Search and selection of articles social work essay

The methodology that is being applied in this dissertation is the review of literature. According to Aveyard (2010), Literature review is a comprehensive study and interpretation of literature that relates to a particular topic. The author provides several reasons why literature review is important one of which is the fact that it provides a snapshot from an increasing amount of literature available to health and social care professionals thereby saving time while being kept informed of recent developments that inform practice. However Sarantakos (2005) is of the view that literature review strengthens the reliability of the project. It also reduce bias and enhanced naturalness since, unlike primary sources, influence on the research samples is usually limited. Lastly, it steers clear of ethical issues that are commonly found in a qualitative approach.

Search and Selection of Articles.

In doing this research I conducted a library study using electronic resources provided by the University via ATHENS, gained access to Sage and internet search engines such as Swetswise, Google chrome, Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE), British Journal of Social Work, Textbooks relating to this project were also accessed from the University library. I accessed information from government policies and guidelines for older people for further knowledge and information. These are results of the sites visited. Social Care Online ' Safeguarding Older people' 5, 309 resultsAcademic OneFile ' Safeguarding Older people and social work' 293 resultsBritish Journal of Social Work ' Safeguarding Older and Social work' 5290 resultsAge UK Safeguarding older people 3, 293 results. Gale Academic OneFile

Safeguarding older people + social work 60 results. University Library

Safeguarding older people abuse social work role 5290 results

Introduction of papers

Taylor and Dodd (2003) identified reasons why abuse is not reported by staff working for different groups of vulnerable adults across Surrey. This paper focuses upon the beliefs and knowledge held by staff about abuse, which would affect their likelihood of reporting. The methodology used in this journal is a semi-structured interview which provided the flexibility to explore any emerging issues when discussing areas of abuse. The limitations are that it focusses on a single borough and only the points of view of staff are taken into consideration. Cambridge and Tessa (2004) examine decision-making in adult protection within a local authority social services department and discussion generated through a specialist training intervention. The paper aims to identify ways in which approaches to decision-making can be made both more effective and more user centred. It focussed on Kent onlyMcCreadie, et al, 2008 identified the implementation of multi-agency working mandated in No Secrets by examining the perspectives of staff working in local agencies, whose experience in carrying out adult protection policy was investigated in a study funded by the Nuffield Foundation. In their methodology they used survey and in-depth Interviews. The strength of this paper is interagency viewpoint. Cooper et al, (2008) did a systematic review of studies measuring the prevalence of elder abuse or neglect, either reported by older people. A comprehensive literature search of multiple databases up to October 2006, supplemented by a search of the references of all relevant articles was the method used. Measures for validity and

reliability had not been demonstrated and tested. Malcolm Payne (2008) reports an audit of safeguarding adults' cases arising over two years from the introduction of an adult protection policy in a UK palliative care. Limitation only considers palliative care settings. Pinkney et al, (2008) provides an insight into the views of social workers about adult protection practice. It incorporated a quantitative phase, a survey of local authorities, and a qualitative phase, which consisted of focus groups of multi-agency adult protection committees and semi-structured interviews with a range of stakeholders. This study was limited in that the views of the social workers were not considered in relation on observation of their practice and so their opinions cannot be verified and views of other professionals could have provided useful and alternative insights into the perspectives held by the social workers. Manthorpe et al (2009) explored many elements of decision-making in practice with people who have dementia, of which decisions around safeguarding are an important part. This aspect of the study informs the main aim of this literature review which is to explore what measures prevent elder abuse. The aim of the study by Manthorpe et al (2009) is to produce resource materials and recommendations in relation to the MCA and its interface with adult safeguarding work. The research applied a qualitative methodology with interviews involving 15 local adult safeguarding leads. The limitation of this study is that it is confined to the London area where practices and opinions might be different in other parts of England and Wales. Humphries (2011) examined messages from peer reviews of the adult safeguarding arrangements include: outcomes and experience of people who use services; leadership, strategy and commissioning; service delivery, effective practice and performance and resource management; and working

