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| HELSINKI STATEMENT ON SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE RESEARCH[[1]](#footnote-1)  **I. Background on the International Network on Social Work Practice Research**[[2]](#footnote-2)  In 2008, a group of international social work researchers met in Salisbury (UK) to explore the nature of practice research in social work. They developed some preliminary consensus that became known as the Salisbury Statement on Practice Research2.  The Statement arose from a concern that the contemporary emphasis on evidence-based practice was not adequately addressing the complexities of social work practice and the tools for improving practice. Social work and its clients might therefore be better served if we gave a stronger emphasis to practice priorities and to more active engagement with practitioners as researchers.  This is reflected in the description of practice research:  Practice research involves curiosity about practice. It is about identifying  (effective) and promising ways in which to help people; and it is about  challenging troubling practice through the critical examination of practice and  the development of new ideas in the light of experience. It recognizes that this is best done by practitioners in partnership with researchers, where (researchers) have as much, if not more, to learn from practitioners as practitioners have to learn from researchers. It is an inclusive approach to professional knowledge that is concerned with understanding the complexity of practice alongside the commitment to empower (practitioners) and (address) social justice (issues), through practice. Practice research involves the generation of knowledge of direct relevance to professional practice and therefore will normally involve knowledge generated directly from practice itself in a grounded way. (Salisbury Statement on Practice Research in Social Work, 2011, p. 5).  Since 2008, there have been many changes in the practice of social work and social work research, and in the social structures underpinning social welfare. In 2012, a group of social work researchers met in Helsinki to re-examine the developments in practice research and update the Salisbury Statement.  The changing landscape of practice research  Practitioners and researchers share a common interest in finding ways to improve social work practice. This process involves an ongoing search for better and more effective ways of helping people through the design and delivery of effective social services. While there is little doubt that some areas of practice need improvement, it is also clear that research can play a role in identifying ways of improving practice. This process is particularly challenging given social workers work with extremely vulnerable and powerless people, whether they are children in need of protection, adults with learning difficulties or older people at risk of mistreatment.  This is the context in which evidence-based policy and practice appeared to offer the hope of greater certainty about what works, but this has rarely been delivered. In many areas, we do not have the volume or the quality of research to know conclusively what is effective.  The financial crisis that has engulfed many Western welfare states has reduced expenditure on services and on research. Thus, at a time when it becomes even more important to know what is effective (because we have less money to spend), we have less research to inform these decisions. We need relevant knowledge for better practice in complex and uncertain situations. This reality reinforces the need to tap into the experience and expertise held by practitioners about priorities for research and about the best ways that research can improve practice. For example, the development of ‘data-mining’ has shown how practitioners can use routinely collected practice information to improve practice.  