Chapter VIII

Conclusion

Student field work was understood by examining it across different settings. This was attempted by looking at work done in each of the sub-sectors separately, that is work in police, with courts, in prison, in institutions, with commissions, and in rehabilitation. An attempt was also made to review it from the point of view of the student, the agency, the sector and the curriculum, so as to develop a more nuanced understanding of the role each of these play and also their inter-connectedness. This chapter is a consolidation of these findings and it is divided into different sections dealing with insights pertaining to the four thematic sections, the field and its six sub-sectors, relationships, learning by doing, and the role of the Centre and Curriculum.

I-The Field and its sub-sectors

The entire field of practice, Social Work in the sector of Criminology and Justice was further seen in the six sub-sectors of work in police, court, prisons, institutions, commission and rehabilitation and an over-view of some insights gained are discussed.

The FAP 1, except in Commissions has a common presence across five of the six sub-sectors. The client group is anonymous here. They are invisible, dispersed and are not bound together except for their temporary association with the CJS. No one wants to be connected to the CJS because of the undercurrent of negativity. So advocacy to establish need for the social worker is a real challenge here.

Significantly, of the six sub-sectors the social worker is present only in two; in institutions as the Probation officer or as the Superintendent’s; for this designation, one of the preferred educational criteria is social work, and in rehabilitation, the social worker has a core role in reintegration. In the other four sub-sectors; that is police, court, prisons and commissions, there are no social workers as a formal part of the system. While the potential of work has been introduced and demonstrated, it has not yet been formally acknowledged by the system.

The social worker is perceived by those in the CJS as someone who oversees their functioning and monitors them and so there is a resistance to them and they are not
considered as peers to work towards the same vision. This could be because one important role of the social worker is to oversee or follow up tasks that the system and its officials are supposed to be doing towards people but not fulfilling, in terms of facilitating access to their rights and entitlement. So one part of their work is some kind of monitoring and that is not accepted well. Thus one of the roles of the social worker in the CJS is actually that of ‘policing’, seeing that things are being done as per rules and requirements of the institution, the sub-sector or as prescribed by the law.

**Locating the social worker in the sub-sectors.** In the entire field of practice, the domains of work have been with offenders, victims, the criminal justice system and society. So work is system related and undertaken with offenders (police, court and prison) or victims (institutions, commissions). Work can also be related to society with elements of prevention and rehabilitation, the latter includes reintegration and reformation; processes that facilitate a person’s movement away from crime as a way of life.

**Table 8.1**

**Locating Work for the Social Worker across the Sub-sectors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Offender focus</th>
<th>Victim focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>System</strong></td>
<td>Police, Court, Prison</td>
<td>Institution (Women, Children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJS related</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Society</strong></td>
<td>Rehabilitation (Crime), Prison (discharged prisoners), Police, Juveniles in conflict with law, <em>Conviscts, Male Under-trials.</em></td>
<td>Rehabilitation (Trafficking), Institution (After care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*new aspects of work that can be explored.

Table 8.1 gives an over-view of where work is located with victims and offenders, within the CJS system and within society. Hence in the system work with offenders is in the sub-sectors of Police, Court and Prison and work with victims it is in Institution and
Commissions. At prison, immediate needs fall into the system related work for example focusing on facilities, services or entitlements. And more long-term work is with offenders or under-trials wanting to move away from crime or post institutionalisation support. In Society, work with offenders is in Rehabilitation, Prison, and Police indicating that work is located within the community. Similarly, at the Police station work could include an element of handling conflicts before they escalate into crimes, and community based awareness as prevention. Work with victims is in Rehabilitation and Institution, as both these allows for an intervention with victims. The former is a focus on helping individuals and can be located in work in prison too, but the focus is having identified a person who wishes to move away from crime. In institutions, it is being able to work with inmates to plan their post release, and to facilitate their re-settling in society again. All institutions have a time bound stay period and eventually the aim is to get inmates to move out and settle down by themselves. The new areas where work can be explored is with the issue of compensation, within the aspect of victims looking at concrete support to them and with convicts or male under-trials. There could be a shift from working with the system to working in society and from work with offenders to work with victims. Work with offenders has an underlying purpose of preventing recidivism, thus protecting society. Work with victims has a focus on healing and closures thus having an individual focus.

II- Relationships

Some of the stakeholders in the field work process are the sector, agency, student and supervisor and an interplay of each pair in turns adds to the field work experience. This section deals with these sets of relationships. They are student and agency, student and supervisor, agency and supervisor and agency and sector.
Figure 8.1
Relationship between Student and Agency

Figure 8.1 describes the relationship between the student and the agency. The challenges that students encounter in a setting are also an indication of how that system is relating to them. It is the dynamics between them that gives rise to challenges, and a review of challenges that the students experience as part of their field work, is an indication of the openness of the system. What is documented by the students as challenges is telling of how exactly their presence and their work is being perceived by the system. The challenge for students working with Police, Prison and Institution is being confronted with incidents of corruption and bureaucracy. Both these are ingrained in the identity of the system itself, one as part of a work ethos and the other almost as a permanent offshoot of it. The criminal justice system is highly bureaucratic and working in that setting requires a different kind of skill set; of dealing with power and authority. In Court and Commission, the non-clarity of role of the social worker/student social worker and in Rehabilitation, it was in connection with relating to clients and trying to understand one’s role as an aftercare worker especially in the prison setting as different from that of a prison social worker. The former is dealing with more long-term work and the latter with immediate prison system related work. The challenge in Institutions is not so much of establishing the role of the social worker, but
reviving it or renewing interest in its potential. The Superintendent gets absorbed into the ‘so called bureaucratic way of functioning’ and often has moved away from their social work orientation to now becoming a part of the system. The environment of the government institution and the ethos of the work there overpowers the social work orientation. The system is getting defined by everyone who interacts with it, either as inmates, family, NGOs or social workers, as being rigid, controlling, unwelcoming, closed and hostile. It is governed by rules and regulations and one has to learn to navigate around that.

The day-to-day struggles that the students faced were: being confronted with a system which at one level is allowing a social worker to be present in their premises by giving them permission to come for field work; but at another level is not very clear about how to work with them or what to do with this student social worker. So it seems like both the systems (Police and Social Work / academics) at a conceptual level want to work together but it is left to the actual individuals concerned to operationalize it and a lot of energy on the part of the student social worker is invested in building that local rapport at the grass root level and this is probably true across most CJS settings. Maintaining continuity of field work becomes a challenge because of this and yet each batch of students learn to build rapport and explain the role of the social worker, and need to be able to do this as an additional skill as compared to, if the role of the social worker was accepted and integrated as a part of the system.