together. The aim is to summarise the principal conclusions from the pilot reviews and key learning points to assist the improvement of safeguarding policy and practice. The limitation is that it focuses on four English local authorities. Mackay et al, (2012) demonstrates that the Adult Support and protection (Scotland) Act 2007 (ASPSA) has had a positive effect on safeguarding practice in Scotland. The aim of the project was to explore the assessment, decision making and intervention of individual practitioners. The methodology used in this research is qualitative semi structured interviews. The limitation is that whether ASPSA made a difference in adult safeguarding. Braye et al, (2012) this article identified report from research into the governance of adult safeguarding policy and practice in England, with particular focus on interagency partnership arrangements. The methodology used is a systematic search and thematic analysis of English-language literature on adult safeguarding. Limitation of this research is that it focuses on England and does not incorporate learning from other jurisdictions. Wallcraft (2012) summarises the review of service user and carer involvement in safeguarding and recommendations for good practice. The study involved a review of selected literature and a consultation exercise with experts in the field of adult safeguarding and telephone interviews with 13 Adult. In addition there is little knowledge of how to involve the most vulnerable service users who are in need of protection, or how to balance risk and empowerment. Fyson (2012) this paper seeks to report some of the findings from an evaluation of adult safeguarding in one English local authority. All adult social care teams in the local authority were asked to complete a short pro forma about the five most recent adult safeguarding alerts that they had managed. The limitation is that it is a relatively small

sample from a single local authority. Parry (2013) identified and encourages good practice in adult safeguarding by housing providers. The literature searched on policy and research on the role of housing in adult safeguarding. Good practice search, drawn from No Secrets. A limitation is that it is not a comprehensive study of all good practice in this area. Emma Stevens (2013) highlights contemporary issues in achieving best practice in safeguarding adults across multi-agency settings. The paper is an empirical exploration, reviewing a range of relevant literature and recent policy to present evidence suggesting that there continue to be challenges in achieving best practice in multi-agency approaches. The paper fulfils the need for discussion on the complexities and challenges that continue to present in multi-agency responses to adult safeguarding practice. Several studies examining the prevention of adult abuse also make use of literature review as a methodology. Braye et al (2012) apply a literature review methodology to their study into the governance of adult safeguarding policy and practice in England, with particular focus on interagency partnership arrangements expressed through Safeguarding Adults Boards. Walcraft (2012) also investigates the field of adult safeguarding with a similar approach. In addition to telephone interviews, the study applies a review of literature to examining service user and carer involvement in safeguarding. In addition, Cooper et al (2008) carried out a systematic review of the prevalence of elder abuse which involved a comprehensive literature search of multiple databases. While Parry (2013) also applies a literature review methodology in her study examining the role of housing in adult safeguarding. Finally, Stevens (2012) examines contemporary issues in achieving best practice in safeguarding adults across multi-agency settings with the aid of literature

review. FindingsThis research employs a literature review methodology as described in the previous chapter. There are many preventative measures that can help to prevent abuse and these have been examined from current literature over the past ten years. From the measures described, several recurring themes have been identified and will be analysed in detail in this chapter. The main themes that were identified include Multiagency View of Safeguarding Adults, Service Users Perception/participation, Training, Stakeholders, Best practice and Serious case review.

Serious Case Reviews

On the one hand, Flynn et al (2011) state that organisations wanting to learn from the past have a process by which they reflect on things that have gone wrong in order to identify what went wrong, who contributed, why it went wrong, and what can be done to prevent it happening again. A Serious Case Review (SCR) is such a process and in social care services may be referred to as a case study. While on the other hand, according to Brown (2009) the primary purpose of SCR is to focus on the few cases that test adult protection work and system beyond its capabilities, causing very serious concerns in the relevant professional networks and minds of vulnerable people and their relatives. SCRs are another useful tool that can help to safeguard adults. Several studies considering serious case reviews have explored how interagency networks responded in cases of self- neglect (Braye et al, 2012). They have also explored the importance of involving service users in decision making (Stevens, 2012). The role of housing has been examined in relation to safeguarding adults (Parry, 2013). Manthorpe and Martnieau (2010) also researched SCRs. Their study revealed that SCRs

have not generally provided accounts of the review processes. They suggest that greater transparency of practice may lend a report greater authority, and observations about any lack of co-operation or approaches that seemed to have been particularly fruitful may be of interest to the safeguarding practice community and to campaigners promoting the human rights of all citizens (Manthorpe and Martnieau, 2010). A serious case review of a death associated with self-neglect has been used to examine more closely the legal and ethical factors that practitioners must take into account and balance when dealing with such cases. In so doing, not only have several complex issues been raised, but the discussion has also suggested that ' safeguarding' can be a malleable and, in some circumstances, potentially problematic label (Scourfield, 2009). SCRs identify the requirement for work-embedded support if they are to promote on-going professional development efforts. The best scenario involves the high interest of managers and practitioners across disciplines in exploring and considering the findings and learning from SCRs, without creating a feeling of work overload. However, the reporting of SCRs takes professional learning into new locations and unfamiliar arenas (Flynn et al, 2011).