Another development since 2008 is that the number of studies of practice research initiatives has significantly increased. Studies have shown the changing relationship between university and practice-based research call for raising the standards related to practice research. Studies of Nordic practice research explore the range of relationships between research and practice, and studies in North America reinforce the need for organisational supports for research-minded professionals.  In Finland research on the development of national policy and organizational  structures to support practice research has identified four models of practice research: the practitioner-oriented, the method oriented, the democratic and the generative model (*Practice Research in Nordic Social Work*). The common goal in all the models is to bridge the gap between research and practice.  These development call for increased understanding of the range of activities within practice research as well as theory that can inform and practice that can inform theory. At the same time we need to include ongoing analysis of changing welfare structures and economics in order to effectively promote practice research within the context of scarce resources.[[3]](#footnote-3)  **II. Evolving Philosophies and Methodologies of Practice Research**  Practice research is not a specific research method but rather a meeting point between practice and research that needs to be negotiated every time and everywhere it is established. In essence, practitioners are not going to become researchers, nor will researchers become practitioners. What is critical and interesting is the exchange of perspectives.  The theoretical and methodological framework for practice research calls for flexible and collaborative structures and organisations. Therefore practice research cannot be captured by a single philosophy or methodology, but need to evolve its own philosophies and methodologies for defining practised-based knowledge within the context of supportive and flexible organizations. There are at least two approaches that can be used to address this challenge; namely, the ‘Science of the concrete’ and ‘Mode 2 knowledge production’[[4]](#footnote-4).  The science of the concrete can be described as a pragmatic, variable and contextdependent science comprised of the following key elements:   * getting close to reality (the research is conducted close to the phenomenon studied), * emphasizing little things (research studies the major in the minor), * looking at practical activities and knowledge in everyday situations * studying concrete cases and contexts (research methodology is context dependent), * joining agency and structure (the focus is on both actor and structural level) and * dialoguing with a polyphony of voices (the research is dialogical with no voice claiming final authority)   The science of the concrete includes dialogue with those who are studied, with other researchers, and with decision-makers as well as with other central actors in the field. In contrast to the traditional research approaches guided only by academic norms, practice research using both practitioner and researcher frameworks are discussed and evaluated by a number of partners, including lay people. This process takes place in public spheres and involves an interaction between many actors, each of whom represents different interests and contributes a variety of competences and attitudes.  