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Towards a curriculum in disaster risk reduction from a green social work perspective

Carin Björngren Cuadra and Guðný Björk Eydal

Introduction

The social work curriculum needs serious development to cover disasters. In this chapter, we argue for the systematic inclusion of disaster risk reduction in it. We build upon what green social work (Dominelli, 2012) and other scholars emphasise when demanding the inclusion of environmental issues in social work (Dominelli, 2011; Kemp, 2011; Gray et al., 2013). We suggest that developing disaster risk reduction as embedded in green social work has strong potential to impact on mainstream disaster risk reduction because it strengthens interventions in the very processes that lead to disasters.

Disaster risk reduction in both policy and research (Baez and Becker, 2016) involves the:

practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyse and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards, lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events.

(UNISDR, 2009: 10)

The strength of the construct is its recognition of the ongoing nature of disaster risks and potential to reduce these (ibid). Disaster risk reduction aims to analyse and manage the causal factors of disasters (Rapeli et al., 2017) and respond adequately when risks become manifest in crises, during disasters and in their aftermath. We note that all such tasks are integrated into green social work.

This broad and encompassing approach to disaster risk ties it to transdisciplinary conversations on environmental concerns, making disaster risk reduction a salient aspect of social work’s contribution to sustainable development, ecologically, economically and socially. From a social work perspective, disaster risk reduction addresses socio-ecological risks including global injustices and threats to the environment. Thus, disaster risk reduction can be considered a part of the global sustainability agenda (Chmutina et al., 2015). This agenda leans on the concept of sustainable development understood as meeting ‘the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own’ (World Commission on Environment...
and Development, 1987: 16). As pointed out in this Commission’s Report, the concept of sustainable development implies limitations imposed by the present state of technology and social organisation on environmental resources and the ability of the biosphere to absorb the effects of human activities (ibid).

For this chapter, we draw upon information obtained through a web-based questionnaire sent to the European Schools of Social Work (EASSW) in June 2016. This limits the discussion to the European scene. The project sought to map the extent to which disasters as a topic were covered in the social work curriculum and whether any school had an interest in participating in the possible development of a joint European course.

The questions consequently asked to what extent the schools of social work teach topics connected to disasters. Courses, for example, could be labelled disaster social work, disaster interventions or have alternative names in the area of disasters such as disaster preparedness or disaster management, or green or environmental social work. The questionnaire was distributed via email to all members, 310 in total. After two reminders were sent out, 38 questionnaires were returned, making the response rate 12.2 percent. This low response rate may mirror a low interest in the topic and could imply that member schools chose not to answer the questionnaire as they did not deem themselves affected by the subject. The low response rate can also be ascribed to gaps in the internal communication within respective member schools and the administrative distribution chain, or a heavy workload, a well-known reason for not answering questionnaires.

Based on these findings, we argue and show in Table 43.2 on page 530 that the schools of social work in EASSW do not include much about disaster risk reduction in their curricula. This implies that neither practitioners nor educators can utilise the basic competences in this domain of social work and assume an active role in disaster risk reduction. We will join the call for the better acknowledgement of social workers as vital partners regarding disasters (Alston, 2007; Dominelli, 2012). This plea is based on an appreciation of the general knowledge domain of social work alongside its orientation towards social risks and vulnerability which have always been part of the field of knowledge of social workers (Soliman and Rogge, 2002). Social work involves theoretical and practical field questions regarding processes that create and counteract social vulnerability as well as how social work interventions can be organised and implemented to prevent and reduce social vulnerability (Cuadra et al. 2013). Furthermore, the individuals and communities that primarily pay for the implications of environmental degradation and ecological crisis in terms of the destruction of lives and livelihood (Fotopoulos, 2007; UNDP, 2016) are the same people whom social workers have engaged with traditionally. However, we suggest that to enhance a qualitative engagement in addressing disasters, there is a need for a comprehensive curriculum that is firmly linked to environmental issues in disaster risk reduction and gives social workers a solid knowledge-base for their interventions in disaster settings. As suggested by Kemp (2011: 1200), the base involves a conceptual framework, research and practice. To this knowledge-base green social work adds policy formulation and implementation (Dominelli, 2011, 2012).

