Lisbeth Verharen is Professor Strengthening Social Quality
at HAN University of Applied Sciences. Lisbeth.Verharen@
han.nl

Mariël van Pelt is Senior Associate in Social Work and
Professionalisation at Movisie, and Professor in Social
Resilience at Fontys University of Applied Sciences.
M.vanPelt@Movisie.nl

Ilse Menheere is lecturer-researcher in the social work
programme at HAN University of Applied Sciences. Ilse.
Menheere@han.nl

Nicole Moorman is researcher at the research group
Strengthening Social Quality at HAN University of Applied
Sciences. Nicole.Moorman@han.nl

Richard Sleegers is lecturer-researcher in the pedagogy
programme at HAN University of Applied Sciences.
Richard.Sleegers@han.nl

Correspondence to: Lisbeth Verharen

E-mail: Lisbeth.Verharen@han.nl

Category: Research

SWAN: SOCIAL WORK AT ALL LEVELS
DESIGNING A TOOL FOR MULTILEVEL INTERVENTIONS

SWAN: SOCIAAL WERK OP ALLE NIVEAUS
HET ONTWERPEN VAN EEN TOOL VOOR MULTILEVEL INTERVENTIES

LISBETH VERHAREN,
MARIËL VAN PELT,
ILSE MENHEERE,
NICOLE MOORMAN,
RICHARD SLEEGERS

ABSTRACT

Social workers focus on changes and improvements in people's social functioning and the social quality of society. To do so, they intervene at different levels: individuals and households (micro), groups, neighbourhoods and communities (meso), and organisations and policies (macro). Opportunities for multilevel interventions are under-utilized in the Netherlands, as social workers mainly focus on the micro level. Researchers from HAN and Movisie were asked to develop a tool which supports decision making on various intervention levels. In a design-oriented study, together with social workers, they developed SWAN (Social Work at All Levels): a conversational guide in the form of a card set, based on the theory of social quality and the decisive professional model. This tool is designed to help social workers look more broadly at a practice situation, recognise points of intervention at different levels, choose between interventions at these levels, and to justify their choices. Although social workers can use SWAN to identify intervention opportunities at all levels, it is not yet clear whether this actually leads to more interventions at meso and macro level.

KEYWORDS

SAMENVATTING

Sociaal werkers richten zich op veranderingen en verbeteringen in het sociaal functioneren van mensen en de sociale kwaliteit van de samenleving. Daarvoor kunnen zij op verschillende niveaus interveniëren: op het niveau van individuen en huishoudens (micro), op het niveau van groepen, wijken en gemeenschappen (meso) en op het niveau van organisaties en beleid (macro). Deze mogelijkheid voor multilevel interventies wordt in Nederland onvoldoende benut. Sociaal werkers lijken vooral gericht te zijn op het microniveau. Onderzoekers van HAN en Movisie werd gevraagd een houvast te ontwikkelen voor het maken van goede afwegingen op verschillende interventieniveaus. In een ontwerpgericht onderzoek werd samen met sociaal werkers SWAN (Sociaal Werk op Alle Niveaus) ontwikkeld: een gesprekshandleiding in de vorm van een kaartenset, gebaseerd op de theorie van sociale kwaliteit en het model van de beslissende professional. Deze tool helpt sociaal werkers breder naar een praktijksituatie te kijken, aangrijpingspunten op verschillende niveaus te herkennen, een keuze te maken uit interventies op de verschillende niveaus en deze keuze te verantwoorden. Hoewel sociaal werkers met behulp van

SWAN interventiemogelijkheden op alle niveaus weten te benoemen is nog niet duidelijk of dat ook daadwerkelijk leidt tot meer interventies op meso- en macroniveau.

TREFWOORDEN

Multilevel interventies, sociale kwaliteit, professionele besluitvorming, ontwerpgericht onderzoek, reflectiepraktijk

INTRODUCTION

Social workers' main focus is on changes and improvements in people's social functioning and societal quality (Koeter, 2022; Van Ewijk, 2010; Verharen, 2017; Verkenningscommissie Hoger Sociaal Agogisch Onderwijs, 2014; Verkenningscommissie Hogere Sociale Studies, 2022). Points of leverage for intervening are at the level of (Metz & Verharen, 2021):

- Individuals and households (micro)
- Groups, neighbourhoods and communities (meso)
- Organisations and policies (macro).

