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ABSTRACT:
Social work education in Australia and New Zealand is predominantly embedded within tertiary education systems modelled on university pedagogy. Consolidated by the demand for professionalisation, this location has shaped the social work curriculum into traditional, discipline-based academic courses and delivery. Calls for graduates and practitioners to be robust, resilient and critically reflective have come from employers, the social work profession and educators. This paper acknowledges the impact of external stressors on social work and, within the context of debates over the nature of the social work profession, conceptualises these pressures as a demand on the resilience and reflective capacity of practitioners. Identifying core issues of the need for skills in critical reflection, the lens turns to the construction of the social work curriculum itself. Three models of programme design and curriculum delivery are presented and, using a recently implemented example, questions are raised about the potential for structural change to the curriculum that may enable a central focus upon integrative processes and critical reflection.
THE CHALLENGE OF PEDAGOGICAL DESIGN IN SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION

This paper arises out of the author’s recent experience of exploring the challenges of programme and curriculum design for social work education during a period of tenure at the University of Plymouth in the south west of England. Plymouth’s traditional modular system of knowledge delivery, similar to many social work education models in Australasia, underwent a philosophical, conceptual and structural re-organisation in response to the challenges and tensions facing social work identity and practice, some of which are described in this paper. Whilst many social work educators are committed to embedding notions of reflective and/or reflexive practice within the curriculum, discussion regarding the case study of the ‘Plymouth model’ illustrates a structural approach to programme design that may offer a pathway towards honouring the demands from the social work profession, from employers and from recipients of social work services for critically reflective practitioners to be able to respond creatively to stressful situations of complexity and risk.

SOCIAL WORK IN A CONTEXT OF RISK, UNCERTAINTY, CONFLICT AND CONTRADICTION

A critical reflection process starts with an awareness process, but is not fulfilled without a commitment to changes for the benefit of people. Askeland and Fook (2009, p.287)

Central to social work curriculum design is the concern that both the content and the process of the curriculum be responsive to the needs of the profession, employers and to the public. The social work profession practises within the sites of tension constructed by the opposition of public and private, individual and society, and care and control. Awareness of the public and professional demands on social workers is captured within descriptions of risk and vulnerability (Beddoe 2010) and in the necessity for the development and maintenance of resilience and robust practice in the face of considerable stressors (Collins 2007).

Stressors in social work practice are well documented. There is considerable literature that attests to the impact of workplace stress on social worker morale, sustainability of best practice, job satisfaction, retention and recruitment (for instance, Coffey, Dugdill and Tattersall 2004; Collins, Coffey and Morris 2010; Huxley et al. 2005; Occupational Safety and Health Service 2003; Russ, Lonne and Darlington 2009; Storey and Billingham 2001). Occupational safety and health issues for social work take on a unique flavour, shared only by a few other occupations under the public lens. As a profession, social work can receive external disapprobation and sometimes vilification for its activities and performance. Laming’s report after the death of ‘Baby P’ deftly summarised the state of the English Children’s workforce:

Frontline social workers and social work managers are under an immense amount of pressure. Low staff morale, poor supervision, high case-loads, under-resourcing and inadequate training each contribute to high levels of stress and recruitment and retention difficulties. [...] Public vilification of social workers has a negative effect on staff and has serious implications for the effectiveness, status and morale of the children’s workforce as a whole. Laming (2009, p. 47)
Such pressures impact upon social work practice. In relation to child deaths in New Zealand, Connolly and Doolan (2007) suggest that one effect of public and media scrutiny is a reduction in social workers’ willingness to work with ambiguity. People do not want to take risks in a ‘risk society’. Such conservatism in practice is not, they argue, what complex situations need. Managing risks such as maintaining a child’s position within a family in turmoil requires what Laming (2009, p. 55) acknowledges as emotional resilience and what Russ et al (2009) suggest are skills in working autonomously. Laming’s comments echo those of the organisation responsible for oversight of social work education in England, the General Social Care Council, which states that social work graduates need to demonstrate ‘independent critical judgement’ alongside the facility to work in much more innovative ways: for example, through ‘a fully developed capacity to take responsibility for the use of reflection and critical analysis’ and through the ability ‘to work creatively and effectively … in a context of risk, uncertainty, conflict and contradiction’ (GSCC 2005, pp. 19–20).