Another aspect of the agency-student dynamic is value conflicts and they were evident in: an ideology difference between the student and the court-based NGO they were placed in, and with the staff in Prison, or in seeing the agency’s limitations in Commission. Value conflict in rehabilitation was with regard to clients and maintaining boundaries, and not knowing how to respond to authority because the student is there with permission granted for a learning purpose; so the dilemma of when to intervene, when to ignore, what to accept, what incidents or situations to let go off, becomes difficult choices to make in police, prison and institutions. While this is evident across sectors and is a part of field work experience, since someone is not with the student the whole time, its incidence is higher in this sector due to the nature of the settings.

One cannot assume that student field work organically translates into the development of the sector. It has been and can be a role that is crucial and useful for work at an initial level but it needs to be further sustained either by field practitioners or academicians engaging in
the field to professionally establish itself. Students can be a good resource to try out a new sub-sector. The team work of an experienced supervisor and an enthusiastic student can open out so many new sub-sectors but it will have to be supported with work that is more sustained and continuous, for it to be accepted as a serious field of practice. The two FAPs of the Centre working on the issue of homelessness and De-notified tribes, emerged exactly in this manner, of individual students who were passionate about certain issues and wanted to explore work in that direction. The Centre initially supported them via a fellowship (through a stipend and mentor support) and after a year of exploring the potential of working with the issue, they went on to develop into FAPs. This happened because of administrative support and guidance offered by the Institute, a key role in leadership by a Centre faculty member and the efforts and interest of the two alumni concerned.

**Student and Supervisor**
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**Figure 8.2**

**Relationship between Student and Supervisor**

Figure 8.2 describes the relationship between the student and the supervisor. Some settings are challenging intrinsically and it has implications for the supervisor to mentor the student more systematically and rigorously. In spite of the nature of the agency the learning experience can still be meaningful and satisfying. Those agencies where fieldwork is new,
need facilitation and anchoring by the faculty supervisor and the style of supervision is more participative and nurturing. A ‘good’ field work experience is not about having a supportive agency or a facilitative field contact or a long list of interesting tasks. It could be none of the above, yet an experienced supervisor who is able to anchor and hold the student through this entire journey sometimes makes all the difference between a student enjoying their field work or being unhappy and frustrated. One characteristic of an experienced supervisor could be someone who can identify and link a learning goal to any kind of situation thus being able to convert any field experience into a learning experience.

Often field work agencies in this sector are government institutions or have a close connect with an authoritative overbearing CJS. The negative attitude of the staff sometimes demotivates a young student just stepping into the profession, especially if the comments of the staff are about the profile of the client group or about the futility of reformation or the failure of rehabilitation. It is in situations like this that an experienced supervisor plays a crucial role in terms of processing these kind of experiences and yet instilling a sense of belief about social work, in the student. Often supervisors have a system or an issue focus while students at the field level have an individual focus. This can be explained due to various factors, a new or unexperienced student may need to engage with individuals to understand the issue in the first place, while supervisors with their experience might want students to see beyond individuals to what are larger issues or structural problems.

Students likewise get frustrated when they see the struggles that some clients go through. The people one comes across in this field of practice are desperate, in pain, and pinning their hopes on some semblance of justice that is still wanting. Since the student’s orientation professionally is with this vulnerable group, it sometimes distresses them especially when violence is witnessed and despair is high. And this is similar for all students, their perception of those in need and why they are working with them is clear. At these moments intense discussions with supervisors give them some solace and direction to contextualise work and also to understand the agency and its role from a different angle. The supervisor shields or counters this harsh field reality.
Figure 8.3

**Styles of Supervision**

Figure 19 describes the styles of supervision. There appear to be distinct styles of supervision and different levels of engagement with students and the whole field work experience. Overall there seem to be three levels of engagement in supervision; the first was a basic, following the minimal requirements and a task focus according to the curriculum requirement so one did all that was listed out as generally expected to be done.

The next is a medium level of supervision with an administration structured focus according to the agency expectation so there the cues for work were largely defined by the agency. And the third is an intense individual student focus with a nurturing, creative, self-exploring and self-expression element. They may not be mutually exclusive compartments but more like a focal point around which tasks and supervisory inputs get centred. It was also seen that the agency supervisors do not write comments in the recording files as much as the faculty supervisors. But it is also possible that they are discussing issues, concerns, problems in the regular IC/GCs which were not accessed for this study.

What emerges as constituting a complete recording is if it is able to capture all happenings in the field from an ideation to the execution, to the evaluation and subsequent learning. Another important element is the process aspect of the various stages of on-going learning and the student being able to connect the learnings both to their self and the curriculum. This is what was described as reflective learning, which is a process of interpretive discovery embedded in experiences. Gould and Tayler (1996); Sheppard and Ryan, (2003) discussed this; the central premise of which is that, the idea that knowledge is founded on experience. When recordings are not ‘rich’ one can assume the field work was not intense and the students did not have anything of significance or interesting to write about. Here it is not about the work done or positive experiences but about the challenges and limitations and the related learning and more importantly it is not about proficiency in English language or the
ability to write well but just being able to express oneself because that is an indication of how the student has understood the field and its connection to the curriculum.

Figure 8.4 describes the factors influencing recordings. Recordings can also be influenced by the scope of work available at the agency, the student’s initiatives in field work, their ability and interest to write. All of this is also connected to their interest in field work and social work itself which is primary to this entire learning experience. If a student is clear about the choices they have made with regard to social work and are comfortable with those choices, it has a positive impact on how they engage with field work, what they talk about it and how they write about it. The enthusiasm and interest in the work will reflect in the recordings. The other way is also true where a meaningful field work experience becomes a positive introduction to field work.
Figure 8.5 describes the relationship between the agency and the supervisor. This is an important connection of the discipline and the profession. There are very few NGOs in this sector and usually as a criteria laid out by curricular requirements, field work agencies need a full time social worker present for them to qualify as a placement option. This is to have a role model available for the student to emulate and to learn from, and curriculum learning can be facilitated by those who have been through the program. The problem in some sub-sectors where work needs to be developed is the absence of this social worker. Student field work is sometimes used to explore work in new settings as a way to build inroads into the sector. What this translates into is intense engagement on the part of the supervisor and existing leadership qualities on the part of the student, since it is literally about exploring and opening out the field. A variety of factors influence these new explorations, it could be an individual faculty member’s interest, it could because a student wanted to explore a new issue or it could be that the need or request emerged from the field and the Centre responded by assigning a faculty-student team to respond via field work, as a consequence of a research undertaken for example or as a response to a field request.
The CJS is hostile towards anyone who interacts with it either as accused or on behalf of the accused and this is largely reflected in the attitude of most staff. Officials see a kind of conflict when interacting with social workers and this could be due to an inherent difference in value or it could be that the expectations from each other are opposing since their connection to the client group is from different angles. The system sees people as trouble makers and coming in conflict with them because the nature of behaviour displayed has been against the rules and thus they are not like a common law abiding citizen, which is the reference point. The social worker sees them as citizens and human beings with rights and dignity and they view the crime or deviance as an aberration due to external factors keeping the focus on the individual and his potential. Keeping this background in mind the responsibility of orienting and anchoring the student lies with the supervisor.