This division in levels can vary (Payne, 2014); in particular, organisations are sometimes found at the meso level. We have chosen to classify them at the macro level, as organisations and policies both refer to the institutionalised social resources of the system world (Nachtergaele et al., 2017).

Internationally, the ability to intervene at different levels in social work is referred to as multilevel intervention (Reid, 2002). This describes a broad approach to social work that includes plurality of modes of action. Only a century ago, Dutch and international social work organisations had clear ideas regarding a broad multi-level approach (Spierts et al., 2017, p. 42). These could involve simultaneous or sequential interventions at one or multiple levels (Berg et al., 2009).

Hesitation to act

Despite this history, the methodological development and practice of social work in the Netherlands is still mainly focused on the micro level, to a lesser extent at the meso level, and very little work is done at the macro level (Scholte, 2018). For example, research by Van Arum & Van Ende (2018) shows that social workers in social (neighbourhood) teams are mainly concerned

with individual approaches to individual problems. Collective arrangements such as peer contact or neighbourhood development receive less attention, despite social workers indicating that they consider these important and that in many municipalities this is an explicit assignment for social work. Thus, the focus is on supporting individual social functioning. As a result, social workers are mainly concerned with solving the *consequences* of structural problems, rather than addressing the *causes* and thereby preventing these problems occurring at a macro level. Moreover, social workers make insufficient use of the societal strengths and opportunities available to them at the meso level, e.g., volunteer or citizen initiatives, while this could be more effective and efficient (Scholte, 2018).

Results from focus groups held by HAN and Movisie (Verharen & Van Pelt, 2018) show that in practice, social workers tend to act cautiously when it comes to multilevel interventions. They don't see opportunities and have difficulties justifying interventions at the meso and macro level. Also, they don't follow through when they pick up on the structural causes of problems.

Social workers who mainly have experience in solving problems of individual clients and families (micro level) find it difficult to approach an issue from the strengths and needs of the community. They are generally so comfortable working individually that they rarely deploy meso- and macro-level interventions. Or, in some cases, a reference is made to a social worker who is more used to working collectively e.g., a community worker.

Social workers who do carry out interventions at a meso level, focusing on a neighbourhood, district or community, often have difficulties justifying their decisions at a municipality level. They have problems explaining how they go about their work and why they proceed in a certain way, what methods of work they use, how much needs to be invested, and what yields.

Although they are of great value to their clients and in the neighbourhood, both individually and collectively-oriented social workers are rarely able to function as an interpreter towards organisations or the municipality about structural causes – what causes people to get into trouble and what needs to be done about it at a macro level. As one social worker stated: 'As the first point of contact, we, the ones who get our hands dirty, are the local eyes and ears that actually see how policy choices impact our community.'

Most commonly, signals stay within the workplace. The preconditions for passing signals on to higher levels are not in place; organisations don't have a defined process for dealing with those signals and social workers have a heavy workload and therefore lack time to address structural causes at the macro-level. Team composition also has an effect, e.g. community builders have more experience and knowledge about intervening on meso- and macro level. In addition, organisations must answer to clients at the level of cases and activities, and not on the level of structural changes they have imposed, even though administrators and policy officers of municipalities confirm that they need social workers to be their eyes and ears in the community. Finally, social workers also articulate something we call a reluctance to intervene: 'Together, we send out many signals, but then?' The social workers asked us to develop a guidance to help them decide on which level to intervene and how to justify their choices. This was the start of the Social Work at All Levels (SWAN) project.

DESIGNING SWAN IN FOUR STAGES

In a design-based research project between May 2019 and November 2021, we worked together with social workers to develop a tool that would offer them practical guidance. We received a RAAK Public grant from Regieorgaan SIA for this project. The leading questions were: *What guidance can social workers be given when deciding which interventions to deploy at which level, and how can their choices be justified?*

The aim of the project was therefore to design an aid or tool that can be used by social workers to make an informed assessment of possible and necessary interventions on different levels in a particular situation. We opted for design-oriented research to be able to develop a concrete solution to their practice issue while researching together with social workers.