The tasks of social workers in times of disasters

Social workers have been recognised as important resources both before disasters in mitigation and preparedness; and after disasters in response and recovery (Desai, 2007; IASSW, 2010; Gillespie and Danso, 2010). This is regardless of the causes of disasters. The focus of social workers in disaster management is usually the local scene, at municipal and community level (Cuadra, 2015). In an international systematic review of the literature, Eydal et al. (2016) with reference to Rapeli (2016) identified 30 different tasks that social workers perform.
In the immediate response phase, their tasks involve outreach services, alongside the identification of victim-survivors and those most exposed to hazards, and referral to relevant services including healthcare. Tasks cover the provision of shelter and housing, water, medicine, food and clothing, and other practical help such as providing channels for information. They also coordinate various actors in civil society and the voluntary sector (Eydal et al. 2016).

In the aftermath of disasters, social work can be involved in the reconstruction of communities and coordination of actors in channelling the distribution of resources. It can also involve the reconstruction of social functions and development of new possibilities for livelihoods alongside supporting victim-survivors in insurance issues (ibid). Other tasks in the aftermath involve psychosocial support to individuals, families and communities to recover from any trauma, bereavement counselling, helplines and contributions to family reunion (ibid). Additionally, social workers have a crucial role in supporting decision-makers and management in advocating for the needs of the most vulnerable people (ibid).

Regardless of their multiple tasks, social workers can play important roles in disaster management and advocacy as identified by Dominelli (2011, 2012), Adamson (2014) and the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR). In line with green social work the latter is particularly keen to promote social worker engagement in disasters (UNISDR, 2015a). UNISDR stresses that the role of social workers in disaster risk reduction is far more than simply helping communities cope with the impacts of events like floods or earthquakes. It also connects to social workers’ engagement in the causes relevant to vulnerable peoples, such as poverty, poor health, housing, environmental challenges or, as occurs frequently, a combination of such factors (ibid). When responding to these, social workers act as a ‘transmission chain’ (ibid) or, as we would put it, adopt a mediating position between policymakers at government levels and various communities. This position can promote unheard voices to broaden the understanding of ‘the human dimensions of environmental issues’ (Kemp 2011: 1200). It also entails a re-examination of the interconnectedness between people, the physical environment and their impact on human well-being (Dominelli, 2012; Kennedy 2016).

The endeavour to strengthen social work’s engagement in disaster risk reduction is underpinned by a global consensus regarding very problematic future scenarios that encompass a growing number of disasters (Manyena, 2011; UNISDR, 2016; UNISDR, 2015b). The numbers of natural disasters, especially climate-related ones, have more than doubled since the 1980s (Munich Re, 2015). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (2014) concurs that a growing number of severe negative events due to climate changes are very likely. Furthermore, the Global Risk Report, places extreme weather events, involuntary migration, and natural disasters (in that order) among the top 10 global risks most likely to occur (World Economic Forum, 2017). Also, the impacts of extreme weather events and natural disasters are ranked high, only topped by weapons of mass destruction and water crises (ibid). It is noteworthy that the risk of failure of climate change mitigation and adaptation are considered interconnected not only to weather events but also to water crises and large-scale involuntary migration. The latter can be due to environmental degradation such as draught as currently in East Africa and Horn of Africa (IOM, 2017) as well as due to warfare, which is currently witnessed in Syria (IOM, 2016). From the European perspective, the highest ranked risks are increasing polarisation and the intensification of national sentiments over large-scale unemployment (World Economic Forum, 2017) that are largely interlinked with involuntary migration.

With this problematic situation encompassing risks that can be framed as socio-ecological, humanity faces a ‘daunting double challenge’ in how to support equitable human development while preserving the bio-physical integrity of Earth systems (Gerst et al., 2013: 123). If humanity
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follows the path of ongoing conventional development, it will transgress more than five out of
seven planetary boundaries by 2025 (ibid). The planetary boundaries are: climate change, ocean
acidification, nitrogen cycle, phosphorus cycle, global freshwater use, change in land use, and rate
of biodiversity loss. Thus, planetary boundaries refer to the safe operating space for humanity
to respect environmental processes that regulate the stability of Earth (ibid). Successfully staying
in Earth’s operating space would require that resource-efficient and renewable technologies are
more equitably distributed global income alongside social and cultural changes (ibid). Green
social work asks social workers to address those issues.

