Reconceptualising Well-being:
Social Work, Economics and Choice

By Graeme Simpson & Ani Murr

Abstract

In this paper we examine the intersection of well-being, agency and the current political and economic structures which impact on social work with adults and in doing so contribute to 'interpreting and mapping out the force fields of meaning production' (Fornäs, Fredriksson & Johannisson 2011: 7). In it we draw upon Sointu's (2005) work which identified the shift from conceptualising well-being in terms of 'the body politic' to conceptualising it in terms of 'the body personal' and identified parallels with understanding well-being in English social work. There has been a shift in the nature of social work in the United Kingdom in how the question of agency has been addressed. For many years this was through the traditional notion of autonomy and self-determination (Biestek 1961) and later collective approaches to welfare and services (Bailey & Brake 1975). The development of paradigms of mainly personal empowerment in the 1980s and 1990s (Braye & Preston-Shoot 1995) saw social work become less associated with collective engagement in welfare and more concerned with the enhancement of individual well-being (Jordan 2007). Whilst the rhetoric of well-being, in contemporary English social work, continues to include autonomy and self-determination, this is focused primarily upon the narrower concepts of independence and choice (Simpson 2012).

The UK Department of Health's *A Vision for Adult Social Care: Capable Communities and Active Citizens* (DoH 2010) is the template for national social care policy to which all Local Authorities in England had to respond with an implementation plan. This paper draws on a documentary analysis of two such plans drafted in 2012 in the wake of an 'austerity budget' and consequent public expenditure reductions. The analysis considers the effect of economic imperatives on the conceptualisation of individual choices and needs in the context of Local Authorities' responsibilities to people collectively. A concept of 'reasonableness' emerges, which is used to legitimize a re-balancing of the 'body personal' and the 'body politic' in the concept of well-being with the re-emergence of an economic, public construction. Our discussion considers why this is happening and whether or not a new synthesised position between the personal and political is being developed, as economists and policy makers appropriate well-being for their ends.

Keywords: Well-being, wellbeing, social work, choice, neo-liberalism, adult social care, austerity

Introduction: Sointu and her Exploration of a Shift in the Conceptualisation of Well-being

Sointu (2005, 2011) argues that the meaning of well-being is constructed and reconstructed through social practices, which reflect and shape the value given in society to subjective and objective goods; individual and collective agency; and, to responsibility. Sointu (2005) identified a shift in use from 'the body politic' in the mid-1980s, to 'the body personal' in the 1990s.

This 'move towards perceptions of wellbeing as related to personal lives' (Sointu 2005: 261) and away from economic well-being through a strong national economy, is identified through the emergence of newspaper articles which presented personalised, biographical accounts of people (mostly women) enhancing their well-being through the use of therapeutic experiences, which were increasingly commercialised to appeal to subjects constructed as self-responsible consumers. This is related to the rise of the consumer culture and a subject who can be understood as a self-responsible person in search of personal well-being. Importantly she argues that, once self-responsibility has become a norm, it can also become 'the primary means of governing individuals' (ibid.: 262) as the self-responsible individual becomes expected to make 'healthy choices' about their 'personal lifestyle' based on the assumption that 'people want to be healthy, and ... freely seek out ways of living most likely to promote their own health' (ibid.: 263). Thus, socially constructed expectations about the roles, responsibilities, duties and rights of citizens become significant factors in governance.

Drawing upon Sointu's work, we are concerned to examine the contemporary meaning of well-being and the inter-relatedness of agency, consumerism, markets and governance in the context of adult social care in England.

Towards an Understanding of Well-being in Social Work

Much of the research into well-being attempts to quantify and measure it, and different terms are used, often interchangeably. Schalock (2004) prefers the term 'quality of life', whilst Cummins (2005: 335) argues that 'subjective well-being' is now the 'generic descriptor' although a range of terms including 'happiness', 'subjective quality of life' and 'life satisfaction' can be identified. In summary, well-being attempts to hold in tension 'everyday meanings' of 'happiness', 'good health, and 'prosperity' all of which have contested meanings. Thus a 'ubiqitous term' disappears on further examination, 'like a cultural mirage' (Ereaut & Whiting 2008: 5).

