has become part of the technology of the normalising agencies in the production of new forms of subjectivity (Foucault, 1978, pp. 53-70).

The old theme of sin gives way to the opposition between the normal and the pathological (ibid. p.67). While particular issues of personal competence may be discussed, the conversations tend to work under the auspices of the background, if floating standards of normality in family functioning and personal expression. This of course is also one of the sites where the "personal" is produced as well as expressed. However, as we argued in chapter one, Foucault's discussion operates at a high

level of generality and there is little attempt to distinguish between variations in the confessional form over time and between normalising agencies. We have labelled the particular space of social worker client conversational discourse, within which the conflicting pressures of the bureau-profession are worked out as the confessional strategic environment.

It is in this confessional, strategic environment that the two levels of discourse, citizen exchange and normalising discourse, operate. However, we should note *carefully* at this point, that normalising discourse encapsulates both the disciplinary and regulative (or educative) dimensions of normalisation, which, we argued in chapter one, characterise social work interviews. As we will see in the analyses in this chapter, and more precisely in the later chapter on normalisation, interview discourse may demonstrate the binding of client and social worker in disciplinary power relations, without necessarily moving fully into the sphere of regulation. In the latter case, the client fully takes over the confessional, client subject position, in such a way that s/he presents the possibility of a growing and productive relationship between social worker and client. In such a relationship, the client accepts the need to work towards the goals prioritised in professional, social work discourses.

THE SPACE OF SOCIAL CASEWORK

Let us now flesh out more precisely the space within which the confessional form of the social work relation takes place.

The post war psycho-social strategies have not wholly displaced earlier welfare strategies and have been challenged by a range of alternative rationales for social work from both the left and the right of the political spectrum. (2) However, there is a spirited defence of what Whittington & Holland call traditional social work (cf. Davies, M. 1981). By now the once suspect and alien psycho-social casework knowledge and methods are considered a part of the orthodoxy of desirable professional social work, even if chronic lack of trained workers and other resources prevent their realisation in a way which would consistently satisfy professional trainers.

Yet the form of this knowledge tends to be ideographic rather than nomothetic; that is social workers tend, both in Britain and the the U.S.A., to prioritise knowledge of individual cases rather than general classes of case or type of client. Meyer et. al. pointed out that, "The bulk of professional writing reports conclusions illustrated by cases rather than by systematic research or practice procedures" (Meyer et. al. 1964, p.253, quoted in Timms and Timms 1977, p. 119). Similarly, Borgatta et. al., in their Pennsylvania study of social workers' conceptions of clients found that,

"Social workers frequently assert that their attention must be directed to the individual case and they sometimes deny, therefore, the

necessity or utility of generalisations about types of individuals, families or groups." (Borgatta et. al.1960 p.58).

Likewise, Black et. al.'s more recent study of three British social services area teams found that social work activity,

"was described as 'case work' but it was difficult to encourage workers to talk in the abstract about their role or methods of work. Concrete case examples were usually presented, illustrating complex family breakdown or child behaviour."(Black et. al. 1983 p. 82).

Given this individualising tendency in their conception of knowledge, Timms and Timms bemoan the fact that,

"it is difficult to see how practitioners could systematically relate particular groups of cases to the literature. Second, social workers seem to have preferred ways of working which respond little to the differences in the various kinds of clientele with whom they come into contact." (Timms and Timms op. cit. pp.119-120).

This is confirmed by Black et. al. who found in all three teams which they studied, a remarkable consistency of general orientation to practice which prioritises one to one case-work methods. This they attribute to the organisational structure and culture of social work (ibid. pp. 163-164). It is important to note that the "casework" to which they refer is not the pure form of sustained therapeutic

intervention on psycho-analytic grounds, as emphasised in the psycho-social counselling strategies, or in any other particular body of social work theory. Davies (1985 p. 51) points out that his study of social work practice (Davies 1974) and Browne (1978) show that "counselling rarely takes a 'classical' or 'in depth' form. It tends to be brief, often superficial, and geared either to routine maintenance or to the provision of practical help or guidance" (Davies 1985 p. 51).

Thus "casework" refers less to the logical application of a body of prescriptive social work theory than to a set of bureaucratically circumscribed practices. Yet within that framework social workers do, in their "practice theories", make use of theoretical formulations. Black et. al. provide one of the most useful guides through this maze. They deny that social workers rely simply on intuition, but rather "on their own individual experience of training and subsequent work with clients" (Black et. al. op.cit. 193). They argued that the divide between theory and practice is more apparent than real, for,

"it was clear... that although not articulating casework principles as underpinning their work, concepts such as 'individualisation', 'acceptance', and 'self determination' were central to the approach of social workers. Several of them also expressed the view that they felt more secure working in this way. It was the form of intervention for which training best prepared them, in which they were most experienced and towards which the procedures of the organisation were geared".(ibid. p. 194).

Moreover, it is precisely in work with families and children, say Black et. al., that the emphasis on casework is strongest. In the urban Selly Oak team they studied,

"sixty nine percent of the long term cases were characterised by the existence of a supervision or care order. Such work was individualised, invisible, and infinitely variable. Of all the client groups this one is least amenable to conceptualisation, measurement, or evaluation as 'service provision'." (ibid p.161).

It is in this social space that conversational discourse between social workers and their clients takes place. Moreover, as we indicated earlier in this chapter, this conversational discourse involves a difficult combination of what Jefferson and Lee describe as "troubles telling" and "service encounter" talk (Jefferson and Lee, 1981). As a combination of citizen exchange discourse and hierarchical normalising discourse, it is reducible to neither. Thus, the casework strategic environment is a space which is jealously guarded as a privatised professional arena in which social workers "covet(ed) the freedom they (have) in their work with individual clients" (ibid.p.222). We could add that it is also the arena within which both models one and two of social worker/client conversational discourse operate, concealed within the continuous flow of conversation.

The construction of motherhood in conversational discourse operates precisely in this hidden space, yet as Fisher notes, "almost every...British client study...contains no direct material on what happens when social worker and client meet." (Fisher,M. 1983 P.63). Without this information we lack a crucial dimension in our understanding of social work discourses. Dingwall et. al have provided a perceptive account of conversational discourse between normalising agents in which elements of motherhood are constructed and negotiated. These conversations clearly provide an important discursive environment to social worker

client discourse and are usually beyond the purview of the client; but we need to penetrate the hidden space. As Philp puts it, in modern casework "the worker engages in a process with the client where the client is encouraged to see within himself his possibilities for social adjustment. The worker speaks to the objectified subject about the social subject which lies within him" (Philp M. 1979 p. 103). But how does this process work itself out through unfolding speech? How is motherhood, our current focus for concern, constructed within this field.?

INTERVIEWING AND MAKING CONVERSATION

In their study of the language of social work interviewing, Baldock and Prior found that despite the shift in social work discourses since the time of the Mayer and Timms study, towards an attempt to encourage social workers to conceive of their central professional tasks in terms broader than simply casework with clients, there remained considerable resistance to such a recasting of priorities. According to the newer models, social workers should spend more time on other tasks, like performing a welfare rights advocate role, negotiating with public utilities and so on. But as Baldock and Prior put it, for the social workers they studied, "discussion and 'the relationship' remain central to social work." (Baldock and Prior, 1981, p.20). In the words of one of their social workers,

,"I have something of a scale within the job of what constitutes valid work. And if valid work is what it's all about, the most valid type of work I personally consider is if I'm involved with an individual in what I'd broadly term some sort of counselling process where I'm able to interact with them and help create, you know, some reasonable ideas that might assist the situation."
(ibid. p.20).

We have already indicated that Black et. al.'s (1983) work in Midlands social service teams tends to support the view that the casework relationship is a jealously guarded space for professionals.

In contrast to the expectations of instructional discourse about how to conduct interviews, as distinct from open ended chats, Baldock and Prior found that (and in comparison with the more terse, and to the point, interviews between doctors and patients) social work interviews were longer and broad ranging; moreover they did not seem to follow a strictly and openly defined agenda. They could not discern a "clearly demarcated 'central core'; no equivalent of the doctors diagnostic stage was discernible, either to us, or, we suspect, the clients." (Baldock and Prior, 1981, p.29). Baldock and Prior explain this broad ranging style in terms of what they see to be the central function of interviewing (a contention which aligns with the thrust of this thesis) in monitoring the lives of clients, -

-

"The workers were using the interviews to collect information about the pattern of the clients' daily lives and their feelings in order to calculate the danger of their problems getting any worsemonitoring the circumstances of the client, while not the most valued goal professionally, was the dominant one in terms of time spent on it in the interviews.

..

However, this object was not explicitly communicated to the clients. It was achieved by getting the client to talk about his or her life while the worker listened, alert for any ominous change. They played the roles of story teller and listener....The client was set on his narrative course with a few, fairly precise, closed questions. The clients, for the most part, understood their task in

this procedure and rambled on to the encouragement of 'ums' and 'ahs'. When they had run out of things to say, or a gap appeared, another trigger question and so the interview would proceed in a series of stops and starts. Such structure that social work interviews have is based on this 'stop-go' cycle, and it characterises the interviews, from beginning to end." (ibid. p.30).

As we shall see, the subject positioning of the client as a "story teller" is a key feature of the social work interview as a strategic environment. Cuff and Francis (1978) have indicated that invited stories are different in character from stories which arise in the course of conversational flow. In those situations, the story teller has to choose the right moment to introduce the story and must show how the tale is relevant to the topics which have already been discussed. Moreover, the narrator must also manage the problem of suspending the usual rules of conversational sequencing and prevent other speakers from leaping into pauses in the story and thus curtailing the narrative flow (Schegloff 1978, p.94 and Elbourne 1982 p.111). As Elbourne found in his research with subjects in sleep laboratories, the problems are largely solved because, "the inviter has nominated the subject of the story, and the tellers produce that story on the initiative of and timing of the inviter." (ibid. p.111).

POSITIONING OF THE CLIENT AS STORY-TELLER SUBJECT

The subject position of the client as story-teller lies somewhere in between the narrator who must battle to claim and hold onto his or her speaking rights on the one hand, and on the other hand the narrator who is asked to narrate on cue. While there is the general form of a conversation between client and social worker, in this type of interview the client is given a *general* invitation to narrate. This has implications for the maintenance of a recognisable sense of conversation and as we shall show, the function of interruptions in conversation (which are varied and complex) between client and social worker. However, while Baldock and Prior are correct in stressing the client's story-teller role, they neglect to analyse how it is produced as a subject position. This is not an automatic process. Whereas an experienced client may launch off, with little need for prompting, into a stream of narrative, given the failure of social work, so far, to establish, in Foucault's terms, its authorities of delimitation (Foucault, 1972, pp.41-42), interaction with a new, inexperienced client may be tentative until the appropriate subject positioning is established.

The Neophyte Storyteller

Let us explore how this process can operate by examining how subject positioning is set up in an initial interview with a couple who are seeking to adopt a baby (tape two, side one, "The Adoption Interview"). The baby has already been placed in the home, provisionally, by an adoption agency and the social worker is visiting in her capacity as a guardian *ad litem*, representing the

interests of the child on behalf of the community. The social worker described the interview as, "Straight forward welfare duties on a child living with its prospective foster parents." While the adoption society would have already made an exhaustive assessment, the social worker must monitor both the worth of this assessment and the parents' suitability, on behalf of the state. The couple are, in effect, on probation. If they are deemed to be unsatisfactory, the baby could be withdrawn. In the context of a severe shortfall in the supply of (non-handicapped) babies available for adoption in relation to demand, the social worker's "power" in the eyes of the prospective parents is likely to seem considerable. We have already made reference to the opening exchanges between social worker and client, when discussing the frame of conversational discourse, with its tension between citizen exchange and normalising levels of discourse.

As we pointed out earlier, the social worker presents her role as that of a referee who represents, impartially, the interests of all parties involved in the adoption. She suggests, therefore, that she will not be conducting an *interview* as such, more a "hello" (L2). In this interview, for the first three minutes the social worker takes the floor and takes speaking rights, explaining her role and the purpose of the interview. At this stage, the client responds, minimally, to the statements made by the social worker. The task is to get the client (here the mother, who does the talking) to take the floor and provide a flow of narrative, which can offer a window

on the life circumstances, biography and affective states of the prospective, adoptive parents, particularly of the mother.

In instructional discourse the inquisitional style of interviewing, with a rapid exchange of questions and answers, is discouraged, particularly during early stages when there is an attempt to create rapport. "Why" questions are considered less productive of narrative flow than "how" questions (e.g. Garvin and Seabury, op. cit. pp.96-97). Requests for an open flow of information can be more efficiently achieved through the form of general requests for information, or statements which imply such general requests, rather than requests for specific, bounded pieces of information which take the surface syntactic form of a request. Thus, for example, after the initial phase in the interview when the social worker held the floor, there occurs what Schegloff and Sacks (1973) call a disjunct marker. This is a device in discourse which signals a break with what has gone before and which also marks the beginning of a new phase of discourse (cf. also Stubbs, 1983, p.69). The disjunct marker attempts (and we cannot assume that it always succeeds in its aim) to provide a new contextual framework around forthcoming talk; the implication is that new information cannot simply be located within the framework of the discursive practices which have immediately preceded it and that part of this shift involves the construction of new fields of objects and practical concern.

In this instance the social worker shifts attention to the topic of the baby, which is lying in the room, --

19 SW3: So uhm this is what we're all talking about is it, down
20 here? =

21 CL: =Yeh stretched out.

22 SW3: Isn't she gorgeous?

23 CL: She's quite nice yes she's a bit pretty really.

24 SW3: Pleased with her are you?

25 CL: Mm yes.

26 SW3: This is the problem, you can't allow yourself to become too
27 pleased.

28 CL: It's true yes

29 SW3: What does everybody else think of her?

30 SW3: Well everybody spoils her, cause she just eats and eats and
31 things and you know, she's just sort of perfect baby really
32 (laughs), you know we couldn't be luckier.

33 SW3: Ehm what about your other daughter?

34 CL: Well she's on holiday at the moment () but you know
35 she's I thought she might be a little jealous you know in
36 the beginning but I have involved her in you know holding
37 her, things like that, getting things for her, she doesn't
38 really (0.5) in fact she's too old to be jealous you know
39 ehm she's seven and a half and there's not you can't know
40 you can't kind of detect it/that easily no

41 SW3: / In comparison (1.0)

42 What about, she knows she's here almost permanently doesn't
43 she?

44 CL: Well I haven't told her that she might have to go back you
45 know.

46 SW3: You've told her she's permanent?

47 CL: Well I've told her she's just () 'cause (cuts off speech
48 to care for the baby -3.5-) Ehm there's no point in
49 thinking I don't know, in my opinion there's no point in
50 telling her things like that and maybe it won't happen, you
51 know when it does well it's bad enough.

The client here continues her extended discussion of the reaction of her daughter Caroline to the new baby, by emphasising that she had told her that the baby's mother was a nurse and that the baby had come from a hospital, then, --

52 CL: 'cause where we picked her up from, it looked a little bit
53 like a hospital sort of thing (1.5) she was with us, it
54 made it look you know , I told her it was a nurse's baby
55 and it made it seem, it all fitted in to me=

56 SW3: =Yes yes it was reality, you could actually see the thing
57 happening before your eyes.

58 CL: Yes (4.0).

59 SW3: Tell me a little about yourself.

60 CL: (4.5) Well, (laughs) what would you like to know, where do
61 I start?

62 SW3: I don't know, right from the very beginning, you were
63 brought up in Ireland were you?

64 CL: I was born in Ireland.

65 SW3: Lost your accent very well.

("The Adoption Interview").

This was followed by an extended narrative by the client about her upbringing, the fact of her parents' divorce, living with her grandmother in Ireland and eventually moving to live with her father in England while in her teens. She drew a link between her having been an only child and not wanting Caroline to be an only child. The discourse then moved back into a question and answer sequence where the social worker took the floor once more and the client lapsed back into a more passive subject position where she responded to points made by the social worker, --

66 SW3: They'll have an advantage in a way, they'll both be only
67 children.

68 CL: Yes, because=

69 SW3: =She'll be doing her babyhood while the other one's doing
70 her little girl bit.

71 CL: This is true.

72 SW3: You'll still have the advantage of ().

73 CL: Yes.

74 SW3: (3.0) Sorry I interrupted you.

75 CL: Oh I don't know (laughs). Got married at nineteen, I had
76 Caroline when I was twenty one and mm (0.5) not much after
77 that (laughs) I had carrying in the fallopian tube three
78 years ago and um and the other tube () they took half
79 of that away, so therefore I was left with just the stump of
80 the tube (2.5) which is (1.0) ninety per cent certain or
81 something that you can't have any more (2.0) ninety nine or
82 something like that (3.5) and then we thought, well you know

83 we always wanted (1.0) at least two children wanted two
84 children and we had the rooms for them.

85 SW3: This is your house is it?

86 CL: Well, mortgaged.

87 SW3: Well yes this is your own house, it's quite adequate isn't
88 it?

89 CL: Yes, so uhm (1.5) that's about all really (laughs) about
90 myself.

An assumption underlying this stretch of discourse, is that the client should be expected to adopt a story teller subject position and provide intimate details about her life without any reciprocal obligation on the the social worker to do likewise; as we have argued, this is explicable as a component of Foucault's notion of hierarchical surveillance. This underlying rhetorical message, part of the unstated agenda of the interview, was rewarded by considerable "flow" of narrative materials. But the flow, which required a more active role on the part of the client than at the start of the interview, was built up gradually. Thus, the social worker's opening turn (L19) has the surface, syntactical appearance of a question, the interrogative form. Yet the interrogative element is confined to "is it", which requires confirmation or disconfirmation. Given the context, the statement embedded in the turn is hardly contentious, so it can be read as an open ended question, which invites the client to generate her own utterances, rather than await a specific question which elicits a specific response.

As we indicated earlier, this type of talk embodies elements of both "trouble telling", which might take place between friends, focussing on the personal characteristics and experience of the teller, and "service encounter" talk, which focusses more precisely on the topic of troubles or personal problems than on the unique characteristics of the trouble teller (Jefferson and Lee, 1981). As in service encounter talk, the social worker offers little personal information about herself, or much expression of affect, yet unlike service encounter settings where there is a precise focus on a particular issue or problem, here there is a characteristically open-ended dimension to the talk.

The scope of possibly relevant personal information remains very wide. This is not simply because the social worker remains accountable for monitoring a broad range of happenings and conditions in the client's life, which may be held to have some bearing on her suitability as an adoptive parent. It also, more profoundly, as we argued in chapter four, stems from the fact that social work discursive practices are involved in the attempt to construct and reveal a rich, complex and (on the surface at least) unique form of subjectivity in the client. Such a construction is usually beyond the scope of other service encounters which are confined to more tightly defined agendas, and hence we can see here a way whereby the provision of broad personal information, otherwise confined to relations between intimates, becomes transformed into a key procedure of a normalising profession.

In addition, as we shall see later in analysing this interview, the broad scope of possibly relevant personal information is narrowed down, in part, possibly, by the experience by the client in prior discourse with the adoption agency, in such a way that her brief narrative summary of her biography is geared to what may potentially be deemed to be relevant life events and motivations for her wanting to adopt. In anticipation of the themes of chapter seven, we can say that this client's cooperation in the proffering of relevant personal information can be seen as a manifestation of an emerging harmony between constructions of the good adoptive mother in social work and paedriatic discourses and the constructions of her subjectivity in the client's discourse.

But let us focus on the unfolding construction of the storyteller subject. The social worker's second and third turns, "Isn't she gorgeous?" (L22) and "pleased with her are you?" (L22), again can be seen to function as part of the general invitation to take the floor and become the story teller. The client's initial responses, however, at this stage remain truncated responses, as if to an interviewer in authority, with an automatic right to dominate the conversation. In fact, the social worker's third response, "This is the problem..." (L26) could be read as a confirmation of the authority relationship, since the social worker, via her assessment may well be instrumental in advising that the child be withdrawn from the adoption process. However, the social worker's next turn (L29) is more open-ended in form and elicits a more elaborated

response, which describes the family's affective responses to the baby in a very positive light.

By now, the client's flow is building up and the social worker's next turn reinforces the shift in mutual subject positioning towards the social worker as passive, receptive and the client as active, by asking another open ended question, "what about your other daughter?" (33). The social worker's next full turn takes the syntactic form of a specific interrogative and is met with a brief reply, "Well I haven't told her she might have to go back you know" (L44). But the social worker's next turn, "You've told her she's permanent?" (L46) functions as a prompt which advances the client's narrative flow through a standard device in instructional discourse, the use of paraphrase. As Kadushin puts it, "Paraphrase is a restatement of what the interviewee has said by the interviewer in her own words." (Kadushin, op.cit. p.162). Moreover, a paraphrase is not to be confused with simple imitative repetition since,

"A well chosen paraphrase highlights the significant aspects of the client's statement. It thus insures visibility, clarity, and pertinence of the important aspects of the client's communication.....In using the paraphrase the interviewer confirms that she is interested and attentive, that she is following the interviewee and is encouraging the interviewee to continue. It helps the interviewer to check her understanding of what the client is saying. The paraphrase might be accepted and confirmed or corrected or modified by the client." (ibid. p.163).

In instructional discourse, paraphrases are constructed not as questions but as statements, which provide a mirror to the interviewee, reflecting the sense of his utterances back to him (cf. Heritage and Watson, 1979). We shall later question this view of the function of paraphrasing, but would agree that it can shift the discourse along, as in this instance.

The client's response, after an interruption through having to deal with the baby and a response which is itself marked by self interruptions and linguistic markers of hesitancy, as in "...there's no point in thinking I don't know in my opinion...." (L48/49). This in turn led off into an extended narrative. We can say that here, the use of paraphrasing, taken with the shift towards more open-ended questions functions not simply to move the discourse on, purely in the sense of the flow of utterances. Rather through this process, the devices are helping to stabilise the client subject as a story teller.

However, the construction of the story teller subject can move in fits and starts, it is not an inevitable or mechanical process. Furthermore, the use of particular discursive skills like paraphrasing, can be important in determining the rapidity of the transition. There is, for example, a fine line to be drawn between productive paraphrasing which moves the discourse along, and simple imitative paraphrasing which simply invites a monosyllabic reply of affirmation or denial. The social worker's turn, "Yes, Yes, it was reality....," (L56) after the client's extended narrative could be

seen as straying over the fine line and into imitative repetition, particularly since it is met with a simple "yes" response (L58), followed by silence for four seconds. The social worker takes advantage of this break in the discourse to shift the topic more clearly towards the client's personal life, inviting a broad, confessional response with an open-ended question, "Tell me a little about yourself" (L59). The client's uncertainty about the contextually appropriate response to this question, and thus the subject position which goes with it, is apparent in her request for clarification (L60). The social worker's suggestion that the client start right from the very beginning (L60), an echo of fairy story openings for children, is the clearest indication so far of the attempt to clarify the preferred subject positions within this discourse.

This reinforcement of the general invitation to storytelling succeeds in producing an extended narrative response about the client's upbringing. But the social worker's response to this flow of talk produces a flurry of brief questions and answers which progressively whittles down the length of the client's utterances until she is reduced eventually to the monosyllabic reply, "yes" (L73), to a series of paraphrases, which in this case do not move the discourse further on. By this stage, the client is reduced to silence and the social worker has, once more, taken the floor. That this is clearly a deviation from the preferred distribution of speaking rights at this stage of the interview is clear from the social worker's apology, "Sorry, I interrupted you" (L74). This turn

accounts for the social worker's resumption of dominant speaking rights as an unfortunate deviation from the expected path and breaks a silence. It is difficult for the analyst to attribute this silence to a particular speaker, and probably difficult also for the participants within the discourse.

The social worker's apology is followed by a narrative which yields information about the client's gynaecological history (L75-84), which could be seen as centrally relevant in providing an adequate motivation for wanting to adopt, within the terms of professional discourse. In this somewhat tentative way we can see how, in a general cultural context where social work knowledge and its systems of relevancies are not widely known or legitimised, subject positions can be artfully built up within the unfolding, sequential flow of conversational discourse.

THE EXPERIENCED STORYTELLER

Clients who have had much experience of social work interviews can be considerably more fluid in their speech styles, being more ready to open up into a narrative flow. The slow build up to the positioning of the storyteller subject which we have been examining in the case of the neophyte client, has already been undertaken in previous interviews. Let us consider an interview (T5S1, "The Hostile Client") with a client who has children on the at risk register, and who has had considerable, conflictual contact with social workers and other normalising agents. One consequence of the

client maintaining the primacy of the story teller subject position is that the corresponding subject position of the social worker, as the orchestrator of the interview, can become constrained. The requirement of the client to maintain narrative flow can, as we shall see later, limit the scope of the social worker to affect the direction of topics. At this stage, we will simply note the implications of the crystallized story teller subject position, for the general exchanges between the social worker and client.

At the beginning of the interview in question, there is discussion about the client's complicated network of relationships with her cohabitee, and circuitously, with his ex-cohabitee. There is a dispute over his access to his children by that previous relationship. The social worker's discursive role at this point is to provide information about the practical legal issues involved and also to seek information from the client about the situation.

1 SW1: So I can't work you out on that one (0.5) mm, does it
2 matter why is it because wants to know what (1.5) you
3 mean.

4 CL: No I mean to say (1.0) she's also got her brother living
5 up here now.

6 SW3: Is she claiming for him?

6 CL: No 'cause last time he lived up there (1.0) the money he
7 was giving her, a tenner 1.5) for the kids (1.5) she was
8 going up there and feeding them. (2.0)

9 SW1: Yes but does social security know he's up there?

10 CL: No. (4.0)

11 SW1: Do you really

12 CL: / And another thing, she said that if she meant
13 (1.0)um she said that social security (0.5) she's off sick
14 mm she said that mm she's been to the solicitor and if
15 anything happens to her like she has to go to the hospital
16 or anything (1.0) he can't look after the children, her
17 mother's got to have them.

18 SW1: Well he can dispute this, I don't think that she can
19 organise the custody of the children without him getting
20 some piece of paper or something to tell him what's been
21 done (0.5) er (0.5) whose house is mm whose name is the
22 flat in or the house?

23 CL: It's in Mr. and Mrs. L's, but her name isn't that.

24 SW1: No but the point is that if his name's on the rent book
25 too, she can't keep him out of the house totally. If the
26 rent book was in her name then she could keep him 'cause
27 she could keep him out.

28 CL: Yes

29 SW1: Do you see what I mean?

(interruption by child)

30 CL: And she said if she went into hospital or anything like
31 that, he couldn't look after the kids so they'd have to go
32 to her mother.

33 SW1: But he would like to look after them, does he want the
34 kids?

35 CL: Yeah well he says she's not fit to look after them (1.5)

36 his mother could have them all day long.
37 SW1: I don't know enough about the law and how it stands for him
38 as they're not legally married, you know he'd really have
39 to go to a solicitor, to find out effectively where he
40 stood (1.5) why doesn't he go to the citizen's advice
41 bureau?
42 CL: I said citizen's advice bureau to him.
43 SW1: Because I think it's going to be a tricky one legally.
44 CL: Mm.
45 SW1: But I'm sure she can't just go and/take custody.
46 CL: /Cause she turned round
47 and said to me that when she goes to court she's going to
48 tell the court that he didn't buy her no clothes or
49 anything like that, I said, I said the court ain't worried
50 about her if she walks about nude ().

(Tape five, side one-The Hostile Client

Now we can see here, at the outset, elements of the "inquisitional," question and answer approach to interviewing. The social worker's second (L4) and third (L6) turns are requests for factual information, which are answered with intelligible replies. In Schegloff and Sacks' sense, we can see these exchanges as "adjacency pairs." By this is meant that there is a conventional, normative requirement for a second speaker to supply a response to the first part, the question. Clearly, questions are not always answered, but if they are not this can be cause for query, the non response is worthy of comment in its own right, and is often accompanied by a

repeated request for the completion of the pair (Schegloff and Sacks, 1973, pp. 295-296). Schegloff and Sacks present this normative rule as a universal property of conversational exchange. In their framework, this normative demand for reciprocity refers to the necessity for a turn in a conversation to demonstrate "sequential implicativeness", that chains of discourse are built up through normative guidelines governing sequence. (3)

However, we can see a clear break in this reciprocal pattern in the client's fourth turn. At this point she interrupts the social worker, without any account of why she does so, cutting the social worker off in mid speech. Her opening remark "And another thing..." (L12) can be seen as a tying device, which links this turn with the client's previous story, thus in Schegloff and Sacks' terms, the forthcoming turn demonstrates its "sequential implicativeness." What may look like an obvious piece of conversational deviance can, however, make sense and appear orderly if one recognises that this exchange takes place within a strategic frame in which subject positions are already set. As an experienced client, she "knows" that her narrative flow is the prime *raison d'être* of the interview and hence, her speaking rights take priority. In this context, unlike in, say, a job interview, the client's conversational conduct is not necessarily rude or disruptive of orderly conversation; this is reinforced by the social worker's failure to comment on the interruption as an interruption. We may recall that in the previous example, the social worker gave an apologetic account of her interruption of the client's flow. Furthermore, from this

perspective, the client's fourth turn (L12) could be seen to be a resumption of a narrative flow which was interrupted by the social worker's attempt to redirect the conversation towards the topic of social security. (4)

After the client's brief narrative, there is a resumption of a more obviously reciprocal conversational pattern for five turns (L's 18-29), where the social worker's authoritative, expert status in relation to her access to information about child custody and tenant's rights (in Philp's terms the advocacy role of the social worker), is reinforced. The adjacency pairing, in which turns are immediately paired in relation to each other, continues until an interruption by a child. As in the previous example, this interruption becomes an opportunity for a topic shift. In this case, the client makes the topic shift, away from the welfare rights dimension, back towards a resumption of her narrative flow.

The use of the conjunction "and" (L30) indicates that the ensuing turn is retrospectively linked with her previous narrative of reported speech. The social worker, in her next turn (L33), responds to the issue of the cohabitee looking after his children, and this resumes a reciprocal question and answer sequence for the next seven turns. Again, the social worker is operating under the auspices of the advocate's subject position, providing information about how other agencies, in this case the citizens advice bureau, can be used. In the next turn, the client, once more, interrupts the social worker and resumes the narrative of reported speech, "Cause she

turned round and said to me... " (L46). Thus we could see this whole stretch of interview so far, as consisting of the client's rapidly claiming a monopoly of speaking rights, under the auspices of the confessional requirement to create narrative flow. This is interspersed with commentary and some questioning, relevant to advocacy, by the social worker. The priority given to speaking rights seems to entail a suspension of the reciprocal norms which apply in other conversational discourse, at the least in conversation between formally equal citizens; that suspension enables the client to interrupt.

To the extent that priority is given to client's maintaining narrative flow, as we have suggested, it is doubtful if the "interruption" even counts as such discursively. Once more, we can see the paradox that in social work/client conversational discourse, the very power basis of that speech, in hierarchical normalising discourse, which produces a non-reciprocal confessional flow, can, on the surface of discourse, constrain the orchestrating capacity of the social worker. For much of the time, the function of the social worker is to respond, artfully, to the client's speech, which largely wanders off in its own directions.

But, having examined the construction and maintenance of the fundamental, confessional, storyteller subject positioning of clients, let us focus more precisely on the construction of mother positions.

THE MOTHER CHILD RELATIONSHIP---A),Resistance and the Elaboration of
the Mother-Subject

It has already been argued that, despite the multiplicity of expectations of the social mother's competences, her core function is to socialize further subjects in a way which conforms with wider biopolitical requirements. Let us consider an interview with the parents of a girl with a persistent record of thieving, lying, and absconding. The parents had been ambivalent about the kind of help they wanted. While they complained that the girl was beyond their control, they refused to cooperate with social workers' attempts to get a care order on the child. The child's behaviour was not yet bad enough for the courts to grant a care order without a request by the parents that the child be taken into care as being beyond parental control. Previous attempts at effective intervention over a three year period had all met with failure, from the social worker's perspective. In the social worker's terms, "when work was attempted before, the parents withdrew allegations and the family closed ranks".

As Dingwall et. al. have argued, where a child is deviant, since his or her responsibility as a moral agent is in doubt, the search for a cause then goes first to the mother for, "she has failed to give him the necessary security or to accord his needs the necessary priority, at whatever cost to her own desires" (Dingwall et.al., p.70). So too in

this case the same assumption operates. After a series of narratives presented by the mother about the child's staying out late at a disco and her lying, the truth of which accounts were not challenged by the social worker, the social worker initiates the topic of socialization with an analogy between children and monkeys:

1 SW: Children are like monkeys, they have to be patterned into
2 behaving (1.5) and I think with your own you've got to
3 try (3.0). Thing is how do you know she's being good, unless
4 you actually find out her lies you assume you assume she's
5 being good.

This is followed by a further narrative by the client about the girl's smoking and:-

6 SW: So what do we do with her

7 CL: She's beaten me

8 SW: I think that's a very difficult thing to say because I don't
9 think it's all on a mother's side. There's a certain amount of
10 L's makeup comes into her behaviour (2.0) I would say
11 that a good 25% you can't help because it is L, doesn't
12 matter which mother she has she'd have turned out that way

13 CL: Mm

14 SW: OK fair enough, I don't think you can say you're entirely not to

15 blame either because that would be wrong as well (1.0) and the
16 difficult thing is to find out what to do.

(Tape two, side one, "The Mother's Socializing Responsibility".)

In this interview, there is a measure of resistance to the full acceptance of the good enough mother subject position by the client. At this point it is necessary to note that the fact of resistance is a stimulus to the negotiation and elaboration of fairly fluid client subject positions. These cannot be reduced to a simple list of ideal mother characteristics, but nevertheless do have a relationship to normalising standards. Thus in this example the social worker's moves allow for the recognition of a measure of influences and self determinations in the daughter's behaviour, independent of the mother. These could be seen as a moral concession to the mother/client, while at the same time putting the socializing influence and responsibilities of the social mother back on the agenda; with an implicit invitation to partake in the discourse in such a way that acknowledges the relevance of the educative social mother to the life of the individual woman here.

But what subjects are being constructed here? It is significant that even though the father was present, the socialization issue was directed towards the mother and the degree of her responsibility. The good enough mother, rational, emotionally warm, with a naturally given

bond with her child and responsible for her character formation, remains a rhetorical basis for the negotiation of the relevance of this idealised subject's applicability in this instance. Again, this illustrates, as Silverman reminds us, Donzelot's argument that the tutelary complex of normalising agents have long been concerned to bolster the role of the mother in the family, at the expense of the authority of the man (Silverman, D. 1987, p.264, Donzelot, 1979, p.104).

Again, without directing the point specifically towards the client, another central feature of the the socialization theme within the psycho-social strategy was introduced in the same interview: the developmental model of family pathology.

17 SW: Met a woman of thirty who is only just now growing up 'cause
18 she didn't receive help as a small child.

Now this is a central Freudian theme, in that an adult is unlikely to break out of the traps of narcissism and provide sufficient love and attention to her children if she had failed to overcome the developmental hurdles in her own childhood and adolescence. This view is expressed by an eminent paediatrician writing in a leading child care text. This author, who acknowledges Winnicott as the source of these ideas of good enough or inadequate parenting and their consequences (Cooper, 1985,p.59), is reworking a, by now traditional theme in the psycho-social strategy:--

"The traits we see developing in children from an abusive environment present as personality handicaps as the children reach adulthood and some in turn become abusing parents in the next generation. The degree and varieties of handicap vary but in some individuals they severely impair family life and general functioning in society."

(Cooper, 1985, p.73).

While some incompetence on the part of the mother might be excusable, in difficult circumstances it is advisable to be given expert "help" to guide the child through towards a civilized and competent subjectivity. While some mistakes in socialization are excusable, the refusal of expert help when a pathology has been diagnosed and help offered may not be so excusable. As Dingwall et. al. argue, in conversations between social workers, health visitors and other normalising agents, evidence of such a refusal may call into question her own status as a responsible person, warranting further investigation (Dingwall et.al, op.cit. p.72). In a more prescriptive mode, the aforementioned paediatrician argues that,

"Ordinary parents discuss their children's needs from time to time and plan for them together, and in doing so they sometimes seek advice from professionals and others." (Cooper, 1985, p.59).

A rational mother would have the capacity for effective socialization despite the obvious difficulties. Yet the need to gain the cooperation

of the parents puts limits on the degree to which an unequivocal attribution of incompetence and moral blame can be made. In Philp's terms, the Kantian social work subject who can be both subjective and social, is an underlying grid for the good enough mother. Secondly, the constraints of a character which seems to some extent to be beyond the influence of parents and the external objective constraints of (in this case) a south London environment, with its dangerous and threatening temptations for a young teenage girl, are presented as not insuperable obstacles in themselves, if only a rational control strategy is adopted. Yet the mother's responses distance her from her responsibilities for the child's character and problematic behaviour. This is reinforced in a later exchange where the client says;

18 CL: I'm sorry for her.

This is followed by,

19 SW: But that's not going to help her.

(The Mother's socializing Responsibility)

One can see Philp's third operation of subject creation in the construction of a mediating position where the social worker, on behalf of the general operation of the normalising agencies, "speaks for" the

client, which in this instance means both the parents and the child, while the situation remains pathological:-

20 SW: You see I think she can be helped but I think she'll have to
21 have professional help, because she's gone so far, and the only
22 way we can do that is, as I say, by taking her into care. This
23 would mean going to court.

This is reinforced later with

24 SW: She needs help

25 CL: Agreed.

What is at stake here is not simply the responsible subject status of the child, but also, by implication, the competence of the mother; even though there is an avoidance of explicit attempts to impugn that competent subject status in an obvious way. In addition, we can see the way that the two models of conversational discourse, citizen exchange and normalisation operate simultaneously. The polite and non hierarchical forms of citizen exchange operate not simply as an ideological mask for the power relation involved in a meeting between the client and an agent of the state. Rather the citizen exchange level *must* operate given the limits of coercive power available.

If normalising discourse is to operate effectively, it requires the cooperation of the client. In a democratic culture, this usually requires an acknowledgement, through speech, of the client's citizen/subject status. It must also be borne in mind that an ever present countervailing resource remains with the client in this situation, in simply withdrawing from the relationship. Such a move would deprive the normalising agency of its most important medium of power, i.e. the ongoing collation of knowledge through monitoring of the clients.

Dingwall et. al., under their "rule of optimism", argue that normalising agents do not operate with a presumption of guilt and will generally neutralise minor evidence of pathology in family circumstances and behaviour, until the evidence becomes pressing or there is a refusal to accept proffered help (Dingwall et. al. op.cit., chap.4). This would warrant further investigation and therefore the ongoing monitoring which is a part of normalising judgement. Once a child or children in a family are on the "at risk", register, the warrant for investigation and intervention is established legally and professionally, but not necessarily within the field of conversational discourse. Since, given the still limited powers which a social worker has to gain access to a child, it is essential to maintain a civilized relationship with the client.

If the client will not speak to the social worker, then no vital monitoring knowledge can be gleaned. There can be actual or potential resistance to maintaining the relationship itself and there may be resistance by the client to the offer to enter into an educative social work discourse with its client subject position as "a mother who needs to be educated". Within this confessional strategic environment, the negotiation of common ground is a major priority. From an interpretive sociological framework, this process may be conceptualised in terms of a negotiation between selves holding discordant value positions, whereas in discourse theory the emphasis shifts to the discursive framework which provides positions for subjects.(5)

However, as we have already argued, given the fact of resistance, the subject positions are not fixed and ready made. Rather they are fluid negotiations according to what Foucault and Donzelot identify as floating standards, in this case of the good enough mother. The standards themselves therefore are not fixed Platonic forms, rather it is through the identification of pathology that they come to life and are elaborated.

Let us briefly explore how the elaboration of mother subject positions in interviews we have been considering so far in this chapter are also effected by double binds placed on motherhood within the encounter between client and normalising agent. This theme has been explored by Silverman in his study of the relations between doctors and young

diabetic patients and their parents. Following Sacks (1972a, 1972b and 1974) and Cuff (1980), Silverman argues that the parent-child relation can be seen as an example of a "standardised relational pair" (SRP). By this is meant an institutionalised, morally laden description of related identities, which is embedded in the assumptive world of our culture. This is not to be confused with the functionalist, social order notion that there are shared, stable, general expectations about the status and behaviour of a particular pair, for example husband and wife. Rather, in conversational discourse, these pairs operate within morally specific accounts about good or bad performance within these identities. Moreover, there is considerable scope for negotiating the meaning of the pair in question (Silverman, op. cit. p.242).

Thus, Silverman argues that the moral version of the mother-child (or more broadly, parent-child) SRP is internally contradictory. A responsible parent is supposed to monitor and care for a child. Yet in our culture a good mother is supposed to respect the autonomy of the child in his or her development towards responsible adulthood. This can become a classic no-win double bind situation. In the clinical context, mothers who are perceived as assuming "too much" responsibility for their diabetic children's self monitoring and self-administered medication, risked being criticised for being over anxious and stifling the development of a responsible attitude on the part of a child towards his or her body. Too little interest by the mother, leaving the child to make his or her own mistakes, on the other hand, could always

be interpreted by doctors as lack of care, or indifference. Silverman's analysis focusses on how mothers cope by "skillfully asserting both norms simultaneously" (ibid. p.243), anticipating possible charges that could be made against them in terms of either of these two norms and rebutting them (ibid., pp.243-249).

In short, Silverman argues that "the SRP parent-child can be constituted in terms of parental responsibility or of children's autonomy" (ibid., p.249, original italics). This double binding is also an issue in "The Mother's Socializing Responsibility" (T2S1). As we have argued, in L's 1-5 and 14-16 particularly, the social worker emphasises the mother's responsibility for the child, especially in the light of the finality of L7, where the client claims that her daughter had "beaten her". A responsible mother cannot legitimately wash her hands of responsibility for a school-age child in that way.

The autonomy theme in L's 11-12, skillfully elaborates the responsibility theme by admitting that about a quarter of L's character and behaviour would be of her own making anyway, regardless of the mother's attempt to influence her. This is an important moral concession to the mother in the general attempt to get her to accept greater responsibility for socializing her daughter. But note that this notion of the child's autonomy is ambiguous. It could, in this setting refer to individual recalcitrance or waywardness, that is resistance to any attempt at socialization. On the other hand it could, in an echo of

Durkheim, refer to the positive values of individualism, for example, the right, and indeed responsibility, of the young person to control her own conduct, on the basis of the moral and rational skills she has acquired. If those skills are to develop, they must be practiced.

This view of the autonomous child is morally Kantian rather than simply as being beyond external control. Clearly, in Kantian terms - and we have argued that the Kantian conception of the subject is central within social work discourses - to be beyond external control may also mean that one has little, if any, control over oneself. Moreover, as we have argued, the Kantian view, at least as a goal to be worked for, is central to the construction of biopolitical individual citizenship in a personalist ethical framework, through the discursive practices of normalising and control agencies (cf, Garland, 1985 and Minson, 1985). Surely, the implication in the social worker's discourse is that L is autonomous in the latter, egoistic, rather than Kantian, sense. If she is to achieve the Kantian ideal of rational, autonomous self control, a positive version of individualism, then the mother's socializing influence is crucial in helping the girl to internalise the self controls over conduct which are deemed to be the preconditions of a genuine, rather than spurious autonomy.

There are also signs of double binding in the adoption interview. On the one hand, the candidate mother is expected to demonstrate her capacity to be loving and warm. On the other hand, she is expected to

realise that until the adoption process has gone through all its stages, she cannot act as if the mother-child bond is complete. Put another way, she cannot talk under the auspices of the conventional mother-child SRP, as it would operate where there was a biological bond. In this context, to presumptuously talk as if the bond were already set could be considered deviant.

