

Institutional Racism: Holding up a Mirror to NHS Practitioners and Managers

Jim Cowan and David Woodger

EURODIV PAPER 34.2006

DECEMBER 2006

KTHC - Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Jim Cowan, *Visiting Senior Research Fellow, London South Bank University*
David Woodger, *Goldsmiths College, University of London*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/EURODIVpapers/default.htm>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

The special issue on *Cultural Diversity* collects a selection of papers presented at the multidisciplinary and multinational Marie Curie project on “Cultural diversity in Europe: A series of Conferences” (EURODIV).

EURODIV focuses on cultural diversity in Europe and aims to understand the ways of dealing with diversity and its dynamics in the globalisation era. Its primary objective is to provide top-level training opportunities to researchers in the first years of their research career. EURODIV is a four-year project (2006-2009) co-ordinated by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM) and supported by the European Commission, Sixth Framework Programme, Marie Curie Conferences and Training Courses (contract no. MSCF-CT-2004-516670).

Schedule of Conferences:

- **First Conference “Understanding diversity: Mapping and measuring”**, 26-27 January 2006, FEEM, Milano, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Second Conference “Qualitative diversity research: Looking ahead”**, 19-20 September 2006, K.U.Leuven, Leuven, Belgium. Contact person: Maddy Janssens, maddy.janssens@econ.kuleuven.ac.be, and Patrizia Zanoni, patrizia.zanoni@kuleuven.ac.be
- **Third Conference “Diversity in cities: Visible and invisible walls”**, 11-12 September 2007, UCL, London, UK. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it
- **Fourth Conference “Diversity in cities: New models of governance”**, 16-17 September 2008, IPRS, Rome, Italy. Contact person: Raffaele Bracalenti, iprs.it@iprs.it
- **Fifth Conference “Dynamics of diversity in the globalisation era”**, 15-16 September 2009, FEEM, Milan, Italy. Contact person: Valeria Papponetti, valeria.papponetti@feem.it

EURODIV goes in parallel with SUS.DIV, the Network of Excellence on sustainable development in a diverse world. For further information on EURODIV and SUS.DIV, please visit the web site: www.ebos.com.cy/susdiv.

This batch of papers has been presented at the Second EURODIV Conference “Qualitative diversity research: Looking ahead”

Institutional Racism; Holding up a Mirror to NHS Practitioners and Managers

Summary

This is an empirical study of the use of critical research that sought to challenge institutional racism and achieve equality of response from health practitioners and managers in two NHS trusts in the mainstream of their service provision. It is a rare study in that it places the emphasis on empowered, self-motivated practitioners and managers as the route to more empowered patients and responsive services. In addition, the work is about change and outcomes in the way core services are delivered. It is not just about an analysis or description of racism that exists in the organisations. The essence of the transformation we were able to achieve was based on our appreciation of the dynamics of race and racism in these contexts. We used this as a mirror to enable practitioners and managers to reflect 'from within' themselves, on their identity, power and language in the creation of new and different responses and services to patients. The study ultimately examines the shared creation or joint action between patients and practitioners and importantly between practitioners and managers in establishing and shaping their own practices from within dominating managerial discourses. The power this change has in addressing institutional racism and these discourses bring about very real and tangible differences to black and white patients. The paper argues for a focus on power, language and identity rather than too much pre-occupation with the 'critical path' developed in the unique situation of this work. Those in other contexts will probably still find the three-stage process enables them to conceptualise variations that seem to offer more in their contexts.

Keywords: Institutional Racism, Action Research, Social Construction, Equality, Health Services, Self Learning Groups, Learning Processes

Address for correspondence:

David Woodger
Goldsmiths College
University of London
31 St James
New Cross
SE14 6NW
UK
E-mail: d.woodger@gold.ac.uk

Introduction

This paper is an appraisal of the use of action research to bring about a change within the mainstream of health services to both black and white patients. The paper specifically examines a series of transformative processes to address institutional racism in provision of health care services to black elders, their carers and communities. It charts the path from articulating and making explicit the nature of racism in two health service organisations to one where health practitioners, professionals and managers were providing responsive services to black patients and improved services to white patients.

The research was conducted over a 4-year period and went through three stages. It was in the third stage that it became possible to focus directly with a 100 practitioners on their day-to-day work. It was essential, in the context in which we found ourselves, to conduct the first two stages to create the conditions for focussing on what practitioners actually did with patients. The work continually changed shape and focus as the dynamics of participants and us as project facilitators moved through the process together. In other contexts focusing and re-focusing on `what is really important` and the imaginative use of research methods will create work of a different shape and pattern to that presented here. We present this work as opening possibilities for others faced with their different institutional contexts.

The starting premise for this work was that the focus needed to be on the organisation and practitioners themselves to bring about change in health outcomes to black patients. Much of the health literature and research either focused on the disparity of services experienced by black communities or were studies of specific health ailments particular to the black communities. Little attention had been given to examine the quality of service provision. Much of the literature on service initiatives focused on access to services with solutions being framed in terms of black communities' need to make fuller use of the existing available services.

Background

The locality of South West London, where our work began in the 1980s, had seen the emergence, development and funding of numerous black community networks offering community based services. There had also been an anti racist initiative to create a network of black and white community activists and statutory sector practitioners. The local social services department had commissioned a piece of work to be done by two people from the anti-racist network to research and report on services to black and racial minorities, especially with reference to the social work assessment process.

It was within this broad piece of research that we highlighted the issue of `hospital discharge`. The report showed that black people and their carers were either not receiving services or not experiencing responses that were reflective of their problem. They were being sent home too early, with little or no involvement with their carers and often without any after/community care services. Significant proportions were quickly being readmitted to hospital.

It was through this piece of work that the local hospital trust and community health trust came to be interested in responding better to black patients and their carers and ultimately commissioned the same two people to work with them towards the local health services changing their mainstream response to black people.