Mode 2 knowledge production is based on interactions between many actors, each and every one of whom represents different interests and contributes a variety of competences and attitudes. It is characterized by a collaboration-oriented structure and network as well as in an environment of organizational flexibility. Within mode 2 knowledge production are multiple and different expectations about knowledge development as well as research design and data analysis. Instead of focusing on possible conflicts between different stakeholders, mode 2 knowledge production seeks collaboration among those with different needs and interests where all partners agree to engage in ongoing reflection on differences.  **Practice Research as a negotiated understanding**  Social work practice deals with relationships, interactions and reciprocity. Practice research deals with the relationship between research methods and related theories and the nature of social work practice. Practice research, thus, reflects the relationship and interactions between researchers and professionals as well as the relationship between research and service users. Practice research is relational by its very nature and knowledge development is something that comes about after practice, action and experience.  Based on an understanding of science of the concrete and mode 2 knowledge  production, practice research can be defined as:  I. Focused on:  • a critical research that describes, analyses and develops practice;  • a process where curiosity, critical reflection and critical thinking from both researchers, practitioners and users are in focus;  • a close, binding, committed and locally based collaboration between researcher/research settings and practitioner/practice settings in the planning, generating and disseminating of research;  • a participatory and dialogue-based research process relevant for developing practice and validating different expertise within the partnership;  II. Using a methodology that represents:  • research based on academic standards, and encouraging explorative and emancipatory approaches;  • research built on experience, knowledge and needs within social work practice;  • research where findings are interpreted and disseminated through dialogue with practice and reflecting learning processes in practice;  • research that, within a social work context address concrete and pragmatic issues.  • both empirical studies as well as theoretical studies that challenge practice in new ways.  Both research and practice share responsibilities for defining the issues to be explored and interpreting the results. Everyone (researchers, practitioners and service users) brings experience and expertise to the knowledge production, dissemination and utilization processes based on a negotiated understanding that each partner has something to contribute and that each partner has an important role to play in the collaborative process.  **III. Practice Research and the Goal of Robust Research**  The theme of the 2012 conference included reference to creating ‘robust’ practice research and the conference papers gave considerable attention to what ‘robust’ might mean in practice research. The concept of robust research needs to be understood within the context of social work practice that involves ever more ambitious agendas, increasing numbers of actors and stakeholders, and more complex processes of change. It is crucial to perceive the nature of social work practice as shaped by context and structural conditions as well as shaping itself and its surrounding conditions. Practice research that seeks to generate socially relevant knowledge needs to reflect this context.  