Consider L26-27, where after the client had said how pleased she was with the baby, the social worker replies that "this is the problem, you can't allow yourself to become too pleased." The dilemma is reinforced a little later when discussing the reaction of the client's daughter to the coming of the new baby. The client showed sensitivity (L's34-40) to the feelings of the daughter to the new arrival, but the social worker questions her about whether the daughter has been told the baby is permanently installed in the family (L's 41-43). The client is caught in the dilemma of a double bind here and this is manifest in the hesitancy of L's 48-51.

She here shows resistance to the possible, if unstated, accusation that she had prematurely prepared her daughter for the arrival of a permanent sister. L'S 48-51 function, in Silverman's terms, as a rebuttal (Silverman, op. cit., p.244) of the charge, "there's no point in telling her things like that and maybe it won't happen, you know when it does well it's bad enough." This could be interpreted as a return to the ready established mother-child SRP as it applies to her relationship

with her natural daughter. A good mother must, in the final analysis, be guided by a consideration of the needs of her daughter. While it may be deviant to tell the daughter that the baby is permanent, it is, arguably, even more deviant to give her the confusing and worrying information that the baby may not be permanent. It is the lesser of the two evils therefore to hope that the problem will not arrive, and to cross that bridge if it should come up. As Silverman argues, any demonstration of responsible parenthood by the mother can be undercut or relativised as merely "versions", tailored to the needs and interests of the mother (Silverman, op. cit., p.257). As in the clinical setting studied by Silverman, this mother took measures in discourse to rebut the undercutting, by here going back to her ready established mother-child relation with her daughter and her superior knowledge of her daughter and the information she was likely to be able to handle.

Thus, to reinforce Cuff and Silverman's analysis, the use of the mother-child SRP becomes the occasion for moral argument about the appropriateness of notions of good motherhood in particular settings, and thus, it elaborates within the unfolding discourse, constructions of motherhood, on the long chain linking broader biopolitical conceptions of motherhood in social work and social policy discourses, with the conversational discourse of social worker/client exchanges. (6)

The Hostile Client

Let us now continue our analysis of the construction of mother subject positions in a context of resistance, rather than cooperation. In this interview (T5S1, "The Hostile Client"), the client is a mother with two children on the "at risk" register and has been known to the social services department, the school and the whole range of normalising agencies as a difficult mother for several years. The last social worker had been unable to gain entry to the home and had been physically threatened. In addition, the client's (male) cohabitee is also in conflict with his ex-cohabitee over access to and care for his children. There is a fear, expressed by the social worker, that these children may end up in the client's home and thus exacerbate the situation. These are important features of the confessional strategic environment in this case. Moreover, there is a major premium placed by the social worker in this kind of case on maintaining regular contact with clients and access to children, for since the Maria Colwell case in the early 1970's, the public scrutiny of social workers' practice in cases which end in tragedy can be intense. Particularly where children are on the at "at risk" register, the awareness that professional accountability can turn into scapegoating, constantly hangs over the social worker.

Given the extreme delicacy of this relationship between social worker and client, still in its early stages, and the concern about violent abuse and neglect of the children, there is little evidence of any explicit attempt to educate the mother with respect to her socializing relationship with her children, or to openly challenge her competence in

this area. In the chapter on normalising judgement, we will see how indirect and subtle challenges and resistances do operate through a variety of discursive processes. It can be noted here, however, that the high level of resistance and paucity of common ground within the conversational discourse produces a considerable gap between the fluid attributions of subjectivity which operate in situ and the standards of motherhood which nevertheless do provide an underlying agenda for the discourse for both parties.

As was argued in our discussion of T2S1, the deviant behaviour of a child can for social workers warrant an investigation of the mother's competence, yet here after extended narrative sequences which discuss what, on prima facie grounds, may look like bullying, perhaps disturbed behaviour by the client's son, Simon in a nursery (which exchanges will be examined in detail elsewhere in this thesis), and the client's admission that she would beat the child. The social worker's responses are confined to requests for information, which can aid monitoring, and a comment which simply formulates, or echoes back what the client has said.--

51 CL: And I shall say well did er Mathew give a reason why Simon was
52 doing it to him. Oh I know Simon is a bit (0.5) er slap handy
53 and eh (1.5).

54 SW: What will you do if he has been, will you give him a wallop?

55 CL: Yeh he'll get a wallop.

56 SW: Mm.

57 CL: If he's going up to kids and pinching them then he'll get a

58 wallop

59 SW: Mm.

60 CL: But if he's doing it for a reason, cause Mathew keeps going

61 like that to him, well then he's got every right, I shall say to

62 her lucky ()

63 SW: You're able to pinch your mother if she's done that to you.

64 CL: (laughs)

(The Hostile Client)

Yet there is support in the discourse for the view that despite the avoidance by the social worker of explicit reference to the child abuse topic, some of the client's turns are premised on the salience of this issue for the whole interview. At a point late in the interview, after extensive discussion of budgeting and other topics, and after a stretch in which both social worker and client have addressed an infant child who is present, the client without any prompting, raises the abuse issue, within a humorous mode. The social worker has drawn a doodle and is speaking to the infant.--

65 CL: Oh what a diabolical drawing, you wanna go back to college and

66 take up art.

67 SW: I can't draw.

68 CL: You're telling me.

69 SW: Who's that? (to child).

70 CL: That's you look (to child). Ooh, if you look like that they will
71 take you away from me. They'll think I been hiding you in that
73 cupboard. Did you read about that little baby in the paper, int
74 it disgusting eh? No Dolly says to me don't tell that welfare
75 lady and I says why's that and she turned round and she says
76 well you might start putting Mathew in the cupboard.

77 SW: (laugh)

78 CL: I said you silly cow why should I put Mathew in the
79 cupboard? (0.5). She said, oh yeh what am I on about.

80 SW: (Laugh), would you ever do anything like that?

81 CL: What put the kids in a cupboard? No I wouldn't.

82 SW: Mm.

83 CL: Id put 'em in their bedroom.

84 SW: Ehm.

85 CL: I wouldn't put 'em in a cupboard and starve 'em.

81 SW: Nah (possibly directed at the child) Right you presumably
82 better get back to Mathew (to mother).

("The Hostile client")

This series of turns by the client, unprompted by any surface moves in the social worker's discourse, can be read as a response to an attribution of inadequate motherhood, unspoken on this occasion though often voiced in the past by normalising agents, and as we can see in a later analysis, voiced in a mitigated, indirect form earlier in the

interview. The social worker's response (L80) simply requests an expansion of the information and does not take up the topic in the framework of educative discourse. In fact the social worker's last utterance (L's 81-82) is a move to close the interview.

In this type of interview, at least when dealing with highly sensitive issues like child abuse, where mitigated, indirect discursive forms predominate, citizen exchange discourse predominates at a surface level, one cannot expect to find many obvious representations of the hierarchical normalising level at work, yet as we can see, it may still operate at a sub-textual, indirect level, until it occasionally erupts onto the surface of the discourse. To the observer who is unaware of the subtext, the eruption may appear to come from nowhere and it may seem that topics follow no logical sequence of development.

B) THE GOOD SOCIAL WORK SUBJECT

We have so far discussed situations in which there is a degree of resistance to the preferred subject positions of educative social work discourse. Let us now consider discourse in which, (at least within the discourse) the client seems to be the good social work subject. The good social work subject, almost by definition, is not quite the good enough mother, who can cope with her difficulties without sustained intervention by a fulltime normalising agent of the state. The majority of mothers can expect to experience difficulties from time to time but may seek their help from more informal sources.

Rees (op.cit.) notes that social workers in his study operated with moral conceptions of deserving clients who played the role of the good client, simultaneously enabling the worker to engage in "real social work" with a casework component, and undeserving clients who did not play the appropriate role, hence preventing or discouraging the worker from playing the full professional role. This is most visible usually in adoption interviews where the client is anxious to play the correct role in order to manage the adoption successfully. It is a recurrent theme of client studies since Mayer and Timms (1970 & see Fisher op.cit.) that clients tend to accept the legitimacy of questions about affective issues and also express more appreciation of emotional support from the worker where there is evidence of the workers' willingness and ability to provide material and practical help as well as talk.

Let us consider an interview in which the social worker is in a clear position to provide, or assist in providing, practical and emotional benefits which are clearly desired by the client at the outset. This (T12S1, "The Good Social Work Subject"), is an interview with a young mother who is applying for assistance from the local authority for day nursery fees. By the social worker's account this client, while having severe financial and marital difficulties and previous social work intervention, was not seen as a priority case for long term monitoring. The client is described as an intelligent person and the interview very easy "from my point of view".

The nursery place for one of the children would enable the mother to return to work and hence pay off the debts. During the early stage of the interview the worker is helping the client to fill in the application form and the client asks, with regard to a question about her status:-

- 1 CL: what shall I put here?
- 2 SW: Housewife at present.

This apparently innocuous response in fact illustrates well the negotiable subject status of this mother. For bureaucratic purposes, to qualify for a grant, it was vital to present the appropriate status of a deserving mother in need. It was possible that before the application was processed she may have begun work and thus lost her housewife status. This element of subjectivity, however, refers to the external

elements of social identity, what Mauss called the personage (Mauss, M., 1985). Within the discourse, attributions of subjectivity are also appellated which refer to more intimate relations within the family, yet simultaneously connect with underlying discursive themes around the good enough or competent mother.

The dual, and perhaps triple role of the mother has already been discussed, but the folk devil status of the selfish mother who goes out to work and is seen as neglecting her children, so fundamental to 1950's demonology, is not yet extinct and for a young mother who wishes to find nursery care for young children to facilitate a return to work, it may be necessary to negotiate this possible, if not explicitly articulated, deviant mother attribution.

This is visible in a series of exchanges about why she wanted a nursery place:.....

3 CL: I don't like the idea of sending her to nursery, I hate it (1.0)

4 You know I'm not one of these mums who sends their kids out

5 just for the sake of doing it.

6 SW: Did you send R and C?

7 CL: To an afternoon nursery only.

And a little later:--

8 CL: See so I thought I'll have to look elsewhere, you know we didn't
9 mind going to the afternoon nursery 'cause it was only two
10 hours in the afternoon and it did him so much good, that you
11 know being in a flat stuck all day long (1.0) you know it gets
12 them out/ () they learned to socialise with other

13 SW: /yeh

14 children, learned to play with other children, because he was a
15 bit of a problem when he was a little boy.

16 SW: He took a little time to learn to talk didn't he ?

17 CL: Yes, see he was um

18 SW: Now he's talking quite alright?

19 CL: Oh yeh can't stop him now, but he was ehm, I think if I hadn't
20 have acted then he might have been one of those children that
21 they would have called disturbed /we could have had trouble

22 SW: / Mm

23 CL with him later

This is followed by the client's emphasising the problems of being
stuck in a flat then:---

24 SW: Mm, is that part of the reason why you'd like to take a job.
25 also it would be good for you in a sense, it would get you out
26 of the house a bit and then you'd give the children a bit more
27 sort of attention?

(The Good Social Work Subject)

Here we can see a good indication of the way that the psycho-social element of the strategy emphasises the mother as having needs herself and that these must be met if other areas of mothering competence are to be improved, in the classic formulations of Winnicott. The social worker's utterance at L16 constituted an offer to accept this subject status which was taken up by the client in the next exchange (immediately following line 27) where she uses this space in the discourse to admit weaknesses which are legitimately accountable for such an accredited subject:

28 CL: Yes because I think that um well everybody, I think you get
29 your times when you've had enough of the kids and they've had
30 enough of you.

31 SW: Mm.

32 CL: You know and they're backbiting you and you're backbiting
33 them and you smack them unnecessarily, I mean not to beat them
34 or anything like that you just sitting there or you're doing
35 something and they come in and you just say oh go away you
36 know and you don't mean to do it but ti just when you've had
37 them all day long and you're sort of like this you know when
38 you're tensed up at the end of the day. You know little things
39 like that when they keep coming up interrupting whatever
40 you're doing, you know what I mean, I try to er (1.0) bring
41 them into everything I do you know when I'm washing up the
42 kitchen I'll get them you know give mummy a hand if they want
43 to I don't force them you know if they want to they come out.

44 A loves it.

The client continues to emphasise how she involves the children in her domestic work and then says,

45 CL: I think it would benefit them to go out to work because I'd

46 I'd=

47 SW: =Think you'd appreciate them more when you got home.

48 CL: Yes yes definately and I could give them more, you know what I

49 mean, I know it sounds silly, I wouldn't have so much time with

50 them but the time I had had with them I'd give 'em more in it=

51 SW: =Quality rather than quantity.

(The Good Social Work Subject)

We can see here the operation of a common tactic in the operation of counselling discourse, whereby the client is offered a space in the discourse to provide her own account of her subjective reactions to her children. This simultaneously provides a window to the social worker on the patterns of behaviour operating within the family and also provides an opportunity to the client to proffer an acceptable account for her going out to work, which counters the traditional Bowlbyesque critique of the absent and neglectful mother. Moreover, the social worker's responses, for example at lines 47 and 51, show the importance of collusion in encouraging the production of these accounts. In the classic terms of the psychoanalytic models, the good social work subject is rewarded for showing "insight" (cf Scheff, 1968). (7)

Furthermore, the client, by presenting her going out to work as a necessary evil in helping to solve the family's serious financial difficulties, with the threat of possible eviction, is displaying a type of instrumental rationality. This involves a means/end schema, within which present behaviour is judged in the light of future consequences, as opposed to the stigmatised present orientation, in which life problems are coped with only in the eternal flux of the present and without regard to future consequences. The same rationality is discursively displayed in the affective arena, whereby the client demonstrates the recognised link between deleterious present conditions and possible future disturbance in children (L's 8-21).

Here can be seen the mutually reinforcing relationship between a social worker able to go beyond the mere maintenance of the client, and the mother as good social work subject who, within discourse, seems to accept the invitation to verbalise her problems in an insightful, reflexive way. In this kind of discourse there is the possibility of going beyond the heavily mitigated, indirect, monitoring form of discourse (which was identified in T5S1) to counselling proper, with its alluring promise of effective change. That is, we can see the move from discipline to regulation.

Here is a salvagable subject who, in Philp's terms, might be able to integrate and go beyond the objective constraints of her life, with the temporary assistance of an expert "friend" who can speak for her. It is perhaps where there is little resistance to this "speaking for" subject

position for the social worker, that there is least tension between the citizen exchange and normalising levels of social work conversational discourse. Subtext and text can become one in the flow of expert friendly advice and the acknowledgement by the client of the professional's friendly, expert, counselling ear.

This "speaking for" subject operates both through negotiations with outside agencies like nurseries and the borough treasurers department but it also works in the more subtle sense of providing the subject position of "one who needs to be educated" and also through providing the framework of signification within which there may be a possibility of the subject moving back towards full discursive rights. This move towards full discursive rights involves an improvement of the other competences of motherhood. Particularly where there is a degree of cooperation by the client, the social worker is able to apply discursive skills to open up these other dimensions to discursive monitoring and transformation through, in Foucault's sense, the confession.

One of the key conversational skills employed by the social worker involves the adroit steering of topics, which have usually been initiated by the client towards related themes which are of relevance to the underlying agenda for monitoring. Thus, in this interview, the mother identity and competent role performance of the woman is, within the terms of what Rose calls the psycho-social strategy, intimately connected to the other subject positions she occupies. In particular

this raises the relation between competent mothering and her position as a wife.

52 SW: And how you feel affects how you feel towards your husband

53 CL: exactly

54 SW: and er=

55 CL: =Of course it does, I mean when he comes home of a night if I'm

56 absolutely exhausted and i can't talk to him or you know < he

57 says what have you got to be exhausted about, then it it

58 trigs, it triggers you know we'd start having a row or

59 something

60 SW: Yes.

61 CL: It all starts from what happens during the day with the

62 children or if he's had a bad day at work.

Here there is a clear acknowledgement of the interpenetration of the mother and wife subject positions; poor performance in one area can lead to poor performance in another. There are, however, no perfect solutions to the problems of lack of integration between subject positions. Furthermore, in the light of the modern social conditions of motherhood, in which mothering must often be complemented with paid work to supplement inadequate family income, it is necessary to negotiate, in the light of "floating" normative standards, an acceptable identity of competent motherhood. This serves not only to provide reassurance for the problematic mother status of the client, but also to provide the basis for an acceptable account of the social worker's

monitoring role. If further problems come to light at a later date, the records of these conversations could be used to show that the right questions were asked, and that adequate monitoring had taken place.

Thus, the scope of this monitoring, as Baldock and Prior (1981) have noted, is necessarily wide ranging, given the scope of social workers' accountability. It means that in social work discourse, it is rarely possible to focus only on the affective significance of the mother's competences, or on one dimension like the mother child relation. Since the various dimensions of motherhood have mutual effect on each other in the complex social world which is the province of social work, the degree of harmony between these dimensions is part of the agenda of intervention. Thus one would expect that in discourse where the good social work subject flows into life, then there will be discussion of the interpenetration of the multiple dimensions of motherhood. This theme will be returned to at the end of the chapter.

As a concluding note to this discussion of the good social work subject, in this kind of discourse, there is the tinge of utopian vision. Perhaps, more is on offer than, in Philp's terms, a mere "return" to full discursive rights. Given the client's rational vision of a future in which, through: simultaneously overcoming financial hardship; obtaining nursery places for the children, with all the advantages of social education for them which that entails; becoming happier and more self fulfilled through work and developing a better marital relationship, there is the prospect of moving up to a higher and more fulfilling life

style for the individual mother and the whole family, by the lights of social work knowledge. In terms of the logic of the psycho-social strategy, this could be seen as a tiny echo of Freud's maxim for psychoanalysis, where id was there ego shall be. It is small wonder then, that the social worker regarded this as "an easy interview".

C) THE MOTHER AS A FINANCIAL MANAGER, THE SOCIAL MANAGEMENT OF DEBTS.

Social workers, as Dingwall et. al. argue, "define their distinctive skills as being the appraisal of the interpersonal environment" (Dingwall et. al., op.cit., p.61). Clearly, their ability to deal with material problems is limited, and perhaps not seen as "real social work" in the same way as dealing with interpersonal issues. Rose shows how the shift of emphasis away from material provision was made possible by the introduction early in this century of policies of general provision of help through social insurance, systems of allowances and so on. This gradually, in the inter-war period, produced consequences which,

"in effecting a separation between the provision of financial provision and that of personal case work...freed the level of personal and familial functioning for its elaboration within a discourse and practice in which material difficulties were symptoms of a problem rather than the problem itself". (Rose, 1985, p.158).

However, as we have seen, motherhood is a complex of different competences, even if the mother's skills in developing the affective

quality of her relationships with her children are relatively privileged among them. But all of them have an impact on the more obviously affective issues; it is difficult therefore for social workers to ignore the material dimensions about which in any case, people do become very emotionally charged.

In their analysis of social workers' and health visitors' assessments of clients' moral character, Dingwall et. al. emphasise that the material environment of a home is usually taken to be a sign of a mother's moral character and competence. Where there are young children, either too much dirt and chaos, or a scrupulously clean and tidy environment can be viewed as signs of pathology (ibid. pp.58-59). The assessment of the material standards of the home is not a one off, juridical style judgement, but rather is made over a period of time and through a range of visits (ibid. pp.64-65). In other words, it is in Foucault's terms a normalising judgement.

By the same token, the management of debts could be seen as a skill whose competent performance can be observed over a stretch of time, and which can have a major impact on every facet of a family's life. As one male social worker says to his client towards the end of an interview almost entirely taken up with the discussion of the client's serious debt problems,

1 SW: I don't think this (debt work) is what social work is all about
2 but I've got a way of dealing with it
(T4S1, "The Passive Client").

We have already noted the recurrent theme in client study research that social workers' interpersonal, psycho-social strategies work more effectively with clients when there is a demonstration of at least some provision of practical, material help. This may not actually mean the provision of money or material goods, but it may mean some assistance for the client in negotiating with the jungle of welfare and social control bureaucracies, or in dealing with public utilities, who are major creditors to the poor.

Chapter seven will examine in detail how attempts are made to educate the client into a more "rational" approach to the paying of bills, what has, in recent years, developed into a new body of normalising professional knowledge and expertise, namely debt counselling. At this stage let us briefly consider the production of subject positions which this educative process entails; it is clear that in some social work discourse the mother as a competent manager of household finances, is still very important, within the multiplicity of mother subject positions.

There is a strong echo here of the old welfare strategy which operated in the pre-welfare state era when it was assumed that any competent mother should be able to make ends meet on a minimal income, so long

as a rational approach was adopted to the payment of bills. Where mothers lacked this competence it was to be improved through education from above.

In the interview already mentioned (T4S1, "The Passive Client"), the client is a young mother with very large debts to a wide range of bodies. Mortgage payments are in arrears and the threat of mortgage foreclosure and hence eviction is a real possibility. In that case the family would have been homeless and become a considerable problem for a variety of agencies and a large burden on the public purse. Not least among the consequences of the resultant stress is often a strain on the marital relationship and even the breakdown of the man-woman relation. The loss of a breadwinner can exacerbate the material problems of the mother and children (though in cases of males abusing wives or children this may not be so) and increase the load on the normalising agencies. In this sense there is a continuity of concerns with normalising and stabilising family life between modern normalising agents and those of the late nineteenth century.

This social worker has negotiated with a series of charitable and other bodies to get help to pay the bills. The usual tactic is for the institution to agree to pay a given amount if the client can match it. For example, the Family Welfare Association had agreed to pay a given amount,

3 SW: Provided that I can get the bill down more, you know so there's
4 another £25 that will be hung onto.

5 CL: Yes.

6 SW: as long as it takes to get the bill down to £100, so when we
7 get it down to that level we've got a nice little lump waiting
8 for us (1.5) but I've written off to one or two other places to
9 see if we can get any more money because the quicker we can
10 get it down the better.

11 CL: Yeh.

Other debts were inquired about, including rates and electricity bills, with the point of encouraging regular if small payments, as if to stave off the predators. With the electricity bill the social worker introduces another dimension, the prospect of light at the end of the tunnel, the prospect of actually reducing the debt rather than simply stabilising it,

12 SW: Anything else financially (1.0) cause the electriciy was the big
13 bill, cause well we've got that under control now, you're still
14 paying off your instalments?

15 CL: Well yeh.

16 SW: That's quite important (1.0) so that means it's going down every
17 week.

18 CL: (2.0) It's just the rates.

Shortly later this is reinforced.

19 SW: As I say, we are winning on that one because although you're not
20 paying for electricity it's going along at the moment, the bill
21 is not actually going up.

22 CL: No.

23 SW: Cause the money that you're actually paying off and the extra
24 money that I've been able to pay off has actually reduced it.

25 CL: Yeh.

Note the use of both singular and plural pronouns by the social worker, who talks of himself getting money to pay for bills, and of "we" getting things under control (L's 6-10, 13 and 19). In the terms of the speech act theorist Stubbs, the use of we and I in this setting is a signal, in speech, of "alignment" which denotes social solidarity between speakers (7) (Stubbs, op.cit., pp.187-189). It is noticeable that in these extracts and throughout the interview the client's responses are economical and in fact minimal. In Philp's terms, the "speaking for" attribution of subjectivity is dominant. As in many interviews which deal with the payment of bills, the role of the social worker, in this case is to intercede with authority in negotiating a more manageable payment strategy. The social worker provides an advocate's service in the medium of friendship and the speech mode of citizen exchange.

As we shall see when we examine these tactics more closely, the dilemma for social work is that the alignment may become chronically long term. At best bills are stabilised rather than brought down and in Davies' terms the social work strategy remains at a low level of

maintenance work. This is, moreover, a maintenance which renders the client dependent on the advocacy and negotiative skills of the social worker. This would lock the client into a permanent and necessary relationship with social workers and circuitously, with the charities and debt reclaiming departments of the utilities and local boroughs. Without the social worker's advocacy, it is doubtful if the client could wrest the same concessions on staggered payments. Thus the danger is that what for Philp is a temporary taking over of a subject's speaking rights by the social worker until she can be returned to full discursive rights, can function in such a way as to virtually silence the client as subject and prevent the goal of active subjectification, the move towards what may look like the chimera of the good, self activating social work subject.

CONCLUSION

This analysis has attempted to show that apparently mundane and practical conversations between social workers and clients can be understood as taking place under the auspices of a complex series of historically constructed discourses, operating both through printed texts and through conversations between normalising agents. These discourses are not necessarily coherent and logical, they may be often vague or contradictory, but they provide some of the conditions of possibility of the social worker/client conversations we have been considering. In particular the discourses of citizenship and social work construct representations of motherhood which provide discursive

environments for the construction of the client as a confessional story teller and a locus for a range of mother subject positions within fluid conversations.

It is important to recognise that the relationship between these wider discourses and what is going on in the social worker/client conversations cannot be understood simply as a relation between cause and effect, because the elaboration of subject positions in the conversational setting is a creative process. The normalising standards of motherhood, elaborated in the environing discourses should not be understood as fixed forms, which are simply applied in a deductive way within the front line setting. They are themselves constructed in a fluid way through the identification of pathology.

So too in the conversations considered here, mother subject positions are fluid negotiations and indeed are multiple constructions. There are a range of mother subjects with their attendant forms of competence, which are the subjects of monitoring and evaluation. Sometimes there are degrees of resistance from the direction of clients to the discursive representation of their subjectivities. In these instances the gaps between the the more crystallised representations of motherhood and the constructions which unfold within conversations can be a relatively long chain. Moreover the representation of these subjectivities can take severely mitigated or indirect forms. Under these circumstances it is difficult for the social worker to exercise a key discursive skill in putting on the agenda of conversational topics

the *relation between* the various subjects of motherhood and how they may be brought into harmony.

This becomes a more realistic tactic where there is evidence of cooperation from the direction of the client, in participating in the psycho-social forms of social work discourse. In these circumstances, the good social work subject can play her part in bringing to the surface of discourse the underlying topics on the agenda, and in particular the relationship between the various subject forms.

Moreover, in these circumstances the tension between the surface level of speech, in the friendly, egalitarian forms of an exchange between citizens, and the underlying sub-text of speech in the normalising power relations between publically accountable agents and vulnerable clients, is partially resolved, at least in speech. Yet this opening up of the agenda is incomplete because through the individualising of clients' problems within the casework frame of the social worker/ client relationship, the most important source of the relations between the individuals in question, in the collective strategies of biopower, remain largely hidden from conscious reflection. In particular, the role of the mother in constructing "good citizens" is no longer given the high profile that it once had. Yet it still remains the basic rationale for social work intervention with mothers.

The Relay

So we can see that despite social workers' emphasis on interpersonal issues within the family, much of social work still consists of providing linkages, or relays between the poor or in some way damaged mother and a quite bewildering array of agencies and institutions which go well beyond the range of institutions which have to coped with by socially better placed mothers. Thus, despite the psycho-social complexities of their work, social workers have not entirel escaped from the pedagogical and "go between" functions of the old welfare officers of the inter-war period (Rose, 1985, pp.154-155).

If the minimal conception of a good enough mother, which focuses on the affective dimension of the mother role were the principal dimension of the mother in face to face discourse, we might expect to find a disproportionate amount of time devoted to the discussion of affective issues. In fact this is not the case in the majority of interviews. While these interviews, as we have admitted, hardly constitute a representative sample, Baldock and Prior(1981) also found that social worker/client conversations covered a wide range of topics even if some were seen as qualitatively more important. This is also supported by research which examined retrospective accounts of social worker/client interaction (eg. Rees, 1978 & Sainsbury et. al 1982).

What emerges from the interviews is that the old welfare concerns of the neo-hygiene strategy have not been displaced in this discourse by psycho-social concerns with affect but rather coexist and interpenetrate each other. Specifically, the monitoring of motherhood

involves a range of competences related to budgeting, managing the housing situation of the family (including cleaning etc.), the management of marital and other intimate relationships, the disciplining of children, relationships with the wider kin network, health personnel, teachers and neighbours. All this is in addition to discussion of the inner life, the affective needs of the mother and other family members. In short, unlike counselling or therapeutic discourse which is structured by more narrowly defined criteria of relevance (Labov & Fanshel 1977), the monitoring role of social workers and their wide range of accountability necessitates a broad range of interests even if as we have seen, the practical difficulties of clients which present themselves on the surface are seen as "presenting problems" which manifest deeper emotional conflicts.

In some of these areas the issues of mother/subject competence are of central importance and are represented in social work conversational discourse. At this stage of research, we can only illustrate these issues by reference to selected themes and here we have focused on mother-child relations and financial management. We could also, for example, have looked at the mother's relation to the school, since the mother's socialising role in relation to that of the school is an important and often problematic linkage which can provide occasion for social workers providing a relay function.

We can also see how the relay function operates in another sense. One of the key characteristics of the shift towards educative, regulative,

discourse, is precisely the possibility of creating relay links *within* discourse, between the various subject positions occupied by a particular client. Within the topics of the interviews themselves, the connections drawn, implicitly or explicitly, between the different mother subjects provides a discursive relay which, rhetorically, raises the possibility of a more integrated personal subject, who can become the author of her/his own actions, a self-activating, unitary subject who rises above the flux of the eternal present and the strength and confidence sapping grip of miserable circumstances. As we argued in the chapter on instructional discourse, this vision of an integrated individual, involved in the process of personal growth, lies at the heart of professional social work discourses.

CHAPTER SIX

NARRATIVE AND CONVERSATIONAL DISCOURSE

INTRODUCTION

So far, the analysis has focused on the production and attribution of mother subjectivities. It was noted that where the professional/client relationship is marked by antagonism, or is in some way fragile, then there is a relatively long chain linking idealised constructions of the competent or good enough mother within social work discourses and the relatively mitigated or disguised attributions operating in particular interview settings. In such cases there is a noticeable gap between the two levels of social work conversational discourse which have been identified, namely the citizen exchange and normalising models.

On the other hand, we examined a situation where there seemed to be less apparent tension between the two levels, where the attribution of subjectivity and negotiations over acceptable levels of competent motherhood performance were openly conducted and where the client seemed to participate cooperatively and openly within the terms of the social work discourse.

May it not be objected that to conduct the analysis in this way is an unnecessarily prolix, even tortuous way of discussing what functionalist or interactionist sociologists would be happy to describe as a clash of values and meanings, between the social worker representing middle class orientations and the client, usually representing lower working class orientations which are deemed pathological within the terms of the former? The symbolic interactionist Thomas Scheff's (Scheff, 1968) characterisation of psychiatric interviews as involving a power struggle to define the nature of the counselling situation (albeit without the class theme) provides one such model.

However, the beguiling attraction of such a translation into plain English must be resisted, because buried in such commonsense models lie assumptions about the human subject and the nature of discourse, which are problematic for the purposes of this thesis. Within this commonsense framework, the social worker and client would be presented as ready made unitary subjects, who, as such, while having distinct bodily and biographical characteristics, are seen as sharing the general characteristics of the human subject everywhere; they are presented as intentional, reflexive, goal oriented and so on. Thus in this commonsense model the interview conversation between social worker and client is simply a medium through which the conflict or negotiation over values, shared in the respective class communities of the participants and reflected in their

minds, is conducted with varying possibilities for victory or resistance.

Walter J. Ong describes this model of language, in a modification of Derrida(1976), as the pipeline theory. Within this framework:

"one assumes that there is simply a one to one correspondence between items in an extra-mental world and spoken words, and a similar one-to-one correspondence between spoken words and written words. . . . On this assumption the naive reader presumes the prior presence of of an extra- mental referent which the word presumably captures and passes on through a kind of pipeline to the psyche." (Ong, 1982, p.166). Thus it is essential to go beyond this representational view of language because spoken, like written words, "do not themselves transmit an extra-mental world as through transparent glass. Language is structure and its structure is not that of the extra-mental world." (ibid., p.167).

The approach adopted here so far is rooted in the work of Foucault and Donzelot and those authors who in varying ways have been inspired by them. Given the theoretical priorities of this academic school, in this approach we cannot operate with commonsense, taken for granted views of the role of the subject and language. Rather, the recognition of particular subjects is largely founded on the forms of discourse within which they participate and are linked to other subjects. We must, however, remember the caveat that we are dealing here with subjects as

they are established in these specific fields of discourse, rather than real life subjects in all their complexity.

Thus we cannot assume that the social worker subject, embedded within her forms of discourse is an equivalent form of subject to that of the client. Yet, it has already been argued that in using Foucault as a guide, there is a danger in becoming over-reliant on written and printed texts as sources of data about discursive practices. It is central to this argument, and the point may be glossed over in Foucault, that conversational discourse is qualitatively different to textual discourses, yet equally, it would be a very serious error to assume, as do some theorists, that all forms of conversational discourse, like all subjects, are qualitatively similar and governed by similar rules.

This chapter will explore the qualitatively different narrative, or storytelling styles (in the broad sense) which operate in interviews. It will be argued that, particularly with clients less firmly embedded within a culture of literacy, narrative styles and the noetic (that is subjective) resources and skills they make possible are confronted by literate based narrative styles and characteristic noetic resources and skills of social workers which are, to a large degree, an alien cultural form, despite superficial similarities.

This exploration of narrative forms may, at first sight, appear to be awkwardly situated in the body of the text. It is, however, quite central to the argument we are developing. We argue that

the Foucaultian style of discourse analysis needs to be supplemented by tools of analysis which better equip it to examine conversational discourse. It is also argued that the literate based discourses of the normalising professions are often likely to be at odds with the residually oral forms of discourse employed by poorer clients, who have had limited education. We argue that the forms of narrative organisation are more rhapsodic, that is more impressionistically pieced together, in residual orality, than in the thematic oral narratives of those more effectively schooled within a culture of literacy.

It is important to recognise these differences in order to uncover the functions performed by different narrative styles in speech. The agenda and underlying messages of social work discourses, tend to work more effectively through linguistic forms which foster a fairly sophisticated manipulation of abstract propositions about the nature of the self, human relationships, choices in action and so on. It is questionable how far the rhapsodic narrative forms, if predominant in discourse, permit a full elaboration of regulative discourse involving social worker and client in a systematic, and necessarily abstract review of the client's patterns of behaviour. In such circumstances, the adoption of the rhapsodic form, with its emphasis on the 'pictorial' representation of human experience, can act as a barrier between the cultural world of the client and that of the social worker. It can thus function as a, perhaps unwitting, form of resistance.

Thus it will be argued that, notwithstanding the individual and subcultural variations of accent and dialect- which are largely beyond the scope of this present enquiry:-

a) narratives are dependant on the strategic environment in which they operate; and

b) on the extent to which they are located in forms of discourse which are rooted in a still predominantly oral framework, or in a more firmly literate framework.

Moreover, the chapter will explore how these characteristics of the orality/literacy shift have profound implications for the possibilities of translation between one language style to another. We cannot simply assume, in other words, that social workers and clients are "speaking the same language". In turn, the chapter will examine the implications of the foregoing for the possibility of the social worker raising with the client issues of value and life strategy. This provides a basis for the more detailed examination of processes of normalising judgement later. Thus, the analysis in this chapter will add to the body of essential methodological tools which will be deployed in the diachronic analyses of interviews in the following chapter, where we will explore in detail, the attempts to move towards regulative discourse.

1) ON DEFINITIONS OF NARRATIVE

a) The strategic environment.

In the previous chapter, it was argued that the social work interview takes place within a confessional strategic framework, characterised by non-reciprocal exchanges of personal information and in which, in contrast with doctor-patient discourse, the client is encouraged to play a storyteller role, discursing at length about her life. This, while giving the client considerable scope to determine the initiation and change of topics and flow of the conversation (unlike in say a job interview), does, through the "information" revealed through the talk, provide the social worker with a window on the world of the client. In short, it facilitates the prime task of social work in monitoring the lives of the client. Although such a model, it is clear, is itself founded on a representational view of discourse, that what the client tells the social worker is, in some decodable way, a reflection of the "real" narrative flow of events taking place in the client's life.

b) Strict and loose notions of narrative.

There is considerable controversy among linguists about the definition of narrative forms and it is beyond our brief to provide a systematic review of the literature. We will, however,

provide an indication of some of the key theoretical issues, insofar as they are relevant to the present analysis and insofar as they indicate the key departures of this approach to narrative analysis from its near rivals.

In a useful review of recent approaches to the study of narrative, Elliot G. Mishler distinguishes two main traditions: a) narratives as paradigmatic, as the way whereby people transform knowing into telling; and b) narrative as only one out of a variety of forms (Mishler, 1986, p. 147). However, whether narrative is seen as paradigmatic or not there is usually some attempt to provide a minimal definition. Chatman's definition is characteristic. He claims that narratives have a distinct logical structure, "narrative subsists in an event chain, operating through time" (Chatman, 1981, p.808, quoted in Mishler, *ibid.*, p. 147). But perhaps the most influential definition was that provided by Labov and Waletzky who identified narrative as a particular way of "recapitulating past experience by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which actually occurred." (Labov and Waletzky, 1967, p.20, quoted in Mishler, 1986, p.78).

Unlike other styles of recounting experience, in narratives any rearrangement of the order of clauses would alter the meaning of the events so being described. Moreover, narratives, in their fullest and most coherent form, involve other elements, namely: an Abstract, which gives some indication of the substance of the

forthcoming story; Orientation, which identifies place time and the characters involved in the narrative; the Complicating Action, the sequence of events; Evaluation, which, in a variety of ways indicates the "point" or what the narrator is getting at in a story (Labov, 1972); Resolution, the conclusion of the action and the Coda which steers the narrator back to the present.

While it is clear that for Labov, not all these characteristics have to be present for an account to qualify and a narrative may be interspersed with a range of free clauses and other tangential verbal elements, it did function as an influential ideal type and in using it one would expect to find, amongst adults in particular, some form of evaluation, because otherwise a narrative could be seen as pointless, like a joke with no punchline. But as we shall see, the nature of "point" or "evaluation" is a very problematic issue.

In contrast, another influential theorist, Barbara Herrnstein Smith, rejects the utility of such a tight definition of narrative. She denies that human beings spontaneously remember or structure experience in terms of strict linear sequence. For her, " 'telling someone that something happened' can, under certain circumstances, be so close to 'saying that something is (or was) the case' that it is questionable if we can draw any logically rigorous distinction between them or, more generally, if any absolute distinction can be drawn between narrative discourse and

any other form of verbal behaviour" (Herrnstein Smith, 1980, p. 232).

Herrnstein Smith, therefore, recommends a relativist and so more loosely structured definition of narrative in terms of "*someone telling someone else that something happened*" (ibid., p.232, italics in original). The principal targets for Herrnstein Smith's criticism are structuralists like Seymour Chatman (1978) and the schools inspired by Propp (1928). For Chapman, the analysis of narrative should be dualistic; one should distinguish the inner deep structure of a narrative, which can then be amenable to structural analysis, and the surface structure, or discourse, which is the means whereby the deep structure is expressed.

This model is rejected by Herrnstein Smith since it embodies an untenable correspondence theory of the relationship between narrative and a reified Platonic conception of reality as "out there". This conception of discourse is seen as "consisting of sets of discrete signs which, in some way *correspond to* (depict, encode, denote, refer to, and so forth) sets of discrete and specific ideas, objects, or events". (Herrnstein Smith, 1980, p.225, italics in original). This seems like an echo of the pipeline theory of language which has been discussed. However, as we shall see, Herrnstein Smith's rejection of that model is incomplete, ambiguous and based on different foundations to the position developed in this thesis (1).

As an antidote to crude correspondence theories of discourse, Herrnstein Smith proposes a pragmatist approach to language. This conception,

"views utterances not as a string of discrete signifiers that represent corresponding sets of discrete signifieds but as *verbal responses that is, as acts which, like any acts, are performed in response to various sets of conditions.* These conditions consist of all those circumstantial and psychological variables of which every utterance is a function" (ibid., pp. 225-226, italics in original).

This is clearly a view of narrative which emphasises the importance of interpersonal context in any understanding of its production and reception. As such, the oral narrative is seen as somehow primordial, literary narratives are variations on the same deep cultural theme. Again, in a way which is characteristic of this tendency within pragmatist theory, there is an egalitarian denial that there is any fundamental qualitative difference between the oral story forms of non-literate societies, or orally rooted subcultures within literate societies and story forms in literate cultures. She argues that non-linearity is the rule rather than the exception in all cultures, and that perfect chronological order "is likely to be found only in acutely self conscious, 'artful,' or 'literary' texts." (ibid., p. 227) (2).

Despite her apparent distance from Labov's view of narrative, in fact Herrnstein Smith shares with him similar pragmatist concerns. Labov also emphasises the need to locate discourse in its interpersonal context (3). Working within a broadly similar tradition, Mishler (op. cit.) and impressively, Charles Briggs (1986), have also argued strongly for an approach to discourse, and interviewing in particular, which gives primacy to interpersonal context and the co-production of accounts. As we shall see, these approaches are useful in some respects, but at a cost. Despite the attempts to avoid a correspondence theory of the relation of narrative to the "reality" they describe, it is doubtful if Herrnstein Smith and others within this tradition can avoid what Ong calls the pipeline theory, since they cling tenaciously to a view of the subject and the noetic resources he or she employs as essentially universal, with no great qualitative differences operating between so called less or more sophisticated cultures.

For Herrnstein Smith, this global and trans-historical position, is part of a "*comprehensive* theory of narrative which reflects a better appreciation of the nature of verbal transactions and the dynamics of social behaviour generally." (Herrnstein Smith, *ibid.*, p.236). Unfortunately, the cost of such a position, which runs through both the tight and more loosely defined approaches to narrative, is to obscure some important differences between forms of discourse and noetic resources which are dialectically intertwined with them.

Collective Basis of Differences in Professional and Client Forms
of Conversational Discourse

The argument to be developed here, while drawing on the work of the pragmatist writers, departs from their assumption that oral discourse is primordial and that in essential respects there is a fundamental similarity in all forms of conversational discourse.

One of the first linguists to draw attention to systematic differences in speech styles between middle class counsellors and working class clients was Basil Bernstein, who in a theoretical paper (not based on empirical research on counselling or therapy) in 1964, argued that there is a basic incompatibility between the requirements and procedures of psychotherapy and what is made possible by the particular types of concretely oriented restricted codes and attendant self structures normally deployed within the lower working class (Bernstein, 1964). Moreover, one cannot understand these differences by restricting one's view to the immediate interpersonal context of conversations; rather the form of these interactions is made possible by speech styles which are collectively institutionalised.

A central and as we shall see, valuable insight is contained here in his noting that lower working class speech styles tend "to make relevant the concrete here and now situation rather than point to reflective, abstract relationships" (ibid., p.63). This

is important since within the terms of the psycho-social strategy, as we have seen, the possibility of growth towards productive emotional expression and self actualisation is based on precisely such an ability to orient towards abstract relationships, visible through a range of particular life situations (4)

Rather than tying down the identification of differences in conversational discourse more narrowly to connections between restricted and elaborated codes, subject structures and family and class structures, as in Bernstein's work, we will follow Walter Ong in viewing these differences more broadly as instances of differences between oral-based and text-based forms of conversational discourse (Ong, 1982, p.106). Some of these key differences will be outlined shortly.

However, in admitting a loose connection between Bernstein's project, in the sense that it was concerned with broad social differences in language and this project, it would be disingenuous not to note that a reaction to that project was led from within the pragmatist school. Thus Labov, while clearly recognising some class and ethnic subcultural differences, did not accept that there are any fundamental differences of logic operating within lower class speech in comparison with educated middle class speech (Labov, 1969, cf. also Rosen, 1974).