The first thing we would draw from this for work in other contexts is that these two organisations felt under considerable pressure to `do something`. The shift in policy towards community care was making public highly divergent practices to the point that a project aiming to tackle racism, in the operational realities of both organisations, became legitimate. In our view this was despite the culture of the NHS being dominated at that time by crisis management and a desire for shortcuts and quick solutions.

The second point is that our contacts with the numerous black community networks and our sustained involvement in a community based anti racist network enabled us to bring to the action research work with the two trusts a `connectedness` with anti racism as a social movement. Kemmis takes the view that "*critical or emancipatory action research is always connected to social action.... Action research offers ways in which people can improve social life through research on the here and now, but also in connection to wider social structures and processes*" (1993).

This connectedness with social action is fundamentally supported when, as was the case with our work, the action researchers have a commitment to race equality as well as personal knowledge of the black communities in the area where the action research was undertaken.

The process of this work included us holding a mirror up all along the journey with the managers and staff. This was not a personal mirror. It was our understanding of racism and how it operates, in this kind of institutional context, which we had clarified and developed together with many others through our prior involvement in this `social movement` type of context.

Theoretical overview

First action-research question

Theoretically our work is grounded in a mix of the Foucauldian and the more recent strand of social constructionism centred on such writers as John Shotter, Anne Cunliffe, Arlene Katz and others (Foucault: 1972, 1979, 1980; Shotter: 1993, 2004, 2005; Cunliffe: 2002).

From Foucault we draw the notion of practices, discursively sanctioned at a point of time and which can give way to other discursively sanctioned practices. We are predisposed to see an institution's history in terms of a repository or archive of practices. Foucault talks about docile subjects who practice unthinkingly and how modern disciplinary power is exercised through its invisibility. Foucault has tended to be interpreted as arguing there is no escape from such dominating disciplinary discourses.

The social constructionist strand centred around Shotter represents profound disagreement with this inevitability of `docility` arguing that through the arresting of the ongoing flow and new forms of talk emerging, that the shared talk gradually moves out from under dominating disciplinary discourses. This strand emphasises the relational-responsive meaning making going on in worlds of work and from within the kinds of language communities we worked with calling it joint action.

We have here a way to juxtapose `discursive formations` with what we understand to be potentially more freely created joint action going on between practitioners in worlds that are more fundamentally ones of practice than of `strategy` and management.

We find Shotter and others work a valuable counterpoint to Foucault's emphasis on the disciplinary. This form of social constructionism offers ways to notice possibilities of the order, we would argue, of bringing new possibilities for movement from within language communities of practice. Specifically one of its contributions is to provide resource for worlds of practice to engage in a completely unfamiliar and alien practice:

As professionals we have (mostly) ignored our embodied embeddedness in this routine flow of spontaneous, living responsive activity. Not only have we let it remain unnoticed in the background of everything we do, but we have ignored its importance as a sustaining and resourceful setting that is always present...." (Shotter, 2004: p40)

In other words it can help focus attention among practitioners in them already having a resourceful world of practice going on around them and which they can influence, shape, add to and so forth.

This is especially pertinent in institutionally racist culture, which tend to remove individual responsibility for actual practices intrinsic to managerially defined `service delivery`. To be effective in our work we needed managers and health practitioners to re-consider their ways of talking with one another, of deciding, and of doing with one another.

The first research question (and which relates to the first stage of our work-see later) was to ask, what is the most important first course of `discursive action` to take in challenging the current discursive sanctioning of racist practice?

By distinguishing a challenging discursive action and the discursive sanctioning of a status quo (to be challenged) we are indicating application of the Foucauldian element in our theoretical view i.e. That practices are themselves sanctioned and therefore there needs to be some sort of discursive shift.

Second action-research question

Although we have referred already to `black and white`, we are aware too of the trend in writing about various forms of oppressive experience (gender,

disability, race etc) to consider things broadly. Our view is that it is still legitimate and indeed essential to be able, when working from within the many oppressive, discriminatory historical (but continuing) legacies to have a specific focus. The clarity and focus of 'discursive action' in tackling institutional racism is very important. There are considerable obstacles in tackling institutional racism and in the context of this work, within these two organisations, it proved essential to put this black-white boundary around the work and we are reflecting this in the way we write about the work.

In using the term 'white' we are drawing attention to a type of power that we think white people can have in institutional contexts in Britain and when they do that it works on multiple levels simultaneously: through personal, professional and institutional dimensions of organisational life. We are not suggesting overt or explicit collusion. Ironically we think the MacPherson definition (see later) is overly personalising in talking about "...*unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping*". In using the word power we are very drawn to Foucault's view of it when he says,

"What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn't only weigh on us as a force that says 'no', but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body, much more than a negative instance whose function is repression" (Foucault 1980: 119)

For us 'white power' is about the power to comprehensively define social realities, to discursively sanction what practices will take place and thereby what practices patients will experience. It is always very challenging to bring about a shared understanding of the dynamics of white power from within either the discursive sanctioning or the ongoing joint action. Krippendorf perhaps points towards our understanding of what we mean by white power with this definition of hegemony,

"...A domination, not by individuals, but by collectivities, majorities, institutions, traditions...All of these derive their reality through collective (widely shared and valued) commitments to rather abstract conceptualisations of systems.... all these become manifest in certain valued and often routinely executed interactive practices."(Krippendorf, 1995:pg18).

We take it to be a profoundly normative kind of power. Its peculiar nature is for it to involve considerable denial. We also do not consider there is anything inevitable that such a type of power should continue to constitute our institutional realities in Britain's public services.