The project was conducted in four phases: a diagnostic phase, a design phase, a test phase, and an implementation phase (Van Aken & Andriessen, 2011), each of which involved active collaboration with social (neighbourhood) teams (Table 1). In total, six teams from five different organisations were involved. One of the teams participated in all four phases. Due to reorganisations one team was no longer available after the diagnostic phase and another team had to stop after the design phase. Therefore, other teams were added to help us in the design, test and implementation phase. In each phase, HAN and Movisie researchers worked together with co-researchers; a social worker from each team.

Table 1: Teams that participated in the study.

Teams and team composition	Diagnostic phase	Design phase	Test phase	Implementation phase
1. Broad social neighbourhood team. 0–100-year-olds. Individually focused and collectively focused professionals. Rural area.	X	X	X	X
2. Broad social team. 0–100-year-olds. Individually and collectively focused workers. Urban district.	X			
3. Social team focused on youth. Especially individually focused (youth care) workers. City and surrounding villages.	X	X		
4. Neighbourhood team focused on 0- 100-year-olds. Individually and collectively focused workers. Medium-sized city and surrounding villages.			X	X
5. Social team. Family coaches. Small town.		X	X	X
6. Social team. Focused on youth and family issues. Medium-sized city.			X	X

An expert group supported the project at each stage. It included representatives from *Sociaal Werk Nederland* and the *Beroepsvereniging van Professionals Sociaal Werk* (BPSW), a researcher, two professors of social work, and a social worker.

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PRACTICE

In the diagnostic phase, we explored social workers' current practice in working with multilevel interventions. We observed several case discussions of the three teams and interviewed six policy officers from municipalities and the managers of the social work organisations involved. The aim was to gain insight into the choices social workers make in their work, and the factors involved. In the case discussions the co-researchers reflected with their team on the decisions made by the social workers and on the level at which they decided to intervene. A total of 18 cases were discussed and analysed.

Professional decision-making

The choice of intervention levels is considered a professional decision made by social workers. Therefore, we have chosen to use 'the decisive professional' model in our analysis of the case

discussions. This model is based on multiple studies of professional decision-making among teams of social workers (Movisie, 2019).

The case contributor provided each team with a written case in advance, including a situation outline, which choices had been made for interventions, at what levels (micro, meso, macro), and which considerations these were based on. The discussion focused on what factors played a role in these considerations. The following factors, taken from the decisive professional model, were assessed (Spierts et al., 2017):

• Social workers' expertise and experience;
• Social mission and values;
• The client and their preferences, needs and wishes;
• The organisation and the organisational context;
• Types of knowledge and knowledge utilisation.

Social quality

The team also engaged in discussions about what was actually (additionally) needed in each case. To support these discussions, we introduced the theory of social quality. This theory (IASQ, 2020) was developed in the 1990s, partly to give meaning to what can be determined as social. The interaction between individual and environment is central to this approach, with the environment considered broadly at micro, meso and macro level. The theory identifies four conditions that a society must have in place for social quality to exist: socio-economic security, social inclusion, social cohesion, and social empowerment (Verharen, 2017; Verharen et al., 2019).

The teams used these four conditions to thoroughly review the cases and find entry points for interventions at different levels. In this way it became apparent on which levels social workers saw entry points for intervention, whether they used these, and which considerations played a role. This quickly showed them which points of entry they initially overlooked in relation to the conditions for social quality. For instance, when discussing a neighbourhood conflict, the view was broadened from social cohesion to social inclusion. This included the access of a family to neighbourhood facilities like sports and hobby clubs for their children. They also included socio-economic security: the condition and design of the family home where, for example, noise pollution was an issue.

Complementary to the case discussions we held interviews with municipality policy staff and managers of the social work organisations involved. This provided insights into the mission and expectations regarding multilevel interventions, and the factors 'organisation and organisational context' and 'social mission'.

Audio recordings of the case discussions and interviews were transcribed and then analysed, using qualitative analysis software (Atlas.ti). For reliability purposes, each transcript was coded independently by two researchers and then discussed. The analysis focused on three sub-questions:

- What interventions do social workers deploy?
- What factors are involved?
- What do social workers need, to arrive at a good assessment?