While accepting the danger that a recognition of difference can easily slide into a celebration of middle class linguistic and cultural superiority, nevertheless, as shall be argued, the "difference-blind" position is inaccurate in important respects and within the field of educational linguistic research, may be seen as a form of romanticism, homologous with the kind of cultural relativism in social work which Dingwall et. al. have argued, became influential (without altogether displacing other professional knowledge forms) in the 1970's.

Within the terms of this (libertarian) cultural relativism, great care was taken not to impugn the integrity of the language and culture of those clients with whom social workers came into contact (Dingwall et. al., 1983, pp. 82-86). Therefore, within this cultural movement, the ideal models of professional/client relationships were ideologically indisposed to seek out linguistic or other cultural differences which could be used to legitimate a downgrading of the cultures of the poor and relatively "powerless".

Literate and Thematic Narrative in Social Work Interviews

In order to demonstrate the implications of an approach to narrative analysis which emphasises the gaps between, respectively, literate and oral based conversational discourse forms, let us consider a narrative initiated by a social worker, within a framework of well practised literacy, but cooperatively produced with a client. The social worker is describing how she interceded with a gas board official on behalf of the client, who is chronically in debt to the gas board. This is a rare example of this social worker performing the story teller role, which, within the confessional frame of the interview as a strategic environment, was normally performed by the client, with the social worker providing supportive, promptive and redirective work in the co-production of stories.

83 SW: Errm, (1.0) oh I rang up about your gas

84 CL: Yes what did they say? =

85 SW: =and they wanted () being in touch with them and I

86 explained that you would be paying the next inst =

87 CL: =Quarter in February

88 SW: Yes within the next ten days or as soon as possible

89 CL: Yeh

90 SW: And I also pointed out very politely that in fact you know

91 that the bill was taken on by Mrs. B, not you and that he

92 is not living there any longer and that you were still

93 anxious to have a look at this and I'm sure that they

94 would get the money (child's interruption) in the end

95 CL: Yeh

96 SW: but that you were struggling hard to do your best.

97 CL: Mm

98 SW: and that it you know you might be a little erratic in the

99 payments but I would ensure you remembered

100 CL: ()

101 SW: So they took my number down and said that they would be

102 in touch with me if they were worried about the payments

103 in future, before they sent you out little letters

104 CL: Oh did they that's alright then

105 SW: They were very nice about it, they said as long ()

106 and if it was easier for you to pay two pounds a week=

107 CL: =Yeh

108 SW: They said they'd take it anyway

(Tape 5, side one, "The Hostile Client.").

It is worth at this stage looking in some detail at the unfolding narrative structure of this stretch of interview talk, although not at all the functions performed by the narrative, a closer analysis of narrative function belongs in the chapter on normalising judgement.

According to Jefferson, where stories emerge from a "normal" flow of conversation and where the participants leave each other space for fairly short turns of talk, stories are "locally occasioned" by the talk, in the sense of being triggered off by the topical

flow of talk, or demonstrably related to a topic already introduced into the talk (Jefferson 1978, p.220); but they also violate the reciprocal exchange pattern of conversations. Thus, in order to retain the integrity of the conversational relationship, one can expect linguistic markers which account for the shift of a speaker into the story teller mode and demonstrate that the story is sequentially implicative for the whole conversation.

Elbourne points out that, "If what follows is not topically coherent with what has been talked about previously, this can be signalled by the use of 'disjunct markers'". (Elbourne 1982 , p.108). In this case, the previous talk was moving towards a tentative conclusion of the interview. The immediately preceding exchange had been,

109 CL: I've got to do my shopping now

110 SW: There wasn't anything else I had to do for you

111 CL: No I don't think so.

So here, the use of "Erm" and a pause (L83), served as a disjunct marker, which indicates that the topic being introduced is not sequentially coherent with the immediately preceding topic. In fact the topic of the gas bill had not been raised at all within this interview, yet was part of the microculture of topics which had been discussed during previous interviews. Thus, while to the naive observer, this topic may seem to be unrelated to the main

flow of talk, its linkages and relevance are determined by its location within the micro-culture which has been set up during a course of interviews.

The reference by the social worker in her first utterance to "your gas" (L83) therefore, in Labov's terms, performs the condensed roles of providing abstract, which gives some indication of the forthcoming story and orientation, which identifies place, time and characters involved. This is a good example of the use of ellipsis, particularly in co-produced storytelling within a microculture, where there has been established a backcloth of common references within the discourse. The client's first response shares and reinforces the ellipsis by the use of the pronoun *they* (L84). This precludes the necessity of making a full identification of the story's characters.

What Labov calls the complicating action is provided in a chronologically sequenced flow of units of discourse, which rhetorically convey the sense of sequential flow in the narrative's report, by means of a clear differentiation of tenses, particularly the present, the imperfect and past tenses. Consider, for example the turn beginning, "And I also..." (L90). Moreover, sequential narrative flow is conveyed in the use of a variety of prepositions, adverbs and conjunctions, including *and*, *but*, *and that*, *so*, *if* and *before* (eg. L90 and L96). Used in conjunction with the manipulation of tenses, these connecting

terms, and the phrases in which they are embedded, are powerful rhetorical tools which make possible analytic and reasoned subordination (Ong, p.37), which can not only convey narrative flow, but also create a broad discursive palette, and which in turn can facilitate the differentiation and use of particular analytic skills associated with a close familiarity with texts.

With the use of subordinate clauses, knowledge can become itemised and recombined in relation to abstract categories. New noetic resources can begin to operate, as Ong puts it, writing and print makes possible, "abstractions that disengage knowledge from the arena of human struggle, it separates the knower from the known" (Ong, op.cit. p.44).

In facilitating the extension of sentences beyond brief declaratives or denials, a wider range of shading in signification becomes possible; for example, the use of the adverbial clause "very politely" in the social worker's fourth turn, moderates the verbal clause "pointed out" (L90). The social worker's fourth turn in the narrative (L90), despite the use of the simple conjunction *and*, is a complex sentence which links the introducing statement "And I pointed out very politely", with four subsequent, dependent statements. As we shall see, this is a device uncharacteristic of less literate clients' narratives and as Ong has indicated (Ong, op.cit. p.37), is the kind of technique which is characteristic of written or printed discourse. For the literate it is possible, with practise, to

carry this technique into speech, it is less easily achieved where oral discourse is less rooted in literacy and more in the spoken forms of discourse.

The identification of evaluation, or the *point* of this narrative is, as so often, less clear cut. However, even though there is no simple statement of principle here, the narrative, in its rhetorical flow, does, in interceding or playing an advocate's role on behalf of the client in relation to the public utility, present the response of the *personalised* representative of the utility as friendly and amenable to persuasion. The resulting offer of a minimal regular payment (by officers who were "very nice about it" [L105]) as a means of reducing arrears, could be seen as a rhetorical invitation to the client to go along with this as a realistic strategy and perhaps accept it as the best possible one in the circumstances.

This narrative should not be taken on its own, it should also be considered in relation to other interventions by the social worker. Nevertheless, it is already possible to see an underlying evaluation, in the form of the proposition- which derives from the historically produced social work discourses which we have already examined- that it is better to adopt a rational, non conflictual strategy in attempting to gain control over household finances and the payment of bills.

At a deeper level, the narrative functions as an invitation-to paraphrase Philp (1979)-to identify with the social work (client) subject who is: both social and subjective, with the capacity for compassionate, rational, morally responsible action; capable of acknowledging the existence and needs of others; and able to see constraints as a bridge rather than as a barrier to relations with others. Moreover, the narrative functions to reinforce the, hopefully temporary, relationship between the client and the social worker in which the social worker, as an articulate and well connected advocate, takes over speaking rights for the client. This is particularly evident in the social worker's seventh turn, where she says "and (they) said that they would be in touch with me if they were worried about the payments in future before they sent you out little letters" (L's 101-103).

Thus, given that social workers operate with a conceptually complex agenda, even if it is rarely made fully explicit-if indeed that were always intellectually possible-one can see a narrative like this as an *example*, or illustration of underlying propositions which derive from complex systems of knowledge and practical professional procedures.

To return to Labov's model of narrative, we can see that the resolution and coda are contained in the social worker's last two turns, which culminate in the offer that the client pay off a little of the arrears on a regular basis. Thus, it is possible to

see this social worker's narrative as an elegant example of an almost fully formed narrative structure (5).

The linguistic skills which facilitate the construction of this kind of narrative, despite its seeming simplicity, enable the construction of themes in discourse, that, for example, a general principle can be developed through the elaboration of a series of sequentialised narrative stages, towards a resolution. We, in literate and typographic cultures, that is those who routinely practise the skills of that culture, tend to see consciously contrived narrative as typically designed in, as Ong puts it "a climactic linear plot, often diagrammed as the well known 'Freytag's pyramid'". (Ong, op. cit., p. 142).

This classic form of narrative plot, familiar to Aristotle and refined in nineteenth century novels, involves an upward slope of ascending action, leading to tension building, reaching a climactic point in the action. This then leads to a descending slope of action, perhaps involving reversal, and eventual denouement or untying. For Ong, the whole process is akin to the tying or untying of a knot (ibid., p. 142). Moreover, the episodes within the plot, despite subplots and perhaps deliberately introduced "extraneous" elements (cf. Pinter's dialogue), introduced to inject a note of realism or for some other dramatic purpose, gain their discursive significance from their systematic relationship with an overall narrative theme.

While, of course, not all the spoken narratives of the literate conform to this model, the ideal of thematic coherence remains, and we suggest that the notion of "point" in stories, within a literate framework, derives from such a thematic model. In contrast, let us consider forms of storytelling by clients which may appear, within the terms of literate criteria, to be disjointed and lacking in coherence, but which, seen in their own terms, do conform to a recognisable and functional pattern within the terms of more orally rooted forms of discourse.

Oral Pseudo-Narratives and Storytelling

It is clear, as we shall see, that in the course of telling a story, constructing pictures of one's life through words, a range of linguistic devices come into operation apart from narrative, in the narrowly defined sense. As Herrnstein Smith puts it,

" it is...useful to to be mindful of the continuities of narrative with all discourse and of the extent to which these definitions and distinctions are drawn, not discovered by narratologists". (Herrnstein Smith, op. cit. p.232).

Labov and Fanshel, for example, identify a form they describe as a "pseudo-narrative", as in the sentence,

"she'll go to the store and get little things..." which "...gives a sequence of the *kinds* of things which occur, implying that there was at least one such actual series of events". (Labov and Fanshel. op. cit. p. 208, italics in the original).

This linguistic feature is commonly used in the interviews under consideration, rather than narrative proper, and is explicable partly in terms of Herrnstein Smith's already mentioned point that it is often difficult to distinguish telling that something happened and that something is the case (Herrnstein Smith, op. cit. p.232). In fact, it can be initially very frustrating for the analyst who searches in vain for well formed examples of

narrative structure, although there is an intuitive recognition that there is here the telling of a story.

But what is at stake is not simply a broadening, or relativisation of what is defined and recognised as elements of stories, which might then be found in any socio-linguistic milieu; rather, it must be recognised that some devices are typical and functional within discourse rooted in orality.

According to Ong, literate cultures have evolved complex grammatical structures and procedures, which have been internalised into the noetic resources employed in speech as well as in writing and print. The potential for the manipulation of complex abstractions has already been discussed and will be again, but one of the key features of literacy which is often taken for granted, is the capacity it introduces for maintaining in "the text a 'line' of continuity outside the mind". (Ong, op.cit.. p.39). The text, and now that would include electronic retrieval systems, creates the possibility of huge stores of memory which it is possible to retrieve or "backloop" into.

With this capacity institutionalised in literacy, and increasingly into the normative speech patterns of what Ong calls secondary orality (ibid. p.136), that is oral discourse which is informed by the noetic processes of literacy, the speech patterns associated with primary orality, or residual orality (where literacy has had only marginal impact), are increasingly seen as

deviant forms in relation to the requirements of literacy. In a magisterial review of research on primary oral cultures (see particularly pp. 31-77), both past and present, Ong argues that such backlooping is impossible, and therefore the mnemonic requirements of discourse tend to produce, despite cultural variations, recognisable discursive and noetic patterns.

We may briefly summarise and highlight for our purposes, some of Ong's key characteristics of orality (ibid. pp. 37-57). Oral discourse is additive rather than subordinate, in the way, for example, that the social worker's narrative employed subordinate clauses; rather, items of knowledge tend to added together.

Bernstein expressed it thus, that, "thoughts are often strung together like beads on a frame rather than following a planned sequence". (Bernstein, 1971, p134). As we shall see, this is not entirely correct since there can be other forms of linguistic organisation in between the poles of simple addition and thematic pre-scripting.

Secondly, orality is aggregative, rather than analytic,

"The elements of orally based thought and expression tend to be not so much simple integers as clusters of integers, such as parallel terms or phrases or clauses..." (Ong, op. cit. p. 38).

Thus, one can expect to find in orally based discourse, extensive use of verbal formulae. Formulaic language is not just "sloppy

speech". or a sign of restricted intelligence: but rather, again for mnemonic functions, provides essential devices to bring together integers of knowledge in predictable fashion.

In orality, there is a premium on bringing and keeping together elements of knowledge, since with only the memory to rely on, any body of knowledge is hard won. Thus, princesses tend to be beautiful, oaks sturdy, and in the case of a mother referring to her difficult daughter repeatedly (Tape 2, side 2, "The Mother's Socializing Responsibility.") as "a compulsive liar", an analytic typology of liars into a range from compulsive to occasional, may be beside the point. And given that aggregated knowledge is so hard won, disaggregation, in the form of analysis, which is central to the noetic economy of literacy, can be threatening. The implications of this characteristic of orality are profound and will be explored more fully in the analysis.

Thirdly, orality is redundant or copious. Without the capacity to backloop into memory stores outside the mind, an utterance vanishes as soon as it is uttered,

"hence the mind must move ahead more slowly, keeping close to the focus of attention much of what it has already dealt with. Redundancy, repetition of the just-said, keeps both hearer and speaker on the track". (ibid., pp. 39-40).

The common error of confusing orality with inarticulacy, is ironic in view of the association of speakers in orality with fullsome, silver tongued volubility.

Fourthly, whereas in text based cultures writing and print can structure knowledge at a distance from lived experience, oral cultures,

"must conceptualise and verbalise all their knowledge with more or less close attention to the human lifeworld, assimilating the alien, objective world to the more immediate, familiar interaction of human beings". (ibid., p. 42).

Fifthly, oral discourse is "agonistically toned". While, as we have already indicated, writing and print make possible abstractions that disengage knowledge from the arena of human struggle and separate the knower from the known, "By keeping knowledge embedded in the human lifeworld, orality situates knowledge within the context of struggle," and verbal formulae do not simply store knowledge, they are also used to "engage others in verbal and intellectual combat". (ibid., p. 44). Clearly combat can be playful as well as deadly, but the essential point is that within such a culture, discourse is not a tool of disinterested reflection.

Moreover, in orality, words are not simply separable from thoughts or things, but are sounded events in time, as expressed

in the Hebrew term *dabar*, meaning both word and event. To make a sound involves power and so,

"Oral man is not so likely to think of words as 'signs', quiescent visual phenomena. Homer (in pre-literacy Greece) refers to them with the standard epithet 'winged words' - which suggests evanescence, power and freedom: words are constantly moving, but by flight, which is a powerful form of movement", (ibid, p. 77).

Thus the tendency to identify words with signs, detachable from their signifieds, variable in meaning, as in a dictionary and recognisable in terms of visual rather than auditory cues, is very much a product of literate cultures (ibid., pp. 75-76).

Finally, oral discourse is situational rather than abstract. This looks like a reprise of Bernstein's point, but as we shall see, there are subtle shifts in the argument here; suffice to point out at this stage that,

"Oral cultures tend to use concepts in situational, operational frames of reference that are minimally abstract in the sense that they remain close to the living human lifeworld". (ibid., p. 49).

While, as has been pointed out, social work clients are disproportionately drawn from the lower working class, among whom

there has been considerable resistance to literacy, it would be unwarrantable to assume complete illiteracy. More research is needed to establish the variations in literacy within the client population and even if writing is little practised, reading may be. However, as Ong argues,

"Readers, whose norms and expectancies for formal discourse are governed by a residually oral mindset relate to a text quite different from readers whose sense of style is radically textual". And, "Even today,..in the United States (and doubtless in other high literacy societies across the globe) readers in certain subcultures are still operating in a basically oral framework, performance oriented rather than information oriented". (ibid. p. 171).

Though this contention awaits solid proof, it remains a good working hypothesis.

CASE STUDY-CLIENT: Mr. Y (Tape 5, side two)

It may help in order to further the analysis by focusing on aspects of one interview in particular, which presents rather rich data on oral discourse. By the social worker's account, Mr. Y, the father of four children who have been left by their mother, is unemployed and living in overcrowded housing conditions labelled as "appalling". The social worker, who knew

that he had convictions for violent assault, considered him to be "constantly fighting authority". He is prone to bouts of depression and is very aggrieved with the council, the landlords, for failing to complete repairs, He claims that he could, and perhaps would, complete the job himself.

There are other problems facing the household, including: violent behaviour outside the home by a son; insufficient household stocks (clothes, sheets etc.); coping with an unemployed and homeless adult couple who are temporarily in residence and possible problems in relating to the children's mother (now ex-wife) who now regularly visits the children. Also present here is Mr. Y's very young cohabitee, who has taken over a parental role with the children.

The verbal style of both Mr. Y and the co-habitee M, is very characteristic of white lower working class subcultures in this part of South London. The following extract of transcript shows the problems with writing which Mr. Y has, and is a good illustration of the "scribe" role which social workers often perform when "speaking for" clients.

- 1 SW: Right (1.1) we can do two things over this if you like
2 I can write on your behalf and then they'll come down
3 and visit/you about it
4 CL: /mm mm
3 SW: or you can write the letter yourself

- 4 CL: (0.5) hm. I've made about four attempts at it
- 5 M: He keep trying it don' you but ()
- 4 SW: Well would you like me to write on your behalf
- 5 CL: Well I'd appreciate it yeh I get started and then I
- 6 think I don't like it c/ause I'm not too bad
- 7 M: /Yeh a couple of words ()
- 8 CL: But I might have to make six attempts at it before I
- 9 finally get it how I want it you know what I mean and
- 10 that's what happens I get the 'ump with it and I throw
- 11 it off the table
- 12 M: Well he showed me a couple of em when 'es written em
- 13 they seem alright to me but if 'es not pleased with em
- 14 he throws em away don't you (laughs).
- 15 SW: Well it's really a question of you know you say you're
- 16 sitting here with not enough to do if you'd like to use
- 17 up your time writing nice little letters to social
- 18 security you can or I can send one off on your behalf if
- 19 you like and ask them to come and see you about it and
- 20 they will want to see you probably or they make take
- 21 (0.3)our word my word for it just like that but usually
- 22 they come down and visit just to make sure that/you
- 23 CL: /No well
- 24 they you know
- 25 SW: in fact got ().

This client clearly accepts the story teller role and discourses at length about a range of invited and uninvited topics, yet

there are very few examples of two or more sequential narrative clauses, in Labov and Waletzky's sense, occurring together. We can however, see in the following exchange a very rare example of a series of sequentially ordered phrases, though even here the tenses used are past perfect (more characteristic of German speech) which in this kind of narrative situation, functions not unlike the conversational historical present, which is employed in reinforcing a dramatic reliving or re-enactment of the scene (Woolfson, 1978). Mr. Y is describing how good the male lodger is in helping him around the house.

26 SW: you start getting the hump=

27 CL: =You know that's what get's me and I think well you

28 ain't got no chance (0.5) you know () Donny's

29 talked about it he's said well. I'm you know he <he said

30 I'll pitch in and help you/yeh while I'm

31 M: /mm

32 CL: here I'll pitch in and help you decorate the place do

33 what you like. Cause he has done like when I was out

34 he's done the windows ent he=

35 M: = Yeh one day he did three windows

36 CL: Ye know what I mean I brought the glass I told you I

37 brought the glass home to do do the job and the timber

38 upstairs. I've got the ump.

39 SW: Yes

40 CL: I've buzzed off/ =he done em

41 M: /he's done it yeh

42 CL: put em in. See 'es willing enough to help you

There are clearly points of continuity with more literate based narratives. In Labov's terms, the client's first turn (L28) provides a minimal abstract, in that it provides a clue to the forthcoming action, "I'll pitch in and help. It also demonstrates the sequential implicativeness of the forthcoming narrative by stating that "Donny's talked about it," linking to the *hump* ('ump) which in this dialect means fed up or depressed. Orientation, which provides indication of time, place and characters emerges in the client's first turn, where he names Donny and in the client's, and M's second turn (L35), which indicate time and place. The narrative is co-produced with the co-habitee, M and with supportive interchange from the social worker.

The complicating action of the narrative proper is contained in the client's third (L35), fourth (L40) and fifth (L42) turns.

This very rare sequence thus runs from, a) brought glass, to b) got the ump, to c) buzzed off, to d) he done em. The links are, however, additive in Ong's terms; there are no conjunctive terms linking the sequences which could provide a rhetorical sense of directive flow to the action and perhaps a motivational push.

This is left to the hearers to divine in terms of a backcloth of shared understanding, evidenced elsewhere partly in this client's very frequent and rapid use of the expression "know what I mean".

As Ong argues, oral cultures are empathetic and participatory rather than objectively distanced. Whereas,

"Writing separates the knower from the known and thus sets up the conditions for 'objectivity', in the sense of personal disengagement or distancing" (Ong, op.cit. p.46), "For an oral culture learning or knowing means achieving close, empathetic, communal identification with the known" (ibid., p.45).

However, evaluation, or point, and resolution are provided in the client's last turn (L40), where, after the action is concluded, the point is reinforced, "See 'es willing enough to help".

This client's characteristic redundancy is visible in the repetition of "I'll pitch in" in his first and second turns, followed with further repetition with "brought the glass" and repetition with slight variation in the client's last two turns with "he done em" (L40) and "put em in" (L42). More subtly, one can also see repetition in the cohabitee's co-producing turns, where she provides a repetitive echo to the client

The aggregative dimension of orality is usually manifested in frequent resort to subculturally standardised expressions or verbal formulae, which can both ease the forward movement of discourse with familiar elements of knowledge and can also, as a feature of redundancy, provide verbal pause or filler while

selecting the next item of performance, in addition to providing disjunct markers and links between episodes of narrative. The use of "know what I mean" has been mentioned. Others which frequently recur in this interview include: "fair enough"; (he) "turned round and said"; "this is it"; "as I say" and "It's the same as.." (which often heralds an example or shift of topic). These verbal formulae are familiar features of South London lower working class speech. Interestingly, the use of "turned round and said" is a particularly pictorial phrase which links a dramatic physical gesture with a spoken, performed utterance as in :

42 CL: You know what I mean and I'd sooner they'd turn round and
43 said no you go got no cha ah well fair enough I know what
44 I'm doing it's like I wanna finish the bathroom what's
45 the use of leaving it as it is

More typical than the rare example of a Labovian narrative just considered, is the use of a broader range of recounting techniques including pseudo-narrative and the fluid mixing of tenses. This style of storytelling dissolves any neat division between a purely "factual" dimension narrative (6) and evaluative dimensions. Rather action is recounted as much for its temporally circular typicality as for its uniqueness, hence the reliance on the past imperfect tense. As both factually and morally laden and often in an agonistic mode, the episodes of the storytelling both recount and provide moral account for the events.

The following extract, following on from a long series of complaints about the council maintenance department, can, from the framework of literacy, look like a tedious, meandering and repetitious list of complaints which does not advance the discourse, in the sense of developing a theme on the social work agenda or any other theme recognisable to literacy. However, on close inspection, it is possible to identify shifts in the client's discourse, which do provide artful links. For Bernstein, this kind of speech, viewed from within the terms of literacy rather than positively from within the terms of orality, involves "a large measure of dislocation or disjunction". (Bernstein, op.cit., p. 134).

Yet between Bernstein's opposition between random stringing together and thematic planfulness lies a characteristically oral mode of connection. Consider this co-produced narrative.

46 SW: They ought to get down here tomorrow or early next week

47 CL: Yeh well as I say all it needs is just the one man/

48 SW: /Yeh

49 CL: =just to look round and he knows what he's looking for you

49 know there's plugs and that alright I'm I'm lucky really

50 cause I know a few blokes in the trade. Alright they'll

51 probably do it for favours but the thing is they're not

52 entitled cause I'm not the type of bloke go running to my

53 mates and say do that for us you know what I mean. I don't

54 like to do it cause you can't afford to give em a drink

55 SW: mm

56 CL: You know an' well it's the same as me the things I've done
57 for blokes you turn round and say no but you always think
58 well it's cost you money well alright a plug how much is a
59 plug today

60 SW: Mm

61 CL: You know what I mean they gotto buy it unless I buy it
62 and then I'll you know really it's a tradesmans job
63 ennit?

64 SW: Yes

65 CL: Well yeh so fair enough he's entitled to a drink of some
66 sort/ but I don't like doing it cause you know yourself

67 SW: /Yeh

68 CL: I'd sooner do it myself struggling on and try and do it
69 myself (1.2) It's the same as that up there I know I know
70 I can get a toilet and sink meself (0.5) and it's going to
71 take me a sight longer to get it but I'll get it

72 SW: Yeh

73 CL: You know what I mean and I'd sooner they'd turn round and
74 said no you go got no cha ah well fair enough I know what
75 I'm doing it's like I wanna finish the bathroom what's
76 the use of leaving it as it is

77 SW: um

78 CL: You know all of that would have been done in in one day/

79 SW: /mm

80 CL: you know. You know I been on jobs just to put a bath shelf
81 round is a two minute job but alright fair enough I know

characteristic of narrative in residual orality rather than as a deviation from a literate model of "well-formed" narrative.

Instead of a theme, we can see here a series of mini-episodes of descriptions of events, reflections on what should be done what the client would like to do, the constraints acting on him, the kinds of fiddles, or corrupt working practices which flourish in the council's employ against a backcloth of generally unfair and inefficient management behaviour.

However, such a summary, within the abstracted language of literacy already does violence to the oral discourse; to assemble these elements into a general theme would compound the felony, because the episodes are constructed as mini-performances within their stream of time.

Through an adroit use of mnemonic formulae, the standard expressions we have indicated, the episodes can trigger off other episodes, which then (to switch metaphors), are stitched together like pieces of cloth in a patchwork quilt. The list of episodes through the client's turns could read thus:

Episode 1, One skilled man should inspect the house (L470).

Ep. 2, Client has mates in the trade--introduced by the self-interruption in client's second turn "I'm Im lucky.." (L49).

Ep. 3, Shift to client and what he has done for folk, introduced by formula, "it's the same as me" in client's third turn (L56).

Ep. 4, Return to problems of having to remunerate "mates in the trade" introduced by "You know what I mean" (L61).

EP.5, Return to 'do it myself', introduced with the formula, "cause you know yourself.." (L66).

Ep. 6, The fiddle , introduced with formula, "fair enough" (L81).

Particular incidents are buried in general classes of past action or possible future action based on past experience. For example, in the client's third turn, reference is made to the kinds of things that the client has done for others. The generalising pattern of utterance reinforces the communal or participative character of the oral discourse, here in its moral dimension.

The stitching together of episodes in oral narratives is termed by Ong rhapsodic (Ong., op.cit., pp. 59-60), in fact the word's Greek root literally means the same. The ability to find or produce links as one proceeds in discourse, can be seen as poetic, tailored to the audience and situation at hand. To shift metaphors once more to the musical meaning of rhapsody, if there is a motif at work in the client's oral narrative stream, it is simply the occasional return, as a reminder, to the motif of, if necessary, "doing the work myself". This operates much as a motif in a rhapsody, which as an impressionistic improvisation in music, might make occasional reference to a simple melodic pattern which can serve as a musical hook for wider explorations. Thus rhapsodic narrative, which is paradigmatic of orality, but operates in probably all forms of unscripted oral discourse, can be seen to operate in that middle ground, which we have

identified, between dislocated, or randomised speech and pre-planned thematic speech.

Perhaps the key point to remember here is probably the most obvious, and hence often missed, which is that *these little episodes are word pictures of scenes from life, or a distillation of such scenes*. The mixing of tenses to heighten dramatic vividness, and the use of figurative imagery like "give em a drink", to refer to payment for cash in hand work, are clear reminders of the priorities set within this type of discourse.

Finally, let us turn to the issue of the relative concreteness or abstraction in clients' discourse; to what extent can we speak of their being propositional?

NARRATIVE AND PROPOSITIONS

The defence of the logical capacities possible in orality, which were made within the broadly pragmatist school, characteristically and ironically demonstrated the essential continuities between oral and literate speech, by translating oral speech back into the expansions and elaborations of literate, linguistic discourse (Labov, 1969). This technique was supplemented by a powerful defence of, what in our terms would be called orality, by Eleanor Leacock. She implicitly challenges Bernstein's characterisation of lower working class speech as concrete rather than abstract by arguing, very effectively, that all speech is abstract, even,

"the simplest act of naming involves abstracting certain features of an object....generalising on the basis of these features, and referring to the object by a series of stylised sounds". (Leacock, 1976, p.325).

Leacock also makes the valuable and useful point that an often unnoticed and certainly undervalued motor of abstraction of lower class speech (particularly among lower class U.S. blacks) is the use of metaphor. Metaphor works on abstracted resemblance from things, situations and so on and sets off a chain of resemblances crystallised in particular images (ibid. p.329). Clearly the figurative component of dialects of residual orality can vary greatly, but as we have indicated, it does play some part in the

discourse of Mr. Y; his use of the subculturally standard term "the 'ump" for what literates call depression is a graphic example, creating a picture of a hunched, downcast deportment.

The main point here, however, is that the simple opposition between concrete and abstract thought is suspect and as Leacock argues, in an echo of Kenneth Burke (1937), even abstractions have metaphoric roots and even scientific enquiry does not escape the process of analogical extension which lies at the heart of metaphoric thought (Leacock, *ibid.*, p.330). It is useful to see the rhapsodic exploration of episodes, which have been identified in Mr. Y's narrative as examples of such a process of analogical extension. The degree of originality clearly varies with the speaker and can often, as Ong points out, simply involve the reshuffling of old formulas and episodic themes (Ong., *op.cit.* p.42). But it is through such a process, it is suggested here, that orality crystallises knowledge, and particularly folk wisdom. As we have seen. Mr. Y's narratives can be accompanied by evaluation, a combined moral and factual distillation of experience.

Yet if orality is not a crude attachment to the here and now and the concrete, are Labov, Leakey, Rosen and their sympathisers correct in denying any essential difference with the abstractions of literacy, and what are the implications for our understanding of social worker/client conversational discourse? These issues will be explored and the methodological contrast with Labov will

be demonstrated through an analysis of propositions and narrative. In "Therapeutic Discourse" (an analysis of an interview between a therapist and a teenage, anorexic girl) (1977), Labov and Fanshel, as in Labov's earlier work, explain what is going on in the interview by means of linguistic expansions of the transcript text. This involves uncovering both the interactions taking place between the parties and also the propositions at work.

However, the same process is also at work within the interview. As they point out,

"One of the specific characteristics of therapy is that both patient and therapist are presumably working towards making some propositions explicit". (Labov and Fanshel, op.cit. p.53), and, "In our own therapeutic session, we will see the therapist making the same kind of strenuous effort to extract and make explicit the general propositions that are implicit in the anecdotes and examples given by the patient". (ibid. p.53).

The twist in the tale is that the therapist, Fanshel, was involved in this process both within the interview and also later with Labov, in his role as linguist.

Following Lennard and Bernstein (1960, p.40), Labov and Fanshel define a proposition as,

"unit of surface structure: 'a verbalisation containing a subject or predicate either expressed or implied'. Lennard and Bernstein paraphrase this as 'the verbal expression of a single idea'; they are dealing with the simpler process of segmenting the words actually spoken. By introducing expansions from the utterances we make it possible to isolate more abstract references, which are fully stated in other points of the interview". (Labov and Fanshel, *ibid.* p. 121).

Earlier, Labov and Fanshel had referred to propositions as,

"predications of some degree of generality -important enough to the interactants to be referred to more than once in the course of an interview or therapeutic session". (*ibid.* p. 121).

They go on to argue that,

"The important characteristic is their use of reference points for the interactive process, which implies the general and abstract character noted above". (*ibid.* p. 121).

However, much hinges around what is meant by the "general and abstract character" of propositions. This seems to posit, by theoretical fiat in advance, a general equivalence in the character and operation of propositions as general, abstract and generative entities for both therapist and client. The concept of proposition is thus both a tool of analysis and is also built

into the culture of the client, whose discourse is under analysis. In other words, in order to study the propositions within a discourse, we employ a concept of proposition which predefines the nature of the object (7) within the terms of literate modes of discourse.

Labov and Fanshel argue that propositions can be communicated by narratives. As we have seen, sometimes a narrative is preceded by an explicit abstract which is "a statement of the general proposition which the narrative will exemplify" (Labov and Fanshel, *ibid.*, pp. 105-106). Also,

"a point may be made by general statements or by giving an instance, normally in the form of a narrative. The narrative mode of argument is the most challenging for the task of isolating the underlying propositions, since the narrative as a whole can be seen as a single speech act whose interactive significance is determined by the evaluative message". (*ibid.*, p. 58).

Sometimes, however, no explicit abstract precedes the narrative, which may follow a request, a challenge or so on. In this case the hearer understands, as does the external analyst, that the narrative plays a role in the discourse similar to that of a single speech act. For Labov and Fanshel, their,

"most general characterisation of the place of narrative in discourse is that it is given as an instance of a general proposition. It is not required that the listener agree to the proposition, or even that he disagree. He must, however, indicate to the narrator that he has understood how this narrative is to be interpreted, that it is intended as evidence for a specific proposition". (ibid. p.109).

This interpretation can be acknowledged in a variety of ways, including agreeing, disagreeing or acknowledging. It is interesting that Labov and Fanshel illustrate this point by referring to a narrative offered by Rhoda (the client) about her aunt, which describes her going out to a store and not getting what she was asked to buy. Labov and Fanshel summarise the narrative as showing "that her aunt is basically helpless" (ibid., p.110). The therapist indicates her understanding of the propositional point by responding with :-

TH: She presents herself as very helpless and needing to be waited on hand and foot

R: Yes

TH: An' she's really used to this in her relationship with mother

R: Yes (breath)

(ibid. p.365).

Here the therapist is using the familiar echo or paraphrasing technique which is emphasised strongly on social workers'

training courses (see Kadushin, 1983, pp. 161-162). It involves an attempt to sum up the gist or essence of what a client has said without slipping into obscure professional or academic jargon (cf. Heritage and Watson, 1979) on formulations in conversations). The client apparently agrees with this formulation or evaluation of her statements, but can we necessarily assume that her agreement indicates that this formulation of a proposition is the same proposition which generated the narrative in the first place? We have no explicit warrant for this. We can, however, note that one possible reading for this interchange is that it involves an educative process, whereby the patient is invited to accept the reformulation of a narrative into an abstract statement. Now this lies at the very heart of the process of translation between the oral discourse of many clients and the literate based discourse of social workers.

The alternative view of narrative, at least in oral and residually oral discourse, which is developed here, is that narratives cannot be seen simply as illustrative examples of logically prior propositions. They perform other, more central functions. Rather than examples, they should be seen as exemplars, or paradigm of good practice (Dreyfus, H and Rabinow, P, 1982, p. 198). An exemplar is not reducible to an abstract set of rules or propositions, which it illustrates in a deductive fashion. Rather, it is a case study or benchmark of good practice, which can serve as an inspiration to others, or to oneself, about how to act or not to act.

In our use of the term here, it can also provide graphic depictions of life circumstances, which simultaneously describe what has and might happen and also make moral points about the actions embedded in the exemplar. Let us explore these issues by examining an extract from an interview ("The Hostile Client", Tape 5, Side 1) with a lower working class mother who has a history of conflict with the social services department. Her children are on the "at risk" register and she is seen by the social worker to take an antagonistic stance in most situations. Her son Simon is seen as having behaviour problems at school. He has been accused of frightening and bullying other children; the most recent incident of which he has been accused is of pinching another boy, Mathew, at school.

111 CL: And I was standing there so she said mm. The other day
112 Mathew had a temperature. If he had a temperature they'd
113 have sent him home and Simon kept pinching him. Well he
114 goes (laughing).

115 SW: mm

116 CL: No then I shall turn round and say well, what's Mathew
117 been doing to Simon

118 SW: Is the teacher a fair person=

119 CL: =Yeh I think she is I just, I just no if I go next time
120 and she says Simon's been pinching Mathew well I shall
121 just say why there must be a reason (2.0) well if she
122 says well his mother said no ().

124 SW: Yes but his mother's only going on Mathew's word for it

125 CL: That's what I mean see they don't stop and say what did
126 you do to Simon

127 SW: Well it sounds a little bit as if the teacher was saying
128 that if she=

129 CL: =Or why did Simon do it, so if I go in there tonight and
130 they say Simon, well I shall say did you find out from
131 his mother why. she said well his mother said that eh
132 well he was just sitting there and Simon came up and I
133 shall tell her I'm not interested

134 SW: But it sounds well you know I think she's used to having
135 to deal with this sort of thing because kids of that age=

136 CL: =Well of course they are if the woman says anything to
137 me, the mother of the child I shall just tell her to grow
138 up

139 SW: mm

(The Hostile Client)

What seems to begin as an "orthodox" narrative (L 112), quickly turns into pseudo-narrative (L's 116-117, 119-123, 129-133), which emphasises the moral, or legitimating dimension. The narrative can be seen as explaining and justifying Simon's behaviour, and of course, as the mother responsible for his character and behaviour, her own behaviour. But in these largely fictional "as if" story scenes, rhapsodically moving from one hypothesised mini-scene to the next, the emphasis is on painting a holistic picture of the situation in which these moral dilemmas could be played out. This is an instance of what Levi-Strauss

(1966, p.245) has described as the totalising tendency in, what he called, the savage mind, but which Ong calls the oral mind (Ong, op.cit., p.175)

It is not suggested that the type of reasoning involved here is, in Lévy-Bruhl's terms, magical or pre-logical. But it is, argues Ong, situational, geared to the immediate practical problems of life (Luria, 1976, and Ong, pp.52-57). It is only with an inculcation into literacy, that individuals could operate with syllogistic and inferential reasoning. Unless one has been fully socialised into its mysteries, that style of logic is seen as irrelevant to the life problems of the primary or residually oral. While situations or problems can be compared and evaluated analogically, moving from exemplar to exemplar, linked perhaps with verbal formulae of folk wisdom, this must not be confused with the disaggregating, analytic modes of discourse associated with syllogistic and inferential reasoning.

Furthermore, pre- and semi-literates find the articulation of self-analysis difficult. As Ong puts it,

"Self- analysis requires a certain demolition of situational thinking. It calls for the isolation of the self, around which the entire lived world swirls for each individual person, removal of the centre of that situation from that situation enough to allow the centre, the self, to be examined and described". (Ong, op.cit., p.54).

But such text-based literate processes are exactly what lies behind, and occasionally on the surface, of social workers' discourse, the invitation to the client to enter into discourse in which, despite the hopeful avoidance of social science jargon, the client can begin to make an object of herself and the relationships within which she is enmeshed, and which can be examined in a disaggregated, more analytic mode. Clearly, there are dangers in exaggerating the gap between literate and illiterate, or in sliding into a linguistic reductionism where other structural factors are ignored. Yet equally, there are dangers in underestimating the barriers, in the form of the types of discourse and their accompanying noetic resources, which provide the conditions of possibility for a practical translation of the social work discourses into the discourses of clients.

We can sum up by emphasising that the form and operation of narratives do vary with the strategic environment in which they are located, but that it is insufficient to identify the context of narrative production just in terms of the immediate interpersonal setting. Narrative also varies with its location within collectively institutionalised and historically constructed forms of discourse. Moreover, subjects are not universally standardised, and are not simply users of discourse; rather, discourse and subject forms are mutually dependant.

CHAPTER SEVEN

ORCHESTRATION TO REGULATION (The Dynamics of Normalisation)

ORCHESTRATION, A NON-HUMANIST APPROACH

We have already argued that though literate based professional discourses within the profession impinge on the working discourses of social workers with their colleagues and their clients; the working discourses are not simply reducible to those professional discourses. We shall see that though the themes of instructional discourse about interviewing are addressed within social workers' accounts of interviewing practice, that practice can differ from the norms set by instructional discourse. In this chapter we will examine, by means of a series of case study analyses of interviews, some of the key processes involved in orchestration of interviews and the attempts to shift towards educative discourse.

The musical analogy underlying the use of the term 'orchestration' must be treated with caution. In music there is usually a division of labour between the orchestration of a musical score and the conducting of a performance. Here the term orchestration, in effect, refers to both processes. An unfortunate consequence is that it may give the impression that the participant, described as holding the orchestrator's

"baton" is personally in control of the discourse, in some way authoring it. On the contrary, the process of orchestration is not to be understood as simply the product of individual action. Orchestration is a collective process, involving all the participants. Without the orchestra playing, there is little point in the conductor waving his baton. Similarly, in the case of interviews, the process of orchestration, which we will describe, is built on a complex of conditions which make it possible. For example, in the analysis of T9S1, where the social worker felt she had very little "power", In the experiential/phenomenological sense of the term, and where, for most of the interview, the baton seemed to be with the client, we argue that her very "control" in that situation, is based upon the distribution of subject positions and speaking rights already set up in the situation. Moreover, at the least, the client's monopoly of speaking rights, which prevented a shift towards regulative/educative discourse, still drew her into the nexus of disciplinary power relations.

We should note here that Dingwall, writing within an interpretive approach to discourse analysis, also uses the metaphor of orchestration (Dingwall, R., 1980). We must recognise the usefulness of Dingwall's concepts, yet also indicate the differences between his formulations and those of this thesis. Following Goffman (1975), he argues that the concern of conversation analysts to develop general models of speech exchange, while useful, have shifted the emphasis of attention too far away from the contextual features which are essential components of

speech exchange. Rather than seeing the mundane conversation as the general and major object of analysis, as it has been in conversation analysis, it should be seen as one type of speech exchange system. The proper goal for analysis should be the comparative study of speech exchange systems, which duly accounts for local, contextual, in addition to universal, properties of speech exchange (Dingwall, 1980, p.153).

Thus in mundane conversations, particularly two party conversations, there is a fairly open range of possible topics, unpredictable in advance (Atkinson, J.M., 1982, p.108). And the rules governing turn-taking help to regulate the flow of talk and manage the scarce local resource of attention (Dingwall, 1980, p.157). The turn taking apparatus,

"in the mundane conversation incorporates preference for next to last as 'next' speaker which provides a motive for reciprocal mutual attention. Where there are only two parties, there can be no doubt who is likely to be required to speak next and to demonstrate that they have been paying attention by producing a sequentially relevant utterance." (ibid., p.157)

By contrast, and on the basis of his analysis of the organisation of talk in courtroom settings, Atkinson argues that in multi-party settings, there is usually a closely constrained topic focus, and the functional requirements to maintain shared attention and regulate turn taking, generate the need for clear rules of procedure, which pre-

allocate turn taking and provide the authority for 'turn-mediators' (eg. judges) to decide who should speak next (Atkinson, op. cit. p.108). Thus, pre-allocated speech exchange systems could be seen to lie at the other end of the spectrum to the mundane conversation.

Dingwall, through his analysis of multi-party tutorials in a training school for health visitors, argues that one can identify an orchestrated encounter as a speech exchange system which lies in an intermediate position between the mundane conversation and the pre-allocated setting. This distinction is made, not so much on the basis of differences in numbers, as on the basis of the purpose of the encounter and the problems in maintaining a shared orientation to it (Dingwall, op. cit., p.157). Formal rules of procedure are necessarily more salient in pre-allocated encounters than in orchestrated encounters, where there are at best, as in a tutorial, informal expectations about how an orchestrator, like the tutor, should behave. In essence, in the latter case, control is role centred, rather than rule centred (Dingwall, 1980, p.169).