We use the word 'black' in an equally political sense. A characteristic of 'white power' is that precisely through exerting normative power various 'black only' 'zones of exclusion' are simultaneously sanctioned. That those excluded by this normative power become, despite innumerable stratagems, located in a kind of mirror image but radically subordinated world. We do not think there is anything inevitable that black and white people in institutional contexts should be subject to such disciplinary dynamics. For us it is the

`undoing` (See Krippendorf) of these fundamentally disciplinary power dynamics that is at issue in tackling institutional racism.

This brings us to a second formulation of our research question: in these institutionally racist contexts in what ways can we highlight how racist existing practices operate?

Third action-research question

In talking about NHS trusts as institutions we are clearly talking about organisations. We take the word `institution` to be identified with a social purpose and permanence transcending individual human lives and intentions and constituted by governance, management, various personnel and other `support` procedures and practices, and various operational procedures and practices.

We are aware of the lengths taken to, as it were, institutionalise a definition of institutional racism; that the effort put into this, especially by the Lawrence family, was attempting to put the matter beyond what individuals might or might not choose to accept as a definition in voluntarist fashion. Given the processes and events leading up to the MacPherson definition of institutional racism we would like to take it as a starting point here.

*“The collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to people because of their colour, culture, or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes, and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness and racist stereotyping, which disadvantages minority ethnic people. It persists because of the failure of the organisation openly and adequately to recognise and address its existence and causes by policy, example and leadership. Without recognition and action to eliminate such racism it can prevail as part of the ethos or culture of the organisation, it is a corrosive disease”
(HMSO, 1999)*

This definition is capable of quite contrasting interpretations. We would like to illustrate this by distinguishing institutionalist as well as constructionist interpretations.

An institutionalist interpretation would stress compliance, the legislative, policy and procedural framework, and changing systems to achieve lasting change. It would also stress leadership, sustained effort, monitoring mechanisms and deterrence. In essence this interpretation omits the voices, personalities, indeed histories of those individuals who, from the constructionist interpretation, constitute the organisational/social realities deemed institutionally racist.

A constructionist interpretation places emphasis on the shared experience of being part of the institution, on the capacity of the individuals running the institution to re-shape it. The constructionist approach stresses the implicitness/explicitness of assumptions, the shared experience between those providing services and those receiving/using them, the ability of internal

stakeholders to connect with one another in the interests of service users, and the capacity of governance, managerial, and a host of background supports to sustain truly responsive operational practices.

The work we present here expresses dissatisfaction with sole reliance on institutionalist approaches and while unashamedly emphasising a constructionist approach does nevertheless seek to encompass institutional change. We are stressing here a tension and a need to seek to address both perspectives.

On the surface a constructionist view might seem to be about individuals and, in effect, a voluntarist perspective. However we want to emphasise that a constructionist view is primarily about the shared experience (i.e. a transcendent experience of being part of the institution) and the interweaving of power, language and identity within all relationships. From a constructionist view the institutionalist approach can seem to `re-ify` the organisational. If institutionalists succeed through the policy framework, new procedures and monitoring, constructionists may question how far this has really become new operational practice `on the ground`. Similarly institutionalists may question, how sustained any change in operational practice can be given that it is, for them, dependent on particular individuals.

We would again here draw from Shotter

“... We attend to events within the contingent flow of continuous communicative interaction between human beings...Until recently this third sphere of diffuse, sensuous or feelingful activity, this unorderly hurly-burly or bustle of everyday social life has remained in the background awaiting elucidation in terms of yet to be discovered, a-historical principles of either mind or world. It is within this flow of responsive and relational activities and practices, I shall claim a sphere of activity...called joint action-that all the other socially significant dimensions of interpersonal interaction, with their associated modes of subjective or objective being originate and are formed” (Shotter, 1997:7)

The problem we have with an institutionalist approach is the lack of freedom of action to bring about change other than new disciplinary forms of discursive sanctioning. One reason we are drawn to the constructionist approach is that by distinguishing the discursive from practice led worlds of joint action, we have, with the latter, creative possibilities for a freedom of action.

A third way to formulate our research question would be to say we were asking what were the ways to free joint action from its tight coupling with dominating discourses and to bring fresh practice into being from within joint action.

Methodology

Using the convention of research questions (but formulated with action research in mind) we take to be part of a view about the socially constructed nature of this type of research.

Considering our research reflexively we draw from Cunliffe

One way is to take a radically reflexive approach in which we accept research itself as a socially constructed process... (2002:143)

This seems to us to be the logic of taking a constructionist stance in action research; that the action research is itself socially constructed and reflective of the very dynamics and processes that we, the writers of this article, who also undertook the work, understood to be at work among the participants we collaborated with to bring about the change the remainder of this article gives an account of.

Using action research to bring about change within the mainstream of operational delivery calls for the imaginative use of research methods as part of a considered process of intervention (O`Brien: 1998). Wadsworth argues the "hallmark of a genuinely participatory action research process is that it may change shape and focus over time (and sometimes quite unexpectedly) as participants focus and refocus their understandings about what is `really` happening and what is really important for them" (Wadsworth: 1998; pg 8). In the work we present we feel there is an unusual intensity of re-shaping and shift of focus in so far as participants joint action decouples from the discursively conditioned and begins to become a shared joint action with us as it were the promoters of change.

Our judgment from the start was that we were not in a context where "imparting knowledge will have the desired effect and participants will reflect and change their behaviour" (Bhavani, 2005; pg 138). We were facing a `collective failure`, which we would interpret as the `locked` interaction between `the institutional`, and individual practice: that a mutual reinforcing is going on, between the discursively sanctioned and joint action. In terms of comprehending the all-encompassing nature of racism we are suggesting this strong interweaving of the personal, professional and institutional.

Both Trusts had policies in place, which showed an intention to create equitable services, and both focussed on the development of structures and systems as the means to change service responses. This policy and procedure framework was experienced by practitioners as overly determining: the institution handing things down to overburdened, pressurised service staff.