Social work and the educational processes that support the profession are therefore challenged to respond to the demands of working with complexity, of holding uncertainty and of responding with creative and effective options in a complex world (Bellinger 2010a). At the core of these challenges lie the concepts of resilience and of critical reflection and reflexivity: concepts that this paper argues are intertwined and embedded as a core developmental process within social work and its education.

**CRITICAL REFLECTION AND THE PROFESSIONAL IDENTITY OF SOCIAL WORK**

The Laming Report (2007) and the subsequent Social Work Taskforce (Gibb 2009) are United Kingdom examples of the use of client death inquiries as a platform for debate over the nature of social work, its performance, relationships and its training. These inquiries formed the backdrop to the conceptual and structural changes in the Plymouth programme. Such inquiries all too frequently also occur in Australasia (for instance, Kiro 2003; NSW Ombudsman 2009) and are informing curriculum development and programme re-design. What is crucial in many recent reports is the recognition of not only the complexities of the world in which we practise, but of the skills and assets that the profession requires in order to creatively respond to the uncertainties of what Butler, Ford and Tregaskis (2007, p. 285) term ‘the messy complexities of practice’. The challenge to practitioners is to build a repertoire of values, knowledge and skills that can then be applied within unpredictable and often highly stressful environments (Eadie and Lymbery 2007).

Critical here are the conceptual notions of resilience and of critical reflection and reflexivity, intertwined concepts repeatedly underscored within documents that explore the identity and nature of social work (for instance, Russ et al 2009). With reference to the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW) Practice Standards and Code of Ethics, for example, complex practice situations are responded to by attention to reflective and reflexive practice, structural analysis, critical thinking and ethical professional behaviour (AASW 2010). Common to all of these processes is an ability to construct a relationship between the practitioner and the situation that is characterised by consideration of factors outside of the immediate demands of the moment; the ability to consider and implement measured and informed responses; and to envisage a bigger picture of patterns and explanation that
(inductively or deductively) links the specific to the general. In relation to child deaths and abuse in statutory child protection, Connolly and Doolan (2007) link reflective abilities engendered through supervision, practice leadership and the use of practice frameworks (Connolly 2007) to good practice and safer families. The desired outcomes of these reflective processes thus connect the individual social worker to their professional value systems, the individual concern to pathways of social justice, and practice to bodies of knowledge, theory and research.

Social work identity is placed within a site of tension characterised by pressures of employer and managerial demands for efficiency and effectiveness (Collins 2007; Napier and George 2001) stacked against social arguments of process, method and purpose. Collins argues that a managerial focus on economy and best value neglects the relational nature of social work practice, whilst Brookfield (2009) argues that critical reflection (not emphasised within the compliance that Hugman (2009) would say may exist within agency-based social work) is essential in order to reveal sources of inequality and power.

Underscoring these demands of practice, and underpinning this article, is the premise that the social work identity rests on the ability not only to reflect on a dynamic ecological scoping of issues – structural inequalities interacting with family dynamics, for instance – but also to incorporate into this a reflective process that recognises the unique perspectives of consumers and social workers. Within this construct, critical reflection is enabled and potentially effective in practice through ecological analysis and the ability to link the bigger picture to individual circumstances. It is further suggested that resilience within the social work profession spans a similar arc between constructions of resilience as internal process and a perception of robust coping as being intimately dependent upon a critical, structural analysis of forces affecting our practice.

Common to the concepts of resilience and critical reflection and reflexivity is a philosophical developmental shift from an emphasis on the individual to that of a relational consideration of the person in their environment, with a value-added consideration of the impact of the construction of meaning, mediated by emotions and perceptions, within this context. Thus Bottrell (2009), in charting the evolution of notions of resilience from an early emphasis on individual characteristics to interpersonal, community and societal interactions, suggests that optimum resilience results from an engagement with both individual and environmental resources and capacities. Resilience in social workers, similarly, can be defined as an emotionally-informed construction of the interaction between the individual and the systems and structures in their working environment.