Thus,

"An orchestrated encounter is characterised by the cession of the right to organise speech exchange to one of the parties for the duration of the encounter. Examples of such organisation include that that party may act as an authorised starter and closer and as an

arbiter of the distribution of the right to hold the floor and to introduce new topics" (ibid., p.169). Moreover, "even two-party encounters may be orchestrated or pre-allocated. Examples of the former might include interviews and professional-client consultations where one party is trying to sustain a particular thematic orientation and to keep the other addressing that theme, rather than introducing themes of his own" (ibid. p.169).

Thus, orchestration, for Dingwall, refers to settings in which there are clear directing roles (or subject positions) operating. This is particularly visible in organisational contexts, like a training college, where there are openly legitimated, hierarchical role divisions (ibid., p.171). The view that professional-client encounters may be usefully characterised as orchestrated in this way, is rather similar to the characterisation of professional-client talk presented by Atkinson, including the view that such talk tends to be mono-topical and conducted within question-answer sequences, with the orchestrator doing most of the questioning (Atkinson, 1982, p.111). But how useful is this view of orchestration in professional-client relations for our purposes?

It has already been argued in chapter five, that in terms of the distinctions drawn by Jefferson and Lee (1981), 'at least in relation to the limited range of interviews considered here, social work interviews embody elements of both the service encounter and troubles-telling. Given the priority placed on allocating a storyteller subject position

to the client and the discouragement in instructional discourse of adopting rigid question and answer interrogation style techniques, it is not surprising that, as in the adoption interview examined in chapter five, such procedures, and an overtly orchestrating subject position adopted by the social worker, could be registered as deviant, leading to the client "clamping up", and proving a barrier to the move towards educative discourse. Thus our use of the term orchestration is not so tightly attached to organisationally legitimated role divisions, particularly when, as we have argued, the authorities of delimitation for the social work profession are not as clearly institutionalised as for many other professions.

Rather, in this thesis, orchestration refers more to a range of discursive tactics, which may operate when either the social worker or the client holds the baton. But clearly, when we refer to a well orchestrated interview, this tends to refer to a judgement of the value of the orchestration from the point of view of the discursive priorities set from within social work discourses. In principle it could also refer, for example, to priorities of resistance set by clients' discourses. However, while the formulations of Atkinson and Dingwall provide stimulating ideal types, which can offer a useful set of contrasts when trying to pin down what is specific to social work interviews, in contrast to other discursive settings, there are, nevertheless, limits to the usefulness of the exercise.

Dingwall's and Atkinson's Goffmanite focus on contextually specific speech exchange systems is a useful advance on the focus on abstract, general properties of conversation. Yet, as we argued in chapter two, our notion of a confessional strategic environment differs from Goffman's notion of a strategic environment, consisting, ultimately, of a rule bound, mutually monitored encounter between subjects, considered as the authors of their utterances, or actions. Here, we do not make these humanist assumptions about the subject. Rather, participants in discourse are seen as bearers of forms of discourse and discursive tactics and strategies. Dingwall comes closest to this position in a cryptic reference to the broader cultural contexts of speech exchange (Dingwall, *op. cit.*, p.171). As always this remains the sticking point for rapprochement between the divergent approaches to discourse analysis.

Despite the useful insights of the interpretive theorists, their focus on a range of speech exchange systems constructs those systems as a particular set of objects and concerns in an academic regime of truth. Within that regime, there is a tendency to abstract linguistic dimensions of discursive practices from the broader dimensions of those practices (which include material practices, forms of organisation, architectural arrangements and so on, both within and without the immediate interpersonal setting) in order to compare and contrast them. Of course, one cannot investigate everything simultaneously and this thesis, at times, may appear to err towards a similar abstraction of linguistic dimensions. At the least, this danger must be recognised. Our

agenda here is different, the only effective way into an understanding of particular, small scale discursive settings lies through the broader environing discursive practices. In our case this is provided by a theory of the construction of biopolitical citizenship; though the movement in research should not simply move always deductively in one direction.

Furthermore, despite their contextual orientation, like other conversation analysts, Dingwall and Atkinson construct a notion of the mundane conversation as a supra historical and culturally universal base point for contrasts with other forms of speech. It may turn out to be a generalisation from forms specific to advanced, modern cultures. For example, what is characterised in this thesis as "citizen exchange", is a form of speech which is grounded in the democratic, individualist ethical constructions of citizenship, which are, in part, constructed through the practices of the normalising professions, rather than being considered a given feature of everyday culture. Where hierarchical relations are considered to be the norm and egalitarian relations an exception, would one expect to find the same expectations about give and take operating in conversations? This is an important empirical question for historical and cross-cultural research. In addition, to what extent, in "mundane conversations", is there topic openness? Even conversations between friends can revolve around a recurrent, limited agenda of topics. And we are usually familiar with taboos on topic

choice in a range of contexts where there may be, apparently, an open range of conversational topics.

But, let us now return to a brief survey of the aims of the chapter. This chapter takes up and extends some of the issues related to the distribution of subject positions and the moves towards educative discourse, which were introduced in chapter five. As we explained in chapter one, in that earlier chapter, our main concerns were with the synchronic analysis of the links between subject positioning within interviews and the broader themes of historically produced social work discourses. In addition, we were concerned with the environing discourses linking the social worker, as a relay, with other agencies of normalisation and administration, like public utilities, social security and so forth. Here, we take up those themes in a more diachronically focused analysis of discursive exchanges within the interview. Again, it is important to emphasise that we are less concerned with exchange between biographically unique individuals than with regarding those individuals as bearers of forms of discourse. A major theme will be the relationship between rhapsodic and thematic forms of discourse.

The chapter will be organised as follows:-----

Section One, Forms of Orchestration.

In this section, we work through a series -in two parts- of case studies, functioning as exemplars of contrastive interview processes which show the links between rhapsodic and thematic modes of discourse and orchestration where either the social worker or the client effectively has the baton. In the first case, the social worker retains the baton but at the expense of the client not adopting the confessional /storyteller subject position; this is illustrated via an analysis of tape four, side one ("The Passive Client"). In the second case, the retention of the baton by the social worker is accompanied by a harmony of client and social worker themes; here we examine tape two, side one, ("The Adoption Interview"). In the third case, we examine tape nine, side two, ("The Orchestrating Client"), in which the client holds the baton and the interview is characterised by resistance by the client. Yet, even in her resistance, the client is still circumscribed by, and drawn into, the disciplinary nexus. Thus, this section includes an analysis of narrative, power and resistance.

Section Two, Educative Discourse.

In this section, we take up themes already introduced and focus more precisely on the tentative stages on the path towards regulative/educative discourse. First we examine the role of indirection in interviewing, that we suspect is a crucial feature of social work interviewing. This involves the need for ambiguous and mitigated discursive forms within fragile social worker/client relationships,

where it is essential, to perform the core monitoring/hierarchical surveillance function, to establish rapport with the client and retain her/his cooperation. We show how with one client (T5S1, "The Hostile Client"), there is a partial shift towards educative discourse, which coexists with the operation of a characteristically oral form of logic - which we have discussed in the previous chapter - inimical to educative discourse.

Secondly, in exploring the operation of subtle, mitigated paraphrasing techniques in tape nine, side two, ("Mr. Y"), we shed light on some of the most potent means available to the skilled social worker to draw the client towards regulative discourse within the indirect mode of interviewing. In the social worker's account, this interview illustrates the usefulness of modern casework techniques in attempting to get through to a client who had had a long history of conflictual relationships with social workers. But note here, that unlike in the interview with the Hostile Client, where the social worker's speaking rights are almost denied, in this interview, the social worker is able to intervene effectively; the discourse thus takes on the character of an exchange, which we would argue is usually necessary for the operation of regulative discourse proper. However, even in this case, the interview hardly takes on the features of full regulation, in part because of the predominance in the client's discourse of a rhapsodic narrative style, which functions as a form of resistance to the literate based, thematic, educative discourse of the social worker.

Thirdly, we return, once more to the Good Social Work Subject, making the nursery application, and contrast the thematic approach to the payment of bills, at work in her discourse, with that in the interview with The Hostile Client. Here is an interview in which it is difficult to attribute the baton of orchestration. The social worker and client themes entwine each other in perfect harmony and the client produces herself as the good social mother/citizen, temporarily in need of support. She is supported by the normalising agents, who draw her back into the status of full "citizenship" as a competent member of the sphere of liberal government.

SECTION ONE:-- RHAPSODY AND THEME AND HOLDING THE BATON

A form of analysis which confines itself to the surface forms of conversational discourse, and disallows, for analytical purposes, reference to other discursive settings and processes which provide the conditions of possibility for the surface forms, would miss the significance of the literate, professional social work discourses which provide an underlying agenda of concerns and principles of relevance. These concerns, as we have argued in the earlier chapters, do have some thematic coherence. A process recording about the interview, later written up by the social worker for the records, may draw out information collated from different parts of the conversation into themes which are relevant to the agenda of interests, both those which were highlighted in advance of the interview and also those which emerged as important and relevant issues in the course of the interview and which form elements of the broad agenda of relevant issues for professional social work. But the interview itself may appear to have a very rhapsodic surface form which makes it seem little different to any other "chatty", spontaneous conversation between friends or acquaintances on an equal level to each other.

Let us emphasise that in view of the historically produced, underlying agenda of discursive themes which provide the conditions of possibility of the interviews of trained social workers, inculcated into the professional cultures of social work, most interviews could be viewed,

from the perspective of the social worker's discourses as guided by literacy based themes. These often operate under the surface of the talk. The openness of the range of thematic issues is such that an interview which may not, on the surface, appear to follow any thematic structure, could, when viewed against a broader temporal span, be seen as part of a grand thematic structure of interviews. For example, a first interview with a client may be a general ventilating session, which randomly covers a range of issues. But this could prove a useful prelude to more thematically focussed later interviews.

However, while all interviews, in the broad sense, could be seen, at least potentially, as informed by an underlying thematic agenda, the links between the underlying agenda of social work issues and surface talk are likely to be part of a long chain, unless the social worker is able to exercise the skills of orchestration in moving along the topics raised, whether those topics are initially raised by the social worker or by the client. Thus, a well orchestrated interview, from the social work perspective, facilitates the links from subtext to surface level discourse (it is not, of course, impossible for a client to orchestrate an interview according to her own agenda of concerns, or resistances to those of the social worker).

Interviews are co-produced stretches of conversational discourse. As such, the exchanges between social workers' and clients' talk form a constituent whole and are not simply the sum of the separate

utterances of the participants. But where the client's discourse is rooted in residual orality, as is that of Mr. Y, analysed in chapter six, and/or is resistant to educative aims of social work discourse, it is likely that where the client holds the dominant speaking rights, the jointly produced narrative is likely to be rhapsodic in form, even if underneath that surface, the topics are being subtly shifted along by the social worker. When the dominant surface form is rhapsodic, topics shift from one to another, with perhaps some spontaneous link through association, but no visible and clearly orchestrated attempt to draw thematic links between the topics so raised, or a move towards some general construction of thematic shape through a resolution.

However, in interviews like "The Good Social Work Subject", or "The Adoption Interview", where there is harmony between the social worker's thematic concerns and those of the client, the surface of the co-produced discourse is likely to come nearer to the thematically based discourse of the social worker. Nevertheless, bearing all this in mind, it could be confusing to use the terms rhapsodic and thematic to refer both to the forms of discourse, of which the participants are bearers and also to the notion of a well orchestrated discourse, which is kept to a thematic agenda. We will, therefore, use the terms rhapsodic and thematic principally to refer to the dominant characteristics of the discourse of a participant.

Let us explore these issues by examining a series of exemplars of interviews which illustrate some of the variations we have been identifying. The purpose of this analysis is, of course, to begin to identify and refine exemplars of key processes at work in interviews, which can provide a basis for further work with larger samples of interviews; it is not claimed here that this analysis should be seen as definitive.

ORCHESTRATION WITH BATON

The orchestrator's "baton" in the interview consists largely of his or her skills in raising and redirecting topics, in rephrasing the clients' utterances and drawing clients into an educative social work discourse. We will examine the processes involved in the latter in a later section on indirection; at this stage we will focus on the former interviewing skills, which are the conditions of possibility for drawing clients into educative discourse.

In the first exemplar, we will, briefly examine an interview (T4S1, "The Passive Client") which has already been the subject of some analysis in the chapter on mothers in conversational discourse between a male social worker and a young mother who has large fuel and other debts. There is the danger of the family's mortgage being foreclosed and the house being repossessed by the building society. This client has had intermittent contact with the social services department for two years

prior to the interview; the social worker has classified the client's problem as one of debts. There is no obvious attempt to portray the debts, in the classical terms of the psychosocial strategy, as surface, presenting problems which are indicators of underlying "real" problems in the client's personal relationships or personality structure.

As we noted in the earlier chapter, the social worker operates within the terms of an advocate's subject position, devising strategies to intercede on behalf of the client with her creditors, and trying to persuade the client to enter into a more rational set of discursive practices in order to reduce her debts. Given an abandonment of the relevance of psychosocial practices in this case, with its attendant requirement to encourage the client take on a confessional, story teller subject position, this social worker is able to retain a tight control over the discourse. He does most of the talking throughout, with the client mainly responding briefly to his requests for information or supplying supportive responses, like "yeh" (Labov and Fanshel, op. cit. p.60). The transcript extracts in the earlier chapter were very representative of the pattern of the talk throughout the interview. Since the social worker is devising the debt reducing strategy, he is able to control the introduction and shifts of topics.

Let us examine an instance where topics could have been shifted or developed in ways which may have taken the discourse beyond the narrowly instrumental level, if indeed that were considered to be

relevant to the social worker's underlying agenda. In fact the opportunity was not seized either by the social worker or by the client. It is worthy of note that the client's husband had recently left her and the children for a period. This had happened before and was, in part, responsible for the family's debt problems. Having talked about how to stagger payments for arrears on local authority rates, the social worker says,--

26 SW5: But apart from that, things are going quite well?

27 CL: Yeh, no more problems.

28 SW5: Yeh apart from being overcrowded I suppose.

29 CL: Well (laughs) ah (to the child) pack it in.

30 SW5: Oh dear (2.0) think perhaps he's beyond coping with.

31 CL: (laughs) No he's alright-alright aren't you really? (3.5)

32 SW5: How are you getting on with hubby now, alright, I mean things
33 are a bit better / 'cause he went away for a stretch didn't he

34 CL: /Yeh /how

35 he's got this new job.

36 SW5: Which job is that, still with the laundry?

37 CL: Used to be security, I never used to see him much.

This was followed by a brief discussion, in a question and answer mode, about the husband's job.

The story teller subject position was not established for the client. The social worker's opening turn, "...things are going quite well?" (L26) is ambiguous as a question form. It could be seen as a rhetorical statement which does not invite an elaborated reply, anticipating a "no problems" answer. Again, the social worker's fourth turn, "How are you getting on with hubby?" (L32), supplies its own answer, "alright." While the form of the question does not automatically rule out a reply in the negative, which could serve as a prelude to an extended confession about marital difficulties, nevertheless, it hardly invites such a response, the subtext may be expressed as "tell me something upbeat." Thus, in this vein, the social worker is able, via a tight orchestrating role, to maintain a closely orchestrated and brief interview structure. There is little room for a rhapsodic drift of topics, and the main rationale for this is that the client's problems are only recognised in terms of debts, with the attendant necessity to focus on devising strategies to reduce those debts.

The price to be paid for such tightly orchestrated, goal oriented interviews, is that the monitoring function, beyond the practical financial issues, is severely curtailed. Furthermore, the discursive style of this interview offers little room for the operation of educative discourse, in the sense that the mainly passive speaking rights and duties established in this interview for the client barely invite her to participate actively in reflecting on her own feelings and her own part in reproducing the emotional and material problems she

faces. As we have argued, the latter are central themes within the psycho-social strategy. In the following section we will examine an interview which is characterised by the forms of orchestration and thematisation which are among the preconditions for educative discourse.

HARMONIZING ORCHESTRATION

The interview which we examined earlier, with the adopting mother (T2S2), can be seen as an exemplar of an interview which conforms well to the rubrics of instructional discourse that were discussed in the previous chapter. We have here an interview in which the subject positions are established in such a way that the social worker is able to make a series of interventions which are related to the underlying themes of professional discourse with respect to adoption. These, in turn, elicit a rich seam of confessional information from the client-as-story teller and as good social work subject. While the client produces a rich narrative stream, this stream is largely thematic in that its stories are focused on the points raised by the social worker's interventions. Also, she accedes to the rights of the social worker to orchestrate the interview and introduce the main topical themes. Even though at the outset, the client defines the interview as a means for the social worker to "check up" on her, this does not prevent the client from opening up a narrative stream. There is thus little overt conflict or resistance between the participants. The surveillance, or monitoring

function of the interview is acknowledged as a legitimate enterprise with which the client should cooperate.

We can distinguish, in the orchestrating skills operating here, between three types of topic direction: firstly, there is the topic shift, whereby the orchestrator takes advantage of a pause in the discourse or a silence, to effect a more or less radical shift in subject matter, one which is not demonstratively linked, in a sequential way, to the immediately preceding discourse; secondly, there is the redirection of an existing topic, perhaps by seizing on a topic raised by the client, which is related to the underlying agenda set by professional social work discourses; thirdly, there is the more commonly used "prompt" device which encourages further flow and can operate through a variety of linguistic means; these may include open and closed questions, supportive gestures like "mm" and simple echo responses, remarks which mirror the immediately preceding utterance of the other speaker.

However, as we have already indicated (and which point we will pursue in a later section), the client can also use the orchestrator's baton and redirect topics in directions relating to his or her own concerns, or in avoidance of the social worker's preferred topics. In the following extract of the transcript, we will illustrate how, characteristically in this interview, the social worker uses a pause in the discourse to effect a topic change. This, in turn, produces a narrative by the client which, in monologic terms, is thematically

structured and also related directly to the themes of social work discourse which provide a rationale for this interview.

After a discussion about how to explain the introduction of a new baby to the client's older daughter, there is a pause, followed by what we earlier described as an invitation to tell a story (Cuff and Francis, op. cit.). As we have indicated, this invitation must be seen as part of the strategy to build up a client subject position as story teller; yet at this stage and with this client, the invitation is specifically focussed and remains largely within the orchestrating control of the social worker, while still producing rich, relevant, confessional narrative materials.

90 SW: Tell me a little about yourself.

91 CL: (4.5) Well (laughs) what would you like to know, where do I
92 start?

93 SW: I don't know, right from the very beginning. You were brought
94 up in Ireland were you?

95 CL: I was born in Ireland.

96 SW: Lost your accent very well.

97 CL: Well I came to live here when I was thirteen, was at school
98 here a couple of years.

99 SW: Mm.

100 CL: But my parents were divorced, so I was brought up by my
101 grandparents and when I came to live I used to come here

102 every year on holiday, 'till I was thirteen.

103 SW: One of your parents lived here did they?

104 CL: Both of them lived here.

105 SW: Both of them.

106 CL: I used to come to my father and my father used to come and

107 see me, and my mother occasionally phoned me, but she got

108 married again you know, so ehm I used to come here every

109 year on holidays and when I was thirteen my grandmother was

110 getting old you know and I came to live with my father, he

111 got a flat so that I could you know cope as well ().

112 SW: You were the only child were you?

113 CL: Yes that's why I another reason I didn't want just to have

114 one child 'cause it's a very lonely life you know in lots of

115 ways. You get lots of clothes and toys that other children

116 don't, you know, have. But even now, I think it's nice to have

117 a brother or sister you know ehm and ehm there's a big age

118 gap between those (the older daughter and the baby) but I

119 mean, when they're in their in their twenties, thirties, it

120 won't be any different. So.

121 SW: They'll have an advantage in a way, they'll both be only

122 children.

We can note that this narrative is co-produced by both social worker and client, with occasional prompts by the client helping to produce narrative flow and keep it on a line which is relevant to social work

themes. For example, "SW: One of your parents lived there, did they?" (L103), functions both as a closed question seeking a specific reply about "fact", and also as an encouragement (which yielded fruit after an echo response, "SW: Both of them."-L105) to supply further narrative information. The social worker's seventh turn (L112) functions similarly. However, the social worker's orchestrating role here should not be exaggerated, since the client produces a thematic flow, largely under her own direction. Like many spontaneously composed oral stories, the client's has rhapsodic elements, in that there are a series of mini-episodes, tangentially related to the main theme, which could be said to have the status of free clauses introduced into the narrative. Yet, they are not truly rhapsodic in the radical sense, as in the case of Mr. Y's story which we examined in the chapter on narrative. Rather, their very tangential status feeds upon the fact that there is a sequential narrative theme running through the story. As we argued in that chapter, "extraneous" elements gain their discursive significance from their systematic relationship to the overall narrative theme.

In Labov and Waletzky's terms, the core elements of narrative are present here in the temporally sequential statements which form the skeleton of the story (Labov and Waletzky, op.cit.). Thus, the first item at the client's third turn, "I was born in Ireland" (95), is followed by the sequentially ordered statement at the client's third turn, "Well I came to live here. When I was thirteen was at school here a couple of years" (L's 97-98). This, however, creates a vacuum, what had happened

in the intervening years? The client's next turn (L's 100-102) fills in the gap with the information that her parents were divorced and she was brought up by her grandmother. This narrative develops further and was reproduced earlier in the chapter. The client revealed that she had married at nineteen, had her daughter, Caroline, when she was twenty one and later suffered damage to both of her fallopian tubes, making further pregnancies very unlikely.

Around this narrative skeleton, the flesh of her key life events was built up, without strict concern for linear sequence (Herrnstein Smith, op. cit. p.232). The concern here is as much with the routine patterns of *la longue durée* of her biography, as with recounting the watershed events. This is revealed in the use of the past imperfect tense, as in the client's sixth turn, "I used to come to my father....." (L106). The use of the past imperfect tense is particularly apposite when explaining about the affective relationship, whose temporal existence clearly transcends the individual moment; the latter is more adequately produced linguistically by, for example the past, past perfect and pluperfect tenses. Moreover, this turn is particularly revealing about the affective biography of the client, since it shows that her pattern of contact indicates a closer relationship with her father than with her mother, and clues about the client's sense of the links between her early experiences and her desire to provide a sibling for her daughter.

The social worker's seventh turn, "You were the only child were you?" (L112), functions as a crucial prompt and redirecting device. The client's seventh turn (L113), which follows the prompt, provides an internal evaluation of her narrative; she demonstrates a sensitivity towards her own motivations towards adoption which can be considered, in terms of our argument, a characteristic of the good social work subject, who accepts the need for reflection and possibly education. Here, she draws a link between her having been an only child and her not wanting her daughter to grow up, similarly, as an only child. Furthermore, despite the age gap between the two girls, in adult life they, hopefully, will be able to provide a support for each other, which the client has not been able to enjoy from a sibling.

More deeply, the thematic basis of the client's narrative is revealed in the overall shape of her autobiography. Her summing up of her life in a few minutes was clearly geared to the underlying social work purpose at hand, the assessment of the client and her family's suitability for adoption, which purpose the client had accepted as legitimate. In this sense, the client's evaluation of her own motivations is a central thematic principle which helps to explain the particular selection of life events and life states for inclusion in this narrative. We must also remember that this client has experienced an exhaustive assessment process with an adoption agency, so that even though this is her first interview with the social worker, she must count as an experienced client, in that she has become aware of adoption assessment criteria

already. Unlike two other experienced clients we are considering in the course of this thesis, however, the client's knowledge is not used to monopolise speaking rights within the interview. Rather, her narrative productions are geared towards the social work agenda, and are gently steered without resistance, by the social worker as orchestrator.

Let us examine another topic area within the interview, which exemplifies the close links between the social worker's orchestration, the underlying social work agenda and the client's discourse. In reviewing the ideological and knowledge bases of adoption practice, Hapgood argues that,

"The notion of matching has changed considerably in recent years. An initial concern with the physical matching of child and adoptive parents has largely been replaced with a greater emphasis on matching in terms of the individual child's needs and what a family has to offer." (Hapgood, 1984, p.76).

Thus, biological, and perhaps eugenicist concerns with finding a convincing substitute for biological parentage, which would generally pass for normal, give way to a more sociological view of parent/child relations, as socially constructed. We can see in the following transcript how both social worker and client collude in such a view.

123 SW: Was she (referring to the older daughter) a particularly
124 rumbustious child?

125 CL: She was a very good baby. When she was a baby from when

126 she started walking she was into mischief all the time and in

127 fact she can still get herself into mischief.

128 SW: Oh quite easily.

129 CL: But ehm. But she was a very good baby as well, she would sleep

130 through the night, she was no problem so I can see what I'm in

131 for. Quiet babies might turn out the same (laugh). In fact they

132 could very well have been sisters. Because they're so much

133 alike as babies.

134 SW: Do you think there was ever a great deal of matching up?

135 CL: Well, to look at her, you wouldn't think so, because she's got

136 blonde hair and blue eyes, but err em. You know we're all brown

137 eyed, but looking at photographs of Caroline, I can see, but it

137 may just be that I want to, I can see a resemblance. But I

139 suppose it isn't there. It's probably my imagination (laughs).

140 SW: You grow like the family you're with. It's like animals, isn't it.

141 Has Caroline got brown eyes as well? =

142 CL: =Yes.

143 SW: You'll get hers as permanently set blue now, not going to be

144 altered.

145 CL: I don't know but she's so fair, that they're probably usually

146 SW: Know what colour her mum was?

147 CL: She was fair as well yes.

148 SW: Yes, I think they're blue and her daddy was fair as well. Had

149 grey eyes. I can remember that much () But one of them

150 had grey eyes (laughs) so she's bound to be =

151 SW: Slightly different.

152 CL: Mm.

153 SW: So there wasn't that amount of matching up?

154 CL: Well I suppose they did because when Sister Veronica phoned me

155 she said we'd like you to come and see this little girl. Are

156 you disappointed it's a girl, would you like a boy, and I said

157 no no, I'll come and see her and she said well obviously you

158 don't have to take her, but this baby is so right for your

159 family. So they must have, there must be something.

160 SW: So right for your family=

161 CL: =Matching up yes, fits in perfectly the background of the

162 families, so.

163 SW: Yes, I think that's more important than colouring.

164 CL: Yes.

165 SW: There's a lot to do with background, what we inherit from our

166 forefathers. So therefore, her background, you know it's very

167 similar to yours, she won't feel left out at all.

168 CL: Mm.

(The Adoption Interview)

We can see how in the client's second turn (L's135-139), she compares the two girls as babies and says they could be sisters. The social worker uses this as an opportunity to raise the social work topic of matching, explicitly, in her next turn (L's140-141), an example of topic redirection. From the social worker's fourth turn (L141), there is a clear attempt to produce a social view of matching, with the analogy of

animals coming to look like their owners. Having established that genetically, the child comes from fair parents, and is hence clearly different from the client's family, who are all brown eyed, by the client's tenth turn, "Matching up, yes, fits in perfectly....," (L's161-162), the client is colluding with the social worker's conventional social work view, that it is the social fit between family and child rather than physical similarity which matters most. Thus, and in anticipation of the analysis of a later section, the client is entering into educative discourse.

ORCHESTRATION WITHOUT BATON

In this exemplar (Tape Nine, Side Two, "The Orchestrating Client") we shall consider an interview with what could be regarded as an extreme case of the experienced client, who claims almost total speaking rights within the interview, providing very little space for the social worker to speak. Under these circumstances, it is very difficult for the social worker to orchestrate the interview. In this respect, this interview shares much in common with the interview with the experienced client, examined earlier, whose children are on the "at risk" register (T5S1). However, as we shall see when we return to an analysis of that interview, despite the attempts by the client to monopolise speaking rights, at the least, the social worker has a greater range of opportunities to take over speaking rights and perform a series of

mitigated, indirect moves in the discourse; these try to draw the client into educative discourse. While the effects of such indirect moves remain doubtful, the social worker does retain some discursive space to use an orchestrating baton, despite the obvious difficulties.

Since many clients are experienced in this way, the exercise of discursive skills in these less than ideal settings is probably a frequent occurrence. In the interview we are about to examine, however, some of the discursive skills which this social worker is able to exercise in other interviews are excluded from the discourse, to the point where the client's tactics, flowing as they do from the primacy given to the confessional client subject position, function in such a way that for much of the time they deny the subjectivities of the social worker. Atkinson notes, on the basis of the findings of the analysis of mundane conversations, that this type of behaviour would normally be considered deviant and grounds for complaint and adverse character assessment. In such situations, the speaker speaks without regard for two of the central rules of conversation: that present speaker selects next speaker, or that next speaker selects him or herself. Hence we have available the familiar pejorative terms to denote this deviance, like "butting in", "talking out of turn" and so on (Atkinson, 1982, pp.97-98).

This middle aged, West Indian client has a long history of social work contact. Her daughter, aged fourteen, is on a Care Order for non school

attendance, theft and because of concern for her mental health in the home situation. In addition, in the social worker's written account of the background to the interview, the social work agency tends to regard the whole family as problematic. The father is described as "odd", the mother is seen as "very inflexible and sometimes paranoid." Moreover,

"Mrs W. always rambles on in long monologues-sometimes she seems deaf, but isn't in fact. Very strict with daughter but at same time does have some understanding of the daughter's problems. Mrs. W is usually very anti social workers because of Care Order. At heart she means well but is quite unable to see she is ever to blame. She is quite an intelligent person."

The social worker argued that, on listening to the tape, she realised that non-verbal channels of communication were particularly important to consider when examining this interview.

This type of interview can be distressing for social workers; the social worker in question here reported feeling under pressure. In our terms we could say that she was, in effect, unable to operate within the orchestrating subject position, central to the operation of casework, which is in turn, as we have argued, symbolically central to the profession. Also, as we have, following Atkinson (1982), also noted, this would often be considered to be conversational deviance in other settings, and an opportunity for adverse character assessments. Here

the social worker does seem to provide such assessments. In this social worker's written account, which provides a legitimation for her own performance in what she described as a very unsatisfactory interview,

"It is literally impossible to interrupt Mrs. W, even when she pauses. Her mannerisms show her inflexibility very clearly. Whatever I might have said, Mrs. W's contribution to this tape would, I think, have been exactly the same. The amount of talking she does is absolutely typical."

The main goals for the social worker in this interview were, firstly, to discuss with the client why her daughter's last weekend visit home, a fortnight previously, from the children's home where she had been placed, had ended in disaster. Secondly, the social worker wished to get the client to agree to let her daughter come, accompanied by a residential social worker from the children's home and herself, the field social worker, to discuss what had "gone wrong" on the previous visit and how the situation may be improved, particularly since the client had refused to allow the daughter to come home during the weekend following the problematic one.

After an initial turn by the social worker, which provides an open ended invitation to resume the previously established story teller subject position and talk about the client's daughter, F, the interview, which at fifty seven minutes was one of the longest in the study,

consisted largely of the client supplying a series of narrative accounts of the daughter's difficult behaviour, both recently and in the past, in addition to an account of her husband's difficult behaviour. Apart from brief, rare passages where the social worker was able to make extended spoken turns, her place in the discourse was restricted to responsive meta-actions, like "yeh" or "mm", which provide reinforcement to the other subject's extended turns (Labov and Fanshel, 1977, pp.59-60).

Perhaps one reason why the social worker describes the client as intelligent, is that her accounts, except at times of high affect, when she adopts a more clearly patois speech form, are phrased largely in fairly literate, standard English, with tense manipulation creating time anchored, well formed sequential narrative structure in Labov and Waletzky's sense (Labov and Waletzky, op. cit.), even if initial abstract and orientation are not provided. That can be left unspoken, or taken for granted, within an established microculture where the same topics are being discussed repeatedly. Let us examine how the opening phase of the discourse illustrates how the client's subject position as story teller is rapidly reestablished.

1 SW2: Now we were going to talk about F weren't we?

2 CL: Yes well um, I'm fed up with a lot of talk, I hope it won't

3 be much because=

4 SW2: =No I hope we make it short this time.

5 CL: I don't want to talk too much because if you've been talking, a

6 person been talking for seventeen years, all the same thing,
7 you fed up over seventeen years.

8 SW2: Mm, She didn't come home this weekend anyway did she?

9 CL: No she was having dental care, the letter from Mrs. C (the
10 daughter's residential social worker) informed me that she had
11 four fillings.

12 SW2: Mm.

13 CL: And she was going back to her root treatment, polishing so I
14 take it she was you know quite edgy when I came in last
15 Friday evening, or the week before when you brought her back.

16 SW2: Yeh=

17 CL: =I'd catch a bus, I left work about a quarter to five, in order
18 to catch a bus home and the same thing happen, I missed the
19 five, the four forty five.

20 SW2: Yeh.

21 CL: It's quarter to five, so I wait at the bus stop and I got a
22 bus five minutes past-by then it was ten past six, ten past
23 five (laugh). So I saw her waiting, so I got out of the bus,
24 waiting to cross the road. There she was waiting to cross
25 over to me, that's where I saw her. When she get back here,
26 she left the key back in the door; the door was open. So I
27 took the key out, I reached the door before her and I took
28 the key out and I came in. So when she came in I said now F
29 you must be careful, you realise you left the door open and
30 your key was in it, and she just flared up at me

31 like that.

32 SW2: What did she say?

33 CL: So I just tried to calm her down, so I did not () she was
34 just just upset like that/ telling me that the door wasn't

35 SW2: /Mm

36 wasn't open I said that she left her key inside. That's the
37 reason why she left the door open, cause she could get in.

38 So I said no you key wasn't in your room, you left it in the
39 lock as well, here it is in my hand.

40 SW2: Mm.

41 CL: So I'm only telling her that 'cause anybody could walk right in
42 and take things, she must be very careful. So since she was
43 like that () she started sobbing, so I said nothing more
44 and then she went into her room. Afterwards, I picked up this
45 letter from Mrs, C, with the information that she's doing
46 well, that she was brave facing up to her treatment and so
47 on (1.0). But the weekend pass, she stayed in that night even
48 without asking. Without my asking she stayed in that Friday
49 night.

50 SW2: Oh good I expect you were pleased.

51 CL: I never ask her to stay in, I always ask her to stay in
52 sometimes if she gets too tired.

53 CL: Mm.

54 CL: That night I asked her nothing and I noticed she went on her
55 own.

At this point the client continues the narrative about the events of the weekend. The next night, F went to a disco, returning late, the mother having told her to be in before midnight. This led to a row.

56 CL: She flared up.

57 SW2: What did she do?

58 CL: She tried to take the room apart and she just grabbed the
59 record player, thing like this (gesturing, presumably, towards
60 the tape machine), and tried to hit me and she did all sorts
61 of nonsense, so I tried to hold her down because she was
62 rearing so high and giving such nonsense, so I hold her like
63 that () and she started screaming just like that, so I
64 tried to get her round to her, round to her bed, into her
65 room, get her to her room, shouting shouting like that in the
66 night. So I take it that she had always been a bit disturbed
67 sometimes and the treatment she had been having had upset,
68 made matters worse. But I'd like her to come back last
69 weekend and go back to that disco and stay out again in that
70 state and I would like the doctor to see her.

71 SW2: I've asked Mrs, C to arrange it.

72 CL: () Mrs C to send the letter to me and I replied her
73 letter and the situation what it was like.

74 SW2: Yuh.

75 CL: And um asked her to see um speak to head about it (2.5) if
76 anything is upsetting her here. I don't know.

77 SW2: Have you any ideas what might be upsetting her?

78 CL: /what's wrong she comes

79 home now, she comes home and if Mrs. C didn't send that

80 letter and informed me about the treatment she been having

81 and other things, she wouldn't have let me know.

This is followed by a further narrative depicting F's disturbed behaviour, followed by,--

82 SW2: Was she crying this weekend, did she cry?

83 CL: She had never been like that any weekend and if she come on

84 the train, so even if come from like Friday evening she would

85 always meet me in T, in the shop.

86 SW2: Yes.

(T9S1, The Orchestrating Client)

This is followed by a narrative about F refusing to go shopping with her mother.

Despite an initial disclaimer that she was "fed up" (L2) with talking about the issue of her daughter, by her third turn (L9), the client had entered the story teller subject position, claiming dominant speaking rights, and had launched into an extended narrative about her daughter's problematic behaviour. Before examining the complex processes involved in the client's narratives, let us note that the

orchestrator's baton had effectively passed to this experienced client. Whereas, in Sacks' terms (cf. Stubbs, M., 1983, p.131), there is, in the opening exchanges, evidence of the operation of adjacency pairing, and thus, a degree of reciprocity in conducting conversational discourse, by the client's seventh turn (L33), she fails to make an obvious reply to the social worker's question, "What did she say?" (L33). The client continues with her narrative as if the social worker had said nothing. Moreover, the social worker made no comment on what could be viewed as a serious piece of conversational deviance.

We have already argued that it is one of the distinguishing features of social work interviews that the primacy given to the confessional client's flow can render clients' interruptions of the social worker as relatively non deviant. However, such suspension of the rules of politeness and give and take in friendly conversations is premised on the recognition of the social worker as a subject who can at least occasionally exercise orchestrating rights within the interview. Where that recognition of the the social worker as orchestrator is withheld altogether, or where it is accorded only lip service, then it can be seen as an invalidation of the social worker's professional and, more deeply, human citizen subjectivity. By this we mean that where this procedure is normalised, the invalidation of a subject's speaking rights within conversational discourse can be seen as a *desubjectifying* practice. Another instance of this form of desubjectification can be seen in response to the social worker's question at her sixteenth turn,

"Was she crying this weekend, did she cry?" (L82). The client's next turn (L's83-84), while using the weekend, in no way can be seen as a response to the immediately preceding turn. Neither is there any account of the client's failure to respond, rather the turn becomes an occasion for a rhapsodic shift in topic which led into a narrative about her daughter refusing to come shopping.

A second desubjectifying practice can be seen in the way that the client makes systematic interruptions of the social worker's speech. The first occasion where this is manifest in the discourse is at the social worker's sixteenth turn, where the social worker begins a turn by saying that she has asked Mrs. C to arrange for a doctor to see F (L71). On first listening, it seems simply that the two speakers had spontaneously begun talking simultaneously. Where this is the case, defining the initial utterances as interruptions by either party can be a moot point. However, on closer examination, it becomes clear that, characteristically, after the first word uttered by the social worker, the client speaks, raises the pitch and volume of her speech, and effectively drowns out the social worker's speech. What may have been an opportunity to redirect the topic of the conversation by the social worker, instead becomes an opportunity for the client to retain orchestrating control over the direction of the discourse, shifting topics slightly in the resumption of her narrative.

Significantly, this narrative shifts into, what we shall see, is a crucial topic area for the social worker's underlying agenda, whether there is anything upsetting F in the home situation. The social worker, in her fifteenth turn, immediately invites the client, in an open ended way, to comment on this possibility, "Have you any ideas what might be upsetting her?" (L77). The client's next turn (L78) cuts off the social worker's turn half way through, again using the device of raising the volume of her voice to reclaim a monopoly on speaking rights. While the client's turn makes no obvious reference to the social worker's question, the notion of "what's wrong" could be seen to tie with the social worker's phrase, "upsetting her." This turn functions to shift the discourse away from the question raised by the social worker and provide account of F's disturbed behaviour in terms of the treatment which she had been receiving, The turn is followed by a further narrative depicting F's difficult behaviour.

In similar vein, thereafter, where the discourse covers surface topics which are germane to the underlying agenda of social work topics, the orchestrating subject position remains, effectively, with the client, until the social worker makes a forceful attempt to bring to the surface of the discourse her major reason for the visit. She makes two attempts before obtaining a reply. The discourse had been interrupted by the entry, briefly, of the client's husband. After he left the room, there was a short, reciprocal question and answer exchange about the school which F was attending and with whom the client was in

correspondence. The question and answer exchanges restored the social worker's validity as a speaking subject and this was followed by her attempt to take the initiative in the discourse,-

87 SW2: What I wanted to talk to you about was=

88 CL: =(reading from a recent letter from the school) That she's
89 doing well, cooperative so far () she's doing better at
90 school.

91 SW2: Yes, what I wanted to talk to you about was, F was a little
92 disappointed that she couldn't come home last week, she asked
93 if she could she if I would come with her to talk about the
94 weekend and see how you could work out some arrangement for
95 the future/ and

96 CL: /I know she'll be disappointed, I want her to be
97 because I want her to behave when she come home.

98 SW: Yup, well what F/would like

99 CL: /if she promise and keep her promise when she
100 come, it will be alright.

101 CL: Yes I agree, F/would like to

102 CL: /'Cause I do want her to come as well because
103 she's away all week and then weekend come, it would be a
104 blessing to have her home.

105 SW: Yes.

106 CL: Providing that she's behaving properly. But, coming to make
107 trouble and to be disturbed and all, take the place apart and

108 all that, it's more harm than good.

109 SW2: For both of you.

(The Orchestrating Client)

However, the social worker's attempts to seize the topic fail amid repeated, insistent interruptions (L6s 87, 96, 99, 102). By L102 the social worker has, in effect, given up the attempt. Yet, the social worker attempts to speak, in Philp's terms, from the subject position of advocate, she speaks for a client. Often this involves interceding on behalf of the client with an external authority. In this case, it involves interceding on the child's behalf with the mother, who has prevented the child from returning home on weekend leave because of her behaviour during the last visit.

It is, perhaps, worth noting that the social worker does not speak from the subject position of the social worker as an independent expert, able to offer advice, nor from the subject position of an agent of authority. Clearly, given the delicacy of the relation between the social worker, the child and the mother, and the fact that the social worker, on behalf of the child is pleading with the mother to take her back, when she could easily refuse, it would be a bold step to adopt the authoritative voice. On the other hand, it must be remembered that a major reason why the mother might be able to refuse to have the child back without automatically calling into question her maternal love for her child, is that the mother's authority over and responsibility for the child has

already been temporarily removed by law, under the Care Order on the child. The social worker, who without protest, has been on the receiving end of desubjectifying practices, operates under the auspices of that Care Order and as such has acquired, *in loco parentis* some of the client's maternal rights.

NARRATIVE, POWER AND RESISTANCE.

There is no obvious, self announced abstract of the gist of the client's narrative at the outset, and the opening topic appears, at this stage, simply to provide orientation, that is it seems simply to provide background information about the context of the about to be narrated events. However, as we shall see, as the narrative unfolds, this item of information could indeed be seen, retrospectively within the discourse, to function as an abstract which provides some thematic coherence, and not simply a rhapsodic motif, for the client's series of episodically constructed narrative passages.

That there are rhapsodic elements in the client's story telling can be seen for example, in the amount of detail provided in her fifth (L17) and sixth (L21) turns about which bus she caught, and her descriptions of F waiting by the roadside and crossing the road; and later, after the social worker's question, "Was she crying this weekend..." (L82), the client's beginning of a story about F coming up to T-neighbourhood and then, later, refusing to go shopping as they would have normally done. If the client's narratives functioned primarily to illustrate a proposition, in the way that Labov and Fanshel argue (Labov and Fanshel, op.cit. pp. 105-106), then it is hard to explain the amount and degree of this apparently extraneous detail, tangential to the main "point" of the story. But, as we argued in the chapter on narrative, whether or not there are thematic elements within story telling, its

central characteristic, which interacts with the other functions it may perform, is to paint a holistic picture, or provide a dramatic reenactment of a human experience, whether personally or vicariously experienced. Such a picture tends to depict its reenacted scenes in moral as well as cognitive terms.