Below, we present the main results for each question.

Interventions by social workers

Social workers deploy a range of interventions when supporting or guiding an individual or family. Commonly used interventions are: referral, coordination and cooperation with other professionals, volunteers, active residents and organisations. Less frequently, interventions focus on the group, neighbourhood, district or community. This happens only when this explicitly suits the social worker's function, as was the case with the participating youth workers, community workers and community sport coaches. The least frequent interventions are those aimed at a wider public, policy or politics, in other words, at the macro level. Interestingly, during the team discussions, participating social workers mentioned opportunities for interventions at all levels in almost all cases, demonstrating that they are aware of a continuum rather than specifically choosing one or the other level.

If we look at macro-interventions, it is striking that in the 18 case discussions, these were mentioned 48 times, of which one third had been implemented and the remaining two thirds were 'desirable'. In other words, social workers are fairly good at stating what needs to be done at a macro level and have concrete ideas but are hesitant to take these signals further and turn them into responsible actions. In a number of cases, the boundary was explicit: 'As social workers

in the neighbourhood team, we sometimes get completely blocked by the municipality. Should we then directly try to change the policy? No, mostly we can't change anything. We must set our limits and be aware of when we no longer have any influence.' In other cases, especially when macro interventions are implemented, we see good cooperation between social workers, (middle) management, and administrators.

The factors involved

When making trade-offs to deploy specific interventions, the five different factors from the decisive professional model played a role:

In the case studies, the most factors were related to the organisation and organisational context (32%) and the expertise and experience of the social worker (33%). Client factors were also mentioned (19%), as well as social mission and values (13%). Least mentioned were types of knowledge and knowledge utilisation (2%). When these did come up, it mostly referred to consulting a colleague or professional from another organisation who had (perceived) expertise on a particular topic (target group, problem, approach). Good examples from elsewhere (e.g., a similar practice in another municipality) was also mentioned. But when it came to intervening, the process and steps were mainly described in everyday language. They rarely mentioned a specific approach or method. Nor did theory or research results play a role when choosing an intervention.

The analysis showed that regarding organisational factors, professionals were unclear about their roles and responsibilities: 'What is, or isn't, our core business?' This also applied to organisations they collaborated with: 'Who is responsible for which action?' In addition, they mentioned the heavy workload and full caseload being factors affecting their decision-making.

Their expertise and experience also played a role when making trade-offs: knowledge of their clients and expertise with respect to a particular theme or target group.

When asked which factors should have played a role, they mentioned: a team vision on their tasks, which reflects their own stand on this, and expressing this position to the municipality. They also named more use of expertise from team members and professionals from other organisations, and more cooperation with other organisations, as desirable.

What social workers need

The case discussions and interviews also provided insights into what social workers need, to make a good assessment: reflecting; asking/being asked questions; support; knowledge and experience; professional space.

Reflecting together was found to be necessary for social workers to look at their work in a more overarching way: follow developments, discuss signals, and recognise patterns. It would help them to determine a joint course of action and make choices. Self-reflection, substantive consultation with colleagues and cooperation partners, peer review, and case discussions were all considered supportive.

In line with reflection, it would help social workers if they had, and were able to take the space to ask themselves and others questions about their choices. This would encourage thoughts such as: 'Can things be done differently?' 'Are there alternatives?' and 'Why did I make this choice?' The theoretical models in SWAN support them to ask, 'the right' and 'different' questions. For instance, conditions of social quality helped social workers ask questions about social and societal influences. They would for example ask questions like, 'Which exclusionary mechanisms play a role?' or 'How does safety play a role?' The factors from the decisive professional model also help professionals to ask questions from different perspectives, such as, 'On what knowledge do we base this?' 'What knowledge is available and what additional knowledge is needed?' 'What matters most from the perspective of the resident?' and 'How do organisation policies play a role?'

Social workers also expressed a need for support when choosing at which level to intervene. They mentioned support from colleagues, collaboration partners, managers and administrators. They stressed the importance of being able to trust that they are not alone in making such decisions, 'that there's wider support' and 'that you know you can fall back on the expertise and practical support of colleagues, the team leader or others if needed'. Case discussions prove to be an excellent way to give and receive support. Finally, their managers and directors also indicated the importance of support. One of the directors stated: '… do what you think is right and if anyone questions this, I'll support you'.