Within the debates about well-being and the application to social work, three approaches can be identified. First, whether well-being is rooted in the quality of personal experiences; second, whether it is rooted in peoples' own choices; or,

whether it emerges from identifiable objective criteria such as achievement, understanding and happiness (Benton & Craib 2001).

Social work in its traditional case-work form (Biestek 1961) emphasised helping within a 'therapeutic relationship', developing 'well-being' in relation to 'the body personal'. It has, however, a lengthy history addressing the social, economic and political conditions in which people live (Price and Simpson 2007). Sointu's 'body politic' and its involvement in these conditions is indicative of social work's implicit concern for people's well-being. This concern has frequently taken the form of political engagement and agitation, as Attlee (1920: 27) argued:

> [T]he social worker is one who feels the claims of society upon him more than others, he brings to all his work this conception of his duty as a member of a civilised society to make his contribution to the well being of his fellows.

The 'radical' social work of the 1970s (Bailey & Brake 1975) continued throughout the 1980s often connected to broader social movements. This approach focused upon social structures and a politically engaged social work (Langan 2002). This focus continues with the contemporary concept of anti-oppressive practice (Dalrymple & Burke 1995), premised upon identifying and challenging social structures which have a negative impact upon people's lives.

Historically, social work embraces the different meanings inherent within the concept of well-being. The more recent rise of person-centred approaches may be seen as a turn to what Sointu termed the body personal. Current person-centred approaches are built upon the resources individuals have for self-understanding and for altering their self-concept. By self-directed behaviour individuals could move towards self-regulation and their own enhancement (Howe 2009).

Whilst the focus upon individuals and relationships remains significant, Jordan (2007: vi-vii) sets well-being for social work firmly in the context of 'quality of life' and 'relationships' within social structures:

> People's unhappiness is far more connected to their physical and mental health, and their relationships with others, than to their material circumstances. What hurts about being poor is not so much the absence of comforts and luxuries, but the stigma of official surveillance ... and the damage to personal relations.

Whilst Jordan identifies links between people's unhappiness (poor well-being) to their experience of poverty within social structures, Howe (2009:176) identifies the potential inability of social structures to deliver feelings of well-being to those materially better off:

> The emphasis on being responsible for your own success (or failure) in a climate of aggressive, competitive self-interest increases levels of stress. There is always someone who seems to earn more and possess far more things than you do. This is a recipe for dissatisfaction and reduced happiness.

Thus within social work there remains a close alliance between the body politic and the body personal. Ferguson (2008) has sought to reclaim relationship social work as a radical project because of the links between the socio-political context

of poverty and wealth, and personal well-being. Jordan (2008) argues that social work, being both person-centred and focussed on structures, is one of the originators of the trend towards personalised interventions addressing both the body personal and politic.

We suggest that the provision of health and social welfare through the first decade of the twenty-first century reflects this wider cultural understanding of well-being as a therapeutic commodity. Mirroring Sointu's analysis of the rise of alternative and complementary well-being services, a market economy for the provision of social care services was developed which, valuing consumerism, promoted more choice and greater control for service users culminating in devolving 'purchasing power' to those in need of services through, for example, direct payments and personal budgets (Lymbery 2012). It is to governance and well-being that we now turn.

Well-being in 'Governance'

The earlier discussion about social work sees it as a profession which can promote well-being at all levels. Social work, however, operates within a clearly defined legal and policy framework – in other words it is an element of national and local Governance, or as several commentators have suggested a mechanism for regulation and control (Jones & Novak 1993).

Ereaut and Whiting's analysis (2008) noted that the meaning of well-being follows 'a general cultural move towards the project of the self in which individuals are encouraged (some would say "required") to assume increasing personal responsibility, say for their illness or wellness' (2008:13). In governance documents, it is used interchangeably between one component of well-being and its whole; between referring to individuals and referring to the well-being of society, or groups within society; between well-being as something neutral and something positive; between being static or a journey; between an end in itself or as a means to another end.