Given the mixture of thematic and rhapsodic elements in the client's speech, we can suggest that the underlying "point" of much of the client's storytelling involves both the characteristics of theme, which provides a rationale or principle which deductively produces illustrative, linearly constructed narratives, and also motif, which provides an inspirational, and often cyclical rallying point for the spontaneous forward movement of discourse. These provide links between mini-episodes in story telling. The recurrent motif/theme in the client's discourse concerns the depiction of her daughter's "disturbance", in such a way that it stands independently, as something internal to F. It may be triggered off by external events in the present and its roots lie deep within her past experiences; yet there is no sign in the client's discourse that the home and the mother in particular, may be recognised as intrinsic elements of the pattern of disturbance, which possibility is, of course, of major concern to the social worker. Moreover, the tight grip which the client maintains on the orchestrating baton prevents this issue from making an overt entrance into the discourse.

In her analysis of the rhetorical dimensions of the attribution of mental illness in everyday discourse, Dorothy Smith (1) provides a useful guide to how rhetoric, that is persuasive procedures in discourse, provide instructions to the reader or hearer to locate accounts of particular patterns of behaviour as signs of mental illness, and not simply odd behaviours which can be normalised away in conventional terms. In her analysis, she demonstrates how a narrator builds up, through a series of anecdotes, evidence of the mental illness of a woman known to the narrator. Smith reminds us that the events referred to in the narrator's accounts,

"are not facts. It is the use of the proper procedure for categorising events which transforms them into facts. A fact is something which is already categorised, which is already worked up so that it conforms to the model of what that fact should look like.".....furthermore, "If something is to be constructed as a fact then it must be shown that proper procedures have been used to establish it as objectively known, It must be seen to appear in the same way to anyone." (Smith, 1978, p.35).

Moreover, according to Smith, the rhetorical devices function in a general way in the discourse to exclude other possible explanations of the conduct of the individual in question. They work in such a way as to create oughts out of is statements, by authorising particular "loaded" accounts of relevant selected facts and objects and situations.

These are accompanied by implicit or explicit "instructions" (almost like stage directions) to the reader/hearer as to how they are to be interpreted (ibid. pp.47-48). The important point here is that there is no recourse to a ready made realm of unworked up facts which state, soberly, the neutral elements of a situation, allowing, then, for them to be transformed into a moral realm of "ought" statements. Rather the working up of facts is coterminous with the moral depiction of situations; how things are presented is how they ought, or ought not to be.

We can see in the present interview under consideration, that the client's narratives about her daughter function in a similar way to those described by Smith. The introduction of the narrative about F's dental treatment in the client's fourth turn (L13), seems on the surface unrelated to the immediately subsequent narrative about meeting F, returning home and the altercation over the key (L's 21-31). However, when put together with the collection of narratives about F's disturbed behaviour, the dental treatment becomes relevant as a trigger, which instructs the social worker to read the behaviour as a consequence of that trigger. But clearly, the trigger works in this way for F. rather than for other people because she is already a "disturbed" personality, and therefore vulnerable to such strains. Thus a reasonable warning by the mother to her daughter not to leave her key in the door is met with, what in "normal" people might be considered to be an exaggerated response. As she puts it, F. "just flared up" (L30).

The later narrative depicting a row between mother and daughter over staying out late at a disco, a hardly unusual event in most families, renders the row deviant by its location within the series of narratives about the daughter's deviance. Similarly, Smith noted that her

"collection in this account...is not greatly convincing. There are few if any items that stand up as immediately convincing. The teller of the tale has to do a great deal of working up in order to display K's behaviour as mental illness type." (Smith, op.cit. p.39).

F attacking her mother and "taking the room apart" (L58) are seen as exaggerated responses to the situation. This is reinforced at the end of this particular narrative, where the client makes an explicit connection between the disturbed behaviour and F's personality, (L's 66-70)

Smith notes that, "the construction of a fact involves displaying that it is the same for anyone and that their recognition of it as a fact is based on direct observation, is constrained by the nature of the event itself and is not determined by hearsay construction." (ibid. pp.35-36). The client's failure to cite independent witnesses presents a problem for her. Her final statement, wishing that a similar scene had been reenacted and that the doctor could see it (L70), is a rhetorical claim that anyone else, and particularly an accredited health expert, would surely agree with her assessment if confronted with the same type of

behaviour. This account also presents the client's own reactions to the daughter's behaviour as legitimate according to cognitive/rational and moral criteria, that is as reasonable and morally correct and hence not a valid topic for appraisal.

The power of this rhetorical production must withstand the test of actual or possible challenges to its cognitive and moral picturing. While the orchestrating baton remained largely in the hands of the client, the social worker did at one point provide, in mitigated form, an account of F's behaviour which presented it as having a modicum of rationality, and perhaps similar to that of any teenager, --

110 SW2: I think it's difficult being a teenager isn't it, 'cause you
111 want to do t~~h~~ings your own way

112 CL: /A lot has happened to F, lot has happened to her,
113 she has been through a lot.

114 SW2: She has indeed hasn't she, and she might have felt that
115 everything was a bit/too much for her

116 CL: /It could be delayed, delayed 'cause what
117 has been with her this experience she had last year
118 everything come just come to a head.

Here the client, characteristically, interrupts the social worker and deftly restates the theme/motif that F has been subject to strain (L112) and, by implication, cannot be simply put into the everyday

category of a teenager going through a difficult phase. The social worker's response fails to pursue her original initiative and in fact reinforces the client's account by agreeing that, "She has indeed hasn't she" (L114). At this point the client takes the opportunity to shift the topic back towards F's early childhood experiences. This is accompanied by tears and involves a strange narrative which remained undeveloped because of an outside interruption, but might possibly have constituted a veiled suggestion that F, when younger, had been subjected to sexual abuse by the client's husband. --

119 CL: But a lot has happened to her in this very place.

120 SW2: yeh.

121 CL: A lot has happened to her. I do wonder sometimes you know I

123 don't want to remember. The state I used to see that child

124 into. (client's voice trembles at this point)

125 SW2: Well don't remember.

126 CL: and she's so courageous because ther were times when she was

127 not attending school at all, she just lay there she's dead in

128 the bed. And when she started my doctor () helped me and

129 she started my doctor () helped me and she started back to

130 school, she could not even write properly.

131 SW2: Really, how old was she then?

132 CL: Not very long ago (1.5) and things were going so contrary and

133 funny, she burst out here one Sunday and flood the place with

134 water because he was feeding (starts crying) I don't want to

135 talk about this.

136 SW2: Well don't talk about it then

137 CL: I don't know what sort of sweets he had been feeding the child
138 at night and I don't think this is normal for anybody, to wake
139 up the child and feed her sweets and water. But one night she
140 would not settle into her room. She tell me she's scared to go
141 to her room and she keep on coming up to my bed and she
142 can't see and all those things. So I decided to let her stay
143 into my room. And I stayed and both of them already. And one
144 night I got up on impulse and I went into the bedroom and
145 there was he holding up the child and feeding her water. I
146 always see him going in with his bottle of water but I could
147 not understand why.

148 SW2: Mm

149 CL: Because I thought he was using it himself. Now after that, she
150 ran out one day (1.5) and () and in the dressing room
151 table drawer there I found some sweets. Some very funny
152 looking sweets he had been giving the child, and feeding her
153 water. Well, when she gets up here this Sunday, (1.0) she
154 started to pass water, she started to wet her clothes (.....) I
155 had to use heavy candlewick bedspread to mop it up, she was
156 flooding like that, burst out. She just burst out and I had to
157 use those things to stop the water (2.0). And I had to drag
158 her to the doctor. They sent her to St. G's (hospital) there for
159 check up. And the doctors discovered that her bladder were

160 inflamed.

161 SW: Really.

162 CL: Yes, (1.0) infection. And when he could not treat her he wanted

163 a report from the hospital. But the report is lost, the

164 hospital report is lost. So all that () they just wouldn't

165 understand. I some things happen to her, I saw some things.

(The Orchestrating Client)

At this point the front door bangs as the client's husband enters the front door; this narrative stops here.

No independent evidence is referred to in order to legitimate the account, even the hospital report is lost. Nevertheless, its rhetorical power, together with the client's domination of speaking rights through interruption, ensures that there is no effective challenge to her own account. If this account of the child's early childhood is accepted, with the dark hint that "I saw some things" (L165) and could add yet more narratives to bolster up the general picture, this provides an account of her daughter's current behavioural difficulties in terms of long term generative factors. This client, with abundant experience over many years, of a range of normalising agencies and the discourses with which they operate, is able to supply an account which, in commonsense form, mirrors a well rounded determinist account of the social factors which can influence the onset of mental illness, "explaining" both the long term, early experiences which predispose an individual towards

disturbance (eg. L's 137-147), whatever the existential, environmental factors which act as provoking factors in the present. The added advantage is that the account removes the client's own behaviour from serious consideration as a contributing factor.

However, while presenting this interview as an exemplar in which the client maintains her grasp on the orchestrating baton, it would be misleading to suggest that the client has all the power "resources" and the social worker has none. While the social worker, from her account, certainly reported feeling "powerless" in the phenomenological sense of the term, in our framework, power is not a resource which is reducible to a property of preconstituted individuals or social groups and distributed on a zero sum basis. As we have argued, for our purposes, the "subjects" which operate within these conversational discourses are to be viewed as constituted within a range of discursive practices. These in turn provide the conditions of possibility for the operation of those subjects, as long as we remember that the term "subject" here refers only to the various subject positions which emerge within the discourse and not to some notion of a conscious, unitary subject or personality, who is the author of his or her actions.(2)

This reality, produced while the orchestrating baton was with the client, creates, through the desubjectifying and rhetorical devices we have discussed, a realm of what counts as truth. Given the limited discursive rights of the social worker here, it could be said that she

is unable to be the bearer of any alternative realm of truth; she cannot be the introducer of any other discourse within which different objects and concerns can enter the interview discourse. So far, it may be objected that this seems like a prolix way of saying that the client resists the view of reality of the social worker. But seen against a wider backcloth of discursive practices, against a wider field of productive power relations, the situation is more complex.

We have argued, following Foucault, that the two broad moments of power relations operate through discipline and regulation. The disciplinary gaze of social work creates the client as an object of its discursive practices of assessment, monitoring and decision making in a range of contexts both within and outside the interview setting and involving a range of normalising and other official agencies. Thus the various constructions of the client within the conversational discourse of the interview are to be understood as only elements within a broad range of practices. However, what is special about the context of the interview is that, potentially, it offers a space within which the disciplinary mode of power, involving the examination, normalising judgement and hierarchical surveillance, can be extended to include the process of regulation. To recap, this involves, in Foucault's terms, "the way a human being turns him- or herself into a subject." (Foucault, 1982, p.208).

As we have indicated, this operates through the ritual of the interview as a confession. But there is a certain ambiguity in Foucault's argument here. On the one hand, regulation involves self regulation, the process whereby the individual constructs his or her subjectivity in line with dominant discourses. This is presented almost like a mechanistic process, as if the act of confessing itself draws one into the dominant discourses. The fact that the act of confession is inserted into the whole architecture of normalisation is enough for subjectification to work, (Foucault, 1979. p.62).

Now, in the case of the present interview under consideration, despite the social worker's sense of powerlessness, we could still see her as an agency of domination, when considered against the backcloth of the broad range of normalising practices. For the life juices of those practices remain the information culled from surveillance. This client's stream of narrative still supplies the social worker, and whatever professional colleagues with whom she shares this information, with knowledge which may form the basis of judgement. It may be judged, for example, that this client's "rigidity" or "paranoia," and her resistance to any involvement in discussion about her own possible role in producing disturbed behaviour in F. could count against any immediate prospect of rescinding the care order on her daughter. Moreover, the client's resistance is itself only possible within the terms set up by the confessional relationship, which brings the client and social worker together and allocates to the client a story teller subject position.

And this very resistance can bind the client ever tighter within the disciplinary relations of power.

However, the exercise of disciplinary power is incomplete in that it stops short of the full operation of the kinds of discourse which are the conditions of possibility of regulation. Here we can see the other pole of the ambiguity in Foucault, which perhaps derives from his scant interest in oral conversational forms of discourse. Because, to draw the client into the dominant discourses of the normalising professions, requires some form of conversational *exchange* between the normalising agent and the client, It is not sufficient for the social worker to lend a mute's ear. The successful element of the client's resistance lies in her tactical blocking of the exchanges which could lead to the entry of the client into the educative forms of discourse. These constitute the framework of regulation, where the client may acquire forms of subjectivity which speak with the voices of the good social work subject. This will be the concern of our next and final section.

SECTION TWO, EDUCATIVE DISCOURSE

As we have argued, the effects of power operate even when there are overt signs of resistance on the part of the client and where the social worker feels she has little control over the interview, but the higher goals of instructional social work discourses posit the client entering into an educative form of discourse with the social worker. This discourse may not take on the obvious mantle of concepts drawn from the literate professional discourses of the social work profession. Still less is it likely to make explicit reference to the historically constructed, biopolitical, strategic rationales for state funded intervention in the lives of individuals and families. Yet, the aims of the social workers' invitations to clients to enter into the educative discursive form are clearly, from the perspective of biopolitical normalisation, to get the client to speak voluntarily with the voices of the good social work subject.

We have argued that where the social worker plays the advocacy role, "speaking for" the client in acting as a broker with social security, control agencies, with public utilities, other creditors and so on, what she is presenting, in Philp's terms,

"is not the client as such.....rather, the worker 'speaks for' the anonymous subject s(he) has created. S(he) speaks of the potential, the

possibilities, the underlying nature, the essential humanity, or even the unalienated core. None of these necessarily has any relation to the client. They all refer to the subject that the social worker perceives beneath the objective status that the others are relating to.".....(while)... "Advocacy clearly fits the picture.....so too does casework. In the latter the worker engages in a process with the client where the client is encouraged to see within himself his possibilities for social adjustment. The worker speaks to the objectified subject about the social subject which lies within him." (Philp, 1979, pp. 102-103).

While Philp's statement remained programmatic, the processes involved in this encouragement, or invitation, are the concerns of the present section.

A) INDIRECTION AND THE CLASH OF DISCOURSES

Where the relationship between the social worker and the client is very fragile, it may not be possible to make an obvious invitation to the client to enter into educative discourse; this may be because, on past form, such an invitation may function as a challenge. In cases where the overriding goal remains the monitoring of the life of the client and hence maintaining a civilized relationship, the surface form of the discourse is likely to be that of citizen exchange. Moreover, the orchestrating moves and attempts to encourage the client to reflect on

her behaviour and life can take on indirect or mitigated forms. The speech act theorists Labov and Fanshel(1977, pp. 48-51) and Stubbs(1983, pp.147-175), have provided insightful accounts of indirect, or mitigated speech forms. However, their accounts are restricted to the localised contexts of interaction between subjects (taken for granted as ready made unitary subjects) and in the case of Labov and Fanshel, with what they see as the category of therapeutic discourse, a type of discourse which characterises exchanges between patient and therapist. For these authors, indirection consists of gaps and tensions between levels of speech action and between underlying propositions and surface speech. We have already explained our objections to the view that "propositions" underlie all surface forms of conversational discourse; our concern here is, rather, with the gaps between the literate, professional discursive themes of social work and the surface of conversational discourse within social work interviews.

Having introduced the theme of educative discourse in a synchronic form, as it relates to mother subject positions, in the chapter on mothers in conversational discourse, in this section we will develop that discussion by focusing on the diachronic, in addition to synchronic, aspects of attempts to move into educative discourse. In other words, we will flesh out the analysis by focussing more on the unfolding of conversational discourse in the interview.

Let us reconsider T5S1 ("The Hostile Client"), an interview with a mother whose children are on the at risk register and who has chronic debts; this client has had considerable conflictual experience with social workers and as we have indicated, the client leaves little space within the discourse for the social worker. As was argued in the chapter on motherhood in conversational discourse, while there are here no explicit attempts to initiate educative discourse, the theme of competence in motherhood, as operating in professional social work discourses, remains a fundamental rationale for the interview discourse. We remarked that late in the interview, the client initiated the topic of child abuse via reference to a newspaper report, even though no explicit reference to this theme had been made by the social worker. Yet, it is possible to note that against the backcloth of the microculture built up between the client and this and other social workers over a long period of time, apparently innocent remarks, or requests for information can take on fringes of implication within the discourse.

The opening discussion concerns the difficulties that the client's cohabitee has been having in obtaining access to his children by a previous partner, and we have also noted the social worker's concern that these children may come to stay in the client's home, thus compounding the "at risk" problem. In the following exchanges, the unstated, but implicit doubt about the client's mothering competence is

deflected by the client's circuitous attribution of incompetence to the cohabitees ex-partner:--

112 SW: But he would like to look after them, does he want the kids?

113 CL: Yeh well he says she's not fit to look after them (1.0)his

114 mother could have them all day long.

After some discussion about the legal situation in relation to custody, the social worker continues her questioning about the other woman's children:-

115 CL: She's got V with her, I suppose the social services know S M

116 (), he's at P. Road, I reckon he's under social services

117 anyway.

118 SW: That's her first?

119 CL: Yeh, he's got two of them there.

120 SW: And she's got one?

121 CL: And she's got one.

122 SW: And she's got the two children she had by B (The cohabitee)?

123 CL: Mm.=

124 SW: =I mean has B got alternative method of having them looked

125 after?

126 CL: What do you mean?

127 SW: Well

128 CL: His mother could have them.

129 SW: Would you have them? (1.0) B hasn't asked you to have them?

130 CL: No 'cause I said to him if I had them there and looked after

131 them of a day or anything like that, I'd have, I'd have V.

132 SW: But his mother would take them.

133 CL: Oh his mother would look after 'em, She reckons they'd be better

134 in an home.

(The Hostile Client)

The social worker's turn at L124 in the latter extract initially leads to a request for clarification by the client. After all, the term "alternative method" is an abstract concept expressed in Latinate form. This is alien to the client's speech, rooted as it is in working class orality, with its largely Anglo-Saxon based lexicon. Yet, without further clarification, the client responds with, "His mother could have them" (L128). The social worker's next turn reveals the implication within her previous turn, "Would you have them (1.0) B hasn't asked you to have them?" (L129). Now, within this particular discursive setting, this question cannot be innocent, given that both parties know that the client's mothering competence with her own, let alone anyone else's children, is the subject of scrutiny.

Yet, significantly, at this point the client does not make explicit reference to the topic of this scrutiny, which is implied in the social worker's turn. That, as we indicated, is initiated by the client, only towards the end of the interview and could be regarded as a response

to this implication. We also indicated in our discussion of this interview in the earlier chapter, that at an occasion during the middle of the interview, when the topic of punishing the client's son for misbehaviour was raised, and after the client's raising of the abuse topic towards the end, the social worker's responses were simply requests for more information. To reinforce the point, we must emphasise that, given the overall context of the interview, set within a microculture which has been built up over time between the client and social workers, these cannot be seen to function as "innocent" requests. Clearly, an implication can "go over the head" of a co-conversationalist; without some indication within the discourse, we cannot know if the implication has gone beyond the speaker. There is a danger here, in the study of indirection, of the analyst moving too far into the realms of conjecture. However, the client's raising of the abuse topic, without reference to any immediately adjacent turn by the social worker, does provide some support for the view that the implication functioned as such within the interview.

This use of indirection, however, is not in itself fully developed educative discourse. Rather, with regard, for example, to the social worker's earlier request, in mitigated form, it both seeks monitoring information and questions whether, given her competence and capacity, the client should take on more children. Its educative edge lies in its open invitation to the client to reflect on her actual and possible behaviour. The challenge or criticism contained in the social worker's

utterances are in a form which is ambiguous, and if it were later described as a challenge by the client, such a description could be plausibly denied.

As we argued in the chapter on mothers in conversational discourse, in such fragile social worker/client relationships, it is vital to seek the cooperation of the client through the operation of citizen exchange discourse. Criticisms, therefore, or challenges operating under the auspices of hierarchical normalising discourse to, for example, the mothering competences of a client, are likely to take on mitigated, or indirect forms. However hard the iron fist, the social worker can rarely remove the velvet glove without putting in jeopardy the informality and trust which remain the key to monitoring and educative discourse. In addition, the discourses of which the social worker is a bearer, do not confront a blank sheet on which to write its scripts; rather, the client can be the bearer of discourses which offer resistance to professional discourses and this can create, at the least, problems of translation from one to the other.

Let us now examine an aspect of this interview which involves a clearer attempt to invite the client to participate in educative discourse.

While the child abuse topic remains the most dangerous and potentially explosive topic to raise openly within the interview, the chronic and long term debts from which this client suffers, are also a key topic for the social worker and easier to raise in an open way. In the

chapter on mothers in conversational discourse, it was argued that budgeting skills are recognised as central for the good enough, social mother. Moreover, in taking on the subject position of advocate in relation to the client, the social worker tends to create within the discourse, a community of "alignment" through, for example, the use of the pronoun "we", to refer to a joint strategy to reduce debts, keep creditors at bay, and move towards a "rational" approach towards the payment of bills. This may avert the recurrent and predictable crises which result from not planning to cope with large bills. Clearly, this strategy operates within (on the surface level of conversation) the medium of citizen exchange discourse.

In this interview, the social worker uses a similar strategy to that used in T4S1 ("The Passive Client"), but with the difference that the invitation to enter into educative discourse is met with resistance, not simply the resistance of a recalcitrant subject, but more fundamentally, the resistance of a form of discourse, of which the client is a bearer.

The social worker introduces the topic of payment arrears through the finely wrought literate narrative, itself a sharp topic shift, which was reproduced in the chapter on narrative, "Errm.. oh I rung up about your gas.....". We argued that in adopting the advocate's subject position, the social worker presents the agents of the creditors with whom she deals in her privileged advocate's capacity, as amenable to reason; they are presented as nice folk who merit an appropriately civilized response.

Such a response would be a departure from the antagonistic, "us/them" view of authority, characteristic of the client's usual stance towards a range of authorities.

The social worker, in her account of her negotiations with the Gas Board, presents a picture of the client as cooperative and motivated to reduce her debts, even if she may sometimes be a little erratic and in need of encouragement. Essential to the debt management strategy of the utility, is the principle that instead of dealing directly, in a draconian and punitive manner with the client as a feckless customer, the utility debt reclamation department agree for the social worker to act as a mediator. The client is invited to enter the cooperative client/subject position, being addressed as *if* she already were such a subject. This technique, whereby the social worker, within the discourse, is symbolically distanced both from the client and from the public utilities (and other authorities), is a particularly good illustration of how the tension between the citizen exchange and normalising modes of discourse are manifested and partially resolved.--

112 SW: And that it you know you might be a little erratic in the
113 payments but I would ensure you remembered.

114 CL: ()

115 SW: So they took my number down and said that they would be in
116 touch with me if they were worried about the payments in
117 future before they sent you out little letter.

The client agrees with this,

118 CL: Oh did they, that's all right then.

Furthermore, she agrees to pay off some of the arrears with the help of some money she has managed to obtain from a charity, and then pay off a little each week once that charity money stops,

118 CL: And er when I've done that next week, I'll be able to cash eight
119 pounds, take four pounds out of my money and pay that off and
120 then what I'll do is I'll have to pay two pound a week after
121 this 'cause I haven't got Mr. L to depend on ().

The social worker confirms that the Gas Board will be happy to to take a small weekly payment. At this point the client seems to agree with the social worker and a collusive spiral of agreement builds up in the discourse; the client reinforces the point by offering to buy a regular "gas stamp" as an easy form of saving to pay bills,

122 CL: That two pound a week would be best 'cause then I'd get it
123 cleared up.

124 SW: Yes well two pounds a week in fact is twenty four pounds a
125 quarter.

126 CL: Mm.

127 SW: But it's just easier to=

128 CL: =Oh yeh it's a lot quicker to pay in two pound. Best thing I can

129 do is buy the stamps, you don't have to pay extra for the

130 stamp do you?

131 SW: No.

132 CL: The gas stamp, I'll get them then and put 'em on the card and

133 just send the card off to 'em.

This appears to signify a shift from the disciplinary, or monitoring, mode of social work practice, to regulation, where in Foucault's terms, the client turns herself into a subject (Foucault, 1982, p.208), recognisable and acceptable to normalising discourses. In other words, it seems to signify the entry of the client into educative, social work discourse, which provides an appropriately rational, self directive and morally responsible subject position for the client to adopt. Up until this point, since the social worker had introduced the budgeting topic into the discourse through her narrative, she had taken the orchestrating baton, rather as did the social worker in the adoption interview which we discussed in the previous section. The collusive statements in the social worker's second and the client's third turns, seems to be the reward for the social worker's adroit management of an advocate's stance, whereby she represents the creditor's position sympathetically to the client and the client's position sympathetically to the creditor agency. Furthermore, the client's seeming entry into the educative discourse could be seen as a small, first step up from the tangled web of a life in the culture of dependency and poverty, a

twilight world where the morality of law abiding, working, respectable citizens is inverted and where higher, long term goals are displaced by the sheer struggle to survive within a world of the constant present. (3)

However, to draw such a conclusion without looking at the context of the whole interview would be unwise. For, while there may be a regulative dimension in the discourse, it coexists with a very different form of discourse. After this exchange, the client once more reappropriates the orchestrating baton, with a narrative about her television licence. As the narrative and exchanges between the client and social worker unfold, a sophisticated logic is revealed, albeit one which operates largely within what is, in Ong's terms (Ong, 1982, pp.31-75), a mode of orality, which draws links between its elements rhapsodically rather than thematically.

134 CL: The only thing I ant got now is the TV licence (laugh).

135 SW: Have you had a reminder?

136 CL: No no, I've had cards sent through saying about I'm a new

137 resident I been having these for two years I'm a new resident

138 and that em (). I just written off that I haven't got a

139 TV. You see D's will cover mine.

140 SW: Why?

141 CL: I told her it's going to, she's got a colour TV and a colour TV

142 licence covers one colour TV and one black and white.

143 SW: Only in the same household.

144 CL: Yeh but she's lent it to me see (1.0) it is hers and she's lent

145 it to me. They have a serial number don't they or not?

146 SW: Yes () when we've got the gas bill sorted out we'll start

147 on your television.

148 CL: No leave it 'till they take me to court.

149 SW: What happened ()?

150 CL: Go to court for ().

151 SW: You said you had a summons for something, telephone, what did

152 you do?

153 CL: Nothing.

154 SW: I thought you said () (child playing with microphone).

155 CL: I said to him about the electric and he said to me, well aren't

156 the NAB (social security) going to query it. I said if they do

157 I'll write off and tell 'em I got it from a church charity.

158 SW: I see ().

159 CL: Yeh I know but see they're not going to ask me what church

160 charity are they?

161 SW: They might do.

162 CL: Mm, I'll say I don't know, just say I bumped into some vicar

163 (laughs).

164 SW: But B is going to help you with the electricity.

165 CL: Yeh, I've got the bill and it's ninety two pounds. But That's not

166 this bill, it em () estimated reading. Oh I meant to tell

167 you em and forty eight pounds arrears from me last bill that I

168 didn't pay.

169 SW: Yes.

170 CL: 'Cause remember one come and it was forty eight pound, it was

171 really only thirty four 'cause I had arrears (1.5) ten pound

172 arrears or something.

173 SW: And so you paid that?

174 CL: No, so the bill come in to forty eight and I said to you, I'll

175 leave it and I'll send it off to the NAB and you told me to

176 send it and I sent it and I got a giro check for forty eight

177 pound.

178 SW: Yes.

179 CL: So I've got that (1.5) well see I ain't told B I've sent it off.

180 I've, B said that he's going to pay the eighty four pound

181 something that the bill is now.

182 SW: Yes.

183 CL: And when my next bill comes it's gonna be a high reading again.

184 I'll just send my giro off to 'em.

185 SW: But you'd better=

187 CL: =And write to the NAB and show 'em the bill and they should

188 send me ().

189 SW: So you have actually got the giro already, have you?

190 CL: Yeh but=

191 SW: =But how long?

192 CL: six months. So get twenty five percent on my next bill, if it's

193 before er.

For the next few exchanges, the client explains that she can, as a social security claimant, obtain a reduction in her electric bills, then,

194 CL: What I'll do is I'll just send the bill that they send the next
195 one, 'cause it's gonna be a high one. Send it to social
196 security, they'll send me what I've paid in, right.

197 SW: Yes.

198 CL: Say twenty pound.

199 SW: Yes.

200 CL: Then I'll still have the giro, the forty eight pound and I'll pay
201 that in at the same time.

202 SW: Yes I can't really see what's stopping you paying that giro off
203 the present one=

204 CL: =Because then, if he writes me a cheque out for eighty
205 something pound, I'll be in credit and when they, the NAB=

206 SW: =Ah=

207 CL: =See and it'll be in credit.

208 SW: And so you haven't told B that they=

209 CL: =I haven't told the NAB that they've paid me. He's going to
300 write a cheque out for eighty four pound, what the bill is and
301 so many pence. I'll take that in and leave the giro for the
302 next bill which comes in three months time.

303 SW: M (to child), Is that your name I've written?

304 CL: See, I only got, I only got an estimated reading of thirty
305 pound.

306 SW: (speaks to child--social worker is drawing and not responding
307 directly to client).

In trying to uncover the relationship of this extract of the client's discourse to thematic, educative discourse, it is useful, initially, to contrast it with another interview, in which the client does enter into educative discourse. In the chapter on mothers in conversational discourse, we discussed the case of a "good social work subject" (T12S1), a mother who wanted a financially assisted place in a nursery. One of the key dimensions of "good" client subject status was the way in which the client's discourse demonstrated a relay between the various mother positions of which she was the bearer. In other words, in her speech, links were drawn between performance as a mother/wife, as mother of small child, as manager of household finances, and so on. We will shortly return to a further analysis of this interview, but at this stage, let us note that this relay effect within the discourse can be said to represent a synchronic dimension of theme, a counterpart to the unfolding, sequential, or diachronic dimension of theme, which has been one of the principal concerns of the current chapter.

As we have emphasised in our discussions of both the wider professional social work discourses, and the narrower instructional discourse relating to interview technique, there is a concern with producing a client subject who reflects on the patterns of behaviour in her or his life, as a prelude to becoming more self-actualising, more

the master and less the servant of fate, or one's inner emotional demands and buffeting external circumstances. Another way of putting this is to argue that the aim is to produce a client who is more of a unitary subject, the author of her/his actions. Such a subject is able to integrate the various parts she plays and is able to plan life over time and, hence, is able to grow, rather than being condemned to keep repeating the same old patterns indefinitely.

We can see - to revive our musical metaphor - this strategy as aiming to produce a client whose life can be represented as a (thematic) symphony, a rationally planned, forward movement in life, rather than as a rhapsody, a series of fragments stitched together around a range of familiar motifs, whereby the client responds within the here and now to contingent life circumstances. But, it may be objected that in T5S1, we are simply dealing with different themes, rooted in different value systems, in confrontation with each other. Such an objection would itself be rooted in an attempt to minimise the differences between literate, professional discourses and residually oral, working class discourses. This objection would carry greater force if our analysis presented the client's discourse as involving the primitive and ad hoc stringing together of representations of concrete experiences, with little attempt at manipulating abstractions. Yet, as we argued in the chapter on narrative, rhapsodic discourse is not necessarily reducible to such a characterisation, nor does it rule out the use of abstraction.

However, as we have indicated, its forms are different from those of literate based discourses.

The social worker initiated educative discourse, in line with the themes of social work discourse, envisages a client/subject who brings a similar, thematic rationality to all her debt problems. In particular, this would involve planning to make payments and saving to make those payments, in the light of the known and predictable sources of income coming into the household. But, the client's discourse reveals a rhapsodic shift from the TV licence topic, with which she opens, to the topic of the electric bill, raised in her eighth turn (L155). The client then launches into a complex account of the tactics she is employing, or intends to employ, in concert with others, in order to obtain money from various sources in order to reduce debt at different stages.

The range of tactics described involve, in the terms we introduced in the chapter on narrative, a situational, rather than thematic form of logic (Ong, pp.49-57). In planning to adopt a plainly illegal approach to the question of the TV licence, the client avoids expenditure on that item in the present, but runs a considerable risk, in the long term, of being caught without a licence, taken to court, fined and hence being faced with an additional large debt. If not paid, this could even lead to imprisonment. The social worker's fourth turn cuts through the client's account, denying its validity as an acceptable alternative approach to dealing with debt, "...when we've got the gas bill sorted out

we'll start on your television" (L146). The social worker's use of the pronoun "we" signals the use of the characteristic alignment strategy in an attempt to draw the client back into the thematic form of educative discourse, within which the client seems willing to operate in relation to her gas bills.

While the social worker's position within the discourse, having lost the orchestrating baton, is restricted, for the most part, to supportive interchange and requests for clarification, her challenge to the client's alternative approach to budgeting is clear in her twenty first turn, "Yes, I can't really see what's stopping you paying that giro off the present one" (L's202-203). More significantly, the social worker withholds support for the production of the client's account in her twenty fourth turn (L303), where she withdraws from the client and addresses the child. While the client's following turn attempts to continue her account, the social worker reinforces her rejection by continuing to engage with the child (L306). This signals the end of the topic. We can see that indirection is a significant feature of the social worker's discourse in this interview. Rejection through withdrawal replaces an open, linguistically framed rejection of the client's alternative.

That, within the discourse, the client does not see all budgeting as necessarily governed by the same kind of logic is revealed in her rejection of the social worker's invitation, in the client's fifth turn,

"No leave it 'till they take me to court" (L148). It is important to realise that the client is only eligible for additional help from social security, if she has no money registered in bank accounts and so on. In her artful logic, she conceals from both B (her cohabitee) and the social security agency that she is getting money from each of them, in order to pay off bills. This form of logic certainly involves abstractions, in that the client envisages her actions within the framework of a complex series of anticipated actions by others and envisaged contingent circumstances.

Following Ong (op.cit. pp.52-53), as we indicated in the chapter on narrative, the thematic, text-based, logic of educative discourse, operates in terms of syllogistic and inferential reasoning. This is not a spontaneous function of the human mind, but is the product of specific, text based forms of intellectual training (ibid, p.53). And, as we also indicated, self analysis, which is central to thematic educative discourse requires a demolition of situational thinking, which does operate more spontaneously. Situational/operational cognitive procedures use abstraction in order to cope with problems close to the recurrent experiences of the human lifeworld, not as the attempt to create a symbolic recasting of one's life within the terms of logically deduced principles.

Thus, the view that one should reflexively review and monitor one's handling of money and bills, submitting oneself to the discipline that

all bills be managed according to the same principle of forward, rational planning, can be seen as characteristic of inferential/syllogistic reasoning. (3)

While the logic of the client's proffered alternative to that of the social worker is clearly artful and clever, it remains essentially situational, in that the client presents a series of rhapsodically interconnected tactics which respond to constraints externally set, with little prospect of achieving a structural alteration in the situation. Moreover, this delicate juggling act, envisaged in the client's account, relies heavily on a series of contingent factors being favourable at the right time. In particular, it is vital that the social security agency do not discover her extra sources of income from her cohabitee and from outside charities.

It is also vital that the client is able to manage her other areas of expenditure; these are left out of account, and in the past, have overwhelmed the client's capacity to meet financial demands, considered, as they are, as an episodic series of contingencies. Again, in Ong's terms, the client's account also manifests another key characteristic of orality, in that cognitive procedures are agonistically toned. By this is meant that discourse operates largely in the course of human struggle, it operates as a form of human combat (Ong, op.cit. p.44). In this respect, the client's other narratives, for example, the account of her

experiences of and attitudes towards other parents at her son's school, are similarly agonistic in tone.

Finally, let us acknowledge a limitation on the view that the client is here the bearer of situational logic. In its extreme form, situational logic is bound to the here and now, to the tried and trusted, orally transmitted, practical knowledge and skills brought to bear on the exigencies of a situation at hand. According to Ong, in simple oral cultures, "Before writing was interiorised by print, people did not feel themselves situated every moment of their lives in abstract computed time of any sort." (Ong, op.cit. p.97). Precise categories and calibrations of clock and calendar time are simply not practically relevant in such a culture (ibid. p.98). Clearly, within such a world, the past cannot be "felt as an itemised terrain, peppered with verifiable and disputed 'facts' or bits of information" (ibid., p.98). We might add that the same would be true for the future. Both past and future exist principally in terms of their resonance and relevance for the present. By contrast, "In high technology cultures today, everyone lives each day in a frame of abstract computed time, enforced by millions of printed calendars, clocks, and watches" (ibid. p.97). Much of the social and economic organisation of such a world is founded on literate and numerate thematisation.

We must remember that *residually* oral subcultures embedded within literate, high technology cultures, are not to be confused with cultures

of primary orality. Thus, this client, whose discourse is marked by some oral characteristics, still has to function in a world of institutions which operate according to the categories and agendas made possible by computed time. Utility bills, for example, are sent out at regular intervals through the year. Thus, through the agonistic stance of the client, through her tactics of resistance against normalising and other authorities which impinge on her life, her discourses, including her modes of logic, necessarily have to address issues set within the framework of computed time.

In this way, her situational form of logic becomes drawn into a relationship with, and is transformed by, the concerns of temporally linear, thematic rationality. Thus, while the client's logic is not framed by syllogistic and inferential reasoning, it is sequential, and in a practical sense, geared to means-ends schemas. From the client's nineteenth to her twenty fourth turn (L's194-302), we can see a practical logic in operation, which is oriented to a task at hand, which is fragmented over a stretch of time; this is, in turn defined by the rhythms of large institutions. The problems of coordination, culminating in the client's twenty fourth turn (L209), are only meaningful in terms of the computed time of institutions,

It is not entirely clear who the "they've" refers to in this turn. But it most likely refers to a charity which has provided assistance. So we have here a juggling act which involves three agencies, the client and

her cohabitee. Information between these parties must be controlled by the client, with close reference to their respective temporal economies. In this respect the discourses of literacy and residual orality, manifested in professional/client relationships, are not simply independent realities juxtaposed, or in conflict, but rather operate in a more dialectical relationship to each other. Resistance, thus, is a vehicle for the creative elaboration of discourse.

B) INDIRECTION AND PARAPHRASING

We have indicated, in the chapter on instructional discourse, that in that discourse, the role of paraphrasing, or echoing back words and feelings to the client, is an important interviewing skill for the social worker (cf. Kadushin, 1983, pp.162-163). We have already indicated that there can be subtle variations in the forms and varieties of paraphrasing, from very crude parroting of the client's utterances, to forms which advance the discourse, by adding a new dimension to what a client has said and asking her/him to agree. The agreement can draw the client into a new framework of assumptions within the unfolding educative discourse. While the language of paraphrasing may take everyday oral forms, usually, its basis can be found in literate professional discourses.

Let us return to the interview with Mr Y, whose narrative we examined in the chapter on narrative. To recap, this client is an unemployed,

single parent of a young family. His son has recently been involved in violent incidents, and his household are facing a range of severe difficulties. The client has had a history of violence and of conflictual relationships with social workers, going back to his adolescence. For a social worker to build up a working relationship with this kind of client, it is likely that indirect modes of discourse will figure prominently; open challenges, for example, would involve considerable risk. Yet, the social worker claims to be pleased with the relationship she is building up with the client. In part, she (modestly) explains her success so far in terms of the use of modern, non-directive casework methods, as opposed to the older, more intrusive and paternalistic methods. The latter had antagonised this client in the past. (4)

In terms of what is visible within transcripts of the spoken discourse listening is accompanied by feedback. In building up a collusive rapport with the client, the social worker makes an adroit use of agreement, which does more than just imitate, it offers a paraphrasing which performs multiple functions. At one point, the client is complaining that he is not allowed to decorate his Council owned house and is forced to remain in idle frustration, waiting for, what he describes as, the inefficient Council workers, to come and do the job,

95 SW: But it makes you feel that you feel like fiddling them too,

96 doesn't it, 'cause the way they're messing you around?="

97 CL: =Uh, that is that is, know true, yeh, but<how can I fiddle 'em
98 anyway?

99 SW: Well.

100 CL: Well I can't (1.0) I'm sitting here getting the 'ump, I might as
101 well be decorating the place.

103 SW: Yeh.

104 CL: That's the way I work it.

105 SW: Yes, but while you haven't the money to decorate, all you're
106 doing is sitting here getting the hump.

107 CL: Well this is it, this is it.

108 SW: And taking it out on everybody else.

109 CL: Well this is what it comes down to. I just keep getting out of
110 everyone's way, you know what I mean (turn continues).

By reflecting back the client's feelings in the form of a paraphrase, the social worker, in her first turn (L95) in this extract, provides, simultaneously, an acceptable motivation for rule breaking behaviour by the client, if it should come to that. This turn, through its sympathy and the way it constructs alignment within the discourse, also functions as a request to the client for information about his intentions. It invites an agreement or disagreement with the social worker's statement, not from the perspective of a hostile interrogator, but from within citizen exchange discourse, from someone who is "on the side of the client". Similarly, the social worker's fourth turn (L's105-106), from a position of alignment, offers an acceptable motivation for

"getting the 'ump", for becoming depressed (though note that the social worker uses the oral subcultural term 'ump, rather than *depression*, taken as it is, from literate, clinical discourses.). The client's next turn (L107) concurs with this, and in the social worker's follow up turn (L108), advantage is taken of the spiral of collusion building up in the discourse, to suggest that this acceptable and understandable motivation, has led the client to make life difficult for those around him. We can see this as an indirect offer to enter into educative discourse and reflect on the pattern of one's conduct. The client's reply (L's109-110) provides an acknowledgement of the social worker's explanatory paraphrase, which goes beyond his own account, but, in effect, declines to take the self-reflection phase any further: he simply uses this as an explanation for his periodic absences.

At another point later in the interview, the social worker comes nearest to providing a reflection which is an outright challenge to the client, but, significantly, it takes the form of a compliment to his warm-hearted generosity. After a discussion about an unemployed couple to whom the client has offered temporary lodging and food in his overcrowded house, the social worker says:--

111 SW: Yes but ah you're still a glutton for punishment T, because
112 here you are trying to scrape through on social security, which
113 most people say is not enough to keep two adults and three
114 kids on, and you're keeping two extra adults.

115 CL: Yeh, two a couple of me mates have said that an' all, funnily

116 enough. But as I say, it's the principle

117 SW: /You do like to do it the hard way.

118 CL: Well this is it.

119 SW: And yet you get through somehow=

120 CL:=I get through (laughs) (turn continues).

The social worker softens her criticism, embedded within flattery, by acknowledging that the client manages to "get through somehow" (L119).

The client agrees (L120) and goes on to emphasise that, on principle, he is always willing to help someone in genuine need. At this point, the

social worker offers a comment which goes beyond (though building

upon) paraphrasing and provides an explicit assessment of the client's character, which, again, is simultaneously a criticism and also flattery.

This succeeds, briefly, in drawing the client out from his predominantly oral, rhapsodically structured mode of discourse, and into a reflective,

educative mode:--

121 SW: Yeh, you're ready to help everybody like that but you find it

122 difficult to accept help yourself.

123 CL: Huh.

124 SW: Don't you? A lot of the time?

125 CL: Yeh, true I s'pose. Yeh, well a lot of it's being independent and

126 on me own for a so long really you know what I mean?