Multiagency view of Safeguarding

A number of articles focussed on a multiagency view of preventing abuse and the importance of strengthening networks. For instance, Flynn (2007) in her study of the serious case review suggested that although adequate information was available across partnership agencies regarding Steven and his circumstances, a failure to share this information contributed to his unnecessary death (Flynn, 2007). As described in Chapter 2, the No Secrets

policy instigated the first formal step towards a coherent adult safeguarding policy which dictates that local authorities are obliged to establish inter-agency policies and procedures to investigate certain incidents of harm (DoH, 2000). However, studies have shown that the cooperation required to ensure the prevention of abuse may not be an easy and straightforward task. For example, McCreadie et al (2008) found that although there was a multi-agency-wide consensus about the need to address and prevent abuse of vulnerable adults and an agreement that it could not be a top-priority task for any of the agencies, there were differences of opinion over how cases should be handled, criticism of how other agencies worked, opposition over which agency should take the lead, and resentment towards those in some agencies who failed to understand how others worked (McCreadie et al (2008). Similarly, according to Stevens (2013), there are many challenges to achieving best practice within multi-agency settings. These include a lack of statutory requirement, within the No secrets policy, for different agencies to work together leading to varied impact and implication. In addition, according to Draper et al (2009) not every agency or professional group saw safeguarding as part of their remit also some groups such as voluntary and private sector providers did not routinely participate. Other barriers to working together could include inadequate understanding of legal rules, the development of different definitions and interpretations of adult protection, a lack of knowledge among other professionals and a clash of cultures, attitudes, priorities and thresholds (Braye et al, 2012; Pinkney, 2008). There could also be confusion around what information can be legally shared in a multiagency context (Pinkney, 2008). Finally, although from a housing collaboration perspective, Parry (2013) also highlights the following as

barriers to joint working for safeguarding between housing and other agencies. These include, lack of recognition by victim that they are being abused; lack of awareness by some housing staff of indicators of abuse, or of how to report concerns; reluctance of some housing organisations to report due to fear of damaging reputation, previous lack of response, or fear of over-reaction; problems with consent of victim to referral; narrow interpretation of '' vulnerable adult''; lack of inclusion of housing in protocols, including information sharing; lack of involvement of housing staff following referral; and lack of awareness by some adult care staff of contribution of housing staff. Front line housing staff are often neglected in multi-agency responses to abuse, despite their often detailed knowledge and observations of service users (Parry, 2013). In spite of the many challenges facing multiagency collaboration, there are many benefits which include being able to share information with other professionals and particularly between social services and the police, shared decision-making and shared responsibility for service user outcomes, new skills learned from other professionals and different agency perspectives (Pinkney, 2008). However, according to Pinkney (2008), most social workers considered that multi-agency working was still at a relatively early stage.

Service Users Perception/participation

Service user perception and involvement is an important aspect in adult safeguarding (Wallcraft, 2012). Results from Pinkney et al (2008) showed that social workers felt that to improve services, more involvement from service users in the adult protection process was required and they hoped that users would play a more active, empowered role. They also found that

user involvement within adult protection at both strategic and operational levels were important. However, there is limited literature within the area. According to Robinson and Webber (2012), research is urgently required on the effect of service user and carer involvement on outcomes for social workers and the service users and carers they work with. However, Wallcraft (2012), in his study considering service user involvement in safeguarding makes the following recommendations. Practitioners should be encouraged and trained to record service user views during safeguarding processes, they should find out what being safe means to people at risk of abuse, and involve service users in their own safeguarding plan. There are many reasons why it is important to involve service users in safeguarding. People who are informed, in control of their lives and empowered to assert their views are less likely to be victims of abuse, neglect and harm and will be in a better position to speak out should it happen (Cass, 2012). For example, Kent and Medway council aimed to inform service users how to exercise choice and control in their lives in order to minimise risk of abuse and harm (Aylett, 2009). While there seems to be a general consensus that it is important to ensure the involvement of service users, there are challenges to its implementation. Wallcraft (2012) highlights some of the challenges one of which includes the issue of risk. She argues that although protecting adults at risk is the main purpose of Adult Safeguarding, research shows that people may be offered safety at the expense of their dignity, autonomy, independence and self-determination and little research exists on service users' views on risk. Some groups may be excluded from involvement by being unrecognised or misrecognised. Unhelpful procedures for investigating abuse can also be a barrier to user involvement (Wallcraft, 2012). In