Service changes and in particular in relationship to race was *'handed down as a directive, an extra piece of work'*. There was no ownership or understanding among practitioners of them developing their practice or of them creating systems to support practice change.

We were drawn towards forms of action research that offered different levels of intervention and ways to progress on from a start point to other levels through cycles of observation, reflection, planning and action (Kemmis referred to in O`Brien; Pg 4).

Rather than thinking our work was primarily about changing individual beliefs we saw a crucial aspect (following Shotter et al) as giving primacy to the emerging of new shared talk among practitioners. This developed into a decision, taken together with a project reference group (representing management and practitioners across the two organisations), to start the work by focussing on understandings about race and racism shared among managers. We could see that this might address our first action research question and become a way to start to unlock the discursive sanctioning we understood to be going on.

In action research mode our understandings were both shaped by and were shaping the understandings of those with whom we were working. We arrived at a decision to conduct focused interviews with the whole group of managers, some 53 of them.

We began to look for a way to bring `the way of thinking` of managers across the Trusts on race and racism, into some kind of collectively shareable understanding. We saw focused interviews, as a way to `bring out` views we strongly suspected would be widely shared. Through becoming `rationally visible` they might begin to become `undoable`.

We conducted focused interviews with four objectives in mind:

- 1 to become clearer with each manager about their aims and values as service providers;
- 2 to understand more about their view of how the service works;
- 3 to understand their view of how black and racial minorities may or may not enter the system and receive appropriate services;
- 4 to elicit their views of the blockages and obstacles facing black and racial minorities.

Our stage one report was circulated widely, discussed directly with managers and with the reference group. This sharing we saw as a highly significant part of the process; that we would bring into being new shared understandings amongst managers.

From this point, using the action research cycle we moved to a decision, together with the reference group, to change direction dramatically. Stage two became a period of time in which we went to the embodied realities experienced by black patients, their family and friends and including the interactions with the various NHS practitioners. We wanted to also make rationally visible the `zones of exclusion`, the practices of the `old` discourse.

We switched the focus of our efforts away from the powerful apex of the organisation to the experiences of black patients. We switched from a `theoretical` engagement with mainly white managers to a very down to earth, practical shadowing of black patients experiences of their route through the health care system offered by these trusts. We ran a mini project with us, the project workers, being referred black patients as they entered and passed through the system. In this second stage we engaged with 30 black users of the services provided by the trusts and their respective practitioners. These were not a sample selected from a wider group. They were 30 patients who

were directed towards us as newly referred or self-referring at the time stage 2 began.

To find these 30 elders and their carers we wrote to 75 community organisations including translated posters and leaflets. We also wrote to practitioners in community health centres and clinics, the diabetes unit, geriatric, cardiothoracic and stroke wards. We also met with district nurses, therapists, business managers and nursing staff on the wards, both as individuals and going to team meetings. While we followed the path of the first 30 referred/self referring to us, the project received a further 45 enquiries from practitioners and community organisations and we explained we were unable to do the intense `shadowing` with this further 45 because of the time available. These 45 went through the `normal` processes in use by the trusts.

We called the process of both collecting information and intervening with patients, carers and practitioners `shadowing`. This involved obtaining detailed information from patients, their carers and practitioners about the experience of the patient's stay in hospital and after care following discharge. With the aid of a detailed debriefing schedule the project was able to gather a substantial amount of specific and detailed information.

The 30 patients broadly represented `black and racial minority patients in terms of language, religion and ethnicity. However it was not to generalise that we worked with them, but to gain in depth understanding of how the work of the various health professionals was experienced. We kept detailed records about the patient, their illness, treatment details, and the practitioners involved. In our conversations with patients we were trying to understand what they had been asked, what they had been told, their feelings of involvement with the process, what they understood, what was explained, whether they asked questions and how far they felt they were understood. Interviews with elders and their families took place both in the hospital and their home. This allowed the patients to reflect fully upon and articulate their experience.

It is important to stress that we also talked with practitioners to find out about their perceptions of the treatment given, involvement in discharge, provision of care and understanding and communication. We wanted to elicit not only what practitioners did but also why they did what they did in contrast to what they may have said earlier in our work with them.

Our report of the second stage was also widely circulated and by now staff and managers were keen to move towards some kind of response. The realities experienced by black patients, as portrayed in the report, were acknowledged as basically being `how it was`. We arrived at a consensus that a way forward that constituted a response to stages one and two should now take place.

We had to spend a good deal of time and effort in agreeing upon a process for the third stage which would truly shake everyone free from the disciplinary influence of the racist constructing and embedding going on in the Trusts.

We wanted to find a methodology which would counter the feeling, expressed by practitioners, that service change in general, but particularly in relationship

to 'race', is something that is handed down to them as a directive, and which is then seen as an extra piece of work, lacking any kind of ownership or full understanding. We began to explore the idea of change taking place through a process of self-learning that focuses on practitioners and managers practices being challenged and unblocked by them personally with one another.

We drew on the concept of "self-learning groups" based on work by Stacey (Stacey: 1992). His approach includes the establishment of a learning process, which practitioners with formal roles in the structure of the organisation participate in. Put in a simplified form his argument is that the formal structure diminishes learning, especially about more complex issues. However the formal structure must be maintained if the organisation is to achieve any degree of day-to-day efficiency. A way of learning can however be set up within the day-to-day structure and self-learning groups become a means 'to learn as well as do'. Participants accept and gain skill in operating two modes: mode A being the more familiar formal role defined structuring of responsibilities. Mode A, however, creates ambiguous, complex, challenging issues, which cannot adequately be dealt within that mode.