In a similar vein, the New Economics Foundation (NEF 2008: 4) breaks well-being down into personal and social. It states that the five main components of personal well-being are emotional well-being, a satisfying life, vitality, resilience & self-esteem, and positive functioning including autonomy, competence, and engagement. The main components of social well-being are supportive relationships, trust and belonging.

Simpson (2012: 624) examined well-being in terms of professional training and the policies within which social work with adults takes place. He argued that well-being is implicitly present, yet subservient to the overriding concept of choice and independence. These dominate the provision of services under the personalisation agenda, premised on neo-liberal policies (Houston 2010). Sointu's (2005: 2011) application of a turn towards the personal can be seen in social work

as it shifts from a general concern with social conditions and economic prosperity to a more personal concept of health and 'feeling good', often characterised in social work provision by having 'choice and control' (Duffy 2010). This is concerned with 'agency', where traditional debates have seen this as either individual or collective. Callinicos (2004) argues that this is a false dichotomy, since to conceive of agency without structure – or even structure without agency – is to miss the point. For our discussion social work is an activity, which embraces the notion of the person and society (Taylor-Gooby 2008). Emphasising individual agency, without an analysis of the social, political and economic framework creates depoliticised practitioners and service-users (Simpson & Connor 2011).

The shift towards personal well-being is situated in neo-liberalism, that is a change in the nature of global capitalism characterised by lower taxation, lower levels of welfare provision and an emphasis upon individualism and profit, which lead to greater disparities between rich and poor (Wilkinson & Pickett 2010). The shift towards personal well-being served as a cultural and political device to mask economic policies, gaining pace in the UK during a time of relative prosperity under New Labour which paradoxically led to higher levels of service provision through public expenditure as well as inequality.

A change in Government in 2010 coupled with the continuing economic downturn, resulted in considerable reductions in public expenditure and alongside this, the Government introduced a 'happiness index'. Duncan-Smith (2011) argued that 'levels of family income are just an approximate … measure of well-being. I do believe that increased income and increased well-being do not always follow the same track'. The UK Office for National Statistics' [ONS] 'happiness index' (ONS 2012: 1) asks four key questions, none of which relate explicitly to people's social and economic situation, focusing instead upon feelings of personal happiness and satisfaction with life. Interestingly, the Cabinet contains a high number of millionaires with an estimated combined wealth, in 2012, of £70m (Hope 2012), and it is easier for those who are in a comfortable financial position to make such comments. This 'distance from necessity' differentiates the working and middle classes (Bourdieu, cited in Cockerham 2005: 56) and is clearly at play in the economic and social factors we discuss.

We therefore suggest that a dialectic is at play. Services are being reduced, as are levels of income and expenditure yet the emphasis in Governance promotes 'well-being', deflecting attention away from the 'economic' basis, and emphasising the depoliticised arena of 'feeling good' as a goal for all citizens, irrespective of income level.

This is the background to our research, which examined emerging policy documents following the public expenditure reductions in the 2012 Budget. We examined the extent of a rebalancing of well-being as an individualistic (personal), and an economic (social or public), state. Whilst this is not a new phenomenon, through examining a potential re-emergence of an economic or public construc-

tion we consider why the time is ripe for shifting well-being back to 'the body politic', whether a new synthesised position between the personal and the politic is in the making.

Rationale and Method of Study

Drawing on the dynamic tensions inherent within 'well-being' and social work, we examined the responses of two Local Councils (both in overall control) to the central government policy, articulated in the UK Department of Health's *A Vision for Adult Social Care: capable communities and active citizens* (DoH 2010), to explore how aspects of well-being are currently being configured.

We analysed the content of documents produced in 2012 by two Councils in the English Midlands, where they set out their strategy for implementing the policy following their public consultation exercises. Although these documents are in the public domain and freely accessible, we have maintained the anonymity of the Councils since, at the time of writing, the policy documents are approaching their final stages prior to implementation. Accordingly we have referred to the Councils as A and B.

