1. Introduction

1.1. The topic
This research report reviews a number of comparative works on social policy and social work in the EU and some other European states, and asks which place the issue of professionalisation have in these works. The author finds it to play quite a junior role vis-a-vis most other subjects discussed in the same texts, and suggests that comparative studies on social work professionalisation in a cross-European perspective might be very useful.

A general finding can be summarised thus: monographs about social work in one EU member state tend to contain rather lengthy passages, even entire chapters, on social work professionalisation, yet this trend is discontinued when we turn to papers, books and articles of an international, comparative nature. By contrast, the review undertaken indicates that the most comprehensive information is to be found in a range of studies undertaken by the European Commission and/or the International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) since the eighties.

1.2. The situation in Europe
Social workers - in the broadest sense of the word - are in Europe represented within a great number of different professional groups. In some countries they are united within one, in others they are found in several groups, their interrelationships being at times not too comfortable (e.g. France, in: Ion & Tricart, 1984; Thévenet & Désigaux, 1985).

According to Reimavuo (1997b, section A), in some countries social work is not legally recognised: in Sweden, the title is not regulated at all; in Norway, it is for some parts of the profession but not for others; and in Denmark, these matters are ruled, not by a parliamentary act, but by ministerial order. In Germany, by contrast, the title of Diplom-Sozialarbeiter is protected by law, and in France, social workers are even provided with a professional ID card and badge, irrespective of whom they are currently working for (European Commission, 1996). Finally, in the aforementioned countries certain degrees and diplomas give access to the profession, whilst in the UK and Ireland, a system of accreditation exists whereby such qualifications are evaluated by an independent body, which subsequently delivers authorisations to join the profession.

All these differences mean that it is methodologically very hard indeed to compare the social work training, licensing and practice of European countries. It is even difficult to ascertain whether social workers are are ‘a profession’ in the narrower sense of that word. This is why we shall first review some studies on definitions.

2. Theoretical literature review

2.1. Making sense of professions, professionalism and professionalisation
The discussion on social work professionalisation - ‘becoming professional’ - is concerned with curriculum planning and innovation, with modalities for taking up responsibilities in ‘social work’ positions and with the status of social workers and their equivalents. The ‘-isation’ ending suggests a move away from something, which would be voluntarism, springing from “parochial and humanitarian amateur activities” as far back as the 15th century (Schmitz & Weingart, 1981. p. 32) and towards a novel condition, professionalism. This latter does, however, call for some clarification of the word it stems from: profession.

It should thus be clear that this article does not use the word “profession” in as general a sense as is normal in English, where it is a common word describing simply a group having roughly the same responsibilities and status. Social workers in English-speaking contexts are regularly referred to as ‘professionals’, and they, as a collective, are not infrequently termed ‘the profession’, as opposed either to their clients or, e.g., central government. This paper uses the word in the narrow, sociological sense presented in this section.

Lone (1984. pp. 61-2) concedes, firstly, that a profession is a group defined by a common activity and/or training, which are of such a kind as to
make the group easily discernable from other groups. Secondly, that the effect of the tasks entrusted to that group cannot be measured. Thirdly, some kind of collegiate body should be responsible for setting standards, some sanctioning powers being vested in it. Training and credentialling may or may not be its prerogatives, so that even groups completely submitted to government control may enter into his definition. Following this line of thought, voluntarism is defined primarily by a number of powers it does not include, the same powers being constituent elements of professionalism. Thus, a profession is especially skilled, regulated and autonomous. This evokes the question of how professions and professionals interact with other groups or individuals. To Thomas and Pierson (1995. p.296), a profession is thought to be:

“A group or body, of some social standing, claiming expertise in an area of work (...) implying that none could possibly fully judge the individual professional except a peer or colleague.”

Hence, professionalisation happens in several stages, the last and ultimate involving “controlling the qualifying process and the conduct of members” (ibid. pp. 296-7). A similar, but more concrete model is that of Leder (1992), which includes three stages of social work professionalisation - Commodification, Scientification and Licensiation. I have combined this model with that of Müller (1993). It details the existence of a number of stages the group will have to run through on its way towards professionalism (see section 2.2) - which, presumably, is an ideal-type more than a reality.