The presence of a social worker in the field as part of the agency, in this case mainly in the form of the FAP, makes a difference in terms of how the system responds to students as compared to settings where the social workers are absent. The frustration level of engaging with the CJS can be quite high for anyone working with the system and particularly for students. It helps to have someone to be able to share any negative experiences especially for a sense of support. Due to no social worker being formally a part of this system the onus is on the student and the field contact to demonstrate the need for and scope of social work in these sub-sectors. Though these are adult learners, the system treats them in two distinct ways; first as professionals from whom they expect skills, for example as in counselling clients in the commission. This comes mainly due to the Institute that they represent and that becomes the primary identity; and the fact that they are still learning is forgotten. And the second way is, as if they are just students and the only learning they have to do is through simple observation. People who follow this second belief cannot fathom any inclination by a student to be involved in an activity or their desire to take up a task. Simple observation is equated to learning in the field, so the intensity of what the field work experience is actually conceptualised to be; is lost here. These are adult learners and cognitive theory talks of humans as being explorers who actively select and organise their own knowledge (Donald 2002). Yet it does not seem that all students are able to exercise this kind of choice or experience this kind of learning.
Agency and Sector

Figure 8.6
Relationship between Agency and Sector

Figure 8.6 describes the relationship between agency and sector. Police is resistant to social workers and this may be because of what the social worker stands for. For the social worker the value framework is within rights and entitlements. The entire field of practice is located within or is connected to a closed, legal, bureaucratic, and government framework within which social work is defined. Most CJS settings are closed and restrictive as there is no access for general public otherwise, in the sense that these are not places people commonly go to. In the case of institutions and prisons it is completely closed and out of bounds for general access. Police is mid-way where access is there but largely on a need basis and finally Court, Commission and Rehabilitation, can be accessed if people want to and need to, though the general public hardly does that. The CJS has largely been resistant to the presence of the social worker amongst them. If it is about superficial, temporary activities and programs they seem accepting of it but the CJS has to still internalize the idea of sharing the same power and authority they exercise, with a social worker. The work of FAPs and field work all these years was sustained because of the support of individual officers who believed in the value of this work. Until a place for the social worker is etched in the CJS, most of the work that they do will be seen more as just humouring the system and being
dependent on the good will of individual officers rather than firmly positioning oneself in a professional role and identity. This is not a comment on the years of work and energy already invested by the Centre and FAPs in engaging with the system but a fact that it is now time that the work is formalised in certain ways, such as through advocacy and a series of meetings with decision makers about formalising the presence of the social worker. It is about moving beyond working in individual prisons or specific courts, to working in prison as a system or court as a system.

The mobility and inter-linkages across the sub-sectors is a feature of field work here in this field of practice (refer to chapter V, p 125). The general role of the social worker in the CJS is to be an intermediary between the system and the people in it. In this role the social workers tasks involve giving information, explaining, clarifying, supporting and is positioned as being open and approachable in comparison to the CJS which is intimidating and hostile. The social workers with their pro-people training humanize the CJS. The perception about the CJS among the general public is largely negative, that it is a closed almost invisible system. The general public is not really interested in the CJS and persons being processed in it, are seen as a waste and written off. This same negativity and dismissive attitude rubs off and is internalized by the system and its staff. Another aspect that is unique to the agencies in this sector is the concept of involuntary clients. They do exist in other sectors like in addictions or in mental health settings but many of the client groups belonging to the sector of criminology and justice are involuntary clients and that becomes something that social workers or student social workers need to keep in mind and be trained to deal with.

Employment for student social workers is an issue as there are no clear-cut jobs. FAPs are one source of employment and there are very few NGOs in this sector for reasons of disinterest and lack of resources; and some NGOs are just starting out and so may not be able to employ many people. NGOs are there in the sub-sectors of Prison, Institution. In Rehabilitation NGOs are indirectly working with youth in the community or issue based work in education, health or skill training which they can extend to this population which is otherwise neglected. There is a need to formalise the role of the social worker in Police, Prison and Commission; to strengthen government presence in Rehabilitation; and to explore work in Courts more. Work in Courts (refer to chapter II, p 45) especially internationally has been defined thus that the social worker has an active role to play in the
court case either in terms of some fact finding or recording statements of victims especially children for example. This kind of acceptance needs a policy level intervention and can only happen when changes are made at that level. A recent example in the Indian context is the new legislation Protection of Children against Sexual Offences (POCSO, 2012) where a role of the social worker has been clearly stated in the Act itself in terms of support to the child victim. But then, this is about specific legislations while one is referring to an overall general role that is not limited to any one legislation.

Figure 8.7
How to strengthen work

Documenting the work being done is critical. More research, empirical studies on core areas are required, the dialogue with the CJS needs to be increased, and there is a need to review what the government is doing for rehabilitation. To deal with challenges of the job market means visibility has to be increased and that can again be done by documentation. There is a lack of recognition for this field of practice both internally and externally, by various stakeholders. Overall society is not interested in this group, the CJS is not inclusive of letting others come in to work with this profile of people, the jobs for social workers do not exist, so new students are not motivated to study this subject.

Another relationship of importance is the student and the sector, the question of how students are impacting the sector. This is a valuable contribution and can be seen in many ways, primarily in how student field work opened up some sub sectors of practice so field work itself became a first entry point like it happened in prisons or police. Another way this is
done is within an agency or sub-sector when newer dimensions are opened up like in the form of research studies, new kinds of case interventions, use of networking or refining understanding of some field practices.