127 SW: Mm.

128 CL: I've had to sort meself out.

129 SW: Well you've certainly gone to the other extreme, because you're
130 hardly on your own at the moment.

This use of indirection is a striking exemplar of the operation of normalising technology, under the auspices of the non-directive, psycho-social strategy. It does, haltingly, yield a small success in this instance, in drawing the client into the social worker's discursive world. The client's second turn (L125) is clearly within the terms of educative discourse, providing, as it does, a causal and abstract account of his unwillingness to accept help. One should not exaggerate the importance of this brief entry into educative discourse, since it coexists within a predominantly oral and rhapsodically structured mode of discourse. It is certainly not an element within a comprehensive, self-critical review of his conduct in the various sectors of his life. However, it should caution us not to see the gaps between literate and oral discourses as watertight divisions. Even though this client is semi-literate, with admitted writing difficulties, literate based discourses do impinge on his life. And social work is probably not the least significant conduit of literate-based discourses into the client's life.

An underlying theme within the interview for the social worker, is to engage the client in seeking an improvement of the family's material situation. Given the client's unemployment, this can only - legally - be

achieved through getting him to apply for all the available benefits to which the family is entitled; much time in the interview is devoted to discussing the filling in of a form, applying for special needs payments for household goods. But the client claims to be an independant man, who does not believe in grasping everything to which he is entitled, he is the type who would normally have earned the money himself. Circumstances prevent him from being the breadwinner, so he is willing to accept a minimal level of help. Much of the later part of the interview is taken up with a negotiation of this issue.

131 CL: When I work out and think, so it's bad enough writing down
132 about sheets an' that. Then they start reading that we want
133 lino. When I said before when I heard that woman up there, I
134 thought to meself, what a cheek you know what I mean the
135 stuff she was getting off of it.

136 SW: Is there a fee a feeling they're sympathetic about now, are
137 you=

138 CL: =I don't know really you know what I mean it's just, you know
139 when I was on me own before, I used to go out and get it know
140 what I mean I could go and do it, but I can't do it now, an'
141 you half think well, shall I ask 'em and you know I don't like
142 the way I've writ that down ()=

143 SW: =Well, you know we can always ask them. If you feel that you'd
144 rather go without for the sake of your pride and wait 'till
145 you're in work and then do it, you can do that,, or but you know

146 there's always going to be the expense with the kids. If you,
147 even if you got a clothing grant for them now, by the time you
148 go to work, they'll be wanting /something else so it'll be
149 CL: / be wanting more clothes
150 SW: summer and they'll want thinner things, so that you know,
151 they'll always be a need where there are kids.
152 CL: Mm.

In her second turn (L143), the social worker acknowledges the client's pride, but provides him with an acceptable motivation for seeking assistance by stressing the constant needs of children. The client agrees with this (L149) and a collusion within the discourse is built up which protects the "pride" of the client. The negotiations proceed in similar vein and a little later, the topic shifts to the children's clothes and their appearance. This is delicate issue on both sides: to openly criticise their appearance would be a damaging criticism of the client's performance as a parent; for the client, having been partially persuaded to claim assistance, an admission that the children were sent to school looking shabby, would be a damaging indication of his failure to cope as a father. The issue is collusively resolved in the discourse by admitting that, for the most part, the children are well clothed and look acceptable, but that the family may need help with specific items.

153 CL: Oh that's something, the pyjamas, the kids need that=
154 M: (the cohabitee): =for the kids yeh.

155 CL: 'Cause ev^erything else they're not too bad. You know it looks a

156 SW: /They've got everything else.

157 CL: bit ropey to me, 'cause I've seen, cause I've seen it for so

158 long, but you know that when they go out they don't look too

159 bad, do they?

160 M: Oh no, They've got their trousers 'ent they for best, /that I

161 SW: /Well they

162 M: put by.

163 SW: certainly always look nice to me, and you know I keep meaning

164 to bring () those dresses down, she's got some good ones.

165 ehm, but you always have them looking nice.

166 CL: Well this is it.

167 SW: Well if we go for the more expensive basic items, like the

168 blankets and the sheets and the floor covering, it may be

169 that you can make do=

170 CL: =Well this is you know=

171 SW: =for the clothing and use what spare money you manage to to

172 make=

173 CL: =Well she'll tell you, I will definitely go a little bit skint

174 to get 'em.

In the social worker's second turn (L161-165), she combines acknowledging that the children look nice, with promising to bring down dresses for them, a difficult balancing act. In her third (L's167-169) and fourth (L's171-172) turns, she effects a resolution which

establishes that the client will only claim for the more expensive items. This reflects back to him the subject position of the good breadwinner, which his discourse was trying to establish, acknowledging that he is not, if anyone had suspected, a "welfare scrounger", grasping at every possible benefit, and is still, in a minimal way, performing the traditional role of the male breadwinner, by providing the extras which the household needs. We can see that bolstering up Mr. Y's subject position as father and breadwinner, is a key element in the interview discourse. The particular subject positions set up within interviews, through both direct and indirect means, can vary, as we have seen. They will, for example, be different for mothers, whose competences are being assessed in the light of the floating, negotiable standards of "the good enough mother", in comparison with single fathers like Mr. Y, whose client subject position, and probably the standards by which he is judged, are likely to be very different. The "good enough father" is a more shadowy and elusive discursive construction. Further research with similar clients is needed to reveal how extensive is this gender difference in subject positioning.

C) EDUCATIVE DISCOURSE AND REGULATION

It is likely that social work interviewing involves a considerable amount of extremely subtle and skillful indirection, and here we have simply pointed the way towards a comprehensive analysis of this dimension of normalising technology. However, its use points the way towards educative discourse proper. In this, the invitations by the social worker to participate in that discourse, are accepted by the client. These include taking on the confessional story-teller and other subject positions allocated to the client within that mode of discourse; not least of these subject positions is that of one who submits to regulation, who accepts that he or she needs help and will speak with a voice appropriate to that subject position. While the lines are not ordained in a tightly scripted way and are, like subject positions, somewhat negotiable. Nevertheless their themes are familiar within the discourses of the normalising professions.

This theme of the good social work subject was first introduced in the chapter on mothers in conversational discourse. There, our interest in, this form of discourse was shaped by our analysis of the allocated mother subject positions and their relationship with professional discourses. In our analysis of the application for a nursery place interview (T12S1, "The Good Social Work Subject"), we showed the synchronic links drawn up in the client's discourse, between her different mother positions, how her accounts of her problems and her

proposed solutions meshed with the thematic agenda of the social worker and hence the deeper themes of social work discourse. Our concerns within this chapter extend beyond that to embrace the more diachronic, unfolding dimensions of educative discourse. Our discussion of the adoption interview in the last section, extended the analysis of educative discourse through its exploration of the use of the orchestrating baton by the social worker, showing how the underlying discursive themes can rise to the surface of the conversational discourse.

In this section, finally, let us further the analysis of the good social work subject, by focussing on the discussion of budgeting in the nursery application interview. First, let us draw a contrast between that interview and two others in which the budgeting topic features prominently. In the discussion of T4S1, which was described by the social worker, despite other family complications, as one "involving very large fuel debts," we noted that the discourse is tightly focussed and orchestrated by the social worker, but at the cost of virtually silencing the client. Her client subject position was geared to the reception of help and advice; the confessional subject position was not adopted. Secondly, in T5S1, which we examined in the last section, we argued that the client applied multiple forms of logic to the issue of debt and the payment of bills; that the logic, characteristic of educative discourse, coexisted with a more rhapsodically structured, situational logic.

By contrast, in T12S1 (The Good Social Work Subject), while the client, like that in T5S1 ("The Hostile Client"), has chronic, long term debts and, indeed, faces the threat of eviction, her approach to debt, with little prompting from the social worker, meshes well with the themes of social work discourse. One could see this interview as mutually orchestrated by two parties who, at least for the purposes of the interview, work within a world of similar objects and concerns.

This client, by contrast with the client in T5S1, works within a discourse with a clearly thematic orientation to time. Financial management within the household, is presented as more than a problem of coping with specific bills, or keeping predators at bay, in the here and now. Rather, it is presented as involving a series of synchronically linked elements of financial control, which have to be managed on a continuous basis, according to rational principles. The logic used in particular situations is governed by the principle that one should prioritise and plan payments for items of expenditure, rather than, for example, use a situational logic which presents bills and debts as discrete problem areas, requiring a variety of situationally selected and elaborated tactics.

Let us explore this issue, first by looking at the client's discussion of the merits of a rent rebate. She explains that, since her husband, the breadwinner, earns low, but variable money, it may be unwise to claim a rebate now, as the level of rebate is set on the basis of a

calculation of average wage levels over a set time period. Thus, to take a rebate now, before the review is complete, may mean that a large amount of money would have to be repaid, so worsening the debt problem. This is the logic which was presented to the client by the housing authority and was accepted as reasonable. In addition, the fact that the client may get a job in the meantime - and this is dependant on the client's application for a nursery place being successful - would alter the income level of the family, --

63 CL: That would alter the situation as well you know so it's very
64 ehm, very difficult to say yes I'll have a rebate when you think
65 well perhaps they'll get it wrong and perhaps they'll get it
66 wrong and I'll have to pay it all back again.

67 SW: Yes, quite.

68 CL: So I think it's best as it is. If they they're trying to help me
69 as best they can you know really.

Clearly, the client's discourse is in harmony with that of the authorities, whom she accepts, are "trying to help me as best they can" (L's68-69).

Secondly, let us consider the client's approach to reducing debt. We have noted that where the social worker takes on the advocate subject position, she, or he often negotiates with the utility, Council, or whatever authority, for the client to make small, regular payments in

order to make gradual reductions in the volume of debt. In this case, the client, without prompting from the social worker, recounts that she has already negotiated such an arrangement with the Council,--

70 SW: Did the rent arrears get to such a stage where the council were
71 sort of threatening to turn you out?

72 CL: Yes.

73 SW: They did, an and what happened? How did you manage to solve
74 that?=-

75 CL:=Well, I went down to see them because my husband it's
76 difficult for him to get time off work now. And I went down to
77 see them and I said to them, you know explained to them the
78 situation and ehm I told them that I'd pay them thirty two
79 pounds a week rent instead of the twenty pounds, so that was
80 just over ten pounds rebate arrears I was clearing off.

81 SW: Yes.

82 CL: And that when I went out to work, I'd be able to give them more,
83 say twenty pound extra a week.

84 SW: Mm.

85 CL: On top of the thirty two pounds you know.

86 SW: Yeh.=

87 CL: =So that it would clear it up that much quicker and they
88 they were quite pleased at the thirty two pound actually. Even
89 if I don't go out to work, that thirty two pound will satisfy
90 them.

Here, the client expresses appropriate satisfaction at the bargain struck, and recognised that "they" were pleased (L80). This is significant if we recall that the social worker in T5S1 presented the bureaucrats of the Gas Board debt reclamation department, not as hard, impersonal cogs in the wheel of authority, but as nice folks, human beings with the same subjective characteristics as the client, and therefore amenable to reason. In this interview, the client accepts the common human status and benevolent intentions of the representatives of the authority, without needing to be prompted by the social worker. But why should a woman with these considerable social skills and fortitude in the face of adversity, need a social worker? Her following turns supply the answer. She remarks that the extra payments she is making, taken out of her husband's small wages, makes money very tight and they are just managing to make it at the moment, because of some overtime payments her husband has been getting recently, but, --

91 CL: So we're able to do it. But next week,I don't know / you know.

92 SW: /Yeh

93 or the week after, I don't know.

94 SW: Well it's a bit shaky really=

95 CL: =Well the thing is I know that I've got to pay that money

96 every week=

97 SW: =Yeh.

98 CL: Whether or not I've got the food money, even if I have to

99 borrow off Mum and Dad.

100SW: Yeh.

101CL: I've got to pay that rent every week, otherwise the kids won't
102 only not have a home.

103SW: Mm.

104CL: They'll not have a family any more. So I've got to sort of

105 ()

106SW: Isn't it very depressing having all this kind of stuff?

107CL: Well it does=

108SW: =put a strain on you.

109CL: It does, but I know I sort of mm=

110SW: =Battle on=

111CL: =Exactly, what else do I do, you know I just got to. That's why

112 I said I got in a panic over this situation. I thought well,

113 there's only one thing for it, I shall just have to fight for a

114 nursery place for A with someone to help me /so that I

115SW: /Yeh

116 can help myself in a way you know. I mean I could easily put

117 him in a day minder's care or something, but I don't like that.

118 I don't want him thinking he's going to a substitute Mum.

The first reason for needing a social worker is the factor of
(material) contingency, which she raises in her first turn (L91). She
can just keep the family's head above water, with her husband's
overtime payments, but, with such a small financial margin to work

within, she cannot know if contingent circumstances will defeat her best attempts at planned financial management. We can see here a parallel with one of the themes of instructional discourse. Social workers' best laid plans may have to be ditched in the light of contingent factors which come to light in the course of an interview. The difference, in terms of instructional discourse, between ad hoc, or rhapsodic drift, in the interview and a salvaged, well orchestrated control over the interview lies in the way in which contingency is handled and related to the underlying agenda of social work discourses. Similarly, this client's discourse recognises that there are limits to her ability to cope; she salvages her status as a good citizen, who needs and deserves assistance, and indeed would prove a good investment for such assistance, by her emphasis on the priority placed on paying the rent and avoiding eviction. She recognises that this priority placed on paying the rent is not only a precondition for physical shelter (L's101-102) for the children, but also, and more profoundly, for keeping the family itself going as a viable enterprise (L104).

Relegating food money to a lower financial priority is not so dangerous a suggestion, in relation to what it may suggest about her mothering competence, as it perhaps appears at first sight. Food money may be obtained by borrowing from within the kinship network (L's98-99), the primary arena of social care. Debts incurred in such a way are not, prima facie, as serious as debts to public agencies. In the case of the

latter, the client's competence as a citizen, in meeting her contractual/legal obligations, is at stake. Her recognition of this meshes her discourse still further in with those of the social worker and the network of other authorities and normalising agencies with whom she interacts.

The second reason proffered through the client's discourse to account legitimately for her need and right to help, is an admission of the emotional strain she is under (L107). This is to be distinguished from an admission of mental illness, endogeneously developed within the subject's psyche, in relative independence of the external pressures acting on one. Her affective disturbance can be plausibly explained as a reasonable and understandable response to strain.(5) A little earlier in the interview, the client had drawn a thematic link between her general material problems, a worsening marriage relationship, and her having nearly having succumbed to a nervous breakdown in the interval between this social work visit and the previous one, some time in the past. She admitted that she had, temporarily and reluctantly, been on medication for this,

119 CL: It's the same thing really you know, I don't know if you knew,
120 but I nearly had a nervous breakdown em, two years ago. I I
121 was up under the doctor with tranquilisers, anti-depressants,
122 you know. Mind you, I got off my prescriptions as soon as
123 possible, I didn't like taking 'em though I was.

With this as a backcloth, part of the knowledge structure of the interview, the social worker, in her sixth turn in the previous extract, offers confirmation of the validity of a disturbed affective response with, "Isn't very depressing having all this kind of stuff?" (L106). This is reinforced by a collusive spiral of alignment between client and social worker with the social worker completing the client's sentences for her in the social worker's seventh (L198) and eighth (L110) turns.

Given this harmony, sentence completion is not a patronising act, *but rather an indicator and reinforcer of the sense that each subject is the bearer of the same discourse, and actively cooperates in its production.* We argued in our analysis of aspects of this interview, in the chapter on the positioning of mothers in conversational discourse, that the client's discourse demonstrates a similar, synchronic linkage between a rational, means/end schema as applied to both material and to affective factors. We can add weight to this point by noting the way that the client draws links between these strains, her debts and the need to get help to win a nursery place, from, "someone to help me so that I can help myself" (L's114,115). There is even here, possibly, a veiled threat that, if the home and family fall apart, then, notwithstanding her best efforts, the normalising authorities would have to shoulder the burden of her children.

It is difficult to envisage a better exemplar of educative discourse in operation. This more diachronically oriented analysis, reinforces and

extends the point we made in the chapter on the positioning of mothers, that here, in Philp's terms is a salvageable subject, able to integrate and go beyond the objective constraints of her life, with the temporary assistance of an expert friend. They participate in a discourse, in which citizen exchange and normalising discourse become one. But we can add to that by emphasising that this discourse truly moves beyond discipline to regulation, whereby, the client actively, and creatively, elaborates educative discourse, in conjunction with the social worker. As we have indicated, it is the aspect of exchange and elaboration in living, conversational discourse, which has, so far, remained undeveloped in the analysis of discourse which derives from the work of Foucault and Donzelot. It enables us to examine the active, and co-produced - whether cooperatively, or conflictually - dimension of biopolitics operating at the interface between professional and client. It is in this space that important dimensions of the construction, reconstruction, maintenance, or perhaps containment of citizens operate.

CONCLUSION

As I pointed out in the introduction, the analyses contained here can in no way be considered definitive or conclusive. They are based on a small, highly selective group of interviews conducted in a particular context of social work practice. Much further work remains to be done on a wider range of types of interview, with a wider range of clients, for example, only one of these interviews involved a black client. There is a whole host of questions to be asked about the involvement of black people in relations with the normalising professions. In addition, the role of the growing numbers of black social workers raise questions about their discursive practices in relation to both black and white clients and also the degree to which they are absorbed into the deeper logics of normalising practices. These questions cannot be neatly explained away in the prepackaged answers provided by ideological discourses. They require detailed and continuing research.

Yet, in defence of this limited venture, I would suggest that small attempts are better than no attempts, and that case study research can offer much to social science (Mitchell, C. 1983), particularly when we are dealing with phenomena which are relatively slow to change. In this case we are dealing with the management of everyday problems of living which are part of the *longue durée* of social existence.

A conclusion can only recap on some of the central themes of a study and draw some of the threads together. In an exploratory, analytical description, an overly symmetrical presentation is probably misleading, in that by eschewing the neatness of positivist models of good research, which tie one down to a clear series of stages, from hypothesis formulation, through to testing and conclusion, in favour of an approach which leads into relatively open territory for exploration, there is a period in the middle of research where one is not sure where one is going, or which ideas one is testing. This is not an excuse for anarchy, but an acknowledgement that this sense of disorder may be productive in the long term. It indicates that one is not simply employing deductive logic, applying ready-made formulae. This is important to stress since this project explicitly attempts to link the the analysis of discourse in the small settings of interviews into a, by now, fast growing body of work on the shifts in the production of normalising strategies, which are a part of our attempt to understand the complex operations of what Donzelot calls the tutelary complex.

We have argued that social work interviewing must be understood as an element at the front line of biopolitics. It is at this site, the confessional strategic environment, that the knowledges of the social work profession come into contact with those of clients. Those knowledges form part of what Donzelot refers to as "psy," signifying the power of psychoanalysis in the practical knowledge techniques of the normalising agencies. As a signifier, the term is not very precise. Hirst has questioned the extent to which

psychoanalysis has had as much influence in Britain, as in France (Hirst, P. 1981, p.80, and Hodges, J. and Hussain, A., 1979). One should not underestimate the importance of English popularisers of psychoanalytic knowledge like Bowlby and Winnicott and the work of the Tavistock Clinic in providing exemplars of social intervention which had psychoanalytic components, marking a shift away from earlier psychiatric knowledge bases (Miller, P. and Rose, N. 1988). But Hirst also points out that Donzelot's meaning of the term psychoanalysis is far broader than Freud's theory of the individual (Hirst, op. cit., p.70). As we argued in chapter five, this also applies to the notion of case-work, which, sociologically, refers to a broad range of practices within the space of face to face contact between social worker and client (Black et. al. 1983, pp.163-164, and Davies, 1985, p.51).

While practice may not always conform to the strict standards of psychosocial social work, more deeply, it refers to the production of the space which Donzelot calls the social,

"Only the 'psy' specialist furnishes a neutral terrain for for the resolution of differences of regime between the management of bodies and the management of populations. The regulation of images (of personal desire) hegemonizes and harmonizes the regulation of corporal flows and that of social flows." (Donzelot, 1979, p.229).

It is in this social space that the links are drawn between the collective and individual, corporal poles of biopolitics. The

attributions of subjectivity in the confessional space, link with attributions in more open spaces of the social: in links between social workers and other normalising agents; in the courts; in case conferences and so on, links which we have only been able to touch upon in this study.

The modern social work discourses have tended to downplay the older rationales for interventions of the tutelary complex into the family and personal lives of poorer citizens. Instead of appeals to the good of the nation or race, we have appeals to the provision of service, the meeting of clients' needs, within a more "technical" discourse. Yet, we have argued that these wider rationales have not disappeared altogether and that the functionalist models which developed in the welfare state period ((Davies, M. 1985, Halsey, A. H., 1982) must be understood as a continuance of this biopolitical rationale. Through the mundane discussion of life problems between social workers and clients (especially mothers), is achieved the ongoing construction of a biopolitical "citizenship," within the sphere of governmentality. This involves the construction of a personalist, moral ontology of the individual (Minson, 1985, p.3), who is recognised not simply as a rational citizen, with rights and duties in relation to the State and the market, but who also has qualities traditionally, and negatively, identified more with women than with men. The citizen of biopolitics is also an organism whose health must be fostered and who *feels*. Intervention which acknowledges the affective needs of the individual, in a sense, is

helping to construct the very subjectivity which recognises those needs.

In a tiny way, this study has been trying to open up a relatively hidden space, in which these processes operate, at the cutting edge of the social. It provides some small confirmation of the view that social workers are not crudely authoritarian agents of social control, despite the considerable juridical authority which they are able to call upon. It has become a cliché to point out that social workers are put into a double bind. They are expected to use their authority with confidence in the defence of the vulnerable: abused children; the mentally and physically handicapped and so on. But when they do so, they risk being chastised for overstepping their "powers" and undermining the authority and privacy of the family. Armed with their new forms of knowledge, they have shifted away from the authoritative interventions of priestly, religious moralism, or the scientific authority of medicine. Their normative standards are a more,

"flexible formula for resolving the frictions between social urgencies and familial ambitions. *Familial behaviours and social norms were 'floated' in relation to one another; the theory of the role of images provided them with a principle of conversion into one another.* Between the risk of a juridical stiffening of the family and a costly and levelling imperialism of social norms, the discourse on the socializing role of parental images introduced a principle of automatic readjustment of the two authorities. It did

not squash either one, but lessened the risks of conflict and combined their functions." (Donzelot, op. cit. p.217).

Given the irrelevance of the traditional rigidities of the priest and the narrow bounds of the doctor's medical expertise, "it is necessary to bring in an expert in indecision." (ibid. p.229). This sounds like a cruel jibe on Donzelot's part, but we might better describe the social worker as an expert in *indirection*. It was argued in chapters five and seven that, given the need to gain and retain rapport and the cooperation of the client, a necessary tension emerges between citizen exchange and hierarchical, normalising forms of discourse in many cases, particularly where there is a degree of resistance to the agenda of social work discourses, and/or fragility in the social worker/client relationship. In these circumstances, a complex set of procedures in discourse emerge, which attempt to gain further, essential monitoring information, or tentatively encourage the client to adopt the subject position of the good social work subject, thus entering into educative discourse, which is the medium for the shift from the monitoring of discipline to regulation proper, the transformation of the subjectivity of the client. Thus, we can see that in this normalising discourse, there is a considerable inbuilt flexibility and discretion. It is inadequate to explain this discretion simply in terms of the supposedly universal, negotiability of roles and definitions of the situation as characterised by interactionist sociologists (Scheff, T., 1968, and Day, P.R., 1987). This flexibility and negotiation is not so much a property of the "social

actors" participating, as a property of the component discursive practices.

The tentative shifts in the diachronic unfolding of interview discourse cannot be understood solely in terms of the concepts provided by Foucault and Donzelot. What were missing were two essential ingredients: first, a recognition of the complexity of exchanges between discourses, borne by the participants to the confessional interview, together with a recognition of the problems involved in constructing the essential story-teller, confessional subject position; and secondly, the recognition of the implications of the differences between oral and literate based forms of conversational discourse for the orchestration of interviews.

While in the most alluring cases for the social worker, there is likely to be harmony between thematic, symphonic, discursive forms employed by both social worker and client, in many cases, I suggest, the predominantly rhapsodic, oral style of the client's discourse will put severe limits on the extent to which the interview discourse can be orchestrated toward both the form and substance of educative/regulative discourse. The latter is based on sophisticated, literate-based discourse, characterised by inferential, syllogistic forms of reasoning, in which the subject can become an object for self-reflection. The degree to which clients remain locked in a world of residual orality may be the degree to which social work is doomed to fall short of the higher goals of regulation.

Yet the goal of regulation may be less important for many clients, if not for social workers, than what Davies calls maintenance. A problem in Donzelot's subsuming of social workers into the same general category as a range of different counsellors, at least in the British context, is the fact that social workers are rarely just counsellors. We can see, even in the few cases studied here, that social workers are engaged in a complex of very practical relays, with a range of agencies. On behalf of the client: they negotiate reductions of debt repayments with the Gas Board; negotiate with housing, social security departments and so on. This puts a major emphasis, reflected in interview discourse, on the social worker's subject position as advocate.

The shift to regulation may often have to operate within the framework of very mundane discussions about the payment of bills and the clothing needs of children. Perhaps, at the heart of specifically social work discourse, is the attempted shift towards regulative discourse through the creation of relays *within* discourse, which create links between the various subject positions and problems of living in the client's life. Thus, in the mundane interchanges between social worker and client, we can see the attempt to extend the ethical conception of the rational, autonomous, growth oriented and forward looking subject, into the furthest reaches of society.

APPENDIX

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

(1) For Minson,

"the term 'discourse' never simply designates a set of ideas; to the extent that the discourse on the family is inseparable from, because it shapes political *concerns*, investigative *practices* and corrective *measures* in respect to families, The question as to what life in the families of the poor was actually like is not as the supreme organising principle of analysis: the family-social mechanism." (Minson, 1985, p.201, italics in original)

(2) Minson takes this "oversocial" view of the family to its logical conclusion in claiming that the modern "social mother", constructed in part through the investigative and monitoring practices of the normalising agencies, is quite distinct from the mother of earlier times. In this sense, "...women have not always been mothers. It might be more accurate to sum up the perennial status of women in respect to children in the pre-social figure of the "*childbearer*." (ibid., p.208, italics original.)

(3) While we would have some sympathy for this use of Donzelot, we would share Minson's criticism of explanations of welfare which try to assimilate it to the functioning of the state, or the needs of the economy, whether conceived in Marxist or functionalist terms. Essentially, these explanations tend to take for granted the

disciplinary powers which provide the conditions of possibility for modern forms of economy and state. (Minson, 1985, pp.189-218).

(4) But until the belated introduction of female suffrage, this membership of the polity remained an almost exclusively male club.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR

(1) Following Kinsey, and with wry humour, Kadushin points to the class variations in linguistic signs, which presumably, are meant to refer to the "same" extra-mental referents, "the lower socioeconomic interviewee is never 'ill' or 'injured', though he may be 'sick' or 'hurt'. He does not 'wish' to do a thing, though he 'wants' to do it. He does not 'perceive', though he 'sees'. He is not 'acquainted with a person,' though he may 'know him' (Kinsey, 1948, p.52, quoted in Kadushin, op.cit. pp.34-35). Moreover, "social workers rarely tell people anything- they 'share information'; they do not explain agency service but 'interpret' it; they may not make friends, although they do 'establish relationships.'

A middle-aged man referred to a family service agency for marital counselling is talking about a problem he has in being on time for appointments. The worker tries to determine whether tardiness is a general problem:

"WORKER: Do you have any other kinds of difficulties in this area?

CLIENT: No, not in this area, but I did have the same trouble when I lived in Cincinnati." (ibid, p.35).

(2) The notion of interviews needing "flow" lends support to Sainsbury et. al's claim, in their study of retrospective accounts of social worker/client relations, that the predominant interviewing style used by local authority social workers was "ventilation". By this they mean the provision of a space within which clients are given free range to ventilate their feelings; this is usually accompanied by the provision of general support by the social worker, who provides comfort to the client trying to cope with difficult life situations, and a nominal form of supervision (Sainsbury et al. 1982, pp.35 and 113).

Moreover, in a significant proportion of cases, over the course of unfolding social worker/client relationships during the period of the study, this style of interviewing came to displace other styles (ibid. p.35).

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE

(1) Pace Dingwall et. al., it is questionable how far medical practice could ever be characterised just in terms of private contractual service provision (Minson, op.cit. chap.6). Certainly this representation was always problematic for social work. This is

particularly the case where mothers and children are concerned. As Dingwall et. al. put it, who is the client? "The interests of children can easily become obscured by the interests of adults in such a context to a degree to which minimises the possibilities of identifying mistreatment." (Dingwall et. al. op. cit. p.105).

(2) For a good review see Whittington, C. and Holland, R. 1985.

(3) The exchange pattern in conversational discourse need not take the obvious form of immediately adjacent, obviously reciprocal speech events. A harmonious, balanced response between two parties may be achieved over a number of turns, and not necessarily all on the obvious, surface level of speech (Stubbs, 1983, (pp,131-132).

(4) Thus, in this account, unlike the ethnomethodological account of Schegloff and Sacks, which relies on the notion that there are universal normative properties of conversations, the appropriate conversational knowledge form, that is how it is assumed that participants should conduct conversational discourse, is itself a product of particular strategic frames of discursive practice, in this case the confessional frame of the social work interview, which both allocates subject positions and makes available knowledge and skills involved in playing out those subject positions.

(5) We cannot take it for granted that participants exist as complete, unitary subjects. At the least, in discourse theory we must put the corporal "existence" of these subjects in brackets for

the purposes of analysis. This is, in part, explicable in terms of the diversity within conversational discourse of subject positions occupied by particular individuals and their developments over time (I am grateful to N. Rose for this point.)

It may seem paradoxical, therefore to talk about clients "resisting" subject positions. We are here up against the assumptions about subjectivity buried in words themselves, that actions are always authored in some way by conscious selves; but we cannot enter into this debate here. Suffice to note at this point that we only refer to resistance as far as it is visible in discourse itself; that it is, for example, located in the utterances of a particular speaking participant of the conversational discourse.

(6) While Cuff and Silverman's analyses are instructive for the analysis presented here, and Silverman draws an explicit reference to the parallels with Donzelot's work, (Silverman, op. cit., p.264), which we could argue, point to the possibilities of rapprochement between hitherto discordant schools of discourse analysis, there remain differences of emphasis and conceptual orientation between these researchers and the concerns of this thesis. For example, it is not clear how membership category devices, or standardised relational pairs become established within a discursive community in the first place. The lack of a clear historical framework in Sacks' original work may help to account for a relative lack of concern with this question.

In the terms of the theoretical framework of this thesis, it is important to locate these devices, not within the abstract realm of culture in general, but within particular, historically produced discursive practices. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to investigate the intricate developments of these devices, but it is useful, at this stage, to locate them within the discursive practices of the normalising professions. The need to rebut accusations of bad motherhood in their characteristically modern forms, and to negotiate the operation of SRPs arises in the general conditions in which the normalising professions have acquired the rights to monitor the inner lives of families, and in which broader constructions of the social mother are made practically relevant to the lives of clients.

Secondly, Silverman makes clear that, in an echo of Garfinkel, his analyses enable him to uncover deeper moral forms, while not reducing the human actor to the level of a "cultural dope" (Silverman, 1987, p.263). In other words, his work is still committed to maintaining a view of the participant in discourse as rational and possibly as a unitary subject, orchestrating his or her moves in discourse (but cf. Silverman, 1985, pp. 90-91). This thesis risks precisely the charge of reducing the individual to a cultural dope, since, like Foucault, it remains agnostic about the general characteristics of the human subject, particularly the epistemological humanist position which presents the individual as a unitary subject. Thus, this thesis rather faintheartedly represents discursive moves of rebuttal and resistance and so forth, cited in

the speech of either the social worker or client, without assuming that either are responsible and reflective, in the full moral sense, about those discursive moves. In fact, given the arguments in chapter six, noetic (subjective) characteristics, are best seen, not in universal terms, but rather in terms of their dialectical relation to varying forms of orality and literacy.

(7) Whether or not she is being a "sincere" interactant or is involved in what Goffman called impression management and face work (Goffman 1959 & 1967) is not at issue here. As indicated at the beginning of the last chapter, it is essential for this analysis to separate the "real subject", with a complex field of unknowable perceptions and motivations from the subjects in discourse, which are more recoverable to analysis since they take a more publically visible form and the strategies adopted by interactants work through historically created collective representations, in this case of motherhood.

(7) And we could add, rhetorically, establishes a world "as if" it exists.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX

(1) Having apparently rejected any notion of a prior substratum of sequentially ordered events as a basis for narrative plot structure, she then smuggles a correspondence theory formulation back in by recognising a caveat in non-fiction narratives, which are presented as a special case. "There are, of course, narratives (such as chronicles, news reports, gospels, and personal anecdotes) that are the accounts of events that have presumably already occurred in some determinate chronological sequence" (ibid., p.228). This leaves the court free for a focus on more obviously imaginative narrative forms, from spoken anecdote to high literature.

(2) In fact it is probably more accurate to use the term story in this framework, since it covers a broader range of accounts than the more narrowly defined notion of narrative.

(3) "we see conversation as a type of human interaction, taking place within a social definition of the situation as a departure for further analysis, we attempt to define the therapeutic interview as a social occasion before we apply to it the general rules of discourse analysis." (Labov and Fanshel, 1977, p.26).

(4) While drawing on the inspiration of Bernstein's work, there will not be here any attempt to provide a systematic evaluation of or application of his theory of codes in this instance.

(5) It would be foolish to suggest that all social workers are literate to the same degree, and it would take considerably more

research to discover the full extent to which social workers' speech patterns in interviews do indicate the internalisation of noetic resources associated with writing and print, yet given their education and training and the practical requirements of report writing, it is reasonable to expect that trained workers must normally practise at a reasonable level of skill in literacy.

(6) Though factual narrative is constructed via an artful rhetoric (cf. Smith, 1978), it could be that the sharp differentiation between fact and value is itself founded on literate discourses, which provide its conditions of possibility.

(7) Frank Parkin makes a similar point when he notes that Weber's preferred solution to the problem of how we can understand the actions of others is that we can better understand them insofar as they share our use of rational thinking processes (Parkin, 1982, pp. 22-24).

NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN

(1) A note of caution should be sounded here. While Smith's account of the function of rhetoric influences this analysis, her account, operating within the ethnomethodological school, tends to present the attribution of mental illness in terms of a general analysis of labelling processes within commonsense discourse. It is beyond our brief in this thesis to provide a systematic critique of the

epistemological basis of Smith's account. We will simply emphasise that, rather than viewing these uses of rhetoric as universal properties of discourse, we will assume that, like the social workers' discourses, they are historically and institutionally structured and located, and create their own regimes of truth within particular conversational settings. These are, nevertheless, usually located within wider discursive fields, which provide the conditions of possibility for conversations. We would suggest that it is plausible to see the client's account as, in part, affected by the contact she has had with psychiatric explanations of conduct.

(2) We are not assuming, for the purposes of this analysis, a definite epistemological position on the existence or non existence of the unitary subject. Thus, within this analysis, clients and social workers are not to be considered as ready made subjects who "use" various linguistic strategies in their dealings with each other. Rather, the subjects are co-constituted within the fields of discourse. Furthermore, and following on from the last point, power is to be seen not primarily as a repressive force used by dominant subjects over weaker ones. It is, rather, a field of relations between subjects which, "produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production." (Foucault, 1977, p. 194).

(3) Now it is important not to view the client's tactics too narrowly, in terms of the deductive application of a form of logic.

While this study provides us with less access to the clients' networks of relationships and their characteristic discursive practices, nevertheless, we must remember that clients' discourses are, like those of social workers, located in a complex network of discursive practices. A key element of the lives of the poor is the struggle to overcome the traps of poverty, whereby, additional income can disqualify one from social security benefits, thus reducing the incentive to gain further income, or providing an incentive to conceal such income. It is plausible to argue that there is an affinity between the recurrent struggle with these conditions of welfare dependancy and the operation of what Ong calls situational logic (Ong, op.cit., pp.49-57).

(4) In explaining, during a group discussion with the social workers involved in the study, why clients have expressed appreciation for her conduct, the social worker put it this way:--

SW1: I don't feel it's me they're talking about, ehm and in fact that chap on that tape, I felt he wasn't and he's he's because he's articulate, he's said it again, either before or since, uhm in more detail and what he's actually saying is that (1.0). I'm the first one who's listened. I think he's got a long history going way back, but not very much recent contact, because he was considered to be sort of unworkable with and I think he did suffer in his adolescence from the older type of social workers who were very directive. Uhm and who got his back up. Uhm and then they they set up a vicious circle, with him slamming doors in people's faces, and he has

several times said, the difference with you is that you *listen*; nobody's ever listened before and I don't think this is me. I think this is the way that casework techniques have changed.

This social worker also remarked that, "People come and see us because they have failed in some way and they're feeling humiliated by this. They do all sorts of different things, but they can't cope on their own. You have to stress what they *can* do."

In relation to this client specifically, she stated that she saw "a long term involvement with Mr. B, to work out his problems, rather than constantly fighting authority."

Clearly, given the logic of our non humanist epistemology, we do not view the social worker as especially privileged in her understanding of her own discursive practices. Her account is one out of many possible ones and may have been partly a product of the interview setting. But, as we have already indicated, in ways which further research must uncover, it seems likely that shifts in instructional discourse have had some impact on professional working discourses, for example in relation to the establishment of psycho-social strategies and the use of techniques like paraphrasing.

(5) Here a contrast can be drawn, in terms of the operation of rhetoric, with that employed in the client's narrative in T9S2 ("The Hostile Client"), about her daughter's "disturbed behaviour".

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adcock, M., and White. R., eds. 1985. Good Enough Parenting, a framework for assessment. London, BAAF.

Agar, M., and Hobbs, J.R., 1982. Interpreting Discourse: Coherence and the Analysis of Ethnographic Interviews. Discourse Processes 5: 1-32.

Astbury, B. E., 1946. The Effects Of Long Separation On Family Life. Social Work 3, 2,: 237-241

Atkinson, J.M., 1982. Understanding Formality: the categorization and production of 'formal' interaction. British Journal of Sociology, vol.33, no. 1: 86-117.

Austin, J.L. 1962. How To Do Things With Words, ed. J.O. Urmson. London, Oxford University Press.

Baldock, J. and Prior, D. 1981. Social Workers Talking To Clients: a study of verbal behaviour. British Journal of Social Work, 11, 19-38.

Bean, P., ed. 1984. Adoption, Essays in social policy and sociology. London. Tavistock

Becker, H. 1963. Outsiders: Studies In The Sociology of Deviance. New York, Free Press.

Becker, S., and MacPherson, S. 1986. Research Note: Poor Clients. British Journal of Social Work, 16: 689-691.

Bernstein, B., 1964. Social Class, Speech Systems and Psycho-Therapy. British Journal of Social Work, 15: 54-64.

Bernstein, B., 1971. *Class Codes And Control* vol. 1, London. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Biestek, F., 1957. *The Casework Relationship*. Chicago, Loyola University press.

Bird, J. F., and Short, S.D. 1984. *Michel Foucault And medical Sociology*, Bristol, Bristol Polytechnic.

Black, J., et. al., 1983. *Social Work In Context, A Comparative Study Of Three Social Service Teams*, London, Tavistock.

Bland, L., and Mort, F., 1984. *Look Out for The Good Time Girl*. In, *Formations Of The Nation And People*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Bogardus, E., 1936. *Introduction To Social Research*. Los Angeles, Sutton House.

Borgatta, E.F. et. al., 1960, *Social Workers' Perceptions of Clients*. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Brewer, C., and Lait, J., 1980. *Can Social Work Survive?*. London, Temple Smith.

Briggs, C. L., 1986. *Learning How To Ask. A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview on social science research*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Brown, B., and Cousins, M., 1980. *The Linguistic Fault: the Case of Foucault's Archeology*. *Economy And Society*, ix, 3: 251-78.

Browne, E., 1978., *Social Work Activities*, in O. Stevenson and P. Parsloe, *Social Services teams: The Practitioners View*, London, H. M. S. O.

- Burke, K., 1937 and 1965. Permanence And Change. New York, Bobbs-Merrill.
- Browne, E., 1978. Social Work Activitie. In O. Stevenson and P. Parsloe, Social Services Teams: The Practitioner's View. H. M. S. O.
- Byrne, P. S., and Long, B. L., 1976. Doctors Talking To Patients. London, HMSO
- Carrithers, M., et. al., (eds.) 1985. The Category of The Person, Anthropology, Philosophy, History. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Chatman, S, 1978. Story And Discourse: Narrative Structure In Fiction And Film. Ithica, N.Y. Cornell University Press.
- Cockburn, C. 1977. The Local State. London, Pluto.
- Cohen, S., 1973, Folk Devils And Moral Panics: the creation of mods and rockers. London, Paladin.
- Cooper, C. 1985. 'Good Enough', border-line and 'Bad-enough' parenting. In M. Adcock and R. White eds. op.cit.
- Corrigan, P., and Leonard, P. 1978. Social Work Practice Under Capitalism. London, Macmillan.
- Coulthard, M., 1977. An Introduction to Discourse Analysis. London, Longman.
- Cousins, M., and Hussain, A., 1984., Michel Foucault. London, MacMillan.
- Cross, C. P., 1974. Interviewing and Communication in Social Work. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Cuff, E.C. and Francis, D.W., 1978. Some Features Of "Invited Stories" About Marriage Breakdown. *International Journal Of The Sociology Of Language*, 18: 111-133.

Cuff, E.C., 1980. Some Issues In The Problem of Studying Versions In Everyday Situations, Occasional Paper no. 3, Dept. of Sociology, University of Manchester.

Curnock, K. and Hardiker, P. 1979. *Towards Practice Theory, Skills and Methods in Social Assessments*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dale, P., et al., 1986. *Dangerous Families, Assessment and treatment of Child Abuse*. London, Tavistock.

Davies, M., 1974. *Social Work In The Environment*. London, H. M. S. O.

Davies, M., 1985. *The Essential Social Worker*. Aldershot, Gower.

Day, P., 1985. An Interview: Constructing Reality. *British Journal of Social Work*, 15: 487-499.

Day, P., 1987. *Sociology In Social Work Practice*. London, MacMillan.

Denzin, N., 1970. *the Research Act In Sociology*. London, Butterworth.

Derrida, J., 1976. *Of Grammatology*, trans. by G. Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore and London, John Hopkins University Press.

Dingwall, R., 1980. *Orchestrated Encounters: An Essay in the Comparative Analysis of Speech-Exchange Systems*. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, vol. 1, no. 2: 151-173.

Dingwall, R., et al., 1983. *The Protection Of Children*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Donald, J., 1985. Beacons Of The Future: schooling, subjection and subjectification, in V. Beechey and J. Donald eds., Subjectivity And social Relations. Milton Keynes, Open Universtiy Press.

Donzelot, J., 1979. The Policing Of Families, Welfare versus the State. London, Hutchinson.

Dreyfus, H., and Rabinow, P., 1982. Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Brighton, Harvester.

Elbourne, R., 1982. Talking About Dreams. Ph.D. thesis. BLL;no. D42875/82, London, Brunel University.

Fisher, M., ed. 1983, Speaking Of Clients. Sheffield, University Of Sheffield.

Fitzjohn, J., 1974. An Interactinist view of the social work interview. British Journal of Social Work, 4, 4.

Foucault, M. 1972. The Archeology of Knowledge, translated by Alan Sheridan. New York, Harper Colophon.

Foucault, M. 1977. Discipline and Punish. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Foucault, M., 1979. The History Of Sexuality. Hamondsworth, Penguin.

Foucault, M., 1979b. On Governmentality. Ideology and Consciousness, 6.

Foucault, M., 1980. Two lectures, in C. Gordon, ed. Michel Foucault, Power/Knowledge. Brighton, Harvester.