Choosing to intervene at different levels also requires knowledge of, and experience *with* different types of interventions. For example, interventions at a macro level require knowledge of municipal policies, the municipal financial situation, municipal politics, including knowing politicians and

understanding political sensitivity. Thus, social workers need a diverse team with expertise in different types of interventions. Inviting experts for a specific case is also a way to bring sufficient knowledge and experience to the table.

Professional space is conditional for intervening at different levels. The organisation and organisational context largely determine within which frameworks social workers are able to make choices. The tighter the framework, the less choices there are to make. They need clarity about their assignment and whether they are expected to intervene at different levels, in order to determine their room to manoeuvre. For example, one manager states: 'Intervening at the macro level also requires a certain way of working. You can't just point out that something is needed. It's also about thinking, how can we do this differently?'

DESIGNING AND TESTING SWAN

The insights from the diagnostic phase were discussed with the teams and incorporated in the functional requirements for the tool's design. In addition, the user and contextual requirements were also determined with the teams, such as their suitability in existing meetings and work processes, support from the organisation and municipality. These requirements were incorporated into a prototype of SWAN. The tool, in the form of a set of cards, became a guide for discussing cases or practical situations. The tool breaks down the conversation or reflection in four phases. Each phase focuses on a number of key questions. This meets the social workers' need to ask/get questions, to reflect with each other, and to be able to use the tool in existing consultation situations.

A conversation in four phases

Phase 1 is about determining the purpose of an intervention in a given practice situation and includes the conditions of social quality. Social workers discuss whether and when socio-economic security, social inclusion, social cohesion and/or social empowerment play a role in the situation; which conditions are at stake and which of those need to be addressed.

Phase 2 supports the social worker when reflecting on which factors are influential. The tool includes five types of factors from the decisive professional model:

- The wishes, needs and abilities of the resident(s);
- Practical knowledge of methods, techniques and of what is effective;

- The professional and expertise related to professional codes, norms and values;
- The organisation and organisational context e.g., policy, (unwritten) rules, and partners;
- The social assignment, including, e.g., government policy or public expectations.

Phase 3 helps the professional make an inventory of which interventions are possible at which levels. This is where the choice is made of what to do, with whom, based on what considerations and whether this will achieve the goals noted in phase 1.

In phase 4, one of the participants summarises the outcomes of phases 1 to 3, and the case expert adds to these where necessary. This summary then provides guidance for follow-up and prompts any action-taking. An example; immediately after a case discussion in which the tool was used, one of the social workers contacted the municipal policy officer about a subsidy that a neighbourhood had applied for. She did this to spark a discussion about the importance the local government attaches to civic initiatives on the one hand, and the discouraging requirements they place on grant applications for these initiatives on the other hand.

Getting started

Social work practice is notably messy and dynamic. We started the project with three teams of social workers. By the time we reached the test phase, two of the three teams no longer existed due to tenders and reorganisations. In the remaining team, about half of the staff had been replaced. We found three new teams, one who joined in the design phase and two who joined in the test phase.

The tool and its use were discussed in each team. For three months, the teams tested the tool in regular case meetings and/or consultations. These were observed by the researchers. After the case meetings, team members individually reflected on the tool using a reflection form. Questions on this form focused, amongst other things, on the added value of the tool when making choices for interventions, strengths and areas for improvement of the tool, and on insights gained when using the tool. Participants were also asked to formulate personal goals for their practice, which were then discussed at the subsequent case meeting.

Audio recordings made of the case discussions, together with personal observations by the researcher, using pre-established observation criteria, formed input for the reports. The criteria focused, for example, on role distribution, time investment, and the progress of the three phases.

Critical moments in the discussions were noted for each phase. For each team, a total of five or six case discussions were analysed, divided into three types of cases: two ongoing, two new, and two fictitious. In the ongoing cases, the outcomes of the case review using the discussion guide and card set were compared with the outcomes of the regular case review meetings. For the fictitious cases, each team was presented with another team's case at the diagnostic phase. In this way, we were able to compare outcomes.