The paradox is addressed in mode B during which it is not the formal roles and responsibilities of individuals that count so much as individual contribution. What legitimises a mode B in the wider organisation is its contribution to making operational services more effective. The creative problem solving capacity developed between participants in a self-learning group is enhanced through complex learning associated with small group dynamics. This struck us as enabling us to `negotiate in` a development process entirely recognisable to managers and practitioners but sited in the heart of mainstream service delivery worlds.

We presented the notion of "self-learning groups" as opening a way for participants to share their understanding of the realities and open themselves up to the critical responses of their peers.

We argued they would involve 3 key principles:

- 1) Having the freedom to operate within the boundaries provided by working together with colleagues and patients to solve problems. The members of each self-learning group being involved as equals through the contribution they make rather than on the basis of their roles in the structure
- 2) Each self-learning group setting it's own challenges, goals and objectives in response to the identified problems facing the service area. Managers especially looking genuinely for new perspectives.
- 3) Each self-learning group having a membership drawn from different functions and levels in the hierarchy.

Six were set up comprising hospital, community and district nurses, podiatrists, dieticians, doctors, registrars and consultants, managers and assistant managers. We argued that each self-learning group needed its own

facilitator to play a crucial role in supporting the group focus on the identification of solutions.

One of the most important aspects of the self-learning groups, established at the beginning, were four ways in which learning was being seen as taking place. Opportunities to be actively reflective with other practitioners are few. Some practitioners took a while to `get into` this very different way of working which questions one's own practice. Having an explicit learning theory actually helped to ground the experiences being shared. The basic learning theories were:

1 Disabling blocks to learning

Groups which remain at a level of seeking knowledge and information, which were `submissive` conforming or rebelling. Having a win-lose polarisation blocks dialogue. So too maintaining the normal hierarchy.

2 Simple models of learning

The group appreciating just how differently people learn. Also that ones conventionally accepted view is like the tip of a large iceberg. Under the surface lie a large body of assumptions and conditioning. Also that gaining a new insight or idea remains theoretical until you engage in its practice. Learning through also reflecting on new experiences becomes a very valuable part of learning.

3 Complex learning

This is where self-learning groups really `get going`. This is the learning process inherent in dynamics between participants in the groups.

4 Learning into action/behaviour

Feelings brought into relationship with thoughts and ideas, gaining confidence in one's own ability implies developing the ability to respond continually to `new` and unique circumstances.

These served as informal `ground rules` and we would agree with Baldwin who undertook participative action research with social work practitioners, Baldwin is talking about group-work when he says,

".... Establishing ground rules at the earliest opportunity makes it more likely that unforeseen eventualities that might block group processes will be dealt with effectively" (Pg 135: In Napier & Fook, 2000).

By this third stage about 100 staff who were key to delivering mainstream services became engaged in the 6 self-learning groups, meeting approximately every 6 weeks for 8 months.

Findings

The Audit Commission's report, *The Journey to Race Equality*, identifies what it calls "groups of assumptions underpinning the main barriers to progress".

- Race equality is a low priority;
- Confusion about `mainstreaming`;
- Lack of resources;
- Difficulty connecting with black and minority ethnic communities;
- Too many or too few targets (2003: Para 56)

All these were present as we began stage one. The process of going through stage one developed an appreciation of `the barriers` as a series of manifestations of a particular stance or view.

We present below some views of managers from stage one. We have selected statements, which express a view shared broadly among managers as a whole.

- *"The reason why we don't get Asians is because the burden is on the family"*
- *"If they could speak English it would not be such a problem"*
- *"Self referrals can be made. However few people know this. There is a reluctance to publicise because of being overburdened with referrals"*
- *"Why don't they come as they know we are here, I spoke to a group myself"*
- *"It is easy to assume the suitability of our services to black and racial minority communities"*
- *"A lot of projects at the moment are seen as extra pieces of work as opposed to being built into the day to day practice of staff, therefore any new projects need to be developed with the whole service"*

By bringing these views out in the form of a report this shared thinking was made `rationally visible` for the first time. In the report we characterised the overall stance or view as a racist one in these terms.

Culture:

The main assumption is that by increasing practitioner's knowledge and understanding of lifestyles, values and cultural norms there will be improved access to and quality of service delivery

Service delivery:

Were black and racial minorities to take up the services, the quality and level would be the same for all patients based on the principle of equal access and service delivery to all.

The desire to change and improve service delivery is constrained by a number of pressures including demands on finance, capacity and the inertia of established systems.

Why we saw this as a racist discursive sanctioning relates to how we defined black and white earlier. There is a considerable denial of the realities actually being created and which black patients were experiencing. What came across was that changing service delivery to black people was on the margins of the Trusts core operations. Our understanding of this `way of going on` was that it has a dominating assumption that the service delivery these various measures intend to provide access to is, by and large, acceptable to black people. In other words these are `linking` strategies; trying to connect the existing service to black people. The managers accepted that this was a valid way to portray a dominating view; their shared view. We did not have to list the tangible expressions of the existence of this shared view since they were easy to point to. For example the funding of `link` workers on the periphery of and excluded from mainstream operations, time limited specialist `race` posts and low referral rates of black patients to relevant services. In our view these various manifestations were the result of a dominating norm. They also became, in practice, `zones of exclusion`.

Our strategy of giving expression to a dominating managerial view, teased out through fairly standard interview methods, meant this shared `way of going on` was no longer an implicit taken for granted. Since it stressed the shared nature of this view it was now possible to discuss it openly without a sense from individuals that they were being attacked personally.

What we found in stage two was:

- A continual stream of black and racial minority elders admitted, discharged and re-admitted within a short period;
- Communication was not based on a dialogue between patient and practitioner. The patient was passive. Services received were based on practitioner white value based assumptions of what they believed black and racial minority patients required;
- Carers integral to the care of black and racial minority patients were overloaded by functions and excluded;
- Information given to patients and carers was either irregular in its frequency or non-existent as a result of poor practitioner relationships with black and racial minority patients;
- Patients and carers were unable to see the whole picture of health care, and viewed the service they received in a compartmentalised fashion. It was not possible for them to make the links between the various services they may have required.