We chose a content analysis approach, exploring language through word searches and considering the meaning of the frequency and positioning of words within the text. Analysing language in this way 'connects the micro (specific features of language use) with the macro (cultural and social meaning and action)' (Ereaut & Whiting 2008: 2). We were mindful that content analysis is concerned with 'data reduction' given that much information is thrown away in the search 'to see the wood through the trees' (Robson 2002: 358). Our purpose was scoping the language to explore the use of 'well-being' in the construction of local social problems and solutions in response to a national policy.

We chose words which reflect the ideas and values linked with well-being in recent social policy, including the promotion of autonomy through the allocation of personal budgets, to explore the extent to which these links are still prevalent and whether or not changes are perceptible. In the analysis we consider and make explicit the manifest content – i.e. the content which is 'physically present' – and the latent content – in terms of inferences and interpretation we draw from the positioning and proximity of words (Robson 2002).

Findings

I. Well-being, Independence and Choice

Well-being was used infrequently in the documents, but when it was, both Councils used the term as if the meaning is clear to all. Council A referred to Health and Wellbeing Boards, a corporate coming together of traditional 'Health and

Social Care services'. This use appears underpinned by an operationalized sedimentation of the term in which 'joint health and wellbeing strategies' are drawn up, targets set, and outcomes measured. It also used 'well-being' in the philosophical sense of the ideal conditions for a 'good life' in assertions about 'The *Borough* [our italics] we want for health and well-being'. Thus, it is well-being for all which is sought.

Council B uses the phrase 'independence and well-being' with an unproblematic acceptance that they fit together and extend each other, consistent with a taken-for-granted meaning emergent in social policy in the past decade (Howe 2009; Simpson 2012).

Well-being is frequently associated with independence, and the exercising of choice is often taken as evidence of independence (Simpson & Price 2010). Both Councils positioned 'choice' at the start of the documents and in sections dealing with either 'priorities' (Council A) or 'principles' (Council B). This positioning foregrounds choice, and associates it with what the documents' authors consider important.

A stated priority for Council A is that 'older people and vulnerable adults will maintain their independence for longer and will have greater choice and control over their care, regaining their independence earlier where this can be achieved'. Council B emphasises 'people's rights, choices and inclusion' and the Council values interventions which enable people to have 'more choice and control and flexibility over the services they receive'. Throughout both Councils' documents, as independence is taken for granted as intrinsic to 'well-being', so independence is linked to choice and control. Whilst Council A uses the word 'choice' to refer to the activity of residents or service users who are making decisions about their care, their document also refers to the Council's 'preferences' which are to be used by social workers when involved in decision-making:

> The Cabinet endorses the approach of supporting people within the borough and returning them from out of borough into a community placement in preference to a residential placement, if such a placement meets their needs.

The report is silent on how differences between residents' 'choices' and the Council's 'preferences' would be resolved, with an implicit assumption that 'bringing people home' would be a 'good thing' naturally promoting their 'well-being'.

The use of 'choice' in these documents supports an understanding of 'well-being' premised on independence and individualism. It is not always clear whether this concerns the choices people make or the things from which they can choose. Furthermore, the documents begin to show that people have choice, but what they choose might not be prioritized by those who implement those choices.

Council B's discussion of national eligibility criteria for receipt of services, infers that it meets its responsibility to make provision where independence is threatened. The draft policy document makes the balancing of individual need

against budget constraints transparent stating that 'maximum independence and privacy is achieved with each individual within the financial limits of the resources available'.

Furthermore, the document asserts that Council B might offer 'different ways of meeting need from the *service user's first choice*' (our italics). The economic limitations in determining service provision and resource allocation are particularly stark:

> ... to balance potentially conflicting responsibilities the County Council has decided to establish a usual maximum expenditure. […] In circumstances in which a support plan to meet need and manage risk in the person's home exceeds the usual maximum expenditure alternative care arrangements would be considered. This might include offering different alternative care arrangements from the service user's first choice.

Choice here is not concerned with 'empowering' people to exercise choice and control over the services they receive (Harris 2003) but is more measured, with peoples' preferences reflected, rather than their choices honoured. The potential for tension between service-users and the Council remains, acknowledged by 'a balance between the Council's resources and people's preferred support plans' with individuals having their preferred support if they supplement any shortfall left by insufficient Council funding. This then connects to another cluster of researched terms.