Experiences with the tool

After three months we held a final meeting to discuss the findings with each team. This was followed by a focus group meeting with the researchers and co-researchers from all four teams to share findings and draw joint conclusions, as well as to determine whether the tool needed any modifying. These conclusions were then shared and discussed with the expert group.

In the test phase, it became clear that the tool provides guidance with determining the intervention level. The questions included in the tool met the users' need to ask and get questions and help them to look more broadly at practice situations and explore options for action. The tool was considered very suitable for discussing complex practice situations, although, according to the social workers, it would also be valuable in less complicated practice situations. One social worker said: 'You should use it in all cases, because in every situation you can overlook things, or choose a certain direction too quickly. At that moment it's important to reconsider your choices using the tool.'

The tool was less suitable for new practice situations where the social workers were just recently or not yet involved. This became clear when discussing the fictitious cases. Social workers then lacked the information to determine what to do. The best intervention in this case is to sit down with relevant stakeholders and discuss the case again in the team.

The conversation tool gave social workers a more complete picture of what influenced the practice situation and opened more opportunities for interventions. The practice situation could be viewed from multiple perspectives which led to more depth, different insights, and the stimulation of follow-up actions. The tool also provided structure to discussions which was much appreciated. 'Each phase has a number of key questions, and by discussing these we avoided selecting a solution (too) quickly.' 'Of all the methodologies we have tried, this was the one that helped the most, in width, but also in depth', noted one of the social workers.

The social workers indicated that discussing practical situations in this way takes up a lot of time, at least 45 minutes to an hour per case. Furthermore, it takes time and practice to work with the tool properly. However, time could also be gained by the clear goal-setting and decision on how to intervene. One-on-one consultations no longer occur during breaks, on the phone or at the coffee machine. That is often how much 'unnoticed' time is lost. Finally, SWAN is not just about finding appropriate interventions in a given practice situation, but also about social workers learning together and exploring possibilities for interventions at other levels than the individual level. In that way, the case review contributes to joint learning and further professionalisation.

SWAN LAUNCHED

The suggestions for improvements were integrated into the final version. The tool was made visually more appealing and some phrasing was adjusted. The design was improved using input from design sessions with co-researchers and members of the different teams. The idea was to better support the different phases with images that promote out-of-the-box thinking.

The implementation phase involved working with social workers to identify what was needed to encourage their use of SWAN. It was made available both digitally and in the form of a card set in a compact box, as many said they would like to have a physical copy. Social workers can use the tool with (part of) the team at network meetings or use the cards in one-on-one meetings. We also developed an e-learning module on intervening at multiple levels; this is freely available via the Movisie academy (https://www.movisie.nl/training/online-training-sociaal-werk-alle-niveaus). The e-learning module includes background knowledge on the importance of intervening at all three levels, social quality, professional decision-making, and identifying structural causes. The tool and other outcomes of the project were published nationally at a webinar for social workers, a webinar for social work teachers, and in an article in the Dutch *Vakblad Sociaal Werk* (Van Pelt & Menheere, 2022). 61 social workers and 40 teachers participated in the webinars. A short film was developed to introduce the tool (https://www.han.nl/projecten/2019/sociaal-werk-op-alle-niveaus/#video-video-over-de-swan-kaartenset), and finally, at the request of social workers, a poster with the different steps from the interview guide was designed as a visible reminder in the workplace.

Using the tool in practice

SWAN was formally handed over to the participating teams. In a meeting, the four teams involved in the test phase looked back on the research process, shared experiences of working with the

tool, and formulated steps to be taken to implement the tool in their own organisation. The social workers noted that working with SWAN requires preparation time and practice. 'It stands or falls with preparation, for example by inviting expertise from outside your own team.' 'You just have to do it often to make it your own.' One team specifically reflected on what the role of social worker entails and how to make signals discussable at another level within or outside the organisation. 'I think that with our work we're always trying to improve society. That's only possible if being involved in policies is part of it - indicating, even at municipality level - that certain things are happening.'