III - Learning By Doing

In settings where there is a presence of FAPs or NGOs, the students learn by following the field contact or the social workers. That the field contact is someone to emulate and see in action makes this transition from learner to doer fairly easy for the students otherwise the learning demands additional effort on the part of the student. And in agencies where work is being explored for the first time or in the absence of social workers in the agency the faculty supervisor then plays a key role. In sub-sectors where the presence of social worker is there, like in Institutions and Rehabilitation, the acceptance of students and the responsibility of facilitating student field work was better shouldered.

Many of the agencies in this sector are catering to people’s needs directly and this is a part of the exploration and demonstration of work in this sector; being able to interact with people directly is crucial for field work. It allows a direct engagement for the students thus giving them a first-hand experience and learning is enhanced rather than only through observation or secondary tasks. In agencies that did not have this like the Anti-Narcotic cell or the Human Rights Commission, the field work experience of the students placed there was affected. Strategies used to counter this, suggested by the Faculty supervisors, have been going to other sub-sectors like Courts to identify cases from the anti-narcotic cell or to the community from railway police or doing awareness programs in the community from the human rights commission. Dewey’s (1938) concept of experiential continuum, that is, of a continuity of learning, emphasized as critical the two way interaction between the internal and the external, where the internal is the individual and the external is the surrounding world. Thus having opportunities for direct work, that is, dealing with people themselves gives students an opportunity to experience this interactivity.

It is important to network with NGOs. They represent some aspects of social work practice; as in being the space where social workers are employed to work in a variety of issues. Networking is a way to connect NGOs with the CJS. This was done in the commissions and in the railway police settings. This is a way of sharing resources towards holistic rehabilitation.
Student learning. The students learn to do a variety of tasks across the various sub-sectors. These tasks are a starting point to see what they did in the field and it becomes an important parameter to assess work done in a particular sub-sector. It also forms the foundation of an analysis of many other aspects like scope for social work and role of the social worker. Activities that the students did can be seen in three categories of work; these are: work that is already established, work that is being established, and work that is yet to be established.

The first category of work that is established indicates that social work in these sub-sectors is fairly settled and would include work in Prison, Institutions and Rehabilitation. It seems to be accepted and practiced well in terms of what all the students can do and the potential for social work in those sub-sectors. These settings being institutions, a core focus of this work is direct work with the inmates and having custodial populations gives rise to the need for a certain kind of role of helping them cope with their stay, linking them up to their support systems and giving information about their rights. The second category of work that is still being established indicates some aspects have been demonstrated but more needs to be done, work in Police would come within this category. This indicates that while some areas of work have been demonstrated; like work with women, and children; or in cases of conflicts, non-police matters that come to the police station, and some aspects of community based preventive work; there is a need to thoroughly discuss all areas of focus for a social worker in Police. Work in Court and Commission come into the third category of being at a stage of work still to be established. Time is not the only factor here as work in Courts was being done since much longer than that of work in Commissions. With regard to both Court and Commission, what the social worker can do in these settings needs further conceptualisation, in both of these, there is scope to work with individuals and on issues of access to justice. The system and these settings may have been open to experiments but beyond that, what the social worker can do in these settings needs to be discussed and understood further.

The next important learning for the student was about the role of the social worker and its relevance across the different sub-sectors. The role as a mediator, included elements of listening to people and their narratives, that space of giving people a chance to just talk was very evident; and one realises it is so important in a setting that is otherwise mired with negativity. The other important role was of representing people and in addressing psycho-social issues of persons being processed by the CJS. This role is significant because officials either do not see this as part of their responsibility or are unable to play the role themselves because of other administrative and security based responsibilities. Another reason could be
because of the sheer volume and constant movement of the client group within the CJS; of going for court dates, to being transferred across prisons, to being released on bail and new arrest cases coming in; giving individual attention may not be possible.

Students also learn about dimensions of self; all the challenges and difficult experiences propel reflections and growth at both the personal and professional level. This is one aspect that got documented as students reflected on the day’s happenings regularly. No matter what type or volume of work was happening the student had something to link it to in terms of their learning, that is, their learning was not dependent on the type of work they were able to do in that agency. For students who reflected on their own learning, their thoughts, and changes within themselves through the field work, their field work experience itself was enhanced. It is a critical component of the field work learning and after a point one realises it is not only about the issue or the agency but about how the student is responding to all this. Field work therefore offers the opportunity for reflective learning (Gould and Tayler 1996 and Sheppard and Ryan 2003) where the students, if required, are assisted by the supervisor, to interpret and understand situations (refer to chapter II, pp 18). Some of the factors that enable students to utilise this opportunity, are an interest in social work and field work itself on their part, and a sensitive, experienced supervisor who is able to facilitate this kind of learning.

The next aspect that students learn is being exposed to issues that emerge in work in these sub-sectors. The overbearing nature of bureaucracy in government bodies is evident in the CJS too and who the person is, what their designation is, becomes important and defines the way the system relates to them. Seeing social workers as outsiders coming in to play non-threatening roles of recreation and counselling is fine but if human rights violations and serious issues are raised the system gets defensive and is not willing to engage any more. The role of the social worker is seen between the system and the inmates. It is this thin tightrope that social workers in CJS have to always walk on (Parker, 2006). The social worker here is trying to maintain a link with the society that is rejecting and the person being rejected. (Refer to chapter II, p15)
Student as the Learner

The ideas of Dewey that is, learning through doing, have had a primary influence in the conceptualisation of field work as bridging and integrating the two companions of social work, viz., theory with practice, thereby combining philosophy with methods. Mallick, (2007) reinforces this point very clearly when he states how a unique feature of field work training is that training and practice occur in the same place. Hence, students are not learning about practice, as is the case in classroom instruction but learning in practice.

Learning for a deeper wholesome integration and where the student is an important stakeholder in the field work learning process is explained by Dewey’s theory contributing to constructive learning. The learning is seen as a process in which the learner actively constructs or builds new ideas or concepts based upon current and past knowledge or experience. Constructivist learning, therefore, is a very personal endeavour, whereby internalized concepts, rules and general principles may consequently be applied in a practical real-world context. Also that field work itself can be an intense learning experience influenced by the individual student learner’s personality, past knowledge and experience, so whether they are from a Bachelor’s in Social Work background with or without prior volunteer, internship or work experience in the NGO sector are elements that influence the field work learning experience and this is exactly what social constructivists propose in terms of the learner building new ideas based on what they already know. This study has highlighted within social work in criminology and justice the factors that aid constructivist learning.