Some readers may be asking, but `how do you know it was not like this for white patients?` If we had been conducting more traditional forms of research a comparative methodology would have been appropriate. However our action research engagement was focused on bringing out the actual experiences of black patients and their carers. We were working through a dynamic that had begun in stage one by focusing on `white power`.

The logic of our action research engagement had taken us to the managerial denial of the social realities experienced by black patients needing to be challenged. Our way of doing this was to give these social realities a sharper empirical edge: to bring these experiences out from the `zone of exclusion`. We took the fact that black people were experiencing the service as we found them to be as reason enough to accept that practice needed to improve. Finally, throughout the work preceding what we are reporting here we have found that when the needs of black people become better addressed, this also tends to improve services for white people. (Recognition of this emerged among practitioners in the self-learning groups in stage three).

We had to be persistent with patients. To begin with they would not really open up about their experience. But when it was clear to them that we understood what they were experiencing, a dramatic change took place and they talked much more openly. We also made it clear we were there to make a difference. At the same time we did not translate this into coercive relationships with practitioners. Had we done so this it would have further reinforced the already disciplinary messages inhibiting the responsiveness of practitioners. Invariably it was enough to raise the question and the practitioners would then themselves say, "Perhaps I should do X, Y and Z?"

Of the 30, 20 had been in hospital in the previous 12 months and had no referral from GPs to community health services or contact directly with community health services. These 20 patients had no awareness of the availability of or the possibility to refer themselves to a district nurse, speech therapy, physiotherapy, and dietetics or podiatry services, despite potentially benefiting from at least one of these services.

Communication between practitioner and patient in 28 of the 30 cases was for the most part inadequate and inappropriate resulting in poor response and outcomes for patients and difficulties for practitioners in both trusts. One African elder said,

"I'm getting so worried because I think they haven't told me because its not very good news. It's getting to the stage where I don't want to know".

For many elders their hospital stay was psychologically traumatic due to minimal interaction with staff, poor information and negotiation about their illness or treatment resulting in inappropriate care. Some practitioners identified black and racial minority elders as detached, problematic, private and "*in a world of their own...with their family to look after them*".

In the overwhelming number of cases it was clear that the family and carers played a crucial role in the care of the patient. Families found practitioners were happy for them to take care of their elderly relatives needs, but felt they were a nuisance or an obstruction if they began to seek involvement in the planning of treatment and gaining more information about their relatives illness.

"Every day we would bring in food for my mother-in-law and that seemed fine. But it was always difficult for us to get from staff or

doctors what was happening to her and what her progress was. We understand they are busy, but we have to care for her and we need to know as much as possible”

All patients, their families and carers reported that the information they received was not adequate and left them unable to contribute fully to the planning of their care or to seek services or refer themselves directly.

“When mother left hospital I was given a lot of written literature...it was hard because I do not have the time to read it because I care for her. And to be honest it is too much. I would rather talk to someone”.

At the end of stage two we were arguing for self-learning groups and we had been working at change in relation to many of the 30 individuals we had been `shadowing`. We were arguing with the two trusts that `patient-centred` meant:

- More effective communication;
- Knowledge of and efficiency of the referral system;
- Information about illness, access to services, efficacy of treatment, and discharge;
- Relationships with families.

We were arguing for self-learning groups at a time when we were working with practitioners who were saying things like;

“We never really have the opportunity to discuss these problems until it is too late”

“I don’t think it should be one or two peoples responsibility. We all have to consider the issues. I don’t think we have thought enough about it as part of our everyday practice”

Stages one and two had the effect of creating a break and opened the space within the organisation to entertain new possibilities. This might be talked about as a point at which people in an organisation accept that the way they have been going on has to change even though they don’t know what it has to change to. As we discovered in stage three, although they were agreeing `things have to change`, as individuals we found there was still resistance to the idea that black people were getting a poorer service. In the Journey to Race Equality there is this observation,

“Many officers, members and non-executive directors told us that hearing about real experiences of black and ethnic minority communities had helped them to understand why race equality mattered” (Para 75)

What we found was that through stages one and two a general resistance had been overcome, race equality begun to `matter`, however resistance was still there for many individual practitioners.

Shotter talks about arresting or interrupting the spontaneous unselfconscious flow of our ongoing activity (1993). For example, by giving prominence to distinctions and forms of talk being overlooked or showing the possibilities present in the circumstances. This was the substantive activity conducted from within each self-learning group: moving on, stopping to re-examine, moving on again, stopping and so on.

In arguing for self learning groups in stage three our expectation was that through the critical and interactive appraisal of their own experiences and values, practitioners would be able to reflect upon and change their practice by becoming co-producers of services or having a real partnership with patients and carers and other professionals. This would enable the development of a continually evolving, individually owned practice, which embraces the perceptions of the patient about the service in the one to one relationship and empowers practitioners in the organisation to take responsibility for change. By drawing from Stacey we were conceptualising a way to free up practices, in short to revitalise the `joint action`. Our expectation of self-learning groups was that individuals would begin to feel more empowered and as they did so much of the resistance would disappear.

We ourselves facilitated each self-learning group and this proved vital as many issues about race and racism, which had not yet been dealt with emerged. We found most of the self-learning groups started by strongly questioning and getting clarification about the nature and existence of discriminatory practice. At the root of this was a view that their practice was (and should remain) the same for all. Initially they did not accept that black patients (despite all the evidence of stage two) received a poorer response. This kind of resistance was sometimes allied to attempts to go straight to problem solving solutions at the expense of agreeing the basis for the work. A key part of the work in these groups was to keep the focus on black patients; coming back to concrete examples and not letting the group focus instead on `externals`. Sometimes it felt as if they would do anything rather than focus on the working dynamic with black patients.