Models like those of Thomas and Pierson (1995) and Leder (1992) have the great advantage of relative simplicity. They list only very few criteria, and so are more operationable especially for transnational comparisons, where data can be rather dissimilar and intercompatibility quite weak. They do, of course, represent a reductionist approach, whereas a fuller sociological understanding of these issues would have to include many more features. Lone (1984. p.61), for instance, knows 21 different profession definitions used by various authors, and indicates 23 different criteria. As this paper is concerned with documenting an important gap in mainstream social work/policy literature, what is called for here is, in fact, solely a simple model that might, in future, be refined.

For all reasonable purposes, it must be clear that neither professionalism, nor voluntarism in their pure forms are worth striving for. While it is easy to share the publicly-held, simplistic dichotomy of professional / unprofessional - e.g., ‘This is professional work’ - which implies that difficult tasks should be left to the former lest terrible things happen. Western societies have in the post-war years experienced both the positive and the negative effects of professionalisation in various domains: a fragmented discourse, downrating of lay knowledge and a too great distance between professionals and the public are all matters much discussed in health Politics. Conversely, though it is unjust, inappropriate and grossly populist to repeat Shaw’s phrase “All professions are conspiracies against laity.” For many a step forward in all the helping professions - was of course due to a more specialised devotion to the matter in question. Perhaps all prejudices are to some extent true. Or, put in the words of Terrenoire (1986), professionals are different sorts: “virtuosi”, “priests” and “prophets”.

2.2. Specific models of social work professionalisation

In most countries, there will be both proponents and opponents of social work professionalism and professionalisation, though within Europe the distribution clearly varies: In Denmark, unpaid social work plays a very minor role, while in Germany it is a pillar of the welfare state. Titmuss (1968. p. 46) has listed the main arguments in favour under four headings: improved professional status; an overall social policy objective; ethical reasons and enhanced social work education. He summed it all up, under his own opinion, saying that social work, independently of legal recognition, by itself becomes increasingly professional and subjected to “codes of neutrality”, since “the analysis and description of social problems can no longer be conducted by social workers in isolation and with the relatively cruder tools of the past” (ibid.).

These thoughts are all nation-state focussed. The same is true as regards the very specific writings of Thomas and Pierson (1995) and Lone (1984). While there are passages of interest to our subject in some empirical studies (see section 3), these are still country-specific and there seems in fact to be no author who has formulated a trans-national, European theory of social work professionalisation.
Some implicit principles can notwithstandingly be extracted from the European Commission (1996) and Reimavuo (1997a; 1997 b). Only Leder’s (1992) and Müller’s (1993) models are so independent of national peculiarities that they seem appropriate as a referential framework for comparative studies at the European level, which is why we shall examine them more carefully in the subsequent paragraphs. Interesting points are found in Schmitz and Weingart (1981).

Leder’s (1992) exploratory standpoint is that of a highly conventional bi-national analysis between Germany and the USA - the homeland and longtime inspiration source of postwar social work in wide parts of Europe (West, 1989). Following this comparison, he sets up a number of principles ruling social work professionalisation in, it is claimed, all systems. Using the terms in my translation, these are:

**Scientification** of the curriculum: From vocational training to scientifically founded education, or what Brauns and Kramer (1991) term “academisation”. Thirty years after Titmuss (1968. p. 37), the claim is still not entirely obsolete that social work is usually less “academic” than many other disciplines, though all courses have since then been modified and in most countries complemented by social science research modules. According to Müller (1993. p.12), the stage of scientification/academisation is no necessary prerequisite, yet commonly thought of as the “hard core” of professionalisation (evidently because of the added prestige it gives). In contrast, Brauns and Kramer (1991. pp. 84-5) see “academisation” as the most ubiquitous sign of professionalisation in a great many countries, and do not underestimate the importance of a discipline’s prestige. Its “status (... ) in the various national systems of education seems to be an indicator of the degree of professionalisation which has been achieved.” (ibid.p.94).