II. Budgets and the Responsible Citizen

Both documents contain frequent references to 'personal budgets', 'individual budgets' and 'budget allocation'. Council A extends the personalisation policy thus: 'entitlements expressed as services have been superseded by entitlements expressed as personal budget amounts'. The document continues to advance 'the body personal' in its presentation of a system of personal budgets developed from the values of independence and autonomy, choice and control shared by 'well-being', and also takes us towards the 'body politic' when setting out its management of resources. Under the heading 'Financial Implications', Council A asserts that the risk of economic failure will be mitigated by the 'strict' controls and 'balance' which will apply to budget management striving for a 'balanced budget'.

Council B's document refers to such considerations in its 'Statement of Purpose':

> Public funding for social care should be allocated in a way that both meets individual eligible need and also takes account of the overall demand for resources and consequent budgetary considerations.

Council B is unambiguous that individual preference must be balanced against Council responsibilities to make effective and efficient use of resources. Furthermore the guidance to social workers notes that the Council takes an approach to arranging services which balances the needs of individuals with the needs of all those for whom it has a responsibility. Therefore, in their professional activities

social workers are to be mindful of their employers' fiscal responsibilities, argua-
bly privileging those responsibilities above the needs of individual service-users,
reinforced by clear 'principles for decision making … and a framework for identi-
fying the *usual maximum* [our italics] expenditure of a care package to support an
individual in their home'. These statements would, or at least should, present so-
cial workers with ethical dilemmas.

Council B's document clearly presents the dilemma it faces in meeting increas-
ing demand in a time of decreasing financial resources. It assumes a utilitarian
consensus that it is 'reasonable' and 'common-sense' to weigh the needs of the
few against the needs of the many. There is a balance to be maintained:

> *This* [our italics] County Council is committed to supporting people to live full and
> independent lives within their local communities. Where people are eligible for so-
> cial care support the aim is to support them in a way that reflects their preferences
> and the outcomes they wish to achieve. However this needs to be *balanced against*
> *this* [our italics] County Council's responsibilities to make best use of available re-
> sources.

People's preferences, rather than choices about support, are reflected and, crucial-
ly, Council B identifies itself as a responsible Council because it seeks to balance
effectiveness with efficiency, central elements of neo-liberal policies (le Grand
2007).

Service-users should be central to policy (Beresford & Carr 2012) and for at
least one Council their needs are being, at best, balanced against or, at worst,
made subservient to economic demands. The language around service-users was
analysed to examine the relationship between people and policy.

III. Service User, Client, Resident or Citizen

Council A refers to 'service-users', 'clients', 'residents' and 'citizens' without
distinction, whereas Council B only refers to 'clients' and/or 'service users'. Both
Councils' policy aim is to reach a position where those who need services can
engage with the market, thereby purchasing services that help them achieve their
planned care outcomes.

Council A alludes to a philosophical understanding of 'well-being' as an ideal-
ised 'good life' and the Aristotelian view of a citizen's journey to self-fulfilment,
in accord with social work's contribution to well-being (Jordan 2007). This vision
of the citizen's journey as one of self-help includes an allocation of a personal
budget 'where needed'. The Council claims that the financial implications of adult
social care policy will maintain or improve outcomes for citizens whilst reducing
costs. Citizens receiving funding for adult social care provision will receive their
monies through an allocation formula, which introduces a distinctly 'economic'
conception of citizenship.

Thus for Council A, alongside the philosophical goal of well-being for the
Borough there is the economic imperative to balance the books. In the specific

context of services, Council A ceases referring to citizens and prefers 'service users' who choose their 'service providers', thereby establishing a contractual relationship based on a duality between 'users' and 'providers'. The distinction is between 'actual' service users, that is people for whom a budget is needed, in contrast to 'self-helping, self-serving, self-directing' citizens.

Discussion: Well-being, Choice, Balance and Social Work

From our analysis of the documents we make one observation and identify the emergence of two themes which are significant in determining how well-being is undergoing a reconceptualisation.