Whilst the definitions of critical reflection, reflectivity and reflexivity continue to be defined, re-defined and synthesised and whilst there is ongoing blurring and overlap between the meaning of these terms (see, for instance, D’Cruz, Gillingham and Melendez 2007), the working principle for this paper is that social work practice (and the curriculum that helps to shape it) requires a focus upon the impact of the work on the self; the impact of the self on the work; and a ‘bigger picture’ integration of this meaning and impact upon a reflection on past actions and an intentional consideration of future actions based upon this learning.
The argument that the skills of critical reflection and reflexivity are core to social work effectiveness and identity can be mounted on several levels. There is considerable evidence to suggest that the individual practitioner’s ability to reflect is a core contribution to their resilience through, for instance, supervision processes (Connolly and Doolan 2007; Mor Barak et al. 2009). Our theoretical understanding of resilience suggests that the ability to cope with adversity over time will have demonstrable benefits to wellbeing and performance (for instance, Luthar and Cicchetti 2000; Russ et al 2009; Ungar 2008). Current resiliency theories also stress the relational and cultural nature of robust coping in the face of adaptation and adversity (Collins 2007; Russ et al 2009). Connolly and Doolan (2007) stress the importance of practice leadership. Maintenance of a social work identity within multi-disciplinary settings can assist resilience and effective practice (Brown, Crawford and Darongkamas 2000; Carpenter et al. 2003). There is emerging evidence that a strong social work identity (with a commitment to its ecological and post-modern knowledge base, its supervision practices, and its ethics and commitment to social justice) assists sustainable individual resilience and Connolly’s implementation of practice frameworks within child protection was underpinned by the rationale of connecting individual practice to the bigger picture of evidence-based research (Connolly 2007).

The reverberation of these debates within social work education is crucial in our consideration of critical reflection and its place within the curriculum.

**CRITICAL REFLECTION AND SOCIAL WORK EDUCATION**

Social work education, alongside other applied programmes within tertiary education, is under pressure from the providers of social services to produce competent practitioners. Agencies and governments expect to employ fully-competent, able graduates following social work education (Gibb 2009). The measurement of competence through mechanisms of learning outcomes, specific competencies and skills is appealing to funders and providers alike and forms part of the backdrop to social work education along with the impact of professionalisation, registration and the accreditation of social work courses by professional and state bodies.

Defining competency in terms of technical skills is in contrast to the social work profession’s definition of competence as creative and reflexive response to complexity (Eadie and Lymbery 2007; Gibbons and Gray 2002; Lymbery 2003). This notion of creativity is echoed in Gibbons and Gray’s account of critical reflection and curriculum development in Newcastle, Australia (2002), and echoed in the curriculum debates and designs of many Australasian schools of social work. These tensions emerge in the debates between competency-based social work courses (for instance, Social Services Industry Training Organisation 2010) and university-style academic-based programmes in what Eadie and Lymbery (2007, p. 671) term ‘the balance between competence and creativity’ or between ‘technicality’ and ‘indeterminancy’. A review of the needs of newly qualified social workers in England highlights the difficulties that new graduates face when an overt emphasis on content and competencies ignores the person of the social worker and the processes in which they are engaged (Jack and Donnellan 2010).
A key challenge for social work programmes is therefore to graduate professionals who are both competent and who have the potential for emotional intelligence, innovation and resilient response to dynamic and challenging social conditions (Clare 2007; Eadie and Lymbery 2007). A further issue developed in the following discussion is whether existing university-style curriculum delivery enables optimal development of reflexive capacity, or whether other models of programme and delivery can be constructed. The following discussion constructs three working models of curriculum and programme delivery and considers each in the light of the previous discussion regarding critical reflection and the development of resilient practitioners.

**REFLECTING ON CURRICULUM CONSTRUCTION: IS IT ALL ‘ACADEMIC’?**

How best is critical reflection served up in a social work degree? Burgess (2004) highlights the tensions between conceptualising the curriculum as content (traditional and discipline-focused); as a set of learning outcomes (perhaps competency-based such as the ‘Skills for Wellbeing’ discussion (Social Services ITO 2010); or in terms of process (which can include reflection, personal relevance and experiential elements, which Burgess (p. 166) terms the ‘creative or imaginative’ curriculum). This paper locates most social work education in Australasia, and certainly in Aotearoa New Zealand (where the author currently works) as having been shaped by the formal legacy of traditional university pedagogy, teaching and assessment, thus reflecting Burgess’ notion of ‘content’. The third model, developed by Plymouth educators, is an example of a model structured around ‘process’.