Climate change has been labelled as perhaps the greatest global crisis which humanity has
faced and can result in a global long-term disaster (Chmutina et al., 2015). The problems are
targeted through a large number of legally binding and voluntary international and national
frameworks (Chmutina et al., 2015). However, the current frameworks have not involved any
significant change in basic institutional structures or values (Gerst et al., 2013). These frame-
works have evolved rapidly, and in many cases their focus has shifted from mitigation of present
and anticipated climate change through to reductions in energy consumption to reduce anthropo-
genic greenhouse gas emission, to adaptation (Chmutina et al., 2015) implying that efforts
grounded towards coping with its effects ignore the causes. From the perspective of social work,
the difference between adaptation and mitigation to climate change is interesting. We return to
it later because it bears upon disasters as an area of teaching and what to include in the universi-
ties’ social work curricula.

According to Earth sciences and resilience research, the global situation calls for a re-assess-
ment and change of lifestyle, values, and what is considered to be human well-being on a global
scale as well as the involvement of social agencies and democratic movements (Gerst et al.,
2013). This provides the context for arguing that a social work that addresses disaster risk reduc-
tion with a long-term mitigation approach is necessary. Further, as upheld by green social work
its practice would by definition be rooted in social justice and respect of nature (see Dominelli,
2012).

Resilience as a prerequisite for sustainable development

During the last few decades, there has been a shift in approaches to disasters (Baez and Becker,
2016). This shift, which has been observed internationally (ibid.) involves a change of focus
from reaction to prevention (Manyena et al., 2011), is of interest to social work. It also involves
a transition from disaster management – trained experts dealing with actual events when they
occur, to disaster risk management (Baez and Becker, 2016). The Sendai Framework for Disaster
Risk Reduction 2015–2030 confirms this development (ibid). It widens the scope of the actions
needed in prevention, preparedness, response to and recovery from disasters (Rapeli et al., 2017).
This approach implies new linkages between policy areas. Policy dealing with disasters con-
ects to areas like the environment, and urban and rural development (Dominelli, 2012; Baez
and Becker, 2016). Thus, a firm linkage between disaster risk reduction and both global and
national goals for sustainable development are essential. The approach thus implies that dis-
aster risk reduction is understood with sustainability as an overarching framework (Manyena,
2016), and addresses people’s vulnerabilities alongside their capacities in the long run (Rapeli et
al., 2017). This development suggests that traditional disaster management organisations are no
longer the only ones expected to take an active part. Instead, disaster risk reduction concerns all
sectors of society – private and public actors, business, civil society and communities as well as
households and individuals (Dominelli, 2012; Baez and Becker, 2016).
This shift calls for a wider understanding of how to enhance communication and co-operation between individuals, families, communities, and organisations in the public, private and voluntary sectors (ibid). It demands new knowledge and methods centred on how to enhance the participation of all potential partners (Rowlands, 2013; Danielsson et al., 2015), as also required by green social work (Dominelli, 2012). For us, this shift calls upon social workers not only to act as a ‘transmission chain’ or in mediating and supporting roles, but also to re-examine the interconnectedness between people, their environment and its impact on human well-being (Dominelli, 2012, 2017; Kennedy, 2016). We term this a ‘prodding role’ most needed in exploring important drivers of planetary change and involve economic, social, cultural, institutional, technological and environmental drivers (Gerst et al., 2013).

A concept that intends to grasp this broad approach to disasters is resilience. We see resilience as a goal oriented umbrella concept for disaster risk reduction. It addresses:

the ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management.

(UNISDR, 2009: 24)

In short, resilience highlights an ability to ‘bounce back’ or learn from experiences to ‘bounce forward’ and move on following a disaster (Manyena et al., 2011). As disasters can be a catalyst for change, the ‘bounce forward’ notion encapsulates change processes within the context of new realities brought about by a disaster (ibid). Thus, resilience as a concept implies elements of continuity over time. This has implications for pre- and post-disaster planning, including community continuity recovery planning (ibid). It involves pre-disaster planning that recognises the importance of adjusting to new post-disaster realities (ibid).