addition, service users have relatively low expectations of providers and expectation of quality was often as simple as being kept safe. There is evidence that service users are reluctant to speak out for fear of any impact on the future care that they receive (Giordano and Street, 2009). Finally, social workers in adult protection often wish to engage service users more fully but are concerned about risks for victims of abuse (Pinkney et al, 2008).

Training

Training is a pertinent aspect of safeguarding and many councils take it as such. According to Humphries (2011) some councils had ensured that all their employees received basic safeguarding awareness training and this paid dividends through many examples of good quality practice and service delivery. Braye et al (2012) found that one way in which boards attempted to secure adherence to consistent standards across agencies was through engagement with training and workforce development. Another area of training for adult safeguarding was with the involvement of service users. According to Wallcraft (2012), a London borough team set up a training course for people with learning disabilities to enable them to be involved in staff training, using their personal experience to get the message across to the trainees. While training is important, what is available may not always suffice. For example, Pinkney et al (2008) suggest that training was sometimes frustrating for social workers especially if there was little opportunity for ' refresher' courses to keep up with developments. In addition, Manthorpe et al (2009) found that although social workers received mental capacity act training, they sometimes felt the training was insufficient. Training provided may also not always take social workers'

experience into account. For example, Richardson et al (2002) suggested that training courses in adult protection need to be tailored according to the participants pre-existing knowledge. Pre-existing knowledge may include previous qualifications. As noted by Taylor and Dodd (2003) participants with a recognised professional qualification were more knowledgeable on issues of abuse though were more likely to be concerned about a negative outcome for the victim after reporting. They were also statistically more likely to recognise procedures and understand how to use them. Training is sometimes seen as an answer to almost all the problems of social care, including addressing the competence differences, recruitment and retention problems, and skills shortages of the social care workforce (Manthorpe, 2008). However, it is a difficult resource to evaluate and in the absence of an initial formal evaluation, as opposed to feedback and monitoring, it is difficult to be conclusive about the impact of training (Aylett, 2009). In addition, determining the training demand for workforce planning is especially difficult in the absence of a rigorous intelligence base on the incidence and prevalence of the abuse of vulnerable adults (Aylett, 2009). Irrespective of the practicalities and difficulties, training has an important part to play in the prevention of abuse and according to Cass (2012), the care home workforce are key to quality and safeguarding and should be supported though induction and training.

Discussion

This literature search set out to examine the preventative measures employed by social workers to prevent abuse and a number of measures where identified from existing literature. The themes identified have been

discussed in brief in the previous section and include serious case reviews, training, multiagency participation and service user involvement. Serious case reviews generally should provide pointers that would lead to prevention of adult abuse, however, some of the literature reviewed revealed that they are sometimes not as detailed as they need to be to ensure that the appropriate lessons have been learnt. They also take social workers to unknown territories and issues they may be unfamiliar with. However, they identify some requirements that may help to prevent a repetition of the same problem. They also point to the importance of appropriate communication between multiagency settings. Multiagency cooperation was also a theme identified and current literature suggests that even though it is vital for multiple agencies to work together to prevent abuse it is not always an easy and straightforward task. Inadequate communication between partnership agencies has been linked to the death of a service user as highlighted in the previous section. There are many reasons why there may be discord between these agencies. These could include differing cultures, expectations, and interpretations. Opinions sometimes differed over how cases should be handled and there were criticism of how other agencies worked and some harboured resentment over agencies who did not understand how the other agencies worked. Another theme raised was that of the importance of the service user involvement. The literature examined suggests that when users are involved in their own care, there is a level of empowerment that is attached to their involvement and they are therefore in a better position to minimise the risk of abuse. However, current literature also suggests that users are not likely to speak up because they may be afraid of the repercussions.