**Model 1: the traditional, discipline-based approach**

Social work education in Aotearoa New Zealand has developed as tertiary-level degree programmes with a balance between university (four year) and other tertiary providers (three year) programmes, and structured in ‘traditional’ or discipline-based academic formats. Challenges from Indigenous or Pasifika models of pedagogy have yet to effect significant structural change outside of Wananga (Maori tertiary providers), although content has expanded to include Maori and, to some extent Pasifika, knowledge bases and models of practice (e.g. Passells and Ackroyd 2006). Australian social work qualifications are attained through a four year university degree. England, with over eighty providers of social work education, has only seven courses based outside of a university, in community colleges and the equivalent, whose higher education courses are linked to an accredited university degree.

Shaped by centuries of British university tradition, social work students enrol in specific courses geared at exploring (for example) the sociological imagination; human development and psychological knowledge; social policy; and social work skills.
Model 1: A traditionally structured academic curriculum

This traditional model is very much a legacy of a scholarship model of tertiary education where content is imparted to the student body from academics possessing knowledge, in a top-down manner with very little lateral or bottom-to-top communication expected or enabled. Separate lecturers teach separate streams of courses. Assessment is modular and hierarchical and knowledge streams in this model often progress through the year levels of the qualification. An outstanding challenge for all students, both in pre- and post-qualifying environments, is to integrate and contextualise this potentially siloed knowledge into a meaningful personal and professional practice framework that will enable competence and the application of knowledge to specific practice situations. A challenge for assessment is to be able to gain a sense of a student’s overall ability to integrate knowledge into practice through critical reflection.

In many ways, this traditional and hierarchical model reflects the construction of education as a one-way process from teacher to student; the conceptualisation of the student as a blank slate; and the designation of bodies of knowledge as ‘expert’ and ‘academic’. Within a post-modern environment where student and service user knowledge is recognised and incorporated within models of adult learning (for instance, Kolb and Fry 1975, and the use of Kolb’s learning cycle with the last generation of social work students), such rigid models of instruction are recognised as limitations on student and practitioner development and ultimately not compatible with critical models of education and practice that seek to establish a relationship between the self and the professional activity of social work.

Whilst engaged in pre-qualifying study in this traditional model, the site for critically reflective practice is primarily the practice learning (‘fieldwork’ or ‘practicum’) experience, whilst some programmes also maintain a final integrative assignment that aims at drawing knowledge from the students’ diverse learning experiences. In practice learning, students are actively required to make a theory to practice link through the use of supervision and field visits by academic staff members, with a common requirement being a form of practice portfolio in which they intellectually and reflectively integrate practice, theory and personal experience.

Using practice learning courses as the focal point for reflection and integration has some structural and systemic consequences. It potentially creates an artificial divide between formal ‘academic’ learning in other subjects (which is addressed and graded according to demonstrated intellectual ability) and practice learning, which is considered experiential, personal and non-intellectual and which is often assessed with pass-fail criteria. This two-tier process of learning and assessment contributes to a hierarchy of learning, which when assessed within tertiary environments dominated by a focus on scholarship, research outputs and the acquisition of government funding, results in practice learning (and the reflective qualities of student integration of experience) being seen as the poor relation of the academic programmes in which they are also enrolled. Academics within research-output
environments such as the Performance-Based Research Fund in New Zealand (TEC 2010) are obliged to focus upon knowledge-based research, or more specifically, upon certain constructions of knowledge (Napier and George 2001). Even more rigidly, academics in the United Kingdom, through the requirements of the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), are required to focus upon the acquisition of externally-funded research contracts in order to fund and justify research endeavours, a structural manoeuvre that can further erode the centrality of academic focus upon practice learning and the reflective abilities of students.

As a structural result of this process, practice learning education and educators are often marginalised within tertiary education structures whilst discipline-specific papers are not required to engage students as active learners (Bellinger 2010a). Many academic programmes will recognise the case of the ‘A’ student who can't relate to people, who presents the challenge of assessing values and emotional intelligence alongside academic ability. The professional integrity of programmes may be challenged by these structures: students who struggle with the professional requirements of practice learning (in particular, the instrumental learners who are challenged by the demands of reflective and reflexive practice) may not always be the students who fail academically. The location of practice learning towards the latter part of degree programmes can result in ‘naming the issues’ of fitness to practice often very late - and ethically, perhaps too late - in a student’s education.