However, from our perspective it is important to acknowledge that the concept of resilience has been critiqued extensively (Emilson, 2015) inter alia bases on a concern that continuity might conserve unjust social relations (Dominelli, 2012). Resilience theory has been criticised for being apolitical, building on consensus, neglecting power issues, being abstract, and presented through an engineering perspective (Emilson, 2015). The concept has also been linked to the neoliberal policy agenda (Dominelli, 2012; Joseph, 2013) which gives primacy to de-regulation, marketisation, privatisation and individualisation (Klein, 2007). The latter emphasises the individual’s responsibility and ‘free choice’ (ibid). Interestingly, ‘free choice’ has been castigated for forming a normative base that has facilitated the introduction of resilience as a concept (Bergström, 2016). This element has played out in numerous information campaigns that target individuals and households and urge them to cope during disasters for at least 72 hours (ibid). We return to this point for its bearing upon the role of social workers.

For social workers, these criticisms become relevant when establishing resilience as a concept and engaging in disaster risk reduction in the field. In social work, resilience is most familiar as a concept aiming at individuals and underpinned by psychology and health sciences in constructs such as ‘born survivors’. In the UNISDR. definition, resilience is conceptually understood and applied at many levels. It describes organisations, enterprises, and technological and ecological systems. In the latter sense, the concept addresses nature’s ability to respond to climate changes, albeit slowly. The concept is also applied at an overarching societal level. There, resilience is understood as a societal ability. While disaster risk reduction is understood as a contribution to a resilient society, the resilient society is deemed a prerequisite for sustainable development.
With these criticisms in mind, a major and valuable point about resilience from a social work perspective is that it highlights disaster risk reduction within a broad multi-sectorial and preventive approach. As not only traditional disaster management organisations are involved, it also implies anticipated engagement by individuals, households and communities. The development of resilience is a societal issue (Baez and Becker, 2016). Resilience also captures the interaction between structural and individual prerequisites (Dominelli, 2012). Another point is that the concept’s broad sweep opens up the potential for responding to unknown and complex hazards. Where there is resilience, there is an ability to respond to unpredictable, unexpected and dynamic processes and events (Bergström, 2016). The concept also introduces long-term reflection, over years and generations to come (Sparf, 2016), which in the context of planetary changes is a valuable consideration.

**Social work developing resilience**

Societal resilience is influenced by a range of factors that involving economies, infrastructures, environments, governments and social systems (Eydal et al., 2016). Social services and social work generally aim to increase the resilience of people (Zakour and Gillespie, 2013). Social workers play an important role at the local level in enhancing the resilience of individuals and communities as their competences involve factors that influence resilience, whether to strengthen households’ socio-economic status through income support, education, support of older people in managing a long-lasting heat wave (Eydal et al., 2016) or enhancing service accessibility for those who are functionally impaired.

The everyday strengthening of resilience is highly relevant for disaster situations (Gillespie and Danso, 2010). Everyday resilience constitutes a fundamental prerequisite for disaster resilience. Given the expected engagement by individuals and households, we want to underline that social workers can perform mediating and supporting roles in relation to those who cannot fulfil current expectations about taking an active part in disaster management (Cuadra, 2017). Another contribution to overall societal resilience are social workers’ disaster preparedness activities and service continuity planning in their own organisation to uphold societal functions (Cuadra, 2017). Competence to interact with policymakers at governing levels adds to their contribution to societal resilience. The value in this latter engagement lies in the knowledge created through social workers’ encounters with individuals and communities.

The identified tasks and contributions to disaster risk reduction and resilience that have been discussed thus far represent a short-term perspective that addresses disasters, when and if, they occur and during their aftermath. The problematic future scenarios that we outlined earlier require engagement through a long-term mitigating approach. Therefore, simply preparing for and responding to disasters through short-term strategies and practices are insufficient. Social workers need to do more, given the current perilous state of planet Earth, a concern of green social work (Dominelli, 2012).