Foucault, M., 1982. The Subject and Power, in Dreyfus, H.L., and Rabinow, P., Michel Foucault, Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics. Brighton, Harvester.

- Freidson, E., 1986. Professional Powers, a study of the institutionalisation of formal knowledge. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Garland, D., 1985. Punishment and Welfare. Aldershot, Gower.
- Garvin, C.D., and Seabury, B. A., 1984. Interpersonal Practice In Social Work. New York, Prentice Hall.
- Gilroy, P., 1987. There Ain't No Black In The Union Jack, the cultural politics of race and nation. London, Hutchinson.
- Glaser, B., and Strauss, A., 1967. The Discovery Of Grounded Theory, Chicago, Aldine.
- Glasser, W., 1965. Reality Therapy: A New Approach To Psychiatry. New York, Harper Row.
- Goffman, E., 1959. Presentation of Self In Everyday Life, N.Y., Anchor.
- Goffman, E., 1967. Interaction Ritual, N.Y., Anchor.
- Goffman, E., 1971. Relations In Public, Harmondsworth, : Penguin.
- Goffman, E., 1975. Replies and Responses - Working Paper, Università di Urbino.
- Goffman, E., Forms of Talk. 1981. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Goldstein, H. 1973. Social Work Practice: A Unitary Approach, Columbia, University of South Carolina Press.
- Gould, N., 1989. Reflective learning For Social Work Practices. Social Work Education, Vol.8, no.2: 9-19.

- Halmos, P., 1966. *The Faith Of The Counselors*. New York, Schocken Books.
- Halsey, A. H., 1982. Provincials and Professionals: The British Post-War Sociologists. *Archives Europeenes de Sociologie*, xxiii, 1: 165-175.
- Hammersley, M., and Atkinson, P. 1983. *Ethnography In Practice, Principles In Practice*. London, Tavistock.
- Hapgood, M., 1984. Older child adoption and the knowledge base of adoption practice, in P. Bean ed. *Adoption*. London, Tavistock.
- Heritage, J., 1984. *Garfinkel And Ethnomethodology*. Oxford, Blackwell. 65
- Heritage, J., and Watson, D.R., 1980. Aspects Of The Properties Of Formulations In Natural Conversations. *Semiotica*, 30 : 245-262
- Heritage, J., and Watson, D.R., 1979. Formulations as Conversational Objects, in Psathas, G., *Everyday language*. New York, Irvington.
- Hirst, P. 1981. *The Genesis Of The Social*, in *Politics And Power 3*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hirst, P., and Woolley, P., 1982. *Social Relations and Human Attributes*. London, Tavistock.
- Hodges, J., and Hussain, A. 1979. Review of Donzelot. *Ideology and Consciousness*, 5.
- Honey, J., 1988., *The language Trap; Race, Class and 'Standard English' in British Schools*, in N. Mercer, ed. *Language and literacy from and educational perspective*, vol. 1, Milton Keynes, Open University Press.

Howe, D., 1987. An Introduction To Social Work Theory. Aldershot, Wildwood house.

Jefferson, G., 1978, Sequential Aspects Of Storytelling In Conversation, In J. Schenkein ed., Studies In The Organisation Of Conversational Interaction, New York, Academic Press.

Kadushin, A., 1983. 2nd. ed., The Social Work Interview, New York, Columbia University Press.

Kempe, C.H., et. al., 1962., The Battered Child Syndrome. Journal of The american Medical Association, no. 181: 17-24.

Keith - Lucas, A., 1963, a Critique of the Principle of Client Self-Determination, Social Work, (USA), 8:66-71.

Knott, B. H., 1974. Social Work As Symbolic Interaction, British Journal Of Social Work, 4, 1: 5-12.

Labov, W., 1969. The Logic Of Non-Standard English, Georgetown Monographs on Language and Linguistics, 22, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press.

Labov, W, 1972. The Transformation of Experience in Narrative Syntax. In W. Labov, ed., Language in The Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular.

Labov W., and Fanshel D., 1977. Therapeutic Discourse, Psychotherapy as Conversation, London, Academic Press.

Labov, W., and Waletzky, J., 1967. Narrative Analysis. In Essays on the verbal and visual arts. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Leacock, E., 1976. Abstract versus Concrete Speech: A False Dichotomy, in J. Beck et. al. eds. Readings For A Sociology Of Education, London, Collier MacMillan.

Leonard, P., 1984. *Personality and Ideology, towards a materialist understanding of the individual*, London, MacMillan.

Lennard, H.L., and Bernstein, A., 1960. *The Anatomy of Psychotherapy*, New York, Columbia University Press.

Levi-Strauss, C., 1966. *The Savage Mind*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Lewin, K., 1951. *Field Theory In Social Science*, ed. D, Cartwright, New York, Harper Row

Lindesmith, A. R., 1952. Comment On W.S. Robinson's 'The Logical Structure Of Analytic Induction'. *American Sociological Review*, 17: 492-93.

Luria, A. R., 1976. *Cognitive Development, Its Cultural And Social Foundations*, ed. M. Cole, translated by M. Lopez-Morillas and L. Solotaroff, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.

Marshall, T.H. 1965. *Social policy*, London, Hutchinson.

Mauss, M., 1985. A category of the human mind: the notion of the person; the notion of self, in Carrithers ed. 1985. *The Category of the person*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Mayer, J.E., and Timms, N., 1970. *The Client Speaks, Working class impressions of casework*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Meyer, H. et al., 1964. A study Of the Interview Process: the Case-worker-Client Relationship, *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 69: 247-295.

Miller, P. and Rose, N., 1988. The Tavistock Programme: The Government of Subjectivity and Social Life, *Sociology*, 22,2: 171-192.

Milroy, L., 1987. Observing and Analysing Natural Language, A Critical Account Of Sociolinguistic Method, Oxford, Blackwell.

Minson, J., 1985. Genealogies Of Morals, Nietzsche, Foucault, Donzelot and the Eccentricity of Ethics, London, MacMillan.

Mishler, E. G., 1986, Research Interviewing, Context and Narrative, Cambridge Mass. Harvard University Press.

Mitchel, J. C., 1983. The logic of the analysis of social situations and cases. Sociological Review, 31, 2: 187-211.

Ong, W., 1982. Orality And Literature, London, Methuen.

Parker, J., 1979. Social Policy and Citizenship, London, MacMillan.

Parkin, F., 1982. Max Weber, London, Tavistock.

Parry, N., and Parry, J., 1979, Social Work Professionalism and The State. In N. Parry et. al. eds., Social Work, Welfare and The State, London, Edward Arnold.

Parsons, T., 1951. The Social System, Glencoe, The Free Press.

Parton, N., 1985., The Politics Of Child Abuse, London, MacMillan.

Pearson, G., 1973. Social Work As The Privatized Solution of Public Ills, British Journal of Social Work, 3,2: 209-27

Pearson, G., 1975. The Deviant Imagination, London, Macmillan.

Phillipson, C., 1982. Capitalism and The Construction of Old Age, London, Macmillan

Philp, M., 1979. Notes On The Form Of Knowledge In Social Work, The Sociological Review, 27, 1: 83-111

Pincus, A., and Minahan, A., 1973. Social Work Practice: Model and Method, Itasca, Ill., Peacock.

Propp, V., 1928 and 1968, Morphology Of The Folk Tale, 2nd ed., Austin, University Of Texas press.

Pugh, E. 1968, Social Work In Child Care, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rabinow, P., ed., 1984. The Foucault Reader, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Rapoport, R., and Rapoport, R.N., 1971. Dual Career families, Harmondsworth, Middlesex.

Rapoport, R., and Rapoport, R. N., eds., 1982. Families In Britain, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rees, S., 1978. Social Work Face To Face, London, Edward Arnold.

Rees, S. and Wallace, A., 1982. Verdicts On Social Work. London, Edward Arnold.

Reid, W., and Shyne, A., 1969. Brief and Extended Casework, New York, Columbia University Press.

Ricoeur, P. 1978. The Rule Of Metaphor, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Robinson, T., 1978. In Worlds Apart: Professionals And Their Clients in the Welfare State, London, Bedford Square Press.

Rock, P. 1979. The Making Of Symbolic Interactionism, London, MacMillan.

Room, G., 1979. *The Sociology Of Welfare, Social Policy, Stratification and Political Order*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Rose, N., 1985. *The Psychological Complex*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Rosen, H., 1974. *Language And Class*, 3rd. ed., Bristol, Falling Wall Press.

Sacks, H., 1972a. *On the Analysability of Stories by Children*, in J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), *Directions In Sociolinguistics*. New York. Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Sacks, H., 1972b. *An Initial Investigation of The UsabilityOf Conversational Data For doing Sociology*, in D. Sudnow (ed.), *Studies In Interaction*. Glencoe, Free Press.

Sacks, H., 1974. *On The Analysability of Stories By Children*, in R. Turner (ed.), *Ethnomethodology*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. and Jefferson, G. 1974. *A Simplest Systematics for the organisation of turn taking for conversation*, *Language* 50, 696-735.

Sainsbury, E., et. al. 1982. *Social Work In Focus.*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Scheff, T. 1968. *Negotiating reality: notes on the assessment of responsibility*, *Social Problems*, 16, 3-17.

Schegloff, E. A., 1978. *On Some Questions and Ambiguities in Conversation*, in W. V. Dressler, (ed.), *Current Trends In Text Linguistics*. De Gruyter,

- Schegloff, E. A., and Sacks, H., 1973. Opening Up Closings, *Semiotica*, 8, 289-237.
- Searle, J. R., 1969. *Speech Acts*, London, Cambridge University Press.
- Silverman, D., 1985. *Qualitative Methodology and Sociology*, Aldershot, Gower.
- Silverman, D., 1987. *Communication and Medical practice, Social relations in the clinic*, London, Sage.
- Smith, B, Herrnstein, 1980. Narrative Versions, Narrative Theories, *Critical Inquiry*, 7: 212-236.
- Smith, D., 1978. K Is Mentally Ill: The anatomy Of A Factual Account. *Sociology*, 12: 23-53.
- Stenson, K., 1986. Foucault, Policing And The Body, National Deviancy Conference, Polytechnic Of Central London.
- Stenson, K., and Gould, N., 1986. A Comment On 'A Framework For Theory in Social Work' by Whittington and Holland, *Issues In Social Work Education*, 6, 1: 41-45.
- Strutt, B., 1974. Traditions of interviewing; practical considerations, in C. Cross ed. *Interviewing and Communication in social Work*, London, RKP.
- Stubbs, M., 1983. *Discourse Analysis*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Whittington, C., and Holland, R., 1985. A Framework for Theory in Social Work, *Issues In Social Work Education*, 5, 1: 25-50.
- Thane, P. 1982. *Foundations Of The Welfare State*. New York, Longman.
- Timms, N and Timms, R., 1977. *Perspectives In Social Work*, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Titmuss, R. M., 1963. *Essays on the Welfare State*, London, Allen And Unwin.

Timuss, R. M., 1968. *Commitment To Welfare*, London, Allen and Unwin.

Wilson, E., 1977. *Women And The Welfare State*, London, Tavistock.

Whittington, C. 1971. *Self-determination Re-examined*, *British Journal Of Social Work*, 1: 293-303.

Whittington, C., and Holland, R., 1985. *A Framework For Theory In Social Work*, *Issues In Social Work Education*, 5: 25-50.

Winnicott, C., 1964. *Child Care and Social Work*, London, Bookstall Publications.

Winnicott, D.W., 1957. *The Child And The Family*, London, Tavistock.

Woolfson, N., 1978. *A feature of performed narrative: the conversational historical present*, *Language and Society*, 7: 215-237

Younghusband, E., 1981. *The Newest Profession, A Short History of Social Work*, Sutton, Surrey, Community Care/IPC Business Press.

TAPE 12 SIDE ONE

THE GOOD SOCIAL WORK SUBJECT

Beginning 2 mins past

- Discussion about client's (minimal) income. Filling in a form which is an application for a council nursery place.

S. W: Nothing under any of these sections.

CL: No we don't get any of these no.

S. W: Yes

CL: Not at the moment see I'd be going out to work. I'm hoping that if he gets into the nursery should be able to go to work to earn some money. See I mean we've got some rent arrears which we've got to clear up other < the council will get very tacky about that situation so we've got to clear that up and I thought well if I go out to work. I can. help you know to get over these mm things

S. W: What kind of work would you do

CL: Office work

S. W: Office work yeh you've done that before

CL: Oh yes yes I've had ehm six years experience of office work you see so I'm not sort of I know what I'm doing when it comes to it and I've been offered a job actually in my old firm but it hasn't come up yet

S. W: MM=

CL: = But they said when it comes up see () < there's no rush for a job at that particular time but now I sort of got to the stage where I've panicked inside and I've thought I must do something (laughs) you know go out to work and do something you know. So ehm I thought what I'd do I'd do is go temporary first

S. W: Yes with an agency =

CL: Yes yes and then I'd what I earn well I'm not sure but I think its about about (?) an hour perhaps more. I'm not really sure all depends on what sort of office work 'cause I'll take anything

got you know I'm not going to say just typing or just invoicing
CL: or just filing or whatever you know whatever they've got that
week I'll take you know So ehm

S. W: But this depends on A getting into the Royal

CL: exactly

SW: = do you call him A or T?

CL: A A A

S. W: A?

CL: A for the children that's what they called him you know

S. W: And how old is he?

CL: He's three and three quarters he'll be four in April. You're
nearly four love (to child) Alright shush

S. W: Have you got a nursery place for him?

CL: Well I went over to C H over here and they said ehm I said to em
have they got any places and they said well we have got a few.
So she said you do realise it's f- a week now and I said oh I'm
helping the welfare might be able to help me a bit you know so
she sa< oh well in that case if the welfare's going to help you
you've definately got a place.

S. W: Yeh

CL: You know so I mean she said I'll put his name down could start
today I said well I haven't (laughs) seen the welfare worker yet

S. W: Yes uhm

CL: You know but ehm if they could help me I mean I know it's I
haven't put down the rent that's £20 Give me that (to child)

S. W: And could you put down what you paid for rent and if you're
paying off

CL: that's including rates as well

S. W: Yes alright

CL: Ehm

S. W: Does your husband have any fares to and from work?

CL: Yes I think works out about £12 a week. Come here (to child) No
sit down (continues to attempt to control child) Ehm I've put
down the electric cooker.

S. W: Yes

- CL: There I didn't put it in there but it works out to about £40 a
CL: quarter about £3.50 per week. Television's a pound a week slot
meter. You see this is where my money goes its in slot meters
you see.
- S. W: Yes =
- CL: I wanted to convert this one back to the ordinary and pay it off
weekly with them it would work out cheaper that way because it's
something like about () our bill now where as with the slot
my friends got exactly the same as me and she pay forty her
- S. W: mm
- CL: last bill was £56
- S. W: She pays she pay herself on a meter or by credit
- CL: On a quarterly
- S. W: Quarterly credit yes
- CL: You see
- S. W: Credit is probably a little bit cheaper the only problem is with
it is you know if you're short of money when the bill comes you
- CL: exactly that is the problem.
- S. W: it builds up and up and up
- CL: Well that we had that problem once before
- S. W: MM
- CL: (admonishes child) Mm Don't get any of this (re the form)Ehm oh
we have we have got the £30 we have to pay £6 a week back to my
mother-in-law cause we had to borrow some money to pay an
outstanding debt with the court you know and oh
- S. W: What kind of debt were you paying off to (...) that your mother-
in-law paid you the money for?
- CL: Well they were gonna make us bankrupt see cause it was about a
washing machine that kept going wrong it's all very complicated
we were accused of (...) and they wouldn't come and repair it
(child interruptions) So we had to borrow money off of B's mum
for it well she offered to lend it to us so we could < so we
weren't made bankrupt so=
- S. W: = I think you should put that down and if you don't mind
explaining to them about finances. They would realise it was an
important debt

CL: hm

S. W: That'd have to be paid but

CL: Thirty

S. W: Put the amount there

CL: And how shall I sort of phrase it?

S. W: Repayment of debt to mother-in-law. Do you want to explain what the debt was for or would you rather leave it out?

CL: Mm well I don't mind explaining eh but it's putting it in the most simplest terms isn't it?

S. W: put in brackets to prevent ban bankruptcy
..... lovely great

CL: Ehm

S. W: Now do you think that's all that would come under your necessary expenditure that's leaving aside food and everything else

CL: Yes that's everything there. So that's err
(....)..... (counting up debts and drawing up balance sheet)

S. W: How much do you think you'll be able to offer towards the

CL: Well I could man I could manage half of it I think

S. W: Well put that down then. It's always a good idea to suggest that you can offer something because they.. (writing)

CL: Just sign it?

S. W: Just sign it and

(discussion about date) (writing continues for c-1 Minute sound of childrens' T.V. programme in the background)

CL: I shall what shall I put here leave it?

SW: Housewife at present.....what I shall do is send in a covering note claiming that

CL: saying that

S. W: you're looking for a job

CL: o.k. ehm

S. W: Now we have all those who've applied at nursery you've applied for we have in fact also because you're applying for financial assistance we have to do our own part too=

CL: Yes

S. W: So I wonder if I can borrow your pen and you could give me details now it's it's A

CL: A yes want his full name? A ()

(discussion about child's name and date of birth and names of other children)

S. W: Now details of parents < oh I'll put them on here because um

CL: um (admonishes child)

(social worker continues filling in family details on her form)

S. W: So if you'd just like to read that.....

CL: Yeh

S. W: O.K? (client then completes the form)

S. W: The only thing I really ehm need to know perhaps you'd just like to show me over the flat because I need to have details of the kind of living accommodation you have

CL: Yes fine

(client shows social worker around flat - tape is switched off)

S. W: Ehm what...do you think you'll do if in fact the borough treasurer turns down your application for financial assistance?

CL: ..Well I'll just carry on as I am now so obviously the nursery is out at the moment cause eh I mean I couldn't afford it

S. W: It's quite a lot = to commit yourself to

CL: It is

CL: Oh yes definately if the if the job at TTT where I used to work come up within the next two weeks I mean possibly I could manage it then but

S. W: yah

CL: but it really it wouldn't be

CL: worth my while working cause of paying it

S. W: Yah

CL: It would be cheaper to stay at home

S. W: Yeh

CL: Cause I'd be working for no reason I wouldn't be able to help financially which is what I hoped to do to clear us out of money worries so that we can well () later on. I don't like the idea of sending em to nursery I hate it. You know I'm not I'm not one of these Mums who send their kids out just for the sake of doing it

S. W: Did you take eh did you send R and C?

CL: To an afternoon nursery only

S. W: Yes I don't know whether you remember I called about a year

CL: yes that's right

S. W: or two years ago in fact you've changed a lot since then I was almost wondering if you were the same Mrs H

CL: laugh

S. W: I seem to remember you telling me you were going also to some sort of playgroup

CL: That's right it's the one o'clock club

S. W: yes

CL: and I took them to MH nursery in fact it was the health visitor who got them into MH this one first and then it just followed on they all went and I tried to get a day place for him which they did do day places at the time

S. W: yeh

CL: and she said we would have loved to have taken him but we don't do it anymore.

S. W: Oh dear

CL: See so I thought I'll have to look elsewhere you know we didn't mind the afternoon nursery cause it's only two hours in the afternoon and it did him so much good that you know being in a flat stuck all day long, you know it gets them out (1.0) they

SW: Yeh

CL: Yeh.

learned to socialise with other children and learned to play with other children cause he was a bit of a problem when he was a little boy.

S. W: He took a little time to learn to talk didn't he?

CL: Yes see he was um

S. W: Now he's talking quite alright?

CL: Oh yeh can't stop him now but he was ehm I think if I hadn't have acted then he might have been one of those children that they would have called disturbed

S. W: mm

CL: We could have had problems with him later. You know cause being in a flat and not having I mean the neighbours here don't socialize you know you don't have coffee mornings or anything like that where the children all get together we're stuck in here day after day with nowhere to go.

S. W: Yes

CL: <You know it wasn't so bad in the summer cause you could go to a park or go outside on the green but in the winter you know it was

S. W: Mm is that part of the reason why you'd like to take a job also because it would be good for you in a sense it would get you out of the house a bit and then you'd give the children a bit more sort of attention?

CL: Yes because I think that um well everybody I think you get your times when you've had enough of the kids and they've enough of you

S. W: mm

CL: You know and they're backbiting you and you're backbiting them and you smack them unnecessarily I mean not beat them or anything like that you just sitting there or you're doing something and they come in and you just say oh go away you know and you don't mean to do it but it just when you've had them all day long and you're sort of like this you know when you're tensed up at the end of the day you know little things like that when they keep coming up interrupting whatever you're doing you know I mean I try to to er.. bring them into everything I do you know when I'm washing up the kitchen I'll get them you know give Mummy a hand if they want to I don't force them you know if they want to they come out A loves it It's his idea of heaven in the

S. W: yes

CL: morning when I've taken the children to school come home and help me do the washing up you know

S. W: Yeh

CL: = he thinks he's grown up and everything. But I try to involve them in everything I do more or less to a certain extent obviously. I think it would benefit them to go out to work because I'd I'd...

S. W: Think you'd appreciate them more when you got home.

CL: Yes yes definately and I could give them more You know I mean I know it sounds silly I wouldn't have so much time with them but the time I had with them I'd give 'em more in it=

S. W: =Quality rather than quantity.

CL: =Exactly You know I mean they wouldn't be fed up with me they'd be pleased to see me likewise I'd be pleased to see them cause when they come from school when they've been there all day the two eldest.

S. W: Mm

CL: I'm really pleased to see 'em. They respond you know whereas at weekends when I've got them home you know and they can't go out cause it's raining or like now they're ill

S. W: Mm

CL: You know they start getting bored they keep on Mummy do this Mummy do that < every five minutes it's something different you know

S. W: And how you feel affects you know how you feel towards your

CL: exactly

S. W: husband and er=

CL: =Of course it does, I mean when he comes home of a night if I'm absolutely exhausted and I can't talk to him or you know< he says what have you got to be exhausted about then it it trigs it triggers you know we start having a row or something

S. W: Yes

CL: It all starts from what happens during the day with the children or if he's had a bad day at work for instance you know e'll come home

S. W: yes

CL: It's the same thing really you know I don't know if you know but I nearly had a nervous breakdown em two years ago. I I was up under the doctor with tranquillisers antidepressants you know. Mind you I got off my prescriptions as soon as possible I didn't like taking 'em though I was

S. W: Can you remember I think that must have been after I last saw you=

CL: =that's right yeh

S. W: And because I when I last saw you things were although not perfect they were just about keeping an even keel

CL: They were then my husband left his hospital job

S. W: Yeh=

CL: =and he went to work with DER Instead of bringing home I suppose about () he was only bringing home about £58 a week. You know it was just about enough at the time we had a rent rebate which was good you know because eh with that we could hardly manage with what he brought home.

S. W: Have you got a rent rebate now?

CL: No we haven't We tried but they said that. I said to them that the money my husband's earning it's very difficult to work out his average earnings so what they're doing is they're helping me by when he's been working in April after he's worked there let's say three weeks after April they're gonna eh want me to take down one of his wage slips with how much he's earned in that time and they'll take an average of it you know but they said until that time there's not really much point because otherwise if we do give you a rent rebate say three or four pounds a week if

S. W: mm

CL: it's wrong you're gonna have to pay us back and you'll be in even more in arrears so I said well I'd rather do it that way see I know it's worse

CL: it works out...you know... plus my chance of getting a job as well I told him that I would probably be getting a job so

S. W: mm

CL: that would alter the situation as well you know so it's very ehm

very difficult to say yes I'll have a rebate when you think well perhaps they'll get it wrong and perhaps they'll get it wrong and

CL: I'll have to pay it all back again.

S. W: Yes quite

CL: So I think it's best as it is. If they they're trying to help me as best they can you know really.

S. W: Did the the rent arrears get to such a stage where the council were sort of threatening to turn you out?

CL: Yes

S. W: They did an and what happened? How did you manage to solve that?=
CL: Well I went down to see them because my husband it's difficult for him to get time off work now. And I went down to see them and I said to them you know explained to them the situation and ehm I told them that I'd pay them £32 a week rent instead of the £20 so that was just over £10 rebate arrears I was clearing off

S. W: Yes

CL: And that when I went out to work I'd be able to give them more, say £20 extra a week.

S. W: Mm

CL: On top of the £32 you know

S. W: Yeh=
CL: =So that it would clear it up that much quicker and they they were they were quite pleased at the £32 actually. Even if I don't go out to work that £32 will satisfy them.

S. W: Yes

CL: You know but em Well as you see our budget's very tight and £12 onto that

S. W: Mm

CL: Well £10 makes it rather er even more tight you know.

S. W: Are you managing to keeping with the present rent without

CL: Well at the moment we're lucky my husband has got a bit of overtime

S. W: Yeh

CL: So we're able to do it but next week I don't know you

S. W: yeh

CL: know or the week after I don't know.

S. W: Well it's a bit shaky really=
CL: =Well the thing is I know that I've got to pay that money every
CL: week whether or not I've got the food money even if I have
S. W: yeh
CL: to borrow off my Mum and Dad.
SW: Yeh
CL: I've got to pay that rent every week otherwise the kids won't
only not have a home
S. W: Mm
CL: They'll not have a family any more So I've got to sort of(...)
S. W: Isn't it very depressing having all this kind of stuff?
CL: Well it does=
SW: = put a strain upon you
CL: It does but I know I sort of mm=
S. W: =battle on=
CL: =Exactly what else do I do you know I just got to. That's why I
said I got in a panic over this situation I thought well there's
only one thing for it I shall just have to fight for a nursery
place for A with someone to help me so that I can help
S. W: yeh
CL: myself in a way you know. I mean. I could easily put him in a
day minder's care or something but I don't like that I don't want
him thinking he's going to a substitute Mum.
S. W: Mm
CL: You know I want him. If he's going to a school situation he'll
accept that cause he's accepted it since he was three
S. W: mm
CL: going to a nursery afternoon. If he goes to a school situation
where children. It's a school as far as he's concerned. Mummy
takes me and Mummy picks me up. He knows that I'm not palming
him off onto somebody.
S. W: No
CL: But if I take him to a day minder, he'll think you know I mean
I'm only surmising what he'll think but I don't think he'll like
it very much it's a substitute Mum isn't it.
S. W: You you wouldn't like it so much

- CL: No I wouldn't I'd feel em. I wouldn't be able to work happily.
- S. W: No
- CL: I wouldn't be able to go out and not worry about him cause I would You know cause whereas in the nursery situation everything is unbalanced isn't it
- S. W: Yeh
- CL: It's on an even keel and the children I mean the teachers are there specifically to look after the children and that er they don't have that harassment of having a baby of their own whereas those child minders sometimes have a baby of their own to cope with as well as another child and I know myself that that's rather difficult you know.
- S. W: You might sort of < they might take a more professional approach to it=
- CL: =Oh yes definitely with a childminder it might become too em. I mean you never know I'm not saying anything against childminders but I mean you might get a situation like was in the papers not so long ago about that woman who starved her own baby to death.
- S. W: Yeh
- CL: You know something like that I know it's going to the extreme.
- S. W: Yes
- CL: Those are the sort of things I'd worry about. You know I'd be thinking is he alright is he getting enough food is he he you know she's not hitting him or anything you know I mean slapping them if they're naughty is one thing. But actually laying into 'em is another isn't it you know.
- S. W: Yes alright Er O.K. alright well look. Best thing is for me to take this form away.
- CL: Mmm
- S. W: Uhm the borough treasurer tends to take a while in doing this assessment.
- CL: course
- S. W: So that if you put A in the day nursery next Monday you'll find that. Well they'll either want assurance that you'd pay £24 a week for the first weeks and went for a rebate uhm or probably say you better wait until you know for sure whether you're going

to get it or not.

CL: Well that's what I'd rather do I'd rather wait until I'm

CL: absolutely sure that you know cause like I say temporary work
it's a bit dicey. I and if it's if this job comes up in the next
couple of weeks you see I can sort of go out and know that I've
got that money coming in.

S. W: Yeh

CL: Whereas if I'd have taken it feel a little bit you know

S. W: Mm

CL: but then again If you're not fussy you em get more or less you'd
be working constantly. You know cause I did temporary when I was
in L and I was never out of work cause there were so many things
I could do you know.

S. W: Yeh

CL: Working in a working in a bank you know so many different um
aspects to office work that you er can always do (admonishes
child) quite a lot so I wouldn't have the worry of saying well I
can only do copy typing or I can only do invoicing or I can only
do filing.

S. W: You can in fact do quite a few=

CL: =Oh yeh () I can do cash registering I mean even if it came
to it I could work in Safeways.

S. W: Mm

CL: You know anything like that. Another aspect of bank work.

S. W: Mm

CL: Work with money (don't worry about that cause I've worked with
thousands and thousands of pounds up in London when I was working
up in the bank. Yeh so I mean I'm not worried about the jobs

S. W: mm

CL: It's just worrying about the children I know I can work every
week every day you know it's just knowing what their=

S. W: =Having had three children have all the responsibility of a
mother and at the same time trying to have the

CL: of course

S. W: responsibility of keeping the family finances in order. Well

S. W: shall I take that with me then?

CL: It hasn't got the nursery down has it?

S.W: That doesn't matter I can fill it in at the top.

CL: And it's er

S.W: It's really the financial ()

CL: Well I've heard this one had good reputé so I'm not worried.

S.W: =Who's your health visitor?

CL: Mrs Mrs ooh.. forget her name now

S.W: M

CL: That's it M

Tape finishes here - but interview finishes virtually immediately after.

TAPE 5 SIDE 2

MR Y

- S. W: Anyway They came and they did it < and they did it properly.
- CL: Well it's all working right now so they must have done it properly you know made em a cup of tea and that But that
- S. W: Mm
- CL: =was alright he said we've only just heard about it but you don't know who to believe but he turn round and said we've only just heard about it like I would have been down there straight away.
- S. W: well
- CL: I said well you < you knew about it Friday =it's a week
- S. W: Mm
- CL: =you knew about it I said the council knew about it Friday.
- S. W: yeh
- CL: I said en < as I say you just come now.
- S. W: yeh
- CL: No he said we'll get stuck in now < we'll say he didn't do it you know
- S. W: I don't know whether in fact Mrs E had had this conversation or whether it was just me ringing her 'cause I rang as soon as I left you.
- CL: =It probably was you ringing her I think so
- S. W: ehm and she said it would be done today <uhm yesterday
- CL: mm
- CL: That's right < as I say I suppose it was round about half hour and they were down
- S. W: Well I'm glad I can work some miracles < ehm'did ju < did they anything about they haven't been about the rest of them.
- CL: No they haven't been Well I'll be quite honest with you Mrs (L) I was sitting here thinking of it last night and again this morning I might as well do it myself.
- S. W: Well I asked about it and I explained about how infuriating it was for you that you didn't know that if they were going to say no: you would get on and do it yourself.

CL: mm

CL: Mm

S. W: Um There's just this hanging round and you didn't want to start looking for a job until it was out of the way. So she said that she would speak to them again and she said she had spoken to them and they would be down in a couple of weeks.

CL: Yeh but their couple of weeks it's been three weeks now ennit?

S. W: Well I did also.

CL: Well you know yourself it doesn't take a qualified fellow who know what he's doing like decking and decorating to go < it don't take 'em five minutes to go round and say well you need this you need that or like fair enough we aint gonna do it it's down to you.

S. W: Yah

CL: Which really and truly it isn't down to me cause that place up there hasn't been touched for two years cause they're entitled to decorate it but fair enough they don't wanna do it I'll do it and I'll just turn around and say fair enough. I'll keep a bill of everything I do.

S. W: Mm.

CL: and you knock it off the arrears it's gonna take em longer a sight longer 'cause I can't afford to do it all in one go but I'll do it I'll do one room at a time and 'at's 'at.

S. W: Well what I think I'll do if you like when I get back is is ring the maintenance department director and so far I've gone through Mrs E all the time

CL: mm mm

S. W: cause I thought it was politer to do it that way and better but if I ring the maintenace department direct and try and explain could they do it quicker I mean they got it in hand they said within a couple of weeks she said she was going to try and hurry them but if I ring up and try and hurry them as well.

CL: mm

S. W: They ought to get down here tomorrow or early next week.

CL: Yeh well as I say all it needs is just the one man =just to

S. W: Yeh

CL: look round and he knows what he's looking for you know there's
plugs and that in there alright I'm lucky really cause I know a
CL: few blokes in in the trade. Alright they'll probably do it for
favours but the thing is they're not entitled cause I'm not the
type of bloke go running to my mates and say do that for us you
know what I mean. I don't like to do it cause you can't afford
to give 'em a drink.

S. W: mm

CL: You know an' well it's the same as me the things I've done for
blokes you turn round and say no but you always think well it's
cost you money well alright a plug how much is a plug today?

S. W: mm

CL: You know what I mean < they gotto buy it unless I buy it and then
I'll < you know really it's a tradesman's job ennit.

S. W: Yes

CL: Well yeh so fair enough he's entitled to a drink of some sort

S. W: Yeh

CL: but < I don't like doing it cause you know yourself its I'd
sooner do it myself < struggling on and try an do it meself...
it's the same as that up there < I know I can get a toilet and
sink meself...and it's going to take me a sight longer to get it
but I'll get it.

S. W: Yeh.

CL: You know what I mean and I'd sooner they'd turn round and said no
you go got no cha < ah well fair enough I know what I'm doing
it's like I wanna finish the bathroom what's the use of

S. W: uhm

CL: leaving it as it is. You know all of that could have been done in
< in one day you know I been on jobs just to

S. W: mm

CL: put a bath shelf around is a two minute job but alright fair
enough I know today near enough everybody's on the fiddle like
extra couple of hours at work you know that's what he was doing
cause the dinner hours he had < you know don't say nothing but
dinner hours he was having were ridiculous but

S. W: mm

CL: fair enough but I know what the council are like you know cause
far as I'm concerned he put in a full day's work at it you know=
S. W: except that there wasn't a full day's work to be seen
CL: course
there wasn't nah there wasn't but there again that's neither here
nor there but the way they mess around then they're entitled to
get fiddled which their blokes are doing.
S. W: But it also makes you feel that you feel like fiddling them too
doesn't it cause the way they're messing you around=
CL: =Uh that is that is true know yeh but < how can I fiddle em
anyway.
S. W: Well.
CL: Well I can't... I'm sitting here getting the 'ump I might as well
be decorating the place.
S. W: Yeh.
CL: That's the way I work it.
S. W: Yes but while you haven't got the money to decorate all you're
doing is sitting here getting the hump.
CL: Well this is it this is it
S. W: And taking it out on everybody else.
CL: Well this is what it comes down to I just keep on getting out of
everyone's way you know what I mean..but eh < see like as I say
with me mate I went round his place the other day and packed up a
bit of stuff for him like he's got one or two cats < nothing
immaculate it don't make no difference it's a start ennit.
S. W: Yes.
CL: < know what I mean < but where do I put em you seen the state
of that room in there everything's lumbered up the beds I can't
use which you got me
S. W: no
CL: I can't use em see what
S. W: Where are they sleeping?
CL: =The kids up stairs but like I
S. W: they're having to double up=
CL: Yeh that's it.

S. W: Yeh.

CL: You know I just can't do it you you can hardly move in that room

CL: there, you know and I'm in here and me mate and his wife in there they should be hearing something this week and all cause they've applied for a off licence job with flat above it.

S. W: yuh

CL: But you know it's getting beyond a joke now it's not as though I can start on one room

S. W: Well if I could get you the rest of those kitchen cupboards down you could at least start on on them.

CL: Oh yeh they're nice.

S. W: because you can they'll need a bit of stripping down cause that'll give you something to do

CL: Yeh that's nice yeh they mm=

S. W: =And I'll chivvy the maintenance people to come down and at least say whether

S. W: they're going to give you the paint and stuff=

CL: =well even if they turn round and said to you on the phone Mrs L no well we're not going to do this or do that < that is fair

S. W: ()

CL: enough cause I'll get up that bathroom and I'll smash it to pieces like to get it done.

S. W: Yes

CL: I will there's no doubt about that.

S. W: Yeh.

CL: Well I'm frightened to touch anything up there.

S. W: Well I'll ring up and tell them you want to get on you really want a yes or no answer.

CL: That's all I want if they turn round and say < well I'll know what to do I'll go and get me bits and pieces and get a bill everytime and that's it fair enough they can do it that way and I'll turn around and say to knock it off me me bill now.

S. W: Yeh.

CL: Which I suppose might be in their mind to do.

S. W: I don't think they work that way I think that in fact what they will do is they'll bring down paint and paper for you or

CL: mm

S. W: give it to you out of their stock 'cause they can buy it at
S. W: greatly reduced cost.

CL: this is what I thought it's not as though I wanted anything
fantastic up there ()

S. W: =But Mrs E in fact said to me they'll be taking the paint down
any day.

CL: Yeh < just a minute (leaves room for a few seconds)

S. W: O. K.

CL: As I say I don't want anything flashy I just want any old paper
or not even paper just emulsion it.

S. W: Yuh.

pause (then client greets K (a child))

S. W: Yuh well let's get a yes or no out of them then you'll know where
you are.

CL: That's what I want.

S. W: So we'll deal with that < Uhm: I hear T's going to a boxing club.

CL: Yeh he is he's going again tonight, he couldn't go Tuesday.

S. W: ()

CL: yeh he loves it

CL: Yes twice a week he loves it yeh.

S. W: Have you been down there with him?

CL: Oh I take him down there=

S. W: =How do you get there?

CL: If I go D takes him down by bus and er=

S. W: =Which end of G L?

CL: It's the far end =opposite the swimming baths

S. W: did you

S. W: Did you have a job finding it?

CL: Nah Nah easy enough < I I first of all thought there's another
club down there down in the middle of G L can't think of

S. W: yes

CL: the name of it now M H or something

S. W: mm

- CL: Thought it was that one but it wasn't it was further on oh he loves it there.
- S. W: And it's a good gym they've got?
- CL: Yes oh I always have a little watch there and V wants to take him she's gonna try and take him tonight take him down and see him box oh he loves it.
- S. W: Are there any others as small as him? (hello K (to child))
- CL: Well I think there is a couple but you know I don't know how old they are.
- S. W: But it's mostly older boys.
- CL: Yeh bigger boys yeh. Oh I think it was Mr () he said to D he says has he done this before cause he seems to he seems to have taken to it like he loves it T just talking about it like. But he couldn't go Tuesday cause he went to see Mother Goose.
- S. W: Yeh.
- CL: With the school like.
- S. W: Oh well that was nice well he doesn't have to go every time if he's got something else on.
- CL: Well not yet. If he goes into it then he will have to be thre < you know what I mean < I used to do that meself.
- S. W: Have you had a chance < have you had a try down there, do they let Dads in the hall?
- CL: No as it happens you can get the urge and think oh I'd like to have a go at it. You know I used to do it when I was a kid I boxed at his age
- S. W: why don't you offer to help?
- CL: I'd put my mind to it but there's there's three or four blokes down there I found out.
- S. W: Oh.
- CL: That's a good thing < at one time, oh sometime back now I was gonna make that into a bit of a gym that big room in there cause we douldn't use it. I said to her like we'd make that into a bit of a gym like for the kids cause I had a set of weight
- S. W: and
- CL: and everything like at the time.
- S. W: I don't know when they get to know you a bit better down there

you might be able to

CL: <well seems a good club cause I noticed it

CL: < well they noticed it first there's another room they've got all different games, ping pong or something an < yeh it's good, I only went to that one where they do

S. W: mm

CL: =the boxing but apparently there's places there where you can have well two or three places where you can have games an' that I suppose while you're waiting for 'em and it's good it's a good club it surprised me cause I thought it'd only be a little one you know the ring takes up most of the room in there (laught).

S. W: But he does he M was saying he has general training to do, skipping and things of that.

CL: =oh yeh he's been in the ring, he's been in the ring. You know that's what his mum wants to say I think she was going to

S. W: mm

CL: take him Tuesday but as I say went to that Mother Goose thing.

S. W: Mm

CL: So she run him up there.

S. W: Is V coming round much?

CL: ..No not that much there was a lapse of four weeks weren't it (to M) or five weeks and mm then she started coming round quite a bit didn't she? No not really, come round twice one week once the other week weren't it and she's she's gonna try and come round tonight, she come round Tuesday as I say to take him boxing cause she wants to see him. You know it's like

S. W: do the children like her coming round?

CL: Well they seem alright don't they?

M: Oh yeh

CL: You know, what K < K tends to play her up a little bit

S. W: And do they they play up for M after she's gone?

CL: K, but not too, she aint too bad now.

M: She's a bit better but

CL: she's never been very good at eating. K, she can eat alright but she won't < you know what I

mean < she'll hang about she wait < cause I keep em up at the table like, she'll make them three sit and wait for her, you know

CL: what I mean but I let em get down after a while but ehm she won't like every meal there's something she must leave and I

S. W: mm

CL: won't stand for it < you know what I mean < if I know she she will eat it, she will eat it but like greens an that I don't push her do I?

M: Well she, you know she eats at school didn't she, well like today she ate five cakes ()

CL: Is that so?

S. W: She's had five cakes at school?

M: Yeh..On a Tuesday and a Thursday they have a cooking lesson well they they makes cakes well they help the teachers make the cakes=

S. W: =that's how they teach maths these days actually.

M: and they eat them theirselves, so em they have about five cakes each everytime cause em they make a big batch of them and

S. W: mm

M: I say to her every time, how many cakes have you had today? five (whispered)

CL: She fun < oh ye? ah she < like it's not as though < she does it more to be awkward doesn't she? you know she's

M: mmm she does yeh

CL: doing it she keeps looking at you, like last night mashed potato an I'do em really creamy and I know she do like and she's never left em has she, but last night just to be awkward she had to

M: she did last night

CL: leave it.

CL: Ah just a little bit.

S. W: So what do you do?

CL: Straight up there, right you won't eat it, and I fed her like and she's had it said< there y'are < see how easy it is and () and I said do you want that rhubarb crumble? Yeh: I said right wallop, it's all gone ennit < see if there's something on that

M: what it was

CL: table cause as I say I've always given em a back up meal, a sweet

or something every mealtime and if there's something a bit tasty on there she's gone she want to leave a lot more don't she?

M: ()

CL: =but when 'er Mum's here like you know she's got the habit of coming I suppose it means she's finished work when they're having their dinner round about six, half six and like she she'll be up there and she won't eat nothing then cause her Mum's here and she expects her Mum to dive in < well I pulled her Mum up about it I said don't say nothing now I run the kids () she did one time when you was in 'went it

M: Oh leave it she said let her ()

CL: Oh leave it < know what I mean < well I'm not having that

S. W: that
makes it impossible for M doesn't it?

M: Well I had to, I ended up having to send her to bed.

CL: Well this is what I said.

M: = didn't I because she started crying cause you know it's not K's fault.

CL: She was a bit dubious as what to say to K while her Mum's here and I said just as though she's not here if she plays up

M: cause I
do get a big devious about that don't I?

CL: Well don't that's what I said to her

S. W: Well it must be

M: As I said to Mrs L (Soc. W.) the other day I got a bit worried about what to say in front of her cause as I say things to em and act when she's not here, I feel a bit uncomfortable when she is I don't know why

CL: the thing is you've got,
you're running the kids I mean they're her kids but

M: oh yeh

CL: you're running em and they got to listen to you.

S. W: But it is awkward I mean you must know at work when somebody's watching you do it.

CL: Oh yeh, oh I've never said anything < I've never had a go at V.

S. W: = No but if V < I was just saying it's awkward for M if V's

there, she's bound to feel sort of looking at her and=

CL: mm

CL: =Well I don't think V'll do it any more cause I pulled her up
didn't I in the kitchen, didn't I?