Despite the initial resistance, which in all cases was strong and in some prolonged, most individuals in the self-learning groups were able to arrive at a point where their own responsibility for service improvement and what they could do had become the focus.

In each group one or two practitioners eventually began to lead the change:

"It is interesting that these cases we are raising are all the ones we usually define as difficult ones. Yet they never see the light of day as I guess we just brush over them because I, for one, don't like admitting that I got it wrong."

"We do not give enough time to question our motives and reasons for doing things in our practice. We hold on to our way of doing things previously."

As the process of change picked up momentum with more and more practitioners questioning their practice we asked them to put down what they had learnt through the groups. One practitioner recalled how they had begun to look at their engagement with black patients and their families differently. She was also aware that by doing things differently her patients were more comfortable. Because they were more comfortable they were more responsive and as a result her practice, with them, was improving.

Another practitioner narrated her experience of an angry African patient. The practitioner had also become angry with the patient and also tried to ignore her. This had been going on for some time. The practitioner was now beginning to question her own actions and consider what different action she should be taking. In the self learning group she revealed her own assumptions, *"I felt she did not like white people and that her family, although pleasant, intimidated me..."* In the next group meeting this practitioner talked about how she had approached the family differently and had had a 'good discussion' with the patient. What made this a 'good discussion' was that the patient had expressed herself and her concerns, resulting in a different and more appropriate service made available. As she put it in the group, *"My inability to recognise these assumptions seriously affected the relationship"*. This experience had a powerful effect on all members of this group, leading on to more questioning of assumptions by people in the group.

We present below statements from practitioners across the 6 self-learning groups, at this stage in the work:

- *"I will think about how I communicate to patients/ carers and whether I am really getting across"*
- *"I realise how much of a 'professional' I become often to the detriment of my own culture"*.
- *"I will try not to make assumptions that the family will manage but explore the reasons why they do not want services."*
- *"It was good to be able to talk freely about what it feels like to be black and working for the organisation."*
- *"At first I couldn't see that we would achieve anything but after much discussion I have got more than I expected."*
- *"The input from other staffs experience and perspective was invaluable and it gave me insight into how other staff approach situations."*
- *"Our values and ways of working are also shaped by our organisation's expectations. Have we questioned enough the culture of our organisation and its impact on our communication"*

The two trusts set up their own evaluation process, whereby every participant in a self learning group provided written feedback, and each group produced its own brief report. The in-house evaluation was co-ordinated by a quality manager who drew together an overview. In it she expressed the view that *"the learning groups have had influences across services through a ripple effect, and gradually upwards through the two organisations towards policy level"*. As our work with the two trusts came to an end, the reference group, which included the business and strategic managers of the trusts, continued

meeting, as a self-learning group. As the trusts overview stated, *“Because of the complex learning process it has gone through, there are opportunities to continue exploring strategic and operational issues across both Trusts and how progress with this agenda can be influenced”*.

The six learning groups continued meeting and further self-learning groups were set up. Trust wide workshops were held to disseminate the learning and process. There were numerous institutional changes made as a result of the self learning groups to specific policies, systems including monitoring and evaluation, referral processes, assessment procedures and processes, new induction plans, changes to education and training programmes, a new examination of staff-management diversity policies and a number of specific service reviews initiated. Numerous leaders and responsibilities were designated to advance and monitor progress many of which emerged from the learning groups. Business plans were now stating this area of work as a priority and building in the process as a coherent aspect of the trusts mainstream approach.

On a general note the overview concluded,

“The self learning groups widened the recognition at service level of the “intangible” nature of services; that it is in the inter-action with patients that much of the quality of service as experienced is created. If the culture within each organisation only really values tangible products or outcomes the recent gains from these learning groups will gradually be eroded. The priority must be to raise awareness of the value of these “intangibles” and individualised service responsiveness through the influence of individuals and their experiences”

Discussion

What is distinctive for us about a racially unaware white view is its inability to acknowledge itself. Just as we might see much historically conditioned `white culture` as assuming its universality, so we can also see a `historically conditioned` white professional practice as assuming its universality. One of the managers during stage one expressed this,

“We get a number of black and racial minority elders on the ward but we don’t treat them any differently. Why would these people be treated any differently, aren’t their problems the same as the indigenous population?”

In stage two practitioners were saying things to us like

“We never treat anybody any different here. They are all the same to us”

“We know there are problems, but isn’t it the same for white people?”

This assumption about universality is very much an NHS aspiration. Both managers and practitioners were `stuck` on a particular interpretation of this.

How practice was discursively sanctioned had not been subject to any critical thinking. It was not a simple matter of saying at the outset: you are all operating just one interpretation of `universality`. In our view it will always be necessary to subvert a dominating discourse if it is ever to be possible to change racist practice. In our view this will also entail bringing new joint action into being.

Stage one and stage two set the scene for both managers and practitioners themselves to begin to take responsibility and change the way they understood universality to be about the way the work is done with each person's unique situation and needs in focus. What we found was that self learning groups were an effective way to move the shared understandings forward to a view of universality in which individuals need to be responded to individually: that it is universality of uniquely tailored responses because of the unacceptable inequalities now acknowledged to arise from a more literal and conditioned `the same` response.

From a Foucauldian and Shotteresque perspective too much emphasis on individual agency is problematic. Our theoretical perspective gave us, we feel, a more contingent view that particular practices happen to be in place at a particular time, but that others can come into place if adequately sanctioned. Our perspective was also about joint action having a life within organisations that can at times utterly elude being subject to dominating discourses (and indeed can be part of their subversion). We found it necessary to find a way to make tangible (self learning groups) the arena and processes of this change in joint action.