These tensions are, of course, the frequent site of debate both within Schools of Social Work and in the academic literature (e.g. Burgess 2004; Eadie and Lymbery 2007; Napier and George 2001) and many social work programmes have evolved creative solutions and integrative processes within the assessment of particular courses. Nash (1993), for instance, writes about the creation of assessment around students’ personal identities and location within families of origin. These initiatives are located, however, within individual papers or streams of subjects. In addition, the question of ‘what’ should be taught in the curriculum (rather than the ‘how’) has often resulted in issues of ‘curriculum creep’, ‘moving the tables on the deck of the Titanic’ and other metaphors for cramming the curriculum full of things that students need to know, without necessarily improving overall outcome. The alternative argument is to focus on curriculum processes that create opportunity for critical reflection and integration across a range of subjects (Napier and George 2001).

Model 2: Integrating theory and practice

The challenge within social work education has been to incorporate learning space within the curriculum so that reflection and integration of discretely taught knowledge can occur. Envisaging the curriculum as a process of critical reflection requires a considerable conceptual re-alignment of emphasis.

Beginnings of this process can be identified as the creation of frameworks such as the integrated practice model, whereby social work students are encouraged to incorporate an understanding of the worldview of themselves and others in the application of theory and practice skills to social work process. In New Zealand, this was conceptualised by Prasad (1988), developed as a teaching tool within social work programmes at Massey University and utilised in research-informed practice (for example, Keen 2005). Similar models have been used in social work practice education (Maidment and Egan 2004).
Model 2: The integrated practice model
(adapted from Nash, Munford and O’Donoghue, 2005)

The integrated practice model, whilst naming a relationship of critical reflection between theory and practice, perpetuates a potential distance between knowledge and its application: critical reflection, after all, is a process that can be applied anywhere, or not at all. Similarly Trevithick (2008), in a comprehensive review of knowledge for social work, identified important core features of a social work knowledge base, leaving the structure of curriculum delivery unexplored. By retaining the structure of discipline-specific delivery, these approaches do not specifically locate practice learning or any other process as a site of reflection and learning, and thereby leave knowledge and reflection to be as integrated or as discrete as the integrity of the academic programme allows.

Various models of reflective and reflexive practice, critical thinking and integration are current in social work texts and learning opportunities within the curriculum. Burgess and Laurance (2007) offer a solid review of different options for promoting creativity within social work curriculum and practice. Fook’s writings, for example, are rich in examples of structured approaches to reflective practice such as critical incident analysis (Fook and Gardner 2007; Fook, Ryan and Hawkins 2000). Small group work is advocated as a means of exploring critical awareness and use of self in Napier and George (2001). Eadie and Lymbery (2007) suggest specific approaches to learning practice that will enhance a student’s ability to reflect, especially for those who are instrumental learners. They suggest scenarios from practice, action learning sets, problem-based learning, small group work, role play, self-directed learning, working with service users, and so on. Reflective skills are also utilised in the growing use of pre-and post-qualifying professional development portfolios and in the uptake in professional supervision courses. In Aotearoa New Zealand the challenge of integrating knowledge and experience through a culturally created process has only been taken up by a few courses, predominantly in areas where student and staff represent Maori and Pasifika perspectives (Passells and Ackroyd 2006).

Model 3: The case for structural change in the social work curriculum

The previously described models of social work programmes have clearly proved to be able to produce students who can thrive and survive in complex and demanding settings. A critical question here is the degree to which the programme design itself can optimise student potential to make links and integrate the personal, professional and academic learning that is required. Bellinger (2010a and b) argues that teaching and assessment should be fundamentally geared towards reflective and integrative functions. Resilience theories suggest that we need to assess resilience and coping by not only an expected developmental level but also by the structural or relational barriers that may exist to impede progress (Bottrell 2009; Brown and Bourne 1996). The third curriculum model for consideration reflects a more structural approach to constructing and optimising student learning and reflection opportunities. What follows is a description of an experiment in
programme design that recently made the transition from a traditional, modular structure to one structured around reflective practice.