First, through the study of well-being in these documents it is clear that, on the few occasions the word itself is used, its meaning still ranges across the philosophical, the body personal and, implicitly, the body politic. The more philosophical use of the term is evident in its conjunction with citizenship. The evidence suggests that, whilst well-being remains associated with 'the body personal', conveying an underpinning assumption that self-help, self-directed choice and independence are commonly shared values in society and constitute proper goals for health and social care provision, it has also become increasingly sedimented in the language of governance through 'health and wellbeing' terminology. Overall it appears that 'well-being' is integral to hegemonic structure, providing a linguistic cloak for less benign developments in which well-being begins to acquire what Hall (1988: 44) argues is a 'symbolic power … the horizon of the taken for granted'. To this end, well-being becomes a paradox: politically and culturally important, yet devoid of definition; part of the invisible constructs of everyday speech in that its meaning is never specified, but always assumed. This is deeply significant in understanding the emergent themes.

The documents reveal a significant reconceptualising of choice, in ways which are clearly articulated, representing both a change of policy and a significant challenge to social workers and other social welfare professionals who have come to regard choice as both empowering and liberating. Duffy (2010) is a major proponent of this arguing that social workers need to understand the philosophical underpinning of choice, and suggesting that critics, such as Ferguson (2007) and Houston (2010) are unduly fixated upon the economic aspects of the personalisation agenda. Our findings would suggest that the economic imperatives are now being clearly articulated and that the premise of the economic factors have also changed. It is no longer the appeal to a rational economic being, much vaunted by neo-liberals which dominates, but rather choice is now restricted by economic imperatives and expenditure limits.

It could be argued that empowering people to make choices was never intended to, nor indeed ever did, mean that such choices would then be honoured, although we would suggest this was implied in policy. Our analysis of these documents

detects a trend of Councils becoming transparent in stating that some people's first choices may not be honoured, where a shortfall between the first choice and the council's preferred alternative cannot be made up. In the clash between individual choice and a Council budget, choice is reframed as preference. The personal well-being of an individual (previously constructed in social policy as independence, choice and control) seems to weigh less in the balance with the economic well-being of the Council. Different kinds of ethics underpin different kinds of philosophical well-being and, as stated earlier, well-being is premised on the nature of what is 'good' for people. By focusing upon every residents' well-being, in a utilitarian way, it becomes possible to use the concept of well-being to underscore changing economic realities.

The second theme identified is 'balance'. The context for the shift in offering service-users choice articulated as 'preferences' appears to be an economic one. In the current economic climate of 'austerity measures' and the 'demographic time-bomb' of increasing numbers of elderly people with social care needs, some councils appear to find themselves needing to address the desire to balance their responsibilities explicitly.

In the documents, balance became a metaphor upon which to draw. Kirmayer (1988: 57) argues that 'when values are explicit, they may be openly debated but rhetoric uses metaphor to smuggle values into discourse that proclaims itself rational, even-handed and value-free'. Something which is balanced is equally apportioned, fair, and stable, guarding against inequity and instability. The metaphor of balance is called on in the rhetoric of the documents to convey a utilitarian-style value which asserts that, whilst service users are required to be self-responsible, it is taken for granted that people will recognise the common sense approach of councils by which they must ensure that budgets are balanced to fulfilling their responsibilities. Individual independence and autonomy is then limited. In times of relative prosperity well-being can be associated with the individual, with the body personal, but in times of austerity it once more becomes associated with the collective and the body politic, albeit with a different emphasis. Underpinning the metaphor of balance is the notion of a 'responsible council' as one which successfully manages its finances and does not overspend and go over budget. The 'balance' here is not the scales of justice but the book-keeper's ledger. Appeals to well-being in this regard become the tool of the accountant, not the social worker and, most certainly not the service-user.

Conclusion: Implications of the Study

As the Councils' policy documents could be read as instructions for how their professionals are meant to behave, and social workers are likely to be at the forefront of implementing these changes, our initial findings point to social work find-

ing itself once again potentially compromised, in this case by a focus upon individual well-being articulated through a limited conception of choice.