When it comes to climate change, complementary strategies that mitigate current development through energy consumption and greenhouse gas emission reductions need to be applied over the next few decades (IPCC, 2014). As stated by the IPCC, without mitigation efforts beyond those in place today, and even with adaptation, global warming by the end of the 21st century will lead from high to very high risk of severe, widespread and irreversible impacts globally (ibid.). Dominelli (2012) has argued that successful management of environmental crises and climate change require social workers to address structural inequalities, socio-economic
disparities and resource distribution, patterns of consumption and production as well as the use of resources which also includes the utilisation of plants, animals and the physical environment. These form part of the Green Social Work Model that addresses the interactions between people (humans) and their environments within socio-ecological systems. Green social work contributes to developing resilience in socio-ecological systems as well as people and communities (Dominelli, 2012). For disasters, this involves a long-term mitigating approach based on analysing and addressing the causal factors of disasters connected to climate change and other environmental crises. This constitutes part of the disaster risk reduction initiatives supported by green social workers.

Against this background, we have underlined the ‘daunting double challenge’ (Gerst et al., 2013: 124) involving equitable human development while preserving the bio-physical integrity of Earth. For our suggestion regarding the involvement of social workers, we return to our initial interest in mapping the extent to which disaster interventions are included in the curriculum. We supplement this interest with our understanding of the different emphases that come to the fore in schools’ accounts of disasters as an area of teaching.

Getting an overview

The questionnaires EASSW sent to the European schools of social work raised questions about both current curriculum content and willingness to take part in developing a joint European course. These asked whether disasters were covered within a specific course or integrated into overarching subjects, the level of the courses, and if these were elective or compulsory. We will now present the results, though with a caution about the low response rate that limits the generalisability of the conclusions, but which leaves room for suggestions.

Among the 38 schools that responded the questionnaires, five stated that they had no interest in the subject. Out of the remaining 33 schools, 17 expressed an interest to take an active part in developing a joint course. However, as illustrated in Figure 43.1, only nine of the interested schools currently include disasters in the curriculum.

![Figure 43.1](https://example.com/figure43.1.png)

**Figure 43.1** Overview of the responses and interest in developing the topic of disasters in a joint European course
Towards a green social work curriculum

The total number of current courses is higher because schools that expressed that they could not take an active part in a joint course, but still supported the idea, accounted for some of these courses. Their total number is 24 (Table 43.1).

As can be read from the Table 43.1, there are courses dealing with disasters being taught both at non-graduate and graduate levels, and there are both non-elective and elective courses. Further, the topics of disaster are covered both by being integrated in a course within an overarching subject, and in courses dedicated specifically to disasters. The balance between these two pedagogical approaches (integrated or specialist) is fairly even. Practitioners (i.e. persons with or without qualifying degrees active in social work) are also targeted to some extent. According to this mapping there are currently two PhD courses that cover disasters.

Table 43.2 gives an overview of the courses. In the categorisation of the courses we relate to the four phases of disasters – mitigation, preparation, response and recovery (Quarantelli 1997; Alexander, 2015), though questionnaire participants have not covered preparation in their replies. The courses whose overarching subject provides room for dealing with the topics of disasters regardless of the phase are put in a group which we call General. In this group, there are courses introducing fundamental concepts in social work and courses introducing international perspectives. While dealing with the general competences of social work, the content of General courses includes topics about disasters, but it is impossible to tell to what extent coverage occurs based on the responses received.

The next identified group deals with the Mitigation of disasters as the perspective of long-term prevention. Only one of the schools of social work that answered the questionnaire gave a course covering this subject. In this case, it is a course dedicated to social work and sustainable development.

We call the next group Response. Judging by their names, we placed courses and topics that dealt with immediate responses in times of disasters in this group. This included courses such as social work in emergencies and extreme events, as well as crises interventions. In the Response group there were also courses that addressed grief and psychological first aid, trauma, and post-disaster trauma. This latter theme can also be considered an aspect of the subsequent phase, recovery. This phase gave name to the last identified group, Recovery. Here, there was one specialist course dealing with social work with children and families in the aftermath of disasters (Table 43.2).
Some observations

This chapter approaches an issue that might be helpful to the future development of the social work curriculum. In this we join forces with scholars whose endeavours preceded us (see Gray et al., 2013). However, our underlying research suffers from considerable weaknesses. Its limitations include a small group of respondents and material that does not cover the syllabus for each course. Bearing these cautions in mind, we want to share some observations.