Meanwhile, we now receive the initial responses about the use of SWAN in practices not involved in its development. A student from HAN's Master of Social Work introduced the tool in his organisation where it is now used in all teams (Moors, 2022). SWAN helps students (social workers from different organisations) look more broadly at practice situations and recognise different levels of intervention. Cautiously, we believe that the tool will support social workers when deciding at which level to intervene, and to justify these decisions.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The leading questions of this design-oriented research project were: *What guidance can social workers be given when deciding which interventions to deploy at which level, and how can their choices be justified?*

In conclusion, we can say that the conditions of social quality and the factors of the decisive professional model, incorporated into a discussion tool that matches functional requirements, supports social workers' joint reflective capacity in making trade-offs about how to intervene, and on what levels.

A continuum of interventions

The diagnostic phase of the project has shown that in many cases, a situation cannot be linked to only one level of intervention. In reality this is often a continuum: discussing a case reveals possibilities at all levels. Using SWAN in the case discussions generated more ideas for intervening at different levels. A social worker should constantly be aware of the range of intervention possibilities. Especially questions based on the theory of social quality and the decisive professional model help social workers, as these promote their reflective capacity (Moors, 2022). SWAN is a

tool designed to answer the question: 'What should be done?' Organisations should facilitate their teams and professionals in taking the time to reflect and come to informed decisions. Due to the pressures of daily work, this opportunity is often missed. For instance, one of the teams indicated that both the team and the organisation were initially enthusiastic about the tool during the test phase, but that once that phase was finished, SWAN was basically left on the shelf. It would have helped if both the organisation and the team had agreed to continue the use of the tool.

Another team, however, was so enthusiastic that they continued using the tool and an enthusiastic social worker managed to get the tool implemented in his master's programme as part of his master's degree.

An intervention for reflective practice

We have seen that when using SWAN, social workers see intervention opportunities at all levels, but this does not necessarily lead to more actions at meso and macro level. Having a good conversation about multilevel interventions and promoting reflective capacity can be seen as a first step. SWAN 's main value is as an intervention in social workers' reflective practice. The impact of SWAN remains limited when it comes to social workers actually intervening on different and multiple levels.

Nevertheless, feedback from the different teams shows that a number of social workers did start intervening differently at meso and macro level after using the tool. For example, a community worker entered a discussion with the municipality about the limited conception of citizen participation, as was visible in e-mails from the municipality. Another example is that of a social worker who coordinated volunteer work in administration problems. She indicated to policy officials that she, and volunteers involved, signalled an increasing number of people with ever-increasing financial problems, who were late contacting debt relief service of the municipality. Prior to the case discussion, this social worker only communicated her reluctance to intervene and how uneasy she felt about that.

Do not individualise issues

We also observed that social workers differ in their perception of roles and tasks, especially when it comes to interventions at a macro level. They ask questions like, 'Is this actually our responsibility?' 'Is it directly related to our profession?' and 'What should I do or not do at that level?' This is also the subject of professional debate, as can be read in the dossier on politicising social work on the

site *socialevraagstukken.nl*. Regardless of what social workers do or do not undertake at the macro level, there is no doubt that they should be aware of factors and points of leverage at different levels. This prevents issues from being individualised. Even if a social worker's mission is only to support individuals or families, it is necessary for them to recognise that factors at meso and macro level affect the situation. This does justice to both the person and their situation.

In designing and testing the tool, we have seen the choices social workers make and the interventions this results in. As a follow-up, we advise systematically investigating which interventions at which levels social workers deploy as a result of SWAN, and what their impact is.

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST

REFERENCES

Berg, M., Coman, E., & Schensul, J. J. (2009). Youth action research for prevention: A multi-level intervention designed to increase efficacy and Empowerment Among Urban Youth. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *43*(3–4) 345–359. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-009-9231-2

International Association of Social Quality (IASQ). (2020). *Elaboration of the Theory of Social Quality*. Retrieved August 17, 2023, from https://socialquality.org/theory/

Koeter, L. (2022). *Beroepsprofiel van de sociaal werker* [Professional profile of the social worker]. BPSW.

Metz, J., & Verharen, L. (2021). Methodisch werken: de fiets van het sociaal werk [Methodical work: The bicycle of social work]. In J. Metz, M. Jager-Vreugdenhil, J. P. Wilken, & T. Witte (Eds.), *Sociaal werk doordacht.* SWP Publishers.