Social work is once more at a cross-roads, faced with choices about how to respond to these developments. Social work needs to reclaim its historical agenda developed around the body politic and engage not only with service-users, but also with the strictures of developing policy. It should be aware of the history of its language being co-opted by others, resulting in it being pushed into actions which do not accord with its socially liberal aims (Scull 1983; Simpson & Price 2010).

A discernible catalyst for the rebalancing between an economic/objective understanding of well-being and a personal/subjective one is the change in economic fortunes in recent years from prosperity to austerity. There is no room for the redemption of a council with debts. Similarly service-users who rely on services are now faced with hostility from other 'residents'. Services are effectively competing with each other and the public for supremacy, and the policy, begun in 2010, of removing ring-fencing has intensified this. Presenting such political arguments as 'reasonable'; 'fair'; balanced; and promoting 'well-being' aims to establish a specific hegemonic structure, embedded within cultural expectations, which reduce complex social and economic debates to taken-for-granted assumptions. This brief study suggests that this is occurring across Councils in the Midlands, and, most likely elsewhere.

It is our conclusion that in England we are experiencing a cultural turn, which is being developed through local policies with social workers likely to be the people who will be implementing such polices. Oppositional groups such as Disabled People Against Cuts (2013) and the Social Work Action Network (2013) are, by definition, small. The 'body politic', comprising of other 'residents' and politicians, is engaged in a more or less coherent set of policies designed to reshape well-being in the form of the fairness of a 'reasonable' council. At present, in England, this reconceptualising of well-being appears to be holding sway.

Graeme Simpson is a Senior Lecturer in Social Work at the University of Wolverhampton. He co-ordinates the MA in Social Work with Ani Murr, and MA practice placements. His research interests include the impact of austerity on social work practice, European and comparative social work, and the use of critical theory. E-mail: g.simpson@wlv.ac.uk

Ani Murr is a Senior Lecturer in Social Work at the University of Wolverhampton. She co-ordinates learning and assessment for students on first and last placements, co-ordinates the practice educator courses and is joint co-ordinator (with Graeme Simpson) of the MA in Social Work. In addition to research interests in

adult social care policy she is interested in the assessment of social work practice and rural mental health. E-mail: a.murr@wlv.ac.uk

References

Attlee, Clement R. (1920): *The Social Worker*, London. G. Bell and Sons: https://archive.org/details/socialworker00attliala (accessed 11 December 2013).

Bailey, Roy & Mike Brake (1975): 'Social Work and the Welfare State', Roy Bailey & Mike Brake (eds): *Radical Social Work*, London: Edward Arnold.

Benton, Ted & Ian Craib (2001): *Philosophy of Social Science*, Basingstoke: Palgrave

Beresford, Peter & Sarah Carr (2012): *Social Care, Service Users and User Involvement (Research Highlights in Social Work Series)*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Biestek, Felix P. (1961): *The Casework Relationship*, London: Allen and Unwin.

Braye, Suzy & Michael Preston-Shoot (1995): *Empowering Practice in Social Care*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Callinicos, Alex (2004): *Making History: Agency, Structure and Change in Social Theory*, 2nd Edition. London: Brill.

Cockerham, William C. (2005): 'Health Lifestyle Theory and the Convergence of Agency and Structure', *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 46:1, 51–67.

Cummins, Robert A. (2005): 'Caregivers as Managers of Subjective Wellbeing: A Homeostatic Perspective', *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 18:4, 335–344.

Dalrymple, Jane & Beverley Burke (1995): *Anti-Oppressive Practice*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Department of Health (2010): *A Vision for Adult Social Care: Capable Communities and Active Citizens*, London: The Stationery Office.

Disabled People Against Cuts (2013): http://dpac.uk.net/ (accessed: 06 July 2013).

Duffy, Simon (2010). *Citizenship & Community*, Sheffield: Centre for Welfare Reform.

Duncan Smith, Iain (2011): *Families and Young People in Troubled Neighbourhoods*, Speech delivered at the London School of Economics, 2nd December, 2011: http://www.dwp.gov.uk/newsroom/ministers-speeches/2011/02-12-11.shtml (accessed 03 July 2012).

Ereaut, Gill & Rebecca Whiting (2008): *What do we Mean by 'Wellbeing'? And why Might it Matter?*, Research Report No DCSF_RW073. Department for Children, Schools and Families.