Field work has within its format an element of self-directed learning and flexibility thus giving the learner a sense of ownership and stake in the learning process and this is what Lawrence (1993) states as a first requirement for effective learning. This then goes on to reiterate the active role the learner needs to play in the learning process, thus implying that learning is enhanced when the learner is able to engage with the learning environment as a doer rather than a receiver of information and knowledge. ‘Search for self was the major premise of the students’ reflection’. The legacy of individualism, Bleakley (1999) and the learning and teaching goal of social work field education do account for this phenomenon. Influenced by the notion of experiential learning, an explicit objective of social work field education is to allow emerging experience to influence the growing professional self. With
these concepts of ownership and the individualism, the study enables a nuanced understanding of the field work context where the learner is at the center of the experience.

Learning as a contribution to social justice as explained in critical pedagogy, proposed by Giroux (1997) is what field work in social work attempts to do. Giroux states that learning is not about processing received knowledge but actually transforming it as part of more expansive struggle for individual rights and social justice. Exposure to social issues via field work through organisations is a source of learning both personally and professionally and working in this area is done with an underlying understanding of facilitating change for the better, with addressing issues of social justice. Social work and hence social work education has a strong commitment to achieving social justice and Giroux’s definition of critical pedagogy links with this completely. Field work thus is critical pedagogy and the field to classroom to field flow is a significant process of contribution to and knowledge transformation

**Field work as a pedagogy.** Working in this field of practice allows a preview and exposure to the inside of an otherwise formidable CJS. Even though in terms of access, prison is out of bounds for general public and though people can go to Courts and the Police station if they wish to, no one does unless it concerns them in some way. For students training to be social work practitioners, the settings of CJS are great grounds for intense learning, personality development and growth in general. As a learning it is a good experience; as a way to developing the sector; one cannot be sure this work is getting translated into anything bigger or perpetual.

Students while accepting working with the system also disassociate themselves from the inadequacies or wrongs in the system. This view is not peculiar only to any one setting; this seems to be a feeling that is expressed by students across the entire CJS so it is reflecting a feeling about engaging with the system itself. The underlying belief is a strong desire to position oneself within the system and to work with the system but not necessarily identifying with the system and its way of functioning.

Another indication of depth of engagement is when the student has begun to comment on something related to the issue or an existing practice, this application of one’s mind to review is a healthy indication of the student being engaged with the issue in question. Often field work also becomes the place where with the exposure and learning the student is not only
developing an insight about issues but also developing their own point of view and belief system. And for some a deepening of an interest in social work itself takes place. This is what Freire, in his philosophy of education discussed as being able to start from the reality that surrounds the learner. Freire’s conceptualisation of education was that it ought to be based on an awareness of everyday reality experienced by the people and should never be reduced merely to knowledge of letters, words and sentences. This has implications for adult learners and professional programs that have an inherent practice dimension in them like that of a field practicum or field work. This has implications for the supervisors too, in terms of acknowledging the subjectivity the student learner is bringing into the field work experience. Students either come with some past exposure to social work through internships they have done or having volunteered in NGOs, and some come in with no experience at all. Applying Friere’s theory would mean being able to work with both kinds of students easily, as it is about building on their strengths.

The fact that the entire CJS is governed by rules and regulations is something that always comes up in the students’ writings. While it is one thing to study concepts in a classroom, to actually confront them as phenomena in the field can be disturbing and challenging for students. Learning to deal with all of this and yet function in such a setting is what is additionally seen as being of value in the field work experience. Gould and Tayler (1996) and Sheppard and Ryan (2003) explain that when students engaged in fieldwork encounter a disturbing event, it acts as a challenge, the resolution of which provides them with alternative ways to interpret their experience and critically examine their values, ways of acting, and assumptions. The experience of the students fits within the framework of reflective learning. Learning need not always be about positive experiences or successful case handling or having activities and programs achieved or completed. A challenge, an obstacle or a negativity could also become a scope for learning.

While field work is about being exposed to issues as they exist in the field, there is a concern for the supervisors, as to whether this sector of Criminology and Justice and particularly the sub-sector of the Police is largely perceived by the public as being hostile, aggressive and unapproachable. Expecting that students will not get impacted by the dark side of what happens when people are taken into custody, when rights are taken away, when vulnerabilities emerge not only due to a crime link but also due to societal prejudices, is unrealistic. While these experiences are catalysts for learning and facilitate growth in the
student, as they also become opportunities for the student to discuss with the supervisor and for the supervisor to turn it into a critical learning experience, the fact that they are distressing cannot be overlooked. Where the NGO/FAP presence in field work is there by way of field contacts or social workers, it is easier to do a variety of work and learn as compared to where they are not there; the learning in the latter context takes place with a struggle.

Thus what the field teaches students is a real understanding of how the CJS functions, and how laws operate in the field versus an ideal text book situation. It also gets students to confront value conflicts which is an immense source of learning and gets them to literally think on their feet. Field work settings are an introduction to social work and these settings give students an idea of the meaning and challenges in the context of marginalisation of re-entry to society, from either custodial or penal institutions. The experience gives them some insight into systemic problems and what ails the system. All this adds to, and strengthens what they learn in the classroom. Some aspects cannot be taught in the classroom but in the field such as; what it means to be processed by the CJS, how that impacts the dependents and how the legal aid system is experienced by the inmates. The depth of the issues and a nuanced understanding is possible only through field engagement. The field therefore complements the classroom as a space for learning social work. These experiences in the field develop a certain level of maturity in the students and the field hence becomes a significant teacher.

IV-The Centre and Curriculum

The history of the profession and the discipline is intertwined. The students’ recordings and key interviews highlight the fact that field work is largely about working with the system. This seems to be an ideological position that is taken by the Centre and it should be discussed in further detail and more overtly in the curriculum and by the supervisor than it seems to be presently done; which is letting the students come to this realisation over a period of time during the course of field work. This clarity will help students reflect on the positioning and it will give a clearer ground to start work rather than them coming to this understanding by themselves. Ideology is an important construct and one’s understanding of human rights, services, entitlements, justice, dignity influences how people are dealt with by the system and by the social workers. This is to highlight differing views that emerge from the ideology;
if the system is seeing people as if they are being punished then any facilities or services are seen from that lens whereas if they are seen as individuals, citizens, it is with a certain sense of humanity and respect.

It is not clear whose responsibility it is to maintain continuity of work done in field work. This could be with regard to activities initiated and researches done. There is a need to keep track of research studies done by students as a part of their field work, so that other students can refer to it or else they are lost as one off experiences. A certain element of responsibility could be on the Centre and on academicians to open out the field of practice.