Our experience was that action research offered us a vehicle within which to operate a series of stages through which shared understandings shifted.

From our constructionist view it is the very determining, reified experience of the institution handing things down to overburdened, pressurised service staff that was an obstacle at the start. But having engaged operational staff we developed a reactivated professional reflexivity, autonomy, and judgment, and from this these same staff also created some institutional change.

Conclusion

Although we needed to have a well developed critical consciousness of the nature of racism and white power within institutional contexts like the local NHS, in order to make changes in day to day practice, the managers and practitioners with whom we worked did not need to develop an equivalent level of critical consciousness. Rather than trying to convince those with whom we worked about a way of thinking about racism, we used our understanding as a mirror during the work. When this was done within self-learning groups it had a liberating effect among practitioners and managers.

The managers we worked with in stage one did not see themselves in terms of race and racism, with that as a central part of their identity. Through the stage one work it became clear to all that the institutional discourse about responding to black people had a disciplinary quality and was a conditioned stance. Moving through to the self learning groups our impression was that by

this stage they had really made the link between having a sense of who they are in terms of their race and racism, the impact of this in professional practice and what the outcomes can be for black people (and by implication white people too).

For us the core change process was about identity, power and language (as shared talk and ways of doing things). At the heart of tackling institutional racism for us are moments of change in 'ways of looking' and the talk going on between practitioners. We have been struck by the metaphor of social poetics developed by Shotter and Cunliffe (2003). We feel this is very applicable to health and social care worlds of work. It gives a way to grasp how the work going on is uniquely occurring/once only shared creation: between practitioner and patient but also, crucially, between practitioners as well as with managers.

Social poetics as practice can be seen as distinctive methods used by a group of practitioners in coming to a more articulate grasp of their own practices, thus to develop them 'from within'. We take this as one of the goals of 'tackling institutional racism'. Our focused interviews, 'shadowing' black patients, and self-learning groups, were also all about a sense of shifting power relationships, black and white people shifting racial identities and new forms of talk/language engendering new possibilities.

We want to emphasise that we are pointing towards core change processes revolving around power, identity, and language and that the forms these take can vary considerably depending on context. Managers may be in a different 'space' in another context. It cannot be assumed that other contexts necessarily would have managers sharing the kinds of views we found. Similarly in other contexts practitioners may have already moved forward and a stage two may not be needed. In other contexts we will find other local discursive sanctioning and other prevailing joint action.

Butt observes,

"We are unable to identify the critical path for any process of change. This means that organisations embarking on the process of change are faced with taking a significant number of steps at the same time" (20)

Our work has perhaps critiqued the notion of critical path in favour of core processes brought to whatever research approach is used. In our view those who would bring change to institutionally racist contexts, themselves need to be the change they wish to see and need great clarity about how power, identity and language are to be re-shaped. We caution against any simplistic transfer of our stages one, two and three to other contexts.

We would also argue for a notion of empowerment that is about individuals finding ways to develop their own language, identity, and power with which to shape the world of practice they work within and to learn through this that they need to become reflexively capable of undermining their own self-policing tendencies. The difficulties of challenging dominating managerial discourses from within practice worlds may mean external interventions of the kind we

have portrayed may continue to be needed to unlock what otherwise will remain locked.

REFERENCES

Audit Commission (2003) *The Journey to Race Equality*.

Baldwin, M (2000) *Learning to practise with the tensions between professional discretion and agency procedure*. In Eds Napier, L and Fook, J *Breakthroughs in Practice: Theorising critical moments in social work*. Whiting and Birch Ltd

Bhavnani, R et al (2005) *Tackling the Roots of Racism*. Policy Press

Butt, J et al (2005) *Race Equality Discussion Papers*. Social Care Institute for Excellence (SCIE)

Cunliffe, A. (2002) *Social Poetics as Management Inquiry: A Dialogical Approach*. IN *Journal of Management Inquiry*. 11(2) pp128-146

Foucault, M. (1972) *Appendix: The Discourse on Language*. IN Foucault, M *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Pantheon:New York

Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Vintage Books, New York

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* Pantheon: New York

HMSO (1999) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry, Report of an Inquiry by Sir William MacPherson of Cluny*.

Kemmis, S. (1993). *Action Research and Social Movement: A Challenge for Policy Research*. Education Policy Analysis Archives. Vol 1 No 1.

Krippendorff, K. (1995) *Undoing Power*. IN *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*. 12(2) pp101-132. Available on the internet at: www.asc.upenn.edu/usr/krippendorff/POWER.htm

O` Brien, R. (1998) *An Overview of the Methodological Approach of Action Research*. In Richardson, R. *Theory and Practice of Action Research*. Available on-line:
<http://www.web.net/~robrien/papers/arfinal.html>

Shotter, J. (1993), *Conversational Realities: Constructing Life through Language*. Sage: London

Shotter, J. (2004) *On the Edge of Social Constructionism: 'Witness'-thinking versus 'Aboutness'-thinking*. Kensington Consultation Centre and Shotter`s website.

Shotter (2005) *The Role of `Witness`- Thinking `Going On` Inside Chiasmically-Structured Processes*". Organisation Studies Summer Workshop.

(Note: Most of the work by Shotter is on the web at
<http://pubpages.unh.edu/~jds/>)

Shotter, J. and Cunliffe, A. (2003), *Managers as Practical Authors: Everyday Conversations for Action*. IN Holman, D. and Thorpe, R. *Management and Language*. Sage: London

Stacey, R. 1992. *Managing Chaos: Dynamic Business Strategies in an Unpredictable World*. Kogan Page: London.

Wadsworth, Y. (1998) *What is Participatory Action Research?* Action Research International, Paper 2. Available on-line:
<http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/ari/p-ywadsworth98.html>