Ferguson, Iain (2007): 'Increasing User Choice or Privatizing Risk? The Antinomies of Personalization', *British Journal of Social Work*, 37:3, 387–403.

------ (2008): *Reclaiming Social Work*, London. Sage.

Fornäs, Johan, Martin Fredriksson & Jenny Johannisson (2011): 'Editorial', *Culture Unbound*, 3, 5-10.

Hall, Stuart (1988): 'The Toad in the Garden: Thatcherism amongst the Theorists', Cary Nelson& Lawrence Grossberg (eds): *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Harris, John (2003): *The Social Work Business*, London: Routledge.

Hope, Christopher (2012): 'The Cabinet is worth £70 million', *The Telegraph*, 27 May 2012: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/9290520/Exclusive-Cabinet-is-worth-70million.html (accessed 21 May 2014).

Houston, Stan. (2010): 'Beyond Homo Economicus: Recognition, Self-Realization and Social Work', *British Journal of Social Work*, 40:3, 841–857.

Howe, David (2009): *A Brief Introduction to Social Work Theory*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Jones, Chris & Tony Novak (1993): 'Social Work Today', *British Journal of Social Work*, 23:3, 195-212.

Jordan, Bill (2008): *Welfare and Well-being: Social Value in Public Policy*, Bristol: Policy Press.

------ (2007): *Social Work and Well-being*, Lyme Regis: Russell House Publishing.

Kirmayer, Laurence J. (1988): 'Mind and Body as Metaphors: Hidden Values in Biomedicine', Margaret Lock Deborah Gordon (eds.): *Biomedicine Examined*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Langan, Mary (2002): *The Legacy of Radical Social Work*, London: Macmillan.

Le Grand, Julian (2007): *The Other Invisible Hand: Delivering Public Services Through Choice and Competition*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lymbery, Mark (2012): 'Social Work and Personalisation', *British Journal of Social Work*, 42:4, 783-792.

New Economics Foundation [NEF] (2008): *National Accounts of Well-being*: http://www.nationalaccountsofwellbeing.org/public-data/files/national-accounts-of-well-being-report.pdf (accessed 14 February 2013).

Office for National Statistics (2012): *Measuring Subjective Wellbeing in the UK*: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/dcp171766_272294.pdf (accessed 14 February 2103).

Price, Vicky & Graeme Simpson (2007): *Transforming Society? Social Work and Sociology*, Bristol. The Policy Press.

Robson, Colin (2002): *Real World Research*, Oxford: Wiley and Sons.

Schalock, Robert L. (2004): 'The Concept of Quality of Life: What we Know and do not Know', Keynote address: *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 48:3, 203-216.

Scull, Andrew T. (1983): *Decarceration: Community Treatment and the Individual – A Radical View*, New York, NY: Rutgers University Press.

Simpson, Graeme (2012): 'Developing Wellbeing as a Critical Tool in Social Work Education: An Example from the Field of Learning Disability', *Social Work Education*, 31:5, 622–636.

Simpson, Graeme & Stuart Connor (2011): *Social Policy for Social Welfare Professionals: Tools for Understanding, Analysis and Engagement*, Bristol. Policy Press.

Simpson, Graeme & Vicky Price (2010): 'From Inclusion to Exclusion: Some Unintended Consequences of "Valuing People"', *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38:3, 180-187.

Social Work Action Network (2013): http://www.socialworkfuture.org/ (accessed 06 May 2013).

Sointu, Eeva (2005): 'The Rise of an Ideal: Tracing Changing Discourses of Wellbeing', *The Sociological Review*, 53:2, 255-274.

------ (2011): 'Detraditionalisation, Gender and Alternative and Complementary Medicines', *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 33:3, 356-71.

Taylor-Gooby, Peter (2008): 'Assumptive Worlds and Images of Agency: Academic Social Policy in the Twenty-first Century?', *Social Policy and Society*, 7:3, 269-80.

Wilkinson, Richard & Kate Pickett (2010): *The Spirit Level: Why Equality Is Better For Everyone*, London: Penguin Books.