Moors, P. (2022). *Geen tijd voor reflexiviteit. Een betoog ter bevordering van het reflexief vakmanschap van sociale (wijk)teams* [No time for reflexivity. An argument for promoting the reflexive craftsmanship of social (neighbourhood) teams]. [Essay]. HAN University of Applied Sciences.

Movisie. (2019). *Professionele besluitvorming in sociaal werk* [Professional decision-making in social work]. Retrieved August 30, 2023, from https://www.movisie.nl/artikel/professionele-besluitvorming-sociaal-werk-0

Nachtergaele, S., Reynaert, D., Gobeyn, H., De Stercke, N., & Roose, R. (2017). *Sociaal werk en mensenrechten* [Social work and human rights]. Acco.

Payne, M. (2014). *Modern social work theory* (4th ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Reid, W. J. (2002). Het centrale kennisbestand van het maatschappelijk werk: een analyse van trends [The central knowledge base of social work: An analysis of trends]. *Paspoort Maatschappelijk Werk, 5*(3), 7–36.

Scholte, M. (2018). *Op de barricaden?! Over sociaal werk, probleemfiguraties en de aanpak van structurele problemen in het sociaal domein* [On the barricades! On social work, problem configurations and addressing structural problems in the social domain]. [Marie Kamphuis Lecture]. Retrieved August 30, 2023, from https://mariekamphuisstichting.nl/images/mks-lezing-2018-pdf.pdf

Spierts, M., Van Pelt, M., Van Rest, E., & Verweij, S. (2017). *Visie en vakbekwaamheid maken het verschil. Over professionele besluitvorming in het sociaal werk* [Vision and professional competence make the difference. On professional decision-making in social work]. Movisie. Retrieved August 30, 2023, from https://www.movisie.nl/sites/movisie.nl/files/publication-attachment/Visie-en-vakbekwaamheid-maken-het-verschil%20%5BMOV-12664348-1.0%5D.pdf

Van Aken J., & Andriessen, D. (2011). *Handboek ontwerpgericht wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Wetenschap met effect* [Handbook of design-oriented scientific research. Science with effect]. Boom Publishers.

Van Arum, S., & Van Ende, T. (2018). *Sociale (wijk)teams opnieuw uitgelicht. Derde landelijke peiling over gemeenten (zomer 2017)* [Social (neighbourhood) teams re-examined. Third national poll on municipalities (summer 2017)]. Movisie.

Van Ewijk, H. (2010). *Maatschappelijk werk in een sociaal gevoelige tijd* [Social work in socially sensitive times]. SWP.

Van Pelt, M., & Menheere, I. (2022). Professionele afwegingen maken: Kaartenset als hulpmiddel [Professional trade-offs: Card set as a tool]. *Vakblad Sociaal Werk*, *23*(1) 24–27.

Verkenningscommissie hoger sociaal agogisch onderwijs. (2014). *Meer van waarde. Kwaliteitsimpuls en ontwikkelrichting voor het hoger sociaal agogisch onderwijs* [More of value. Quality impulse and development direction for higher social agogical education]. Vereniging Hogescholen.

Verkenningscommissie Hogere Sociale Studies. (2022). *Sociaal in beweging. Empowerment van de sociaal professional als fundament* [Social in motion. Empowering the social professional as a foundation]. Vereniging Hogescholen.

Verharen, L. (2017). *Being There. Working together to Strengthen Social Quality.* HAN University of Applied Sciences Press.

Verharen, L., & Van Pelt, M. (2018). *Sociaal werk op alle niveaus! RAAK* [Social work at all levels! RAAK]. [Public project proposal]. HAN University of Applied Sciences.

Verharen, L., Heessels, M. M. J. G., Jansen, C., & Wolf, J. (2019). *Sociale Kwaliteit voor een sterke Sociale Basis* [Social Quality for a Strong Social Base]. Retrieved August 17, 2023, from https://www.socialevraagstukken.nl/wp-content/uploads/Sociale-Kwaliteit-in-de-Sociale-Basis-.pdf