

Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice –  
2017 – Volume 26, Issue 3, pp. 1–3  
<http://doi.org/10.18352/jsi.538>

ISSN: 1876-8830

URL: <http://www.journalsi.org>

Publisher: Utrecht University of Applied Sciences,  
Faculty of Society and Law, in cooperation with  
Utrecht University Library Open Access Journals

Copyright: this work has been published under a  
Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No  
Derivative Works 3.0 Netherlands License

**NOL REVERDA,  
YKE EIJKEMANS**

## **EDITORIAL**

---

Previously, the *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice* launched a call for papers on the decentralization of the welfare state. We have been happy to receive several interesting contributions on a diverse range of topics from both Flanders and the Netherlands. A number of the resulting articles were published in 2016 (issue 4) and 2017 (issue 1). In this issue, we would like once again to draw readers' attention to this call for papers, which will remain online until the end of this year. We invite both social scientists and social professionals to provide in-depth analyses on various themes in relation to decentralization. Please visit [www.journalsi.org](http://www.journalsi.org) for more information on the call.

Before continuing with the contents of this issue, we would like to announce a change to the editorial board of the *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice*. Yke Eijkemans has returned to her position as managing editor of the Journal and as the principal contact for authors, reviewers, and readers of the Journal. We would like to thank Suzan Doornwaard for her excellent work over the past six months.

We start this issue with an article by Sjef de Vries, who works on the development of social work methods and theory. In this theoretical contribution on the common factors model as a basis for psychosocial support in social work, De Vries describes how medical models dominate explanations

## EDITORIAL

of what works in psychosocial support, even though the social-work perspective of this theme remains understudied. The medical model often forms the basis for the development of methods in social work. However, this vision is hard to combine with the non-specific, generalistic, way of working in social work practice, and its context-specific approach to problem-solving and the goal of empowerment. De Vries outlines how “common factors” are seen as an alternative explanation for what works. Since these factors are grounded in scientific research and correlate with the effects of care, they are described as the scientific foundation of psychosocial support in the social work context.

The second contribution is by Michael Kolen, a PhD candidate at the University of Humanistic Studies in Utrecht and councillor on care ethics/mental care taker at *Stichting Prisma*, Frans Vosman, Professor in care ethics at the University for Humanistic Studies in Utrecht, Guus Timmerman, a scientific staff member on presence and care at *Stichting Presentie*, and Andries Baart, emeritus Professor of Presence and Care at the University for Humanistic Studies in Utrecht. Previously, the authors published on everyday contact as a source of knowledge for healthcare organizations in transition (2016/4). In this issue, they report on a study on daily contact between care professionals and youngsters with a mild intellectual disability (MID). They describe day-to-day practice and the caretakers’ moral orientations as part of this, and they show how this practice involves many “institutionally desired outcomes”, on the one hand, but at the same time many unexpected opportunities for gaining insight into what constitutes good MID care. In their day-to-day contact, the youngsters and their caretakers seem to create spaces for discovering what works and what needs to be done by them both in order to achieve good care. The article describes these findings and the opportunities that they create, which do not yet seem to be recognized in contemporary ethics of care.

This issue concludes with our regular Book Review and Innovations in Social Practice and Education sections. In the Book Review section, Fuusje de Graaff discusses the dissertation of Mariël Kanne, entitled *Co-creatie van goede zorg. Ethische vragen, moreel beraad en normatieve professionalisering in de zorg en het sociaal werk* (Co-creation of good care. Ethical questions, moral case deliberation and normative professionalization in healthcare and social work). In addition, Ed de Jonge discusses *Visie en vakbekwaamheid maken het verschil: over professionele besluitvorming in het sociaal werk* (Vision and professional competence make the difference: professional decision-making in social work) by Marcel Spierts, Mariël van Pelt, Evert van Rest and Sanneke Verweij and Ton Notten discusses *Het geluk van Limburg* (Limburg’s fortune) by Marcia Luyten.

In the Innovations in Social Practice and Education section Josien Hofs, board member of the Association of Social Work Professionals, discusses the challenges and difficulties of “doing the right thing” as a social professional working in the recently established “wijkteams” (neighbourhood teams). She explains how this is particularly complicated when working with people who do not fit into the government’s ideals of self-reliance and responsible citizenship.

Nol Reverda, editor-in-chief

Yke Eijkemans, managing editor