Concrete examples from the EU’s member states are given (ibid. p. 82).

**Commodification** of the work performed: less charity and more paid work. To describe this process, German-speaking authors (e.g. contributors to Pfaffenberger & Schenk, 1993) regularly use the dichotomy *Berufung* versus *Beruf*. The former means vocation in the Latin sense of the word: a calling, a mission (unlike the habitual usage in English, e.g.: vocational training, NVQS, SVQS), the latter is a very German word indeed: Clearly derived from *Berufung*, it encomprises the idea of a position in life, one to identify with and one in which to invest one’s pride and ambitions.

**Institutionalisation** from voluntary work towards licensing schemes. This notion is familiar from comparative welfare state research (institutional vs. rudimentary, traditional or residual systems) and implies, according to the ordinary sociological theories (cf. Thomas & Pierson, 1995, quoted in section 2.1), that exercising specifically defined tasks is limited to a certain collegium - a very gradual process indeed (and in the case of social work, probably never attainable and in my view not even desirable either).

Thus, there are the three abovementioned areas in which social workers may professionalise. The process can, thereby, be subdivided into various stages. Following Müller (1993), they are in chronological order:

**Unification**. This means two things. Firstly, that social workers unite out of a sense of solidarity, or to promote individual interests which a united group may strive for more successfully, or to enhance good practice, client interests, etc. Secondly, that social work is unified from outside, in an institutional and legal sense, by means of common education, unified rules for taking up social work responsibilities and one set of rules for those exercising the profession. In Europe today, this is only the case in a few countries.

**Licensiation**. This is my ad-hoc translation of the German word *Lizensierung*. A neologism, it may look somewhat awkward, yet the unusual ‘-siation’ ending is important in showing that we are talking about a process of introducing a licensing scheme, not of it being in place already. So it is a coming-into-being of licensiation, which means that some kind of credentials are necessary for being appointed social worker. This point is not as self-evident as it might seem, since in all European countries several de-facto social workers are not registered as such. In earlier times of social work history it is quite natural that no formal credentialisation existed, and it may perhaps
never come to affect all those involved in social work. From a theoretical viewpoint, though, licensiation in connection with unification would constitute major evidence of true professionalisation, as these already are reality, e.g., for the medical and legal professions, where they have been so for centuries. In the EU today, a multitude of different modalities exist (see European Commission, 1996), making a general appreciation is extremely difficult.

**Monopolisation.** This would be the ultimate and final stage of professionalisation, whereby solely those unified and licensed may perform duties proper to the profession.

In Figure 1 (opposite), I have designed a graphic representation of the ideas presented by Leder (1992) as combined with those of Müller (1993). The challenging thing about those theories is that they seem to offer operationable criteria for concrete research endeavours.

### 3. Empirical literature review

In this section we shall look at some research contributions up till now, as well as a few selected findings grouped under the headings from our Leder/Müller-based model. A general finding - which unfortunately it would be too lengthy to provide detailed evidence of here - is the general absence of our topic in most documents and publications reviewed: Authors dealing with social work in a national context usually have long accounts for professionalisation issues, but are silent on the same subject in an international perspective. And, vice-versa, works which are international in conception and scale do not mention professionalisation.

#### 3.1 Presentation of research contributions

Multinational research on social work professions has far less tradition than have the bi-national studies, of which Lane and Seibel’s (1979) (UK/Germany), West’s (1989) and Leder’s (1992) (both: USA/Germany) are good examples. The multinational category has also taken more time to develop. Early surveys on our topic came not from professional, but from academic milieux having a more theoretic interest in the matter. Some methodological preliminaries were formulated by Schmitz and Weingart (1981). A number of interesting contributions were gathered from the symposium documented by Zukas (1985), including reports from some then-socialist countries. The study co-ordinated and edited by Brauns and Kramer (1986) was the formal responsibility of the *Deutscher Verein für öffentliche und private Fürsorge* and included representatives from both milieux. Their first, collective, publication is still a splendid sourcebook, as it is extremely comprehensive and relatively uniform. Their later essay (Brauns & Kramer, 1991) constitutes a summary and appreciation with some updated information.