Social work practices are historically formed and shaped by the mission and values of the institutions in which they are located as well as the social policies impacting the organizations. Practices are complex and undergoing constant change and therefore practice research need to reflect these complexities and their impact on practice in order to study and understand them. It is however not just a question of studying how things have evolved or how they work, but also how services can be improved and under what conditions as well as how changes affect the composition of actors and their networks.  Since practice research involves ‘the science of the concrete’, this context-sensitive approach can be considered a precondition for socially robust knowledge production. It combines an interest in describing, explaining and theorizing about practice by using knowledge as a means of improving practice and by testing and exploring new ways of working. Thus, we ensure that the outcomes are relevant in and for practice while at the same time engaging in knowledge development.  Socially robust knowledge is a central element in Mode 2 science where knowledge production calls for moving beyond questions of effectiveness by focusing on the relational dimension of socially robust knowledge where reflexive analysis and deliberation about values and interests address praxis and thereby promote value rationality over epistemic rationality in order to produce knowledge that matters.  The concept of robustness emphasizes not only the research process but also the practice context, cultural differences, and the changes that knowledge production facilitates when findings are disseminated through dialogue with practice in order to reflect a learning processes. Achieving social robustness in practice research may include:   * Negotiations throughout the research process * Incorporating the dissemination elements into the research strategy * Taking into account the embedded values and emotional and political dimensions * Being strategic about choosing collaborative partners * Validating the outcomed in large and external networks   One of the critical issues is to identify possible actors or stakeholders ready to invest in common practice opportunities and possibilities and/or themes. This process involves deliberately inviting different actors to participate and encourage debate from the outset.  **IV. Building on the Past to Explore the Future**  This Helsinki Statement represents an innovative process of capturing the highlights of previous international conferences in order to provide a foundation for the 3rd international conference in 2014 in New York City (USA). In its four short years of existence (2008-2012), a talented and farsighted group of social work practitioners and researchers have laid a new foundation for practice-based research that is rooted in the everyday experiences of social workers and those they serve. The Helsinki Conference in May 2012 provided an important venue in a Pre-Conference format for featuring the work of those engaged in practice research at the Mathilda Wrede Institute for Social Work Practice Research (Swedish) and Heikki Waris Institute for Social Work Practice Research (Finnish) – both affiliated with the Helsinki Department of Social Services and the University of Helsinki. Visits to the Institutes provided opportunities to demonstrate the involvement of service providers and user in the design and implementation of research projects as well as the role of social work research faculty located at local universities.  The theme of the overall Helsinki Conference focused on the process of generating more “robust” research that parallels and augments the rigor and practice utility of other more academically-based models of social work research. In this regard, it featured the contribution of Epstein’s approach to “mining” existing administrative and case record data routinely found in social service organizations. In addition, the conference gave attention to how practice research might be “framed” within the theoretical context of Cultural Historical Activity Theory (CHAT) associated with the pioneering research of Engeström at Helsinki University. Energized by those provocative approaches, the conference moved forward the philosophy and methodology of practice research, raising new issues about how theory informs practice and practice informs theory.  