Education played an important role in strengthening the profession in the initial years. It was proactive and then grew in different directions, it is now again coming together and re-defining itself. Social work is now realigning itself in a network and bonding through the establishment of the National Network of Schools of Social Work (refer to chapter II, pp 8). Field work is an important component of social work education since it allows for impact through intervention; hence, there is a need to theorise field work so it gives direction to the sector. The profession itself is being challenged, so it needs to look within, and re-align to contemporary realities. There is a need to go beyond the good will of individuals in the system towards a formal objective anchoring of the social worker in the CJS.

Thus CJSW (refer to chapter II, p 45) is an overarching field that contains within it the multiple roles that social workers can play in connection with the criminal justice system with an engagement both in institutions and in the community. This is where the future of this field of practice could be moving towards: facilitating the journey of people out of institutions into communities, facilitation of individuals to reclaim their identity and place in society. The word CJSW, has made an entry into the Centre’s parlance now but it has not been discussed deeply. Nor has a common understanding been built and internalised by all concerned stakeholders. And so the next immediate step could be to initiate the dialogue between academicians, field practitioners and the CJS personnel. This would be useful for a profession that is in a transition phase and a sector that is finally coming of age; and emerging with significant potential to address issues in the present societal context.
**Curriculum.** Inputs about curriculum came from the interviews rather than the recordings; in that sense this was the weakest link as far as students’ field work narratives were concerned. There were a few instances of some reference by students in their recordings, to concepts they have been introduced to in class or attempting to link with a theory in Police, Institutions and Rehabilitation. In Commission, a few suggestions of topics to include in the curriculum as a connection to this sub-sector were made. In Court and Prison, very little was written about the curriculum by the students in the recordings. Work in Rehabilitation, highlighted most substantively the trajectory of the focus of the Centre itself as the history of the Centre itself is closely linked to work in corrections. The beginning of the Centre is thus closely linked to this sub-sector and the role of the social worker first emerged here. Some specific concepts that emerged across all the sub-sectors were power and authority and human rights as a generic overarching concept. The students used them directly and the researcher also found them mentioned in a few narratives as the sub-text. The field contacts were not aware about the contents of the curriculum in spite of belonging to the FAP of the Centre. The most apparent part was that after the curricular re-structuring, the changes made were not fully communicated to the FAP staff. Also they are not formally apprised about researches undertaken by the Centre or what are the Centre’s current thrust areas. A refresher workshop on criminology theories, leading to a discussion of linking it to interventions in particular sub-sectors would help conceptualise and theorise the work they do in the field. This would also be a way to test the application of some of the theories to this context of work.

The social work methods are central to the classroom link because they are an easy starting point and the students are most familiar with this conceptualisation because of the emphasis through courses. It reflects the way the curriculum is structured with the methods being taught separately and the integration of the methods of social work fleetingly mentioned with the belief that the supervisor will anchor that part. This discussion on integration needs to be strengthened in the classroom, or some input to address this needs to be provided, since as of now the methods are taught as separate courses and it is assumed that the integration will take place during field work or by the supervisor. Another dimension is that social work itself is going through a discussion of whether the methods are important, especially the way they currently exist in the curriculum. It is possible that the debate and confusion around this has also influenced the supervisors in terms of how they locate the methods in the work. Other frameworks like feminist social work or anti-oppressive social work or theories like
post-modernism and critical theory are taught and discussed in the classroom but in field work there seems to be no movement away from the methods discussion. Integration of classroom and field learning, when examined with a focus on social work methods, highlights three aspects: firstly, ‘who’ will facilitate it, whether it is the supervisor’s responsibility, the question here is, has everyone understood it and do they all follow it. Secondly, ‘what’ components will be integrated or connected; more discussion and clarity on this conceptualisation is required as being core to social work education and thirdly, ‘where’ is the integration to take place; whether it is to be defined to be in the field, in the classroom, with the supervisor or as a part of the student’s learning journey. If these elements are discussed and set in the pace of learning; it may evolve for every student or else it may be dependent on whether this falls in place and not as a given for all students. There are challenges in this integration too: the debates about whether this interpretation is the only way, and perhaps a serious dialogue on the basis of a curricular development is required.

In practice, each agency has a social issue that it is involved with and a focus area and the experience a student gets via field work is influenced and limited by this. This is similarly true of the social work methods used by the agency and the subsequent exposure the student gets. It could be due to the supervisor’s inputs, the opportunities the agency provides, the comfort, and interest of the student or all of these. Every organisation has identified a way of working for themselves and rightly so. It is possible that the agency is set in its practice of one kind of method but that does not mean the other methods cannot be used there. The fact that the CJS is processing individuals also influences the kind of methods practiced. Within the given time restrictions of field work it is probably not possible for students to focus on all the methods. It is not necessary that every student will get an equal exposure to all methods. Even though the supervisors said that mostly all the methods of social work can be used in any agency, the data shows that there is a trend of what was frequently used.
Table 8.2 describes the social work methods used across the six sub-sectors. It appears that the usage of the methods did not happen automatically or naturally to the students. It was largely facilitated by the Supervisors or by the agency social workers or field contact in terms of tasks to be done. Thus the starting point for the student was always of methods being used as was done in the host agency; the students followed what was commonly practiced by the agency.

There are several schools in Criminology and the curriculum of the Centre has drawn on them (refer to chapter II, pp 32). The diagram below (Figure 8.8) depicts the critical components of the MA Program Course. It has some core social work courses and some core criminology courses, the rest of the courses can be seen as drawing on different schools of Criminology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work Method</th>
<th>Sub-Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with Individuals</td>
<td>Most commonly used in Rehabilitation, Prison and Police, in that order in terms of depth of engagement, to a limited extent it was seen in Courts too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Groups</td>
<td>Most seen in Institutions, Prison and Rehabilitation, where there were custodial populations or the need to converge around a common issue affecting them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Most seen in Commissions, Court, Police and Prison; in some as the main entry point and in some as additional work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare Administration</td>
<td>Largely woven into process recordings. It was written out separately only in the Police sub-sector mainly because the supervisor wanted it in that format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Organisation</td>
<td>Seen in assignments that students did for the course work that required some field based application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Action</td>
<td>Seen in one or two examples of some follow up at policy level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8.8 describes the location of the courses of the social work in criminology and justice curriculum within the different schools of criminology. Criminology has branched into different schools. Referring to the Institute under study, there is a need to see which form the Centre was practicing or believed in. From the Institute’s point of view with its focus on the marginalised and vulnerable; sub-altern criminology is what this draws from, in the way social work itself is conceptualised in the Institute is within the framework of working with the marginalised and representing the voiceless. That is an overall value base of the Institute itself and so work in this sub-sector is influenced by that orientation. From trying to contribute to policy through FAPs, it draws from public criminology. From working with and within the system it draws from governmental or administrative criminology. The course
on contemporary debates draws from radical criminology and the paper on media and culture is about cultural criminology. The general criminology papers are trends and perspectives, victimology and crime prevention and juvenile justice. The social work courses are issues and challenges in CJSW and social work methods in the CJS. The Centre itself defines its program as focusing on social pathology, social construction of crime and violence and issues of crime prevention and access to justice thus there is a strong sociological orientation. Thus it is important to reflect on these different types of Criminology that currently exist within the way the discipline is conceptualised. A clarity of which one to emphasise on, will give direction to the Criminology aspect of the curriculum.