The first observation concerns the low number of courses currently dealing with disasters. Second, only one course covers disasters with sustainability as an overarching framework. This implies that the course addresses environmental issues. A third observation concerns a certain bias towards the response phase. Fourth, the individual level seems to be the most common level of intervention. This is the level targeted by courses we classified as pertaining to the response and the recovery phases, namely social work in the aftermath of disasters. This neglects other levels that involve community and structural matters.

Taken together, the observations indicate that current curricula among schools of social work in Europe do not engage much with disasters regardless of phase. This indicates a need for the development of a social work curriculum in disaster risk reduction. Although such development...
can benefit from existing engagement with interventions at the individual level in the response phase, these would need a broadening of approaches to cover all phases of disasters, and long-term mitigation.

Closing up: towards a critical curriculum in disaster risk reduction

The roles of social work that are given primacy according to this mapping exercise are indeed very important in relation to social workers’ engagement in disasters. The importance of targeting individuals who have been victim–survivors of a disaster crisis, resonates with Pyles (2007: 321) who points out that ‘social work has been less involved in rebuilding and community development than in traumatic stress intervention and the coordination of relief efforts’. This tendency might mirror a certain tension between the importance of working on the individual level with psychosocial support and counselling, and emphasising community work that has been observed in the literature (Pyles, 2007; Dominelli, 2012; Rowlands, 2013). Such tension is a recurring theme in the history and traditions of social work (Cuadra, 2015) and is unproductive. Both orientations and their respective competencies are equally important in the daily practices of social workers. And as green social work emphasises, both are necessary in all disasters (Dominelli, 2012).

Social services and social work in various countries have played extensive and important roles in disasters. Their involvement could become larger if the full potential of social work were applied pre- and post-disasters and across the multiplicity of roles that they can assume (Dominelli, 2012; Rapeli et al., 2017). A comprehensive approach would enhance the resilience of individuals, communities and societies as it engages with the interface between structural and individual prerequisites (Dominelli, 2012).

We suggest a curriculum based on green social work that covers all phases of disasters: mitigation, preparation, response and recovery, and reconstruction, for its content and learning outcomes. We argue that social work’s contribution to disaster risk reduction needs to encompass a strong long-term preventive perspective and develop resilience in social-ecological systems besides being engaged in the other phases of disasters. Rooted in social justice and respecting nature, a social work that addresses the interaction between people and environment in social-ecological systems prepares it to assume the transformative approach necessary to address, re-assess, and change lifestyles, values, and human well-being (Gerst et al., 2013). In short, the development of a disaster risk reduction curriculum should be embedded in the venture of green social work.

We are not positioned to outline a complete curriculum but can make an input that keeps the perilous state of Earth in mind. As suggested by Kemp (2011), a curriculum on environmental issues needs to involve giving the students both conceptual frameworks and knowledge-based practice. As the state of planet Earth calls for a re-assessment and change in human lifestyles, values, and well-being (Gerst et al., 2013), the curriculum has to include issues on energy usage, patterns of consumption, and production alongside the use and distribution of resources (Dominelli, 2012). A social work curriculum could engage all those involved in a transdisciplinary exploration of alternative production forms on the borders of capitalist, industrial mass-production together with the commons that promote sharing and collaboration (Sera-valli, 2014). Such engagement implies conceptualisation of the involvement of social agencies and democratic movements as enacted in community work. This can provide opportunities for community-led, renewable forms of energy consumption and sustainable development that can drive local economies in new directions and enhance community resilience (Dominelli, 2012, 2017).
The curriculum could also engage with urban and rural development at local, national and international levels, underpinned by locally grounded knowledges and experiences. This competence requires conceptual frameworks and practice for interventions including advocacy and mobilisation aiming at policy-level changes leading to structural development. In this venture, the student would need conceptual tools to explore the drivers of planetary change (Gerst et al., 2013), the processes that lead to disasters and leave room to develop collaborative transdisciplinary practices.

Developing such a curriculum might be easier said than done. Social workers are optimally positioned to respond to the human implications of environmental change (Kemp 2011), their existing competences could facilitate this being done. But, it would take a widening of the understanding of the person-in-the environment to include concerns for the physical environment and ensure that social and environmental justice become integral to any environmental involvement by social workers (Dominelli, 2012, 2017).
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