This Helsinki Statement is designed to provide some guidance in the planning of the 3rd International Conference on Social Work Practice Research in 2014. Several themes emerged from the Helsinki Conference that would benefit from further attention and analysis. Some of the major themes include:  I. Engaging a wider audience of interested practitioners and researchers around the relevance of social work practice research related to:  • Deliberating public policy; how do findings from practice research get translated into new, more service user relevant policies and practices?  • Deliberating the changing context of practice; how could practice research inform the impact of merging health and social services in numerous governmental locales around the world?  • Integrating senior management in order to develop the necessary organizational supports for social work practice research;  • Inviting other research colleagues to adopt a trans-disciplinary approach to the dissemination and utilization of social work practice research; what are some of the best ways of disseminating social work practice research through a multi-actor approach?  II. Engaging a wider audience of social work educators and researchers regarding the role of social work practice research methodology in the educating of future practitioners related to:  • expanding the domain of social work practice research to actively include service users and engage in inter-disciplinary dialogue about the connections  to survivor research carried out primarily by service users  • engaging in the process of transforming practice questions into practice research questions through the active use of critical reflection and critical thinking (educating the future research-minded practitioner)  • engaging researchers in the exploration of applied research methodologies in order to locate them within the domain of social work practice research | **社會工作實務研究-赫爾辛基宣言1**  **一、背景:社會工作實務研究的國際網絡**2  2008年，一群國際社會工作的研究人員聚集在索利斯堡（英國）探索社會工作實務研究的本質。他們發展出一些初步的共識，後來被稱為索利斯堡實務研究宣言。  該宣言的研擬，肇因於當代所強調之實證為基礎的實務工作(evidence-based practice)，並無法恰當的說明社會工作實務工作的複雜性和改善實務工作的方法。若我們能更強調實務的優先性，以及使研究人員與實務工作者有更多更積極的交流，社會工作與其服務使用者可能因此而到更好的服務。  這反映在實務研究的定義中：  實務研究發自對實務工作的好奇心。為了確認好的且有盼望的助人方法；它透過對實務工作的嚴格檢驗和從過去的經驗反射出新的理念，挑戰不良的實務工作。我們認為實務研究最好由實務工作者與研究人員合作進行，後者應盡可能地向實務工作者學習，實務工作者也可以向研究者學習。實務研究是透過包容性方法探索專業知識，以實務工作，理解其複雜性，搭配促權的承諾，以實現社會正義。實務研究包括專業實務工作相關的知識產生，因此通常會涉及從實務本身直接產生的扎根知識。（社會工作的實務研究：索利斯堡宣言，2011年，第5頁）。  自2008年以來，在社會工作與社會工作研究的實踐上，以及支撐社會福利的社會結構已經有許多變化。2012年，一群社會工作的研究者聚集在赫爾辛基，重新審視在實務研究的發展和更新索利斯堡宣言。  **形勢不斷變化的實務研究**  實務工作者與研究者有共同的興趣，都會想辦法來改善社會工作的實務。這個過程透過設計和輸送有效率的社會服務，以尋求更好，更有效地助人方法。毫無疑問實務工作上有些地方需要改進，而也很清楚我們可以藉研究找出改進的實務工作的方式。進行社工實務研究的過程是特別具有挑戰的，因為社工往往服務於弱勢的人群，包括需要保護的兒童、有學習障礙的成人、或遭受虐待的老人。  在以實證為基礎的政策和實務脈絡中，我們知道某些作法的已經有更明確的把握，但這些作法很少實踐出來。在許多領域中，我們沒有足夠質量的研究可以知道什麼作法是決定有效的。  席捲許多西方福利國家的金融危機已經造成服務和研究經費的縮減。因此，此刻知道什麼是有效的就更重要了（因為我們可以使用的錢更少了），我們也越來越不能用研究來幫助決策。在複雜和不確定的情況下，我們需要更好地相關的實務知識。這個現實情況強化一種需求，就是我們必須從實務工作者的經驗與專業知識中得知何為研究的重點，以及如何透過研究改善實務。舉例來說，「資料探勘(data-mining)」的​​發展呈現出實務工作者可以如何透過使用定期收集的業務資料來改善實務。  自2008年以來的另一項發展是，實務研究的數量顯著增加。許多研究表明，學界和以實務為基礎的研究(practice-based research)之間關係的變化，呼籲提高實務研究的相關標準。北歐的實務研究探討研究和實務之間的關係，在北美的研究則強調，必須為具備研究意識的專業者提供組織性的支持。  芬蘭的研究，探討以國家政策和組織結構來支持實務研究的發展，已找出實務研究的四種模式：以實務工作者為導向、方法為導向、民主模式與生成模型（*北歐社會工作的實務研究*(*Practice Research in Nordic Social Work*)）。在所有模型的共同目標是彌合研究和實務之間的差距。  這些發展呼籲我們增加對實務研究各類活動的進一步了解，以及可以實務和理論之間可以如何互相充實。同時，我們也需要對繼續改變中的福利結構和福利經濟進行分析，以便在資源缺乏的脈絡中，有效地推動實務研究。