In this field, there is a natural role for the European institutions to play. In the 1980s, the European Commission together with the then EC Liaison Committee of IFSW’s European region conducted a postal survey (Cocozza, 1989) the findings of which will to a large extent no doubt be obsolete by now. But the matrix and procedure of this survey are laudable: the national data presented are really incompatible. In the 1990s, Commission’s Directorate General V (Employment) initiated a more thorough, questionnaire-based survey (European Commission, 1996) which is not yet terminated. Recently, IFSW has produced two research papers on its own (Reimavuo, 1997a; 1997b). As regards the somewhat more special (non-ubiquitous) ‘social pedagogy’ group, important work was performed by the Marcon group around Professor P. Marcon (Marcon, 1992). An excellent summary of these and other contributions was made by Jones (1994). Under the institutional heading is also found the Council of Europe report (Conseil de l’Europe, 1992) the target group of which is, however, not entirely identical with that of social workers.

In preparing Kornbeck (1996) as well as this essay, I have within all kinds of literature been looking for comprehensive, truly comparative studies comprising intercompatible data of a nature which could be of value to more than just an academic readership. Social work literature can by no means be said to lack comparative studies, in fact the genre is already very voluminous, yet many an anthology or monograph tends to discuss universal matters and philosophical questions more than practical facts - a massive trend, if we are to believe Cochrane & Clarke (1993, Introd. p. 1). By contrast, the matrix/rubrique system used by Brauns and Kramer (1986; 1991), Cocozza (1989), European Commission (1996), Jones (1994) and Reimavuo (1997a; 1997b) are truly comparative and practice-focused. A methodologically good example is the questionnaire that the European
Commission and IFSW sent to member states’ governments (quoted from European Commission, 1996, p.3):

“A. Structure of the profession
1. How is the profession regulated? (For example: reserved activities, protected title, employment in the public sector, reimbursement of costs via the public sector). Please enclose copies of the relevant legislation.
2. Do separate branches within the profession exist? If so, what activities does each cover?
3. What is the name of the body/bodies which represent(s) the profession?
4. What is the competent authority for the profession?
B. Structure of education and training
1. What are the requirements governing the taking-up and pursuit of the profession?
2. How long does the education and training take?
3. Please give details of the course structure (for example: the proportion of time devoted to theoretical and practical components, the number of course hours and the subjects covered), and enclose a copy of the syllabus if possible. Please also indicate whether the course is offered at universities, other higher education establishments, or elsewhere.
C. Titles of the profession
1. Please list by title other professions in the sector giving, where appropriate, an indication of the level of regulation (Diploma 89148, Diploma 92151, Certificate 92151).”

The greatest problem with this publication is in fact that the national ministries have interpreted the task very differently. The best responses are lengthy and detailed, some even including copies of relevant statutory documents. Others are extremely short and offer very little help. All in all, this from its conception very good survey allows for only scarce comparison between national systems.

Yet, though the picture looks quite blurred when we compare within Europe, some typology is possible. Jones (1994) has divided the national systems into those with the “social education” tradition, and those which do not know it but view all social work as belonging to the same generic category. In Germany, for example, Sozialarbeit and Sozialpädagogik are understood as dissimilar.