The degree programme at the University of Plymouth, in the south west of England, came up for re-accreditation by the GSCC in 2008. Staff members opted for wholesale structural change rather than adaptation of the existing traditional delivery format which had incorporated critical reflection into particular courses and assessments (as do most university programmes in Australasia) but where other courses modelled traditional disciplinary-focused subjects that left the integration of material into social work professional contexts to individual student initiative. The effect of this mixed approach had been to restrict reflective practice to the inter-relationship of self and practice and to limit the opportunities for critical attention to be paid to integrating the bigger picture of, for instance, policy and the law.

Bellinger (2010b), one of the architects of the new programme, argues that practice learning (the site of much reflexive development) can be a site of regeneration. In the Plymouth model, practice learning now drives and informs the process of knowledge acquisition. Unlike many degrees in Australasia, Plymouth had the structural advantage that students were exposed to practice situations from the first few weeks of the programme and had, as a consequence, a highly developed and comparatively well-resourced practice learning team. In the new degree, a structure was developed that centralised practice learning and put all other knowledge acquisition in relationship to students’ practice experience. A developmental process of student learning and reflection was conceptualised, with the location of curriculum content (for instance, social policy, skills development, ethics and values) timed to be delivered in relation to what the students were experiencing in practice. Design of teaching content was driven by practice experience and relevance rather than discipline continuity. The curriculum was envisaged as a staged rather than a modular or subject-specific structure. Assessment is now integrative and has requirements for reflection built into the four assessments per academic year. Design of the assessment required constructive alignment, reflexive and sequential linking to promote skills, knowledge, values and critical reflective development.

The structural changes in the curriculum occurred within an intellectual environment of debate over the nature of social work and the demands upon the profession. Proponents of the practice-led model could engage with Gibbons and Gray’s view that:

… critical thinking is crucial to the process of moving students from merely acquiring and displaying knowledge to critically examining and engaging with the issues of social work as a discipline and a profession. Gibbons and Gray 2002, p. 21

Opponents of the structural changes voiced concern over the shift of focus away from academic knowledge-based disciplines and by extrapolation, a risk of losing the emphasis on academic rigour and evidence-based practice (for instance, Howard, McMillen and Pollio 2003). Resistance to change, too, came with an acknowledgement that within the academic institution, the balance of power traditionally lies within academic disciplines and not amongst those with an applied focus. Those with a research base in formal
academic traditions queried potential loss of knowledge, with a critique that this was too akin to problem based learning and would not equip the student with sufficient knowledge bases for competent generic social work practice or for employment in specialised fields such as child protection. There is evidence that other academic programmes have considered and responded successfully to these concerns (for instance, Gibbons and Gray 2005); the Plymouth model is still being rolled out, and its success, in terms of producing a cohort of social workers more equipped to robustly take on a world of complexity and completing demands, is still under evaluation.

Conceptually, the ‘Plymouth model’ is appealing to a profession such as social work, located as it is in the forefront of challenges from employers, consumers and from the profession itself. Structural change is in itself an espoused component of our knowledge base and professional identity. The model’s key characteristic, focusing academic content around student process in practice learning, is perhaps not a transferable method for educational programmes with fieldwork sited late in their programme delivery; the focus upon integrative assessment based upon where students should be in practice development is contentious, and resistance from traditional academic programme design may dominate; and the need for students to develop specialised and in-depth knowledge pertaining to specific fields of practice may not be sufficiently considered for employers to have confidence in this approach. The model does, however, suggest that structural approaches to programme and curriculum design can be designed and implemented from a pedagogical and professional approach informed by concepts of resilience and critical reflection.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Whilst there remain systemic issues to address within the practice-led curriculum described above, it can serve to illustrate the process of structural change aimed at furthering the skills of critical reflection in social work students and practitioners. As Burgess (2004) argues, curriculum design should be a key focus for social work educators. Not all social work programmes within tertiary settings will have the challenge or the opportunity to look at large-scale structural change, but as this paper illustrates, the Plymouth experience rests within a larger professional and pedagogical debate in which it is worth engaging. Social work educators, through a critical structural analysis of curriculum structure and delivery, can assess their own models of delivery for the development of critically reflective practitioners. The Plymouth opportunity serves as an example of critically reflective practice in itself, as structural change and educational practice has been brought to bear upon the key questions of how best a curriculum can develop reflexive and resilient practitioners and whether knowledge-driven or practice-led models best serve the needs of social work practitioners engaging in complex situations.
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