Rehabilitation is about reintegration, reformation and corrections. There is a sociological angle to the way the discipline is conceptualized but work with individuals demands an entirely different focus. If one role of the social worker in the CJS is looking at psychosocial issues then the curriculum should include psycho-social inputs, models or interventions. The aspect of psychology is missing in the curriculum. The theory inputs should be about behaviour change, psychology and human behaviour. That depth of clarity and that kind of alignment somehow does not exist. A generic way of operating we know, it is more like case work and at a superficial level. But to answer the all-famous question of what works in rehabilitation, even after so many years (Fifty years of the Centre, twenty four years of the first FAP) we cannot seem to say for sure. It cannot be only about the external, making available things on the outside which is what it looks like now, the inner work, that is working with the individual and their thoughts, attitudes, values, behaviour and the element of changing things within the person, is the missing link. We cannot talk about rehabilitation of individuals and turn a blind eye to this part. One assumption made is that in field work the field will teach this part which may or may not be happening. There has to be a corresponding curriculum input to nurture this. What theories explain work in each sub-sector and what kind of interventions work best with the related profile of people. This is the next level that collective experience, understanding and imagination has to move into. Until this is not pursued, things will still seem tentative and look more like a trial and error rather than as if work is being done with clarity, knowledge and a sense of purposefulness. While there have been incremental changes made over time, like course reviews, offering new courses and new field work placements, a deeper discussion on specifics needs to be done. And this especially in the context that systematic and active engagement with the CJS is at least two and half decades old now, since the initiation of the first FAP.
The other element that is so closely linked to the sub-sectors is the concept of social stigma. It is inevitable, almost guaranteed to stick to an individual and something that most persons struggle with. On the one hand may be the aspiration was that it acts as a social deterrent to crime and deviance itself but this view is held or applicable only to some sections of persons, as this does not explain the concept of habitual offenders. Or it is possible that it only affects persons with support systems, family and dependents since there is a vulnerability of reputation involved. In spite of being such a crucial component of the CJS, at the curriculum level it is not dealt with in depth, in terms of how the concept exists in society, what is the theorization around it and an academic discussion on what can be done to counter it. The time of trial and error is over, there is a need to clearly state what has worked and what has not and why. Consolidation and understanding of the past will direct work for the future.

In the midst of this situation some tough choices need to be made, like whether one wants to be inside the system or outside. Doing both could be an option but one will have to oversee for congruence as each has its positives and negatives, like becoming a part of the system and behaving like other staff of the system. Various other related doubts emerge, like there being an identity crisis if one works inside the system. And yet there are other professions which work in the system like doctors and teachers visiting prison or institutions. The NGOs who are outside the system may have an independent voice but they may not be strongly established.

From the analysis of the field work recordings of this academic institute it emerged that field work had made a significant impact to the sector. It not only opened up spaces for social work intervention but over the years in doing that it also reached out to many individuals. There is a need for a social worker to look at all CJS related work and to be able to formalise the identity, the social worker has to be a part of the system. There is also a need to do a feasibility study on jobs and employability of social workers in the various sub-sectors of the CJS. Also an impact study on the role and value of the social workers from the system and from the beneficiary’s point of view and a mapping of strategies used pertaining to each sub-sector with related documentation of the skills required for the criminal justice social worker. A deeper analysis of the curriculum to understand the focus on individual based work, the corresponding theories and practices available and the corresponding skill input component for the criminal justice social worker could be done and that may help establish and strengthen this kind of work.
Suggestions for the Centre

Based on the data the followings suggestions could add further add value to field work.

1. One key insight is that field work is largely about working with the system. This seems to be an ideological position that is taken by the Centre and it should be discussed in a little more detail and more overtly in the curriculum and by the supervisor than it seems to be presently done. This is also to have a standard starting point so the students explore field work with this rather than spend the entire field work to arrive at this understanding. Also with the social work methods, it does emerge from the data that there is a comfort in a few of the methods being commonly used and across different sub-sectors. If this information is shared at the beginning it will give students a much clearer perspective and then they can be encouraged to either challenge themselves in a method usage or challenge the agency or the issue.

2. Of the research studies that students do as part of their field work a copy should be submitted to the Centre additionally to keep track of the issue or for continuity of work. This will help document the history of the growth of the field of practice and does not remain at an individual student or supervisor level. A compilation of these and an index of what all has been done should be maintained and later transformed as teaching aids for classroom use. This is a simple way to enhance the practice theory dialogue.

3. Students often initiate a program, intervention and project or do research studies, for example at the Police station a study was done of 10 NGOs working with children to see a connection of the issues and the role of the local police. How do these studies add value to the agency’s work? What happens after the studies are done? Does the agency (in this case the FAP or NGO) carry forward the work done by the students and whose responsibility is this follow up, is it the field contact’s, the supervisor’s or the faculty advisor’s? What aspects of field work are individual to a student (in terms of confidentiality) and what needs to be shared with subsequent students to maintain a continuity of the work? How much of information sharing is acceptable and what will the mode be? As an example a student writes freely, openly with the trust that only the supervisor or at the most the faculty advisor has access to it. It is after all a private documentation. How does one balance an individual learning with the simultaneous onus to develop the field of practice? Clarity on these will
help put in place standard practices with a conscious effort to nurture authentic writing at the individual level and a comprehensive mapping of social work practice at the field level.

The way forward to reduce the gap between the classroom and the field could be in the form of an orientation to CJS before the actual field work begins so that all students have a common minimal understanding of all the sub-sectors. This would cover information about the settings and its procedures and would give all students a common information and skill set no matter which sub-sector or agency they going do their field work in. Another practice that needs to be revived is field work seminars where routinely issues emerging from the field are discussed increasing the scope for praxis. The documentation done by students can become a way of formally adding to academic knowledge. The various forms in which these exist are either as studies done, projects done, interventions tried out, issues identified, case studies, program plans and summary reports. A research project could be initiated to cull out and analyse these writings thus building knowledge in this sector of practice in the Indian context.

