Editorial
A message from the new Co-Editors

This issue sees the arrival of two new Co-Editors and a new Editorial Board. Sincere thanks must go to former Editor Nigel Malin and his team for their diligent editorial work. The new editors are respectively from the social work and psychology fields, signalling the continuous embracing spirit of social work in a wider context. Marcus Chiu had been the editor of the *Asia Pacific Journal of Social Work and Development*, and serves on a few editorial boards for other journals. Jerome Carson serves also as the Co-Editor of *Mental Health and Social Inclusion*. We have an excellent forward programme which will reinforce the unique contribution of *Social Work & Social Sciences Review* to the field. We will actively explore the remounting of the *Review* into the SSCI listing.

*

In this issue, we have two papers on professional practice, one on tacit knowledge, and the other on the nature of the working relationship from a psychoanalytic perspective. In the first paper, Lisa Wallander reported her interesting study on tacit knowledge in social work practice, by analysing the views of 35 Swedish social workers and 11 final year social work students on case vignettes. In her words,

> while a majority of the respondents spontaneously provided basic level arguments, prompts were often required for them to make explicit the level of uncertainty associated with a conclusion, and to elicit information about specific knowledge sources. Further, most social workers failed to provide a more general explanation for why they inferred a specific conclusion from the data, even when queried.

It showed participants were far more conscious of the knowledge base for risk assessment than for general assessment of the problems, and actions needed. Clearly social workers are no exceptions to 'person-in-situation'.

The overriding concern for risk assessment is but a reflection of what is required at agency and professional level in response to reactive policies on risks of certain service clienteles. In the second paper, mental health practitioners and researchers Philip John Archard and Michelle O'Reilly, informed by the Kleinian tradition of psychoanalysis, completed 33 interviews with 15 professionals working in local authority children's services. The discussion made a number of reflections and in fact ignited a scholarly debate on the nature of working relationship with client and raised the question whether it is about "a researcher's desire to be helpful to participants and less about participants' actual experiences". Perhaps this apt query should also be taken seriously by other helping professions as well.

The third paper is by Yasoda Sharma and John Vafeas who examined the examined the adequacy of domestic violence services and programmes provided by 45 service

agencies in rural and urban Pennsylvania. Programme leaders were interviewed with a structured questionnaire to tap into their views of service adequacy, availability and accessibility to the services they needed. Very few rural agencies were able to provide immigration services, and mental health support and none can provide medical and psychiatric services, when compared to their urban counterparts. Urban-rural and in fact regional discrepancies in service provision continue to be a haunting issue for service planners and providers.

The final paper in this issue is a rare cross-over to Geographical Information Systems (GIS). Instead of a straight-forward adoption of the skills and technique in this state of art, Kristi Roybal proposed a participatory approach for Urban Social Work Research. On one hand the author saw the close lines of early works of social work practice with groups and communities, in relation to locality, issues, and environment. On the other, the method can be used to promote integration, cohesion, and justice with particular groups of people. The intersection between social work and GIS is expected to open new research agendas and build new knowledge to enrich each of the two fields. In her concluding remarks,

> participatory GIS challenges the social work profession to learn about and expand understanding of the nuanced and complex ways socioeconomic, political, and environmental factors converge in the daily lives of residents to influence their health. Participatory mapping allows social work to transcend the individual deficit model by situating human behavior in a broader, socially constructed geographic context ... social work scholars can develop an enhanced understanding of neighborhood-level health barriers and health opportunities and in turn more effectively advocate for contextually-relevant policy and practice interventions

The Editors hold similar ideas and that is why we invited a Geographer onto our board.

Apart from the stimulation readers will have in reading the four articles, we are delighted to report briefly that the call for abstracts on the special issue by Ebenezer Cudjoe, Prince Agwu and Marcus on child welfare in Africa has received an overwhelming responses. Inevitably we have to disappoint some authors and it will be another challenge for the editorial team to review and follow through later the full manuscripts. In addition, Jerome is co-editing a Special Issue on Autoethnography in Social Work. Hopefully this will stimulate many social work practitioners to start writing about their experiences and practice. There are exciting times ahead for *Social Work and Social Sciences Review*.

Best Wishes,

Marcus Chiu and Jerome Carson
University of Bolton, United Kingdom