3.2. Unification
In Europe today, only a few countries can claim to have unified social work: In Germany, Diplom-Sozialarbeiter from Fachhochschulen are a homogeneous group, but parallel to them exist university degrees. This is what Lane and Seibel (1979) call Germany’s “binary divide”. The university graduate group of Diplom-Pädagogin is less unified and probably enjoys less professional status. Its long struggle for recognition is documented by Schulze-Krüdener (1996). In France, social workers are of three different kinds with very dissimilar traditions, recruiting systems and trade unions (Ion & Tricart, 1984; Thévenet & Désigaux, 1985). In Denmark, the 80s saw substantial simplifications between formerly very separated professional groups (European Commission, 1996). According to Lorenz (1991, p. 67), this is not as much a question of a North-South divide as it is one between subsidiarity and non-subsidiarity welfare states (cf. Kornbeck, 1997):

“Where social work has developed as part of an (until recently) taken for granted notion of a welfare state as in Britain it can be portrayed more readily as a coherent whole than in countries like Germany and Italy where the welfare functions of the state are limited by the principle of subsidiarity.”

Given that the Union will soon have four, five or more new members, these research activities do in fact seem to be a permanent exercise. One might also ask whether it is right to stop at the EU’s borders. Likewise, both Brauns and Kramer (1986) and Reimavuo (1997a; 1997b) have included non-Community countries.

3.3. Licensiation
As demonstrated by the European Commission (1996) study, there are enormous differences between how the national systems allow persons to take up social work tasks. Brauns and Kramer (1991, p. 81) distinguish three groups within the EU:

q Accreditation countries: The UK and Ireland: This implies that a professional or semi-professional body evaluates candidates’ qualifications (educational and/or acquired). Thus, their evaluation and not a degree or diploma as such entitles to become a social worker.

q Regulation countries: Belgium, Denmark, Spain, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and Portugal. Regulation is understood as government surveillance but not necessarily direct government involvement. As a minimum norm, legal instruments will be decisive a priori.
Having a particular diploma or degree will automatically make a social worker. This group - by far the biggest - shows the greatest variations, ranging from France with its badge and title, to Denmark without a protected title.

Countries with no certification: The authors count Germany and Italy to this category. Like Lorenz (1991), the authors find it significant that these are the two countries where the Catholic principle of subsidiarity is a constitutive element of social assistance law.

In this field, the contribution of the EU is particularly evident. At present two initiatives are running:

Commission’s Directorate General V (Employment) has, as mentioned above, surveyed present realities in social work in the member states. Directorate General XV (Single Market) is working on the mutual recognition of diplomas and degrees, an initiative which IFSW has from the very outset been supporting strongly. It seems in fact as if the social workers have been the only professional group to approach the Commission requesting some kind of EU scheme for them - this would be a remarkable testimony to the European commitment of social work. A conference of IFSW national co-ordinators is due to proceed further with this work, and it is possible that the solution to the accreditation issue would be a private agreement countersigned by the Commission (the model chosen by engineers some years ago).

The second strand is the compilation and documentation undertaken by IFSW itself, the aim of which is to produce some easy-to-use comparative tables for practitioners and their representatives (Reimavuo, 1997a; 1997b).

3.4. Monopolisation
Evidence of monopolisation is hard to gather and nowhere seems really convincing. The above mentioned French ID badge does point in this direction, yet no single contribution from policy documents or research fits into this category.

4. Suggestions for future research

4.1. Appreciation

Though the preceding pages have shown a lot of differences, there are according to Brauns & Kramer (1991. p.98) several pan-European trends in social work. Academisation, secularisation and an “increasingly generic approach” (treating social workers more like a unified group). The curriculum is quite similar (legal foundations, sociology, etc.) (ibid. p. 85), but the formal recognition varies starkly, master’s and doctoral degrees being unknown in many countries while they are a natural thing in some others. The authors see social work as being in a “curious position within the tertiary system, but outside the universities”, yet maintain that “the process of professionalisation through academisation appears to us to be inevitable and (...) desirable” (ibid. p. 94). Labonté-Roset (1993), too, found evidence of “convergence” in current trends up to the conclusion of the EU’s Single Market programme (01.01.1993).

However, the extreme variation in almost any relevant areas is a fact and may be an impedement, e.g. when it comes to social workers’ mobility on the European labour market (Reimavuo, 1997b). These differences are no denial of all that social work has in common, no matter where it takes place. After all, social problems everywhere are about relative deprivation and about exclusion. To the researcher, the interplay between a common vocation and highly dissimilar frameworks is a stimulating, but also demanding feature.