**Significance of this study for Social Work**

It appears that Criminology can be seen as a lens that can be applied to many other sectors like health and mental health, work in communities, work in the field of disability or with children. While this is an advantage of it being flexible and hence universally applicable, in terms of an independent identity this can be a disadvantage too. The time has now come to separate focus areas and anchor them within a particular sub-sector. For example work with juveniles in conflict with the law can be seen both within the criminology sector or within the work with children sector or criminalization of poverty can be seen as within the criminology or the work with community sector. Thus what is required is a sorting of these overlaps or grey areas as this is what adds to the confusion of how is it an issue of focus of which sector thus escalating the debate of both the need and role of that particular social worker. If the focus is kept solely on the issue then it will be easy to anchor it. Thus any interface with the CJS or an existing legislation, any need to bring issues within the purview of a law, all of these could be within criminology. And it is not just about rights since a rights framework now permeates social work practice in general, it is not even about disassociating from a welfare service as some part of work will require that for example in terms of post institutional support, or schemes for dependent families or discharged
prisoners aid or sponsorship for children of prisoners. The focus thus seems to be very clearly in three domains

1. Societal level- with regard to prevention of crime and reintegration of offenders and victim support.
2. Institutional Level- with regard to due process and rights.
3. Individual level-with regard to reformation and rehabilitation.

Hence a very important contribution to social work would be to bring more clarity to the discipline and the profession. This is a task that was long over-due and it today’s context when social work itself is undergoing some course correction, that the same should be done with social work in criminology and justice is only logical. This would then set the pace for work in this sector for years to come.

Field Work and Public Criminology

Criminology in India is struggling to establish itself and make itself visible and relevant, Social Work with its own dynamics, adds to the challenge. The one aspect that social work has to its advantage in this complex situation is its inherent application dimension. It has a presence in Probation and Institutions as the Probation officer, in Police as the social worker (refer to chapter II, pp 14), in Commissions as the Counsellor or public relations officer and in the gamut of Rehabilitation as the correctional social worker. Some of these identities are a part of the legal system like Probation officers; some are there in practice like the Counsellors in Commissions, some need to be revived like the welfare officer in Prison, (the prison officer has a dual role of being a correctional officer but they do not seem to be able to go beyond their prison officer duties and role.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Worker Present</th>
<th>Social Worker has indirect presence</th>
<th>Social Worker not present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>•Rehabilitation</td>
<td>•Police ( Special Cell for Women &amp; Children)</td>
<td>•Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•Institution ( Probation Officer/ Superintendent)</td>
<td>•Commission ( Women’s Commission as Counsellor)</td>
<td>•Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>•NGO presence is there</td>
<td>•No NGO presence</td>
<td>•NGO presence is there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.9

Presence of the Social Worker in the Sub-sectors of the CJS
Figure 24 describes the presence of social worker in six sub-sectors of CJS. The entire CJS is about justice to the individual and to society. It seems as if society and the CJS has failed in that role, and has failed people who are victims and offenders, and their families and their worlds. If the foundation of the system is about getting a sense of justice, closure, an opportunity to change; and the core tenet to prevent further crimes and to give people a chance to move on; then this people interface is exactly what social workers are trained to do. In the ethos of this whole construction exists the role of criminal justice social worker but one is not sure if the closed hierarchical system is open to admit its shortcomings and share the platform with a different ideology now. There is a doubt about whether hierarchy will accept participation, whether authority will accept consensus. It is possible; if the common goal is acknowledged to be the individual and society’s good.

The goal of social work in this sector is to focus on client related work; it is to help the marginalised to get access to entitlements, and to humanise the system. The range of tasks that student have done in field work indicate identifying individuals in need and issues that need to be addressed. Field action projects with their focus on using field realities and field based learnings as a premise to contribute to academic knowledge on the one hand, and to advocate for policy change in the other, is a form of Public Criminology being practiced. So also, field work as an exploration of new dimensions of the practice sector. Thus, it is within Public Criminology that the location of field action projects and field work in criminology and justice can be seen, as in taking an idea into the action domain, of moving from the theory into practice or of taking the curriculum to the field of practice. The manner in which the field of practice has been developed and sustained over a period of time, by the Centre; through research, field work and field action; indicates a contribution to and a scope to develop Public Criminology. This can be further enhanced, through documentation and theory building.

Social Work Practice in Criminology and Justice can be located within Public Criminology in its contribution towards public policy, through field action projects and through field work. In the absence of many NGOs in this field of practice, this responsibility is shouldered by the FAPs and field work. And since FAPs and field work are located within education/discipline, it then becomes the discipline’s responsibility to nurture this field of practice. It is these social workers, whether in the system or outside the system that will emerge now to play a significant role. The Criminal Justice Social Worker has come of age. Society and the Criminal Justice System need to notice this and give them the support, recognition and mandate that is rightfully theirs and that they so deserve.
Developing the Field through Field Work

The thesis emerging from the study is that a field of practice can be developed through field work.

Figure 8.10  Developing the Field through Field Work
Figure 8.11

Key Variables in developing a Field through Field Work
Factors affecting Field Work in Social Work in Criminology and Justice and in Social Work

Field work has played a crucial role in the development of the sector and can continue to do so. Academics has to continue to shoulder the responsibility of developing the field. Some sub-sectors like work in rehabilitation, prison and police are ready to be formalised, so advocacy around that could be done. Some sub-sectors like work in court and commission and other new issues need to be further explored. Student field work recordings are not just individual narratives but indigenous documentation of engagement with this sector itself. There is an opportunity now to consolidate and re-define this discipline and this field of practice.
Operational Definitions

Agency: The office where the student is placed for field work.

Type of Setting: Government, FAP or NGO; Institution or Community based.

Field Action Project: an NGO started by the Centre usually as a response to a new emerging issue or to demonstrate social work practice.

NGO: An independent non-government organisation or civil society organization.

Target group: The community or individual who forms the focus of the intervention, whether male or female, adults or children.

Student requirement: Some agencies prefer only male or female students in particular for example, institutions and some others prefer a combination of both for example, Police station.

Issues working on: The range of social work issues that is being focused on by the agencies.

Criminal Justice Social Work (CJSW) Focus: Thematic focus areas drawn from CJSW, Police, Court, Prison, Custodial institutions, Allied Systems, Rehabilitation, Prevention, Advocacy.