3  **二、實務研究之哲學和方法論的演化**  實務研究不是一個特定的研究方法，而是實務和研究之間的交匯點，並且每次試圖建立這樣的交匯點時都需要雙方進行協商。本質上，實務工作者不會變成研究人員，研究人員也不會變成實務工作者。重要和有趣的是觀點的交流。  實務研究的理論和方法架構需要靈活和協調的結構和組織。因此實務研究無法由一個單一的理念或方法所描繪，反而需要在一個充滿支持和彈性的組織脈絡下，生發出自己的理念和方法來定義以實務為基礎的知識。至少有兩種方法可以用來解決這項挑戰的;即「具體性科學(Science of the concrete)」和「第二模式的知識生產(Mode 2 knowledge production)」。4  具體性科學可謂是務實，多變化和脈絡相關的科學，包括下列基本元素：   * 貼近現實（貼近調查現象的研究）， * 強調​​小事情（研究小細節中的大學問）， * 在日常生活中尋找實務的活動和知識 * 研究具體的個案與脈絡（研究方法是與脈絡習習相關的）， * 加入行動者和結構（同時著重於行動者層次和結構層次）和 * 與多元聲音對話（研究是對話的，沒有人可以聲稱擁有最終決定權）   具體性科學包括與被研究者對話，與其他研究者的對話，並與政策制定者以及與田野中的其他核心行動者對話。相較於只靠學術規範引導的傳統研究方法，實務研究同時包含實務工作者和研究者的觀點，透過與一群夥伴一起討論評估，包括常民。這一過程發生在公共領域，並涉及許多行​​動者之間的互動，每個人都代表不同的利益，並且提供各種專長和態度。  第二模式的知識生產是基於許多行​​動者之間的互動，每個人都代表不同的利益，並且提供各種專長和態度。它的特點是一個合作導向的結構和網絡，以及有組織彈性的環境。在第二模式的知識生產中，重要的是關於知識發展以及研究設計和資料分析，多重且不同的期望。相反，專注於不同利害關係人之間可能存在的衝突，第二模式的知識生產尋求需求和利益不同者之間的合作，所有的合作者都同意在參與過程中持續反思彼此的差異。  **實務研究作為一種協商的知識**  社會工作的實務是在處理的關係，互動和互惠性。實務研究牽涉到研究方法、相關理論，和社會工作實務的性質之間的關係。因此，實務研究反映了研究者和專業工作者之間的關係和互動，以及研究者和服務使用者之間的關係。實務研究就其本質來說是相對的，其知識發展自實務，行動和經驗。  基於對具體性科學和第二模式知識生產的理解，實務研究可以被定義為：  （一）、聚焦於：  \*描述、分析和發展實務的批判研究;  \*一個從研究者、實務工作者和服務使用者的好奇心出發，以批判性反思和批判性思維為焦點過程；  \*一個親密的、聯合的和在地的合作，並以研究人員/研究環境和實務工作者/在實務情境中規劃，產生和播散研究為基礎;  \*以參與和對話為基礎的研究過程，並與發展的實務和驗證夥伴關係中的不同專長有關;  （二）、使用以下的方法論：  \*以學術標準為基礎的研究，並鼓勵探索性和解放性的取徑;  \*建立在經驗，知識和社會工作實務中之需求的研究;  \*將研究發現透過與實務的對話，以及對實務中學習過程的反思，進行詮釋與推廣;  \*在社會工作脈絡中強調具體和務實議題的研究。  \*同時以實證研究和理論研究，以新的方式挑戰的實務工作。  研究和實務兩者都有責任界定需要加以探討的問題，並且解釋結果。每個人（研究者，實務工作者和服務使用者）透過一種彼此妥協的理解為基礎－即每個夥伴都可以有一些貢獻，並每個夥伴在合作的過程中都發揮重要的作用，然後在這樣的基礎上，每個人貢獻自己的經驗和專長到知識生產、推廣和利用的過程，  **三、實務研究和厚實研究的目標**  2012年會議的主題包括創建「厚實」(robust)實務研究的參考資料，且會議上發表的諸論文也相當注意在實務研究中「厚實」的意義為何。厚實研究(robust research)的概念必須在社會工作實務的脈絡下理解，這脈絡包括許多雄心勃勃的議題，更多行動者和利害關係​​者的參與，更複雜的改變過程。認識到社會工作實務的性質是被脈絡和結構狀況塑造的，以及社工實務也塑造其自身與周圍條件，是一個非常重要的認知。旨在創造與社會有關知識的實務研究，需要反思這樣的脈絡。  歷史上，社會工作實務的是由其所在的機構之使命與價值觀，以及影響組織的社會政策所形塑。實務工作是複雜的，且經歷不斷的變化，因此實務研究需要反映出這些複雜性及其對實務的影響，才能研究和了解它們。因此，這絕不僅是的研究事物的演變，或者如何進行，且包括服務可以如何得到改善，在什麼條件下，以及這些改變如何影響行動者的組成和他們的網絡。  由於實務研究涉及「具體性科學」，這種脈絡－敏感的方法可以被視為社會厚實型知識生產的一個先決條件。它結合了描述、解釋和理論化實務工作的興趣，使用知識作為提升實務的一種手段，並透過測試和探索新的工​​作方式。因此，我們確信研究的結果是相關的且為著實務的，並且同時從事知識發展。  社會厚實型知識是第二模式科學的核心要素，知識生產要求超越有效性的問題，而將重點放在社會厚實型知識的關係性層面上，即對價值觀和利益的反思分析和考量強調實踐，從而倡導價值理性(value rationality)勝於認知理性(epistemic rationality)，以便生產重要的知識。  厚實性的概念，強調的不僅是研究過程，也包含實務脈絡、文化的差異，以及知識生產所促進的改變：透過與實務的對話，反映一個學習的歷程，從而將研究發現推廣開來。在實務研究中實現社會厚實性，可包括下列內容：   * 整個研究過程的種種協商 * 整合傳播元素到研究策略中 * 將鑲嵌的價值觀及情感和政治層面考慮進來 * 策略性的選擇合作夥伴 * 在大型和外部網絡中驗證研究結果   其中一個關鍵議題，是找出共同參與實務工作機會中可能的參與者或利害關係者 ，和各種可能性和/或主題。這個過程會特意邀請不同的行動者參與，並從一開始就鼓勵辯論。  **四、立基過去，探索未來**  這份赫爾辛基宣言描繪這次國際研討會的重點，也代表著一個創新過程，以便提供基礎給即將在2014年，在紐約市（美國）舉辦的第三次國際研討會。僅僅四年（2008-2012年）的時間，一群有才華的和有遠見的社會工作實務工作者和研究者奠定了一個植根於社會工作者與服務使用者日常經驗為基礎的實務研究。2012年5月在赫爾辛基舉辦的國際研討會提供了一個重要平台，以會前會的形式介紹了那些在瑞典的Mathilda Wrede 和在芬蘭的Heikki Waris社會工作實務研究的研究所—兩個都與赫爾辛基社會服務部和赫爾辛基大學有密切合作關係。透過拜訪這些機構，讓我們有機會來示範如何在研究計畫的設計和實施的過程中促進服務提供者和使用者的參與，以及當地大學的社會工作研究學者可以扮演何種角色。  整個赫爾辛基國際研討會的主題聚焦於創造更多的「厚實型」研究，如同增強嚴謹性和實務效用給過去以學院為基礎的社會工作研究。就這方面來說，我們強調Epstein對社會服務機關現有的例行行政與個案記錄，在「資料探勘(mining)」方法上的貢獻。此外，本次會議重視實務研究如何可能被赫爾辛基大學的先驅研究者Engeström所發展的文化－歷史活動理論（Cultural Historical Activity Theory , CHAT）所「構框」(framed)。受到這些先進做法的刺激，本研討會從實務研究的理念和方法，繼續往前進步，提出關於理論和實務如何互相充實的新議題。  這份赫爾辛基宣言的目的是提供一些引導，給即將在2014年規劃舉辦第三屆國際研討會。幾個從赫爾辛基研討會產生的主題需要進一步的關注和分析。主要的主題包括如下：  （一）與更多社會工作實務研究相關，有興趣的實務工作者和研究者一同參與下列議題：  \*研討公共政策;如何把實務研究的成果轉化成新的、對服務使用者更相關的政策和做法？  \*研討實務工作中不斷變化的脈絡;在世界各地的許多政府將醫療和社會服務業務整併的的影響下，實務研究可以提供哪些知識？  \*整合高階管理者，以便發展必需的組織性支持給社會工作實務研究;  \*邀請其他研究同仁採用一種跨學科的方法來推廣和利用社會工作實務的研究;透過多重行動者一同推廣社會工作實務研究，最好的方法是什麼？  （二）使更多社會工作教育者和研究者一同參與，考量社會工作實務研究的方法論在教育未來實務工作者中的角色：  \*擴大社會工作實務研究的範圍，主動包括服務對象，並參與跨領域對話，以連結到主要由服務對象進行的倖存者研究。  \*透過積極運用批判性反思和批判性思維，參與將實務問題轉變為實務研究問題的過程（教育出未來具備研究意識的實務工作者）  \*參與研究者對應用性研究方法的探索，以便在社會工作實務研究的範疇中找到其定位  譯者：王實之，台灣 translator: Samuel Shih-Chih Wang |
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