We have found here that no single study explicitly dealt with the subject discussed here, and that mostly relevant evidence would have to be extracted from varying chapters of various works. It seems clear that here is fertile ground for research. But is such research of more than merely academic interest, or does it have implications for practitioners also? I would dare raising the second claim. A few ideas for future research are presented here:

4.2. Ideas for further research
Research should include:

a) Both comprehensive cross-country information on the profession’s legal and practical foundations, information having been collected and presented following a strict matrix in the manner of Brauns and Kramer (1986; 1991), Cocozza (1989), European Commission (1996) and Jones (1994).

b) Analytical sections, justifying the approach chosen and combining the findings with existing
research on policy questions. For it seems that a systematic approach is more widely used in policy, than in practice studies (more widely discussed in Kornbeck, 1996).

As regards analytical and explanatory frameworks, this is not the place to opt for one or more, yet on the political and institutional level comparative welfare research offers a large range of models (sociological, juridical, economic) which have proven both their value and their shortcomings already (in lieu of many others, see Cochrane & Clarke, 1993). The practical tools for such research still constitute an open question, however, the works of Brauns and Kramer (1986; 1991), Cocozza (1989), European Commission (1990) and Jones (1994) would certainly provide good inspiration. I do, however, believe that questionnaires and interviews alone would not be sufficient. They cannot substitute for in-depth examination of legal, administrative, political and scientific documents related to the professionalisation process in the individual countries: interviewees too often do not know what is expected of them. And delegating responsibilities locally entails the danger that the data collected are not compatible: only one researcher or research team, dealing with all countries, can apply the same criteria everywhere.

European institutions and associations like IFSW have an important role to play, and the work detailed in section 2.1 deserves to be carried on in that form, though it may ideally have to be supplemented by other research activities as proposed in the preceding paragraph of this section. Anticipating such developments with the utmost interest, I do nevertheless feel an urgent need to make the case for a unified, reciprocal collaboration between scientific and practitioner milieux engaging in such research. At times, it can be quite astonishing to see the gap between university textbooks and practice.

4.3. Conclusion

Europe-focused, trans-national research on social work professionalisation is needed, both because client realities have become, and continue to become, more European, and because this applies to social worker realities too: not only do employment and prosperity cross national borders, unemployment and destitution do so too. And even when staying within the nation-state, clients are affected by the economic impacts of integration and globalisation. Firstly, understanding social work in a European perspective thus means preparing for a fuller appreciation of many concrete cases. Secondly, it is also a matter of professional interests as exemplified in the question whether social workers may take up work in other countries.

In addition, there is a remarkable convergence between national policies when it comes to restructuring the welfare state. Certain measures like privatisation and the creation of quasi-markets are almost pan-European phenomena (Kornbeck, 1998) and by no means always beneficial to client interests. If there is a united front of those interested in downsizing the welfare states, so should there be an equally united front among those who represent the opposite view - among them: social workers.
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Notes
1. A point which presumably a number of other authors - inclusive of myself - will not share with him, considering that by this token no productive work can be professional. Does a ‘profession’ notion make sense which only embraces the service sector?
2. In fact the realisation thereof is at the heart of the holistically-oriented Health Promotion paradigm.
3. The Doctor’s Dilemma (1991), Act 1
4. (... ) in our daily lives in schools of social work we rarely if ever venture into such academically hazardous waters [as those of social science research, J.K.]. We do not discuss social research, social policy and the role of schools of social work in abstract, universal terms.” [Emphasis: J.K.]
5. I am well aware that such neologisms are used less in English, yet it is precisely in a context like this one - when talking about something fictive - that existing words and phrases may have to be replaced by some created for the moment.
6. These numbers refer to EU schemes for mutual recognition of academic and vocational qualifications.
7. In the case of Germany, I would disagree because of the Fachhochschule diploma’s status.
8. Source: telephone interview with Mr Niels Hjelm Veirup, 13.06.1997.
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