M: Yeh.

CL: I said if she says something and she won't eat it don't interfere
like A threw a tantrum here one night didn't he now he used

M: mm

CL: to be Mummy's, you know Mummy's boy, oh everything about him,
well anyway he threw a little tantrum here one night and I just
let him get on with it and I I looked at V and she went and you
know wouldn't say nothing (laughs) but she wanted to get hold of
him () the minute she gone, good as gold it never works see.

S. W: Do they ever ask her if she's coming back to live here?

CL: No, never ehm when she goes they don't seem worried do

S. W: no

CL: they < know what I mean < There's none of that running up and <
you know hugging her and saying luby Mum an that K might

M: Oh yes.

CL: but then it's all over and done with, like they'll be up at the
table or they might be doing something there yeah tata he goes
and that's it.

S. W: And she doesn't want to come back?

CL: I don't know, I don't talk to her < You know that's the sort of
thing I don't talk to her about anyway

S. W: =I just wondered if this hanging round meant that she was wanting
to.

CL: I think there is half she wishes she was back with the kids like
< you know what I mean but anything else I don't know. I just
say this < you know bare things like.

S. W: Does she still bring the boyfriend round?

CL: Oh yes I () Yeh he comes round but you know like when she
talks to him like she's never talked to me like she talks to him
< you know what I mean then

S. W: You would never have stood for it
would you?

- CL: No. But eh oh I dunno but anyway wish 'em the best of luck really.... Long as I don't have too much to do with him cause a few of my mates that have met him got the same attitude con dear < know what I mean < () there's nothing genuine about him, nothing at all, we Give you an example he's an electrician, now his job was Oh! like it was fantastic this new job he got
- S. W: yes
- CL: How long did he been on there, hff he's got the sack () he's got the sack. Because he's one of them blokes who'd drive you mad, you know like I told you before he'd sit there and you can read between the lines you think oh well fancy trying to tell me that I know different.
- M: No.
- CL: < You know what I mean < he's got that you're a kid attitude when he's talking to you, as though you haven't done anything you know but I work < more building work then he ever know but even D one night he had to leave the room () but there we go she's well she's a lot better off I think anyway in herself you know. She seems to have picked up. I've noticed it seems to have picked up a lot. Ech kids do wear you down anyway I think but eh, seems a bit more=
- S. W: =But she was very young in fact when she had T wasn't she?
- CL: Oh yeah a lot to....
- S. W: she never had a sort of period of freedom and working.
- CL: No
- S. W: She always was tied cause she must have been straight from school wasn't she?
- CL: She was practically yeah cause we ah yeah... yet it's a few year nah when you think of it like but eh you know there's just nothing there now but fair enough now I think I'll let you get on with your life.
- S. W: I keep meaning to ask you who's name are the kids registered in?
- CL: Mine.
- S. W: They are. that's alright because I did wonder where you stood legally
- CL: Oh no.

S. W: It's your name on the birth certificate?

CL: Yeh.

S. W: Yuh.

CL: ... You know I noticed one or two things like she you know don't wanna go too quick and all this kind thing like she's sitting here for ages talking about (.....) you know.

S. W: Yeh.

CL: See () we lived together that long she knows me and no way it wouldn't come up, come up in conversation anyway.

S. W: Yes.. No I just wondered if she did want to and also you know that I've been aware that it must be awkward for M

CL: oh () offered to work abroad or sommat and I said what's the matter with you, you're both silly go she's got no ties. the kids I couldn't go and leae the kids... Well I said what'll I do I said have been looking after the kids you wouldn't come and see them I said we don't miss an opportunity like that I said if it was offered to me < she was talking about my mate going chauffeuring taking his family over to America. I said if that was offered to me I'd be gone I said < I tellyou what I wouldn't pack half of this I'd be done. Woh she said what 'bout the kids should I take them with me said I wouldn't leave 'em oh how would I get on to seeing em < an all this an that <. I thought it's one of them things V if there's more opportunity for them over there I'd go. I'm telling you now.

S. W: Mm

CL: I wouldn't think twice I se < you can always come and see the kids there's nu nothing stopping you cause like 'e was on about I want to go to Australia. Said well go. I wouldn't think twice.

S. W: He's never been married?

CL: I don't think so.

S. W: So he's no kids?

CL: No he'swhen you're talking to him he he's a lot younger than what he looks you know I don't know how old he is but he's not that old () he can't hold a decent conversation with you.

S. W:

mm

CL: It goes childish like silly things he's done...but eh < oh she

talks to him re: eally and how he stands for it I don't know.

S. W: Isn't she going to get bored with him=

CL: =That's what I think it is I think she is now ()

S. W: Well I was more concerned that it must be awkward for M when she comes round well I know you said that M's the one that's to say what the kids do and that < but it's still awkward for M to have V breathing down her neck sometimes.

CL: Yeh well

S. W: cause M's not someone with a lot of self-confidence.

CL: No (laughs)

S. W: And and V's looks as if she got it she could

CL: oh no she has

S. W: =make you feel a fool can't she?

CL: Mm oh yeh definately but since I've had it out with her I < () I'll watch for things like now < know what I mean > I

S. W: yes

CL: watch for it and I watch for the kids but er it's never happened since.

S. W: M is V difficult when you're here on your own with her?

M:she is a little bit but not that much since...it's just that you know she seems to be more for the kids when T's not here but I mean it's obvious cause she's said approaching them too much when ()

S. W: Well she's probably more

M: so she approaches them a little bit more when we're not here but it's not that much not that you'd notice..

S. W: How are things going otherwise < I mean you got M's got this room beautifully clean are things going better?

CL: ..well well yeh I can't see we () work out the meals an' that don't we () aint had so many rows hadn't we?

S. W: You've had that many rows?

CL: No we haven't had that many rows one or two.

M: Still about the shopping see I still haven't got the hang of that yet still having a bit of trouble with it < well I'm I've

CL: nah

M: been out today for instance an' I've got the dinner (farewell to
M: a child) I've got the dinner and soap powder margarine things
like that and I've spent what three pounds fifty just under
£6.50. I've got some change I've got to go down and get
something else cooking apples I forgot (laughs)

CL: mm

S. W: Do you take a list with you?

M: Yeh I always write out a list cause I can't remember any

S. W: You
forget to write all of it down is that it?

M: Yeh sometimes yeh but today I haen't been doing too bad have I
I've ()

CL: Don't know yet haven't looked at the list (laughs)=

S. W: =M makes the list not you

CL: No I make it sometimes like

S. W: who's doing the cooking at the
moment?

CL: Well between us. I usually budget how to cook it.

M: Well

CL: don't I. to make it go round, see it's a little bit awkward at
the moment me mate being here.

S. W: Yeh

CL: But he's waiting on a job as I said like he's got an off licence
job and a tobacconists job annit.

M: Mm

S. W: Yeh

CL: And he haven't heard from that yet he's been after the two within
a two two weeks won't it went after the two.. see (th)ey got to
get a flat down here=

S. W: =Yes well if they get either of those pobably mean they'll yet
accommodational with them

CL: that's it this is what he's after but you know
I'll I said to him last night it's getting a little bit tight in
here especially if I've got to do the work this is one of them
things I think I'll have to say () but it it's awkward <

CL: know what I mean it's they're good mates of mine you know

S. W: yah

CL: what I mean < when I was living it rough I used to go from place to place know what I mean I can understand how they feel cause he can't stand this being out of work either cause he's another grafter...but eh you know he sits in here and he gets down I get down don't I see he's a lot like me he's a broody sort < I look at him an' he looks at me and I thought (laughs) we're both down in the dumps but eh well he'd help me more than anybody but it's gonna come through.

S. W: But he doesn't know when it can come through?

CL: No well you never do do you

S. W: they got to take references and that up=

CL: =that's it yes he's give all the references and that then they get I suppose by the time they check all that it'll be two or three weeks ()=

S. W: =How much longer can you cope with them here?

CL: Well the way I budgetted it out I can go like for a few more weeks but I don't I've see < you know I've talked to him last night..and I think I'll go another week that's it.

S. W: Are they giving

CL: cause if I have to start up there no he

S. W: yeh

CL: hasn't got his self has he.

S. W: He's not getting anything?

CL: No.

S. W: So you're keeping them.

CL: Yes () but it's working ennit.

M: Mm (laugh) just about

CL: Well seems < I know it's hard but there again >I'm soft touch for that because the thing if < I've been done favours I know what it's like I been kicked about and they have so fair

S. W: mm

CL: enough it's not as though they were a couple of you know ()

M: Oh no I

M: mean if he had a job and had the money

S. W: You can't claim dole money I suppose by the time social security money came through if you claimed for them.

CL: You see you know that's another thing this social security now by rights they're not supposed to be here.

S. W: Yeh

CL: < You know what I mean < and you know like as I explained

S. W: You're allowed visitors.

CL: Yeh well that's what he is ennee but eh you know he can't

S. W: yuh

CL: go on that really because he's got to use this address and I said > can't have it () < you know what I mean it's gonna affect them

M: she can't get a grant or anything can she 'bout the baby while she's here

CL: I don't know.

S. W: Has she been ()

M: Well she's been to the doctors yeh.

S. W: Yeh.

M: and she's got to () claim her back taxes or sommin' ant she?

CL: I think so.

S. W: But she's not been up ()?

M: Don't think she's been up social security or anywhere like that yet.

CL: No cause I said to D whatever you do don't put my address down at social security I said cause I couldn't.

S. W: So then can't yes.

CL: You know

S. W: Come unstuck.

CL: Well he knows how I'm situated () fairly knows that he's sleeping in that old room over there and I said that's all I can offer you ennit to put you up.. You know everyone deserves

S. W: mm

CL: some sort of a chance anyway and they are genuine people.

M: mm

S. W: You mean if they asked?

CL: If its just someone like you know just give me somewhere to lay down for a few weeks or something then go out drinking every night then no way then he'd be out on his ear'ole

M: no

S. W: Yes but ah you're still a glutton for punishment T because here you are trying to scrape through on social security which most people say is not enough to keep two adults and three kids on and you're keeping two extra adults.

CL: Yeh two < a couple of me mates have said that an' all funnily enough but as I say it's the principle

S. W: You do like to do it the hard way.

CL: Well this is it.

S. W: And yet you get through somehow=

CL: I get through (laughs). It's I just oh I dunno I can't see it done < you know what I mean if I know someone's a genuine person then I've got to try and help em. That's why I can't stand the likes of them people like the council they look down at you as if to say well you know well you can wait or who < who do you think you are < you know what I mean < he probably done more good deeds than what half of them has seen < you know what I mean cause I=

S. W: =Yeh I'll turn the tape off if you you do things say things like that.

CL: Pardon.

(social worker repeats statement)

CL: Well anyway as far as I'm concerned they deserve a break they've had it hard they come down here to try and get started an' that's it.

S. W: Yeh you're ready to help everybody liek that but you find it difficult to accept help yourself.

CL: Huh.

S. W: Don't you? a lot of the time.

CL: Yeh true I s'pose yeh well a lot of it's being independent and on me own for so long really < you know what I mean.

S. W: Mm

CL: I've had to sort meself out.

S. W: Well you've certainly gone to the other extreme because you're hardly on your own at the moment.

CL: (laughs)

M: (laughs)

S. W: One of the things we were supposed to do this morning was work out this letter about your sheets and things.

CL: Yeh I tried that a couple of times well about four times I suppose=

M: = ()

S. W: Do you know what you've got in the way of bedding and sheets?

M: I do.

CL: Do you oh well that's alright. I know sheets it is it is diabolical.

S. W: Household equipment (S.W. looking up benefits handbook) Let's just look up the list of what....you're supposed to have.

M: Got about six sheets I think.

CL: We aint got that.

M: We have we got () we got two white ones.

extended discussion about possibility of claiming for bedding and other essential household items - S.W. instructs them in how to mend sheets - need to have more items so some can be washed while others are in use. Social worker says that they could arrange for a visit from the social security agency - to arrange payment for essential items or they could write themselves.

S. W: Right... we can do two things over this, if you like I can write on your behalf and then they'll come down and visit you

CL:

mm

S. W: =about it or you can write the letter yourself.

CL: ..hmm I've made about four attempts at it

M: He keep trying it don't you but ().

S. W: well would you like me to write on your behalf?

CL: Well I'd appreciate it yeh < I get started and then I think I don't like it cause I'm not too bad

M: yeh a couple of words ()

CL: but I might have to make six attempts at it before I finally get it how I want it < you know what I mean > and that's what

S. W: yeh

CL: happens I get () I'll get the 'ump with it and I throw it off the table

M: Well he showed me a couple of em when 'es written em they seem all right to me but if he's not pleased with em he throws em away don't you (laughs).

S. W: Well it's really a question of you know you say you you're sitting here with not enough to do if you'd like to use your time up writing nice little letters to social security you can or I can send one off on your behalf if you like and ask them to come and see you about it and they will want to see you probably < or they may take our word my word for it just like that but usually they come down and visit just to make

CL: No well they you know

S. W: sure that you haven't in fact got ()

CL: Uhm ah

S. W: Uhm but you know though I know you don't like asking for this sort of help if you coule get yourself straight then from then on you'll be able to take care of what you need in the way of replacements.

CL: True yeah, See I've sat up here a couple of times and worked it out and I thought well if you gotto get this you gotto get that you gotto decorate the place=

S. W: =You start getting the hump=

CL: =You know that's what gets me I think well you aint got no chance.. You know () D's talked about it he's said well I'm you know he < he said I'll pitch in and help you yeh while

M: mm

CL: I'm here I'll pitch in and help you decorate the place do what you like cause he has done like when I was out he's done the windows ent he=

M: =yeh one day he did three windows.

CL: Ye < know what I mean > I brought the glass I told you I brought the glass home to do do the job and the timer upstairs.

S. W: yes

CL: I've got the 'ump. I've buzzed off =he done em

M: he's done it yeh

CL: put 'em in. See he's willing enough to help you.

S. W: Yeh well I'll do that for you then, how are you all off for clothes?

CL: ..Oh I'm not too bad (laugh) oh I'm all right.

M: ..It's the kids really I mean it's like K she needs new tights and things like that now don't she

CL: Well you know I'll go a bit skint to get their essentials like like their boots an that..

S. W: Mm

CL: It's like I'm going out this week I'm hoping that I've got a couple of bob left Saturday and I'm gonna go down and get another pair.

S. W: Mm

M: See the thing is its like the boys with their school shirts ennit yeh running a bit low..I know that for a start I know

S. W: well

M: that..two bit uns they got two school shirts each.

S. W: Mm

M: and what I'd do they wear one one day and when they take it off in in the nighttime I wash it but they're got the other one for the next day and then I wash that and that's the way I have to do it, but C eh he had two to start with but he's grown out of one () and I wash the other one and made a bit of a mess of it

M: cause I you know I (laughs) I'm no good at washing. I washed it out it's gone a a yellow colour so I I don't let him wear it now so he wears polo-neck jumpers and things like that for school but

I I don't think he has to wear shirts an that but you know
CL: not at the moment it's
not the uniform.
M: =No but he'll be going up into the he's in A's class
now () it's not essential.
CL: Yeh but A doesn't () he will do but his sister if I they
got=
M: =Thing is the summer's coming that was what I was worried about
cause they don't wear jumpers then do they?
CL: No thing is like the only reason A goes in a < half a uniform
thing is because he's got it but he doesn't have to..as
M: yeh
CL: you know but if there's half you know like if there's a
M: yeh
CL: bit of the uniform there I let him wear it I mean like a dark
blue jumper an that but eh but, () C's about the only one ant
he but there again
M: yeh cause he seems to be growing out a lot after Easter you
know cause he's getting a bit tall=
CL: =That's something I can get meself all I want
M: = yeh that's it
CL: helping out with is the worst=
M: =Yeh cause we seem ()
CL: see like when I sat down and wrote a letter
then you mentioned the lino it's a lot you know cause it's two
rooms up there it's eh the landing up there see an ah you
M: yeh
CL: When I work out and think so it's bad enough writing down about
sheets an that then they start reading that we want lino when I
said before when I heard that women up there I thought to meself
what a cheek you know what I mean the stuff she was
CL: getting off of it.
S.W: Is there a fee < a feeling they're sympathetic about it now are
you=
CL: =I don't know really < you know what I mean, it's just you know
when I was on me own before I used to go out and get it < know

what I mean I could go and do it but I can't do it now an you half think well shall I ask em and you know I don't like the way I've writ that down (..)=

S. W: Well you know we can ask them if you feel that you'd rather go without for the sake of your pride and wait 'till you're in work and then do it you can do that or but you know there's always going to be expense with the kids. If you even if you got a clothing grant for them now by the time you go to work they'll be wanting something else so it'll be the summer and they'll want

M: be wanting more clothes.

S. W: thinner things so that you know they'll always be a need where there are kids.

CL: Mm

S. W: Ehm so it's really a question of if you think it would be worthy if you don't mind asking for it right we can ask them they may say no certainly I could ask for I've forgotten about the floor covering ehm I think we could ask for the floor covering on the grounds that you're taking over the top half of the house eh what about curtains?

CL: Mm. yeh cause I'd pre I would say there you go cause there's enough of them=

S. W: =Have you got curtains up there?

CL: Well I've got some up there yeh you know oh no leave the curtains see this is it it seems to me that I'm asking for too much really that's the way I work it.

S. W: well

S. W: I know ehm.

CL: It's you know I've always had that you're lucky to get helped out with somethings < know what I mean >

S. W: =They may not help you with everything in fact.

CL: that's true.

S. W: But if you put in.. a clear list of exactly what you need saying

S. W: what you've got ehm then they're more likely to come up with something.

CL: Mm

S. W: And if they turn you down completely then we'll appeal and it

goes to the tribunal.

CL: Mm

S. W: Ehm and then you get a chance to go along and just put your case it it's held in private there'll just be three members of the tribunal somebody from supplementary benefits you and you're allowed to take a friend well I'll come if you want me too and then you get a chance just to explain your position and

CL: mm

S. W: put your case to them ehm. In fact there's a checklist here of clothes you're supposed to have. A man or a boy is supposed to have an overcoat or a raincoat, a jacket or an anorak two pairs of jeans or trousers, one sweater or pullover three pairs of socks, two pairs of boots or shoes two shirts two vests two underpants and two pairs of pyjamas.

CL: Oh that's something the pyjamas the kids need that=

M: =for the kids yeah.

CL: cause everything else they're not too bad. You know it looks a

S. W: they've got everything else

CL: bit ropey to me cause I've seen cause I've seen it for so long but you know that < when they go out they don't look bad do they?

M: Oh no they're got their trousers ent they for best that I put by

S. W: Well they

certainly always look nice to me and you know I keep meaning to bring () dresses down she's got some good ones ehm but you always have them looking nice.

CL: Well this is it.

S. W: Well if we go for the more expensive basic items like the blankets and the sheets and the floor covering it may be that you can make do=

CL: =Well this is you know =

S. W: =for the clothing and use what spare money you manage to to make=

CL: =well she'll tell you I will definitely go a little bit skint to get em=

M: =to get em

CL: It's like the boots an that but I'll ok

S. W: yuh

CL: I'll get em in the sale but if its

S. W: But if you're having to
get pillow cases or sheets or whatever yourself then there's less

CL: that is it

S. W: money left over for..

CL: This is it see. All I want to do now is make sure they got
another pair of shoes good uns cause at the moment they're the
only < well she uses the little sandals and I've sowed them up so
many times. (laughs)

S. W: Yeh.

CL: That she uses them for playing in the garden=

S. W: =what size is that?

M: Size ten oh eight C is a size ten

CL: So I just want to make sure like the two big uns now their boots
are wearing out.

M: Yeh.

CL: But mind you they've had em some time I've bought em they're
tough boots they don't look really nice but the thing is gfor
school it's good enough but now I want to buy em a decent pair of
shoes right it's K's alright for a minute I think I will see to
the two big uns this weekend.

M: Yeh I think so.

CL: She's alright and C is alright.

S. W: Well let's leave it then and you'll feel better you'll feel
you're not you're doing something for yourself if you go ahead
over the clothes yourself and I'll put in I'll write to them
about this okay?

CL: Lovely yeh.

S. W: Because you know if you < if you don't take help over things like
that then you're not going to have the money to do the extra bits
to the house

CL: nah see as I say it's gonna come to something to

S. W: and that

CL: decorate it ennit you know

S. W: yeh and even if you get help you

see even if I bring you those cupboards down you've got to get the screws you've got to get some paint < there's still expense.

CL: Mm....yeh I know but as I say I should do it one at a time

S. W: yeh

CL: All that's winding me up more than anything is the bathroom Why start on the bathroom and not do the toilet at the same time?

S. W: Probably a different man that does it is it?

CL: Ah the way they work it it wouldn't surprise me you know this is the sort of thing you go in a woman's house you do the lot you don't mess around with one silly item you do the lot especially as regards that toilet.

M: Yeh well that's the main worry cause of the children going up =

CL: =well I said that all along so alright they get caught in the night they got to go downstairs alright there's no light upstairs they have to come downstairs and use the back one. It's pouring with rain and walking on wet like to use it < that's been going on for years that () it's just crazy.

S. W: Well I'll get in touch as we said earlier I'll get in touch with the maintenance people and see if I can get an answer out of them one way or the other so you know where you are.

CL: That's all I want a yes or a no.

S. W: Okay? And I'll let you know about that eh will you be in this afternoon if I drop you some more cupboards in.

CL: Yeh yeh

S. W: Somebody will =and you won't get the hump if you stay in

CL: ()

S. W: this afternoon?

CL: Well no I won't you know I'll have something well sort out.

S. W: yeh

CL: But when you're sitting in here and you you got nothing to

CL: do..you know you think to yourself I'll go and bash that bathroom about I was going to do it yesterday sod em like I'll

M: ()

CL: do it myself. But you know an then you saying I calm down for 24

hours I thought well leave it alone

M: laughs

CL: don't touch it but I will I shall get up there you said calm

S. W: what did I say?

CL: down for 24 hours yesterday leave it for a bit

S. W: And you did id you?

CL: Yeh

S. W: I'm glad somebody takes my advice

CL: But otherwise I will I'll get to such a pitch
an I'll say that's it finished you don't come in here no more
I'll do it meself < know what I mean I will cause once I start
knocking it about I won't have someone else doing what I'm doing
going over my work no way. That's it I'll do it I will do it on
all But as I say until they say yes or no

S. W: mm

S. W: you don't know where you are

CL: You know I'd hate to get up there start knocking it
about and they say oh look we've got all the gear here and

S. W: mm

CL: I've paid money out to get it.

S. W: Yeh if I can keep you occupied on on the kitchen cupboards until
() the maintenance.

CL: ()

S. W: Well I'll bring some more down and you can get going on that
(laughs) and get your hump off there.

CL:

CL: Yeh this is it you know if I get stuck in it kills the time and
you can see something being done.

S. W: Mm

CL: But all the time sitting in here looking at it I think ah waste
of time.

M: Gives you the ump.

CL: Well it does cause I know what I can do.

M: Mm

CL: And yet someone's stopping you from doing it ennit. You know you
can't go no further than say well look fair enough I'm doing

nothing just put the gear in it. I'll do it for you and that's what I'm virtually saying.

S. W: Yes.

CL: Cause they're entitled to do that up there and even that room in there I'm not pushing em for that room in there just do upstairs so I can get the kids sorted out that's all I want as I can get the bedroom sorted out.

S. W: Yes.

CL: But nah they won't even do that see they make you sick they they () for the top half of the house I might just as well said go take that that list and you won't get nothing out of me

S. W: yuh

CL: until you you get it done. That's what I should have done be fare I signed anything.

S. W: Have you got a list of exactly what needs doing?

CL: Yeh

S. W: Oh it's that one

CL: That's in in case they catch me when I'm out right.

S. W: I saw I saw that up there I thought you'd been writing poetry or something because it looked from where I was it looked like ()=

CL: =See it's not a lot of work it's silly work

S. W: Yeh...

CL: The majority of it is.

S. W: see even if they come round when T's out you can show them this.

M: Yeh.

S. W: Okay right.

CL: It's like they have been asked to call admittedly I haven't been out to work. They have been asked to call after half eleven.

S. W: Yeh.

CL: =But they haven't they've been coming before that aint they?

S. W: Yeh.

CL: And as I said to em your lucky to catch anyone in.

S. W: Yeh.

CL: See and they know that but they still sent them round at a silly

time...see and how how work on that.

S. W: so you want them coming round after
half past eleven?

CL: Oh no=

S. W: =and you'd like to know when they're coming if possible?

CL: Well now I'm not working it don't make no difference gbut I'd
like to know when they are coming cause then you can take em
right round cause might pop out like me an D have a walk out
every now and then get down the B see=

S. W: =Well if I can get a date out of them or a definate answer then
I'll let you know straight away okay.

CL: lovely yeh thanks very much

S. W: Right fine...

(Social worker arranges time of next appointment and leaves)

TAPE 5 SIDE ONE

THE HOSTILE CLIENT

- S. W: So I can't work you out on that one...mm.. does it matter..why is it..because...wants to know what...you mean.
- CL: No I mean to say...she's also got her brother living up there now.
- S. W: Is she claiming for him?
- CL: No cos last time he lived up there..the money he was giving her..a tenner..for the kids....she was going up there and feeding them.
- S. W: Yes but does social security know he's there?
- CL: No.
- S. W: Do you really
- CL: And another thing she said that if she meant...um..she said that social security..she's off sick mm she she said that mm he's been to the solicitor and if anything happens to her like she has to go to the hospital or anything - he can't look after the children..her mother's got to have them.
- S. W: Well he can dispute this I don't think that she can organise the custody of the children without him getting some piece of paper or something to tell him what's been done - er whose house is mm whose name is the flat in or the house?
- CL: It's in Mr and Mrs L's but her name isn't that.
- S. W: No but the point is that if his name's on the rent book too, she can't keep him out of the house totally - if the rent book was in her name then she could stop him seeing the kids effectively 'cos she could keep him out.
- CL: Yes
- S. W: Do you see what I mean?
- (Interruption by child)
- CL: And she said if she went into hospital or anything like that, he couldn't look after the kids so they'd go to her mother.

S. W: But he would like to look after them, does he want the kids?

CL: Yeh well he says she's not fit to look after them...his mother could have them all day long.

S. W: I don't know enough about the law and how it stands for him as they're not legally married, you know he'd really have to go to a solicitor.. to find out effectively where he stood..why doesn't he go to the citizen's advice bureau.

CL: I said citizen's advice bureau to him.

S. W: Because I think its going to be a tricky one legally.

CL: Mm

S. W: But I'm sure she can't just go and take custody

CL: Cause she turned round and said to me that when she goes to court she's going to tell the court that he didn't buy her no clothes or anything like that I said. I said the court aint worried about her if she walks about nude (inaudible)

S. W: Obscene display or something

CL: It would be and all

S. W: But is he bothered by all the rows with her?

CL: He says she's a lunatic...

S. W: She's got one child () with her she's got V with her.

CL: Yeh she's got V with her I suppose the social services know S M () he's P Road I reckon he's under social services anyway.

S. W: That's her first?

CL: Yeh he's got two of them there.

S. W: And she's got one?

CL: And she's got one

S. W: And she's got the two children she had by B (client's cohabitee)

CL: Mm

S. W: I mean has B got alternative method of having them looked after?

CL: What do you mean?

S. W: Well

CL: His mother could have them.

S. W: Would you have them... B hasn't asked you to have them?

CL: No cause I said to him if I had them there and looked after them of a day or anything like that I'd have () I'd have V.

S.W: But his mother would take them.

CL: Oh his mother would look after 'em, she reckons they'd be better in an home.

S.W: And they're both under five, one's going to be five in a bit, one's at school

CL: In February yeh one's at school and the other one's at home.

S.W: ...well I think he ought to go to a citizen's advice bureau to find his actual.

CL: She did say that she's pushed and she got legal custody of the children.

(interruptions by children).....

CL: Oh when I was in the school today I didn't say anything. Oh suppose I'd get tonight when I go in there. I put B on the settee she said alright I'll go and say hello to S she came and say hello and if she say hello to S, some little woman come in with her son M.

S.W: Who's she? sorry, this is the headmistress.

CL: No the teacher..go and say hello to S.

S.W: Yes

CL: And then some woman came in and she stopped the teacher and she said mm who's S?

S.W: Mm

CL: And I see the teacher look over to S and her look over to S and I thought get your ears flapping girl.

S.W: Mm

CL: And I was standing there so she said mm. The other day M had a temperature. If he had a temperature they'd have sent him home and S kept pinching him, well he goes (laughs)

S.W: Mm

CL: No, then I shall turn around and say well what's M been doing to S?

S.W: Is the teacher a fair person?

CL: Yeh I think she is I just, I just...No if I go next time and she

CL: says S's been pinching M, well I shall just say why, there must be a reason..... Well if she says well his mother said no (inaudible)

S. W: Yes but his mother's only going on M's word for it.

CL: That's what I mean see, they don't stop and say what did you do to S.

S. W: Well it sounds a little bit as if the teacher was saying that if she ..

CL: Or why did S do it, so if I go in there tonight and they S Well I shall say did you find out from his mother why, she said well his mother said that eh well he was just sitting there and S came up and I shall tell her I'm not interested.

S. W: But it sounds well you know, I think she's used to having to deal with this sort of thing because kids of that age

CL: Well of course they are, if the woman says anything to me, the mother of the child I shall just tell her to grow up.

S. W: Mm

CL: I'm not kidding you wherever he goes he's always accused of doing something last time he was accused of, his daddy was going up the school to saw their heads off. (laughs)

S. W: Is that what'd been said?

CL: Yeh but see when I got him home, I went to the school in the nursery in the morning and she said mm oh we've had to tell she said mm oh we're had to tell S off and put him in our bad book and when he goes to his big school that record goes to the school with him.

S. W: Oh I don't think so.

CL: No I didn't either. I was annoyed though

S. W: I should say.

CL: =so she said eh. There was um -- evidently two little children both woke up exactly the same night with nightmares that S dady was going to come, and saw their their legs off But S said their heads not their legs.

S. W: Mm

CL: And I couldn't make out why he'd done it so when I got him home I

CL: kept on and on to him why he did he say that and he wouldn't tell me so in the end I smacked him (laughs)

S. W: Mm

CL: And it was because they'd been swearing to him cause when I went over the nursery and I said he's got a good hiding because he wouldn't tell me why then I said to 'em that they'd been swearing. I said the little girl K's been swearing. She said oh yes most probably.

S. W: Yes - so it was S's attempt to clean their language up?

CL: Yeh yeh see cause I've always said if I hear him swearing I'll cut his tongue off.

S. W: Yes.

CL: Well his head off. So what they done (unintelligible aside) - So when I told the woman there she said well I'll see their mother and tell them. When she told the mothers..oh no my little girl doesn't swear

S. W: I've yet to meet a child that doesn't sometimes.

CL: So I said to Mrs thingo er I can't remember the other name I said to her - I wasn't interested in it anymore. I just said to get his name out of the book.

S. W: But how do you find S's teacher?

CL: Well she's alright I don't have a lot to say to her.

S. W: No but S likes her.

CL: Yeh I think he does.

S. W: And you think she's fair?

CL: Yeh well I don't know yet do I (laugh) well I mean I aint had a confrontation with any of em yet.

S. W: What happened about that library book?

CL: Oh found it.

S. W: You have.

CL: Somebody had handed it in.

S. W: At the school?

CL: Yeh but they'd didn't not the c.. You know what they'd done they'd taken my carrier bag thinking there was something in it found there was just a library book.

S. W: Mm

CL: Or and took it school themselves or they slung it and somebody's picked it up took it to the school.

S. W: Did you get the carrier bag back?

CL: No.

S. W: No.

CL: There was nothing in the carrier bag. ()

S. W: And it was just a plastic one wasn't a good one?

CL: Yeh yeh they um....no um I haven't had anything yet school about S does this and S does that as far as I know I bet I have it tonight when I go there S's been pinching M.

S. W: Well.

CL: And I shall say well did er M give a reason why S was doing it to him oh I know S is a biter slap handy and eh.....

S. W: What will you do if he has been will you punish him or will you...

CL: Yeh he'll get a wallop.

S. W: Mm.

CL: If he's just going up to kids and pinching them then he'll get a wallop.

S. W: Mm.

CL: But if he's doing it for a reason cause Mathew keeps going like that to him well then he's got every right I shall say to her lucky (inaudible).

S. W: You're able to pinch your mother up if she's done that to you.

CL: Laughs

S. W: I was watching S going to school the other day you know when you know the other person was taking him not you.

CL: Oh yeh C

S. W: He walks like you doesn't he?

CL: Oh I hope to gawd he don't (laughs) I don't walk nothing like him he walks ten to two like that (bangs)

S. W: No no not like that no it wasn't

CL: and he...

S. W: No it wasn't his feet it's the way he goes you know he's going off to school and he's going to get there.

CL: laughs

S. W: And he he looks () it's more the purposefulness he looks like you not the...

CL: Did you see the photographs from school?

S. W: No have you got some?

CL: Yeh I've got two large ones and four small ones.

S. W: You said you'd got them and I....

CL: They're (...)

S. W: You left them down at D's

CL: That's right yeh

S. W: Are they nice?

CL: Yeh they're quite good. She said he knew...I had I mean I don't believe in going up to teacher...

S. W: Mm.

CL: ...Nag nag nagging. I can't stand the people who crawl up the teachers at the school.

S. W: Ah.

CL: Well I mean I asked her how he's getting on or something like that or she says to me he's getting on well.

S. W: Mm well they'll probably have an open night quite soon won't they I mean you can go up and...look at his work or something.

CL: Ooh imagine all the mother's sitting there. My darling (....) (laughs) Isn't he clever (laughs) no actually (to child?) here you put the lid down that's it (bangs) gone The Wimbledon 300 page notebook mm the Wimbledon (laughs)

S. W: You write your name on the front.

CL: Do your name what's your name M you don't know your name do you you're mad. That's it get your shoes off.

S. W: What's your name (to child)?

CL: Ah but S's birthday next month I got his the twenty fifth.

S. W: You've got those two near together haven't you?

CL: Eh

S. W: You've got those two too near together?

CL: Yeh it's D's tomorrow stop it (to child) its D's tomorrow.

S. W: Did you get her what it was you wanted?

CL: No I've got to go and get < it's a shire horse.

S. W: Mm well.

CL: A shire horse like that and it's got the barrels the wooden part with all the barrels in it.

S.W: (to child) what is it? (child screams)

CL: Oooh I'll go and get you some sweeties.

S.W: So have you written back to social security?

CL: Yeh and they've sent me a stamped addressed envelope to reply over it (...) Cause I was going say about me wasting all that money.

S.W: Yeh (.....)

CL: Premonition

S.W: Well that was nice of them to do that. So you've got that to do and mm

CL: Yeh...inaudible just wait.

S.W: Well I'll go to the CAB if you want any further advice.

CL: Citizen's advice bureau yeh.

S.W: Is...

CL: I told him that anyway.

S.W: Is it bothering you P coming round?

CL: No (...) if she didn't turn up

S.W: Yeh perhaps you'd rather she'd turned up and you'd had a got at her?

CL: No I wouldn't have a go at her I'd just open the door and say what do you want and if she says I want to punch you I'd say I'm not interested go away.

S.W: Mm

CL: Oh gawd...never mind no light (for cigarette)

S.W: Oh I haven't got one sorry.

CL: Oh that's alright.

S.W: I'll go and borrow one if you like

CL: Eh

S.W: I'll go and borrow one for you.

CL: Yes alright (inaudible)

Pause while S.W. goes to obtain light for cigarette)

CL: I've got the dentist on Tuesday.

S. W: Alright.

CL: That's 10 o'clock me 10.30 S

S. W: Yes that's when they're going to take his teeth out. That right?

CL: He's only got to have one took out I'm not sure.

S. W: Right.

CL: I've got to do my shopping now.

S. W: There wasn't anything else I had to do for you?

CL: No I don't think so.

S. W: Erm...oh I rang up about your gas.

CL: Yes what did they say?

S. W: And they wanted () being in touch with them and I explained that you would be paying the next inst=

CL: =quarter in February.

S. W: Yes within the next ten days or so as soon as possible.

CL: Yes.

S. W: And I also pointed out very politely that in fact you know that the bill was taken on by Ms B not you and not living there any longer and that you were still anxious to have a look at this and I'm sure that they would get the (child's interruptions) money in the end.

CL: Yeh.

S. W: But that you were struggling hard to do your best..

CL: Mm

S. W: And that it < you know you might be a little erratic in the payments but I would ensure you remembered.

CL: ()

S. W: So they took my number down and said that they would be in touch with me if they were worried about the payments in future before they sent you out little letters.

CL: Oh did they oh that's alright then.

S. W: They were very nice about it then said as long... (inaudible) and if it was easier for you to pay £2 a week.

CL: Yeh

S. W: They said they'd take it anyway.

CL: Actually I think after Mr L has given me this how much as he

CL: given me £12 ennit?

S. W: It's £25 and I think

CL: Is it?

S. W: Yes I thought it was that 'cause you didn't have the last quarter did you? (inaudible)

CL: That's right £24 that's right and I paid that and then I got em oh and I've only got £12.

S. W: Well then you'll be I told them you were only paying £24 this time so you'll be one up (inaudible).

CL: Oh what I'll do is pay £24 and half of it £12.

S. W: Can you do that?

CL: Yes 'cause well she said that next week I'll be able to 'cause to you Mr L's come there and I'll pay it the following week.

S. W: Yes.

CL: Cause then I'll have me family allowance 'cause I've got to cash it this week for D's present.

S. W: Mm

CL: And er when I've done that next week I'd be able to cash £8 take £4 out of my money and pay that off and then what I'll do is I'll have to pay £2 a week after this 'cause I haven't got Mr L's to depend on ()

S. W: But they said if you'd rather pay it off

CL: (interruption inaudible)

S. W: If you'd rather pay it off £2 a week they're very happy to have it anyway.

CL: Mm

S. W: I mean you can you know if you can get if you didn't get the full if you didn't get £2 each week.

CL: Yeh.

S. W: You know that be better they'd rather have it Ah

CL: That £2 a week would be best because then I'd get it cleared up.

S. W: Yes well £2 a week in fact is £24 pounds a quarter.

CL: Mm

S. W: But it's just easier to=

CL: =Oh yeh it's a lot quicker to pay in £2. Best thing I can do is buy the stamps you don't have to pay extra for the stamp do

CL: you?

S. W: No

CL: The gas stamp I'll get them then and put em on the card and just send the card off to em.

S. W: Huh

CL: See if I get a pound...

S. W: Can do you have to go down the gas board to get them...

CL: No you do em in the post office.

S. W: Yes

CL: So I get it in the post office when I go.

S. W: Huh

CL: The only think I ant got now is the TV licence (laugh)

S. W: Have you had a reminder?

CL: No no I've had cards sent through saying about I'm a new resident I been having these for two years I'm a new resident and that em (.....) I just written off that I haven't got a TV You see D's will cover mine.

S. W: Why?

CL: I told her it's going to she's got colour TV and a colour TV licence covers one colour TV and one black and white.

S. W: Only in the same household.

CL: Yeh but she's lent it to me see...it is hers and she's lent it to me. They have a serial number don't they or not?

S. W: Yes... (inaudible) when we've got the gas bill sorted out we'll start on your television.

CL: No leave it till they take me to court.

S. W: What happened (inaudible)

CL: go to court for (?)

S. W: You said you had a summons for something telephone what did you do?

CL: Nothing.

S. W: I thought you said (inaudible, child playing with mike)

CL: I said to him about the electric and he said to me well aren't the NAB going to query it. I said if they do I'll write off and tell em I got it from a church charity.

S. W: I see (inaudible)

CL: Yes I know but see they're not going to ask me what church charity are they?

S. W: They might do.

CL: Mm I'll say I don't know just say I bumped into some vicar (laughs).

S. W: But B is going to help you with the electricity.

CL: Yeh I've got the bill and it's £90. But that's not this bill it em (inaudible) estimated reading. Oh I meant to tell you em and £48 arrears from me last bill that I didn't pay.

S. W: Yes

CL: Cause remember one come and it was £48 it was really only £34 cause I had arrears... £10 arrears or something.

S. W: And so you ...paid that?

CL: No so the bill come in to £48 and I said to you I'll leave it and I'll send it off to the NAB and you told me to send it and I sent it and I got a giro cheque for £48.

S. W: Yes.

CL: So I've got that...well see I aint told B I've sent it off. I've B said that he's going to pay the £84 something that the bill is now.

S. W: Yes

CL: And when my next bill comes in it's gonna be a high reading again. I'll just send my giro off to 'em.

S. W: But you'd better=

CL: =And write to the NAB and show em the bill and they should send me (...).

S. W: So you have actually got the giro already have you?

CL: Yeh but=

S. W: =But how long?

CL: Six months. So get 25% on my next bill. If it's before er....

S. W: You'll get 25% what of?

CL: What for the electric bill.

S. W: From whom?

CL: The NAB I've got a leaflet.

S. W: Oh they've sent that to explain what they're doing.

CL: Yeh

S. W: Oh I'll see that when I come up cause I've not seen one of those.
CL: Haven't you?
S. W: They give it everybody that went up the post office. 1A
CL: They're going to
S. W: Off winter ones or off everything?
CL: No up to a certain time I think it's May and my next one's due in about then And my next bill's due in about then so.
S. W: Right okay
CL: What I'll do is I'll just send the bill that they send the next one 'cause it's gonna be a high one. Send it to social security they'll send me what I've paid in right.
S. W: Yes
CL: Say £20.
S. W: Yes
CL: Then I'll still have the giro the £48 and I'll pay that in at the same time.
S. W: Yes I can't really see what's stopping you paying that giro off the present one=
CL: =because then if he writes me a cheque out for 80 something pound I'll be in credit and when they the NAB=
S. W: =ah=
CL: =see and it'll be in credit
S. W: And so you haven't told B that they=
CL: =I haven't told the NAB that they've paid me. He's going to write a cheque out for £84, what the bill is, and so many pence I'll take that in and leave the giro for the next bill which comes in 3 months time.
S. W: M (to child) M is that your name I've written?
CL: See I only got I only got an estimated reading of £30
S. W: (speaks to child) s.w. is drawing
CL: Oh what a diabolical drawing you wanna go back to college and take up art.
S. W: I can't draw.
CL: You're telling me
S. W: Who's that (to child)
CL: That's you look (to child) cooh if you look like that they take

CL: you away from me. They'll think I been hiding you in that cupboard. Did you read about that that little baby in the paper isn't it disgusting eh?

S. W: Did it...

CL: No D says to me don't tell that welfare lady and I says why's that and she turned round and she says well you might start putting M in the cupboard.

S. W: (laugh)

CL: I said you silly cow why should I put M in the cupboard? She said oh yeh what am I on about.

S. W: (laugh) would you ever do anything like that?

CL: What put the kids in a cupboard No I wouldn't

S. W: Mm

CL: I'd put em in their bedroom.

S. W: em

CL: I wouldn't put em in a cupboard and starve em.

S. W: Nah (to child)

S. W: Right you presumably better get back to M

CL: Yes I got to go and get shire horse.

S. W: Yes He's alright left in the flat or is D keeping an ear on him.

CL: No D's keeping an ear'ole on 'im.

S. W: Mm Right well I'll see you one day next week.

CL: Right.

S. W: Let me know when you hear from social security and if you get 25 pounds you can ring me up.

CL: Alright

S. W: Spend your money on a phone call.

CL: Yes I shall tell him eh.

SW: or drop in on the way

CL: Oh well I dunno the only time I venture in this office is early in the morning.

S. W: you come down pretty often.