

Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice –  
2013 – Volume 22, Issue 2, pp. 89–92  
URN:NBN:NL:UI:10-1-114583

ISSN: 1876-8830

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

Publisher: Igitur publishing,

in cooperation with Utrecht University of

Applied Sciences, Faculty of Society and Law

Copyright: this work has been published under a

Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No

Derivative Works 3.0 Netherlands License

**NOL REVERDA,  
KARIN  
DANGERMOND**

## **EDITORIAL**

The subjects featured in the *Journal of Social Intervention: Theory and Practice* are not restricted to one specific domain of intervention, since the concept of social intervention is relevant to various domains. This current issue is an excellent example of the Journal's wide focus: the topics vary from evidence-based policy and practice to local memory websites, the Best Practice Unit, the self-employed healthcare professional and the client-centred approach to healthcare logistics in nursing homes. However, despite this wide range all the topics mentioned are relevant examples of the concept of social intervention.

The first article is written by an international team of researchers from the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The Dutch researchers Sanneke de la Rie, from the Expert Centre Urban Talent at Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences, and Frans Spierings, director of the Expert Centre Urban Talent and professor of Youth Studies at Erasmus University Rotterdam, and the English researchers Patrick Tobi, director of research at the Institute for Health and Human Development, and Kevin Sheridan, director of Community Engagement at the Institute for Health and Human Development, both from the University of East London, combined their expertise on neighbourhood deprivation monitoring in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Their study was conducted within a Knowledge Exchange Programme entitled *Everybody on Board*, which focuses on learning to improve the participation and health of disadvantaged people in deprived Rotterdam and London neighbourhoods. Although the effectiveness of area-based approaches to tackling health

## EDITORIAL

inequalities has been proven as part of a wider policy of community regeneration, it is not evident that this approach has become embedded in professional health practice. One reason for this may lie in the process by which evidence is generated and its “stickiness” or “usability”. In this article, the authors use the concept of stickiness to explore the role of deprivation monitoring data in creating an evidence base for neighbourhood health policies and intervention. The two largely similar cities of Rotterdam and London are used as a case study.

Social intervention that takes place in the “digital” as opposed to the “real” world is a topic that has been discussed several times in the *Journal of Social Intervention* (Fokkema and Van Tongeren, issue 14/4; Steyaert, issue 19/4; Van Gelder, issue 20/3; Steyaert, issue 20/4). However, the article by Mike de Kreek, a lecturer and researcher with the Cultural and Social Dynamics programme at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, and Liesbet van Zoonen, professor of Communication and Media Studies at Loughborough University and Erasmus University Rotterdam, is innovative because it specifically focuses on new directions in research on local memory websites. In their literature review, the authors identify three levels of analysis in the discussion on the benefits of interventions with local memory websites: micro-level for individual benefits, meso-level for group gains and macro-level for community strengthening processes. One interesting finding is that the accessible, online nature of local memory websites is a key driving force for empowerment, especially at the meso- and macro-levels.

The issue continues with an article on the Best Practice Unit (BPU) by Jean Pierre Wilken, professor of Participation, Care and Support at HU University of Applied Sciences and director of the Research Centre for Social Innovation, Carla van Slagmaat, lecturer Social work at HU University of Applied Sciences and researcher at the Research Centre for Social Innovation, and Sacha van Gijzel, junior researcher at the Research Centre for Social Innovation. A unique form of practice-based research, the BPU is a variant of the Community of Practice model (CoP, discussed in this journal by Schout, Schepers and Van der Kamp issue 14/1; Schout, issue 14/4). The specific aim of the BPU is to improve professional practice by combining innovation and research. For a period of one to two years, professionals, researchers and other interested parties work on the desired improvements under the supervision of a facilitator, who is tasked with optimizing the learning process. In the article the authors describe the outcomes of their analysis of ten BPU cases.

The fourth and fifth articles in this issue address the same theme: namely, that of healthcare, and more specifically healthcare in the Netherlands, also a recurring theme in previous issues (see, for example, Geißler-Piltz, issue 20/1).

The article by Ineke Robbe-Ansems, senior lecturer in sociology at Avans University of Applied Sciences, 's-Hertogenbosch, Willem de Lange, professor of HRM at Avans University of Applied Sciences, and René Schalk, faculty member of the Department of Human Resource Studies at Tilburg University, discusses the new (and hardly investigated) phenomenon of the self-employed healthcare professional. The number of self-employed healthcare professionals working in home care is growing. The authors ask two important questions: first, why do healthcare professionals opt for self-employment? And second, as they are not employed by a healthcare organization, how should we define their relationship with the patient/client? In finding answers to these questions, Robbe-Ansems *et al.* discuss the concepts of *care* and *labour*. The article concludes with a framework for future research on the independent healthcare professional.

The fifth and final article is by Dennis Moeke, senior lecturer in Quality and Logistics at the Avans University of Applied Sciences, 's-Hertogenbosch and Lineke Verkooijen, professor of Client Perspectives in Support and Health Care at Windesheim Flevoland University of Applied Sciences and managing director of research and consultancy agency Verkooijen & Beima, partner in LogiZ. Moeke and Verkooijen previously published together in this journal on healthcare logistics in the Netherlands (see issue 19/1). In this current issue, the authors focus on the client-centred approach to healthcare logistics in nursing home settings. Due to budget costs, nursing homes in the Netherlands are faced with two seemingly opposing tasks: increasing the influence of the client's care and care delivery, and reducing costs. Healthcare logistics can contribute to the affordability of high-quality care and support. However, the literature shows that there is no framework for healthcare logistics that covers both aspects. For this reason, Moeke and Verkooijen developed a conceptual framework that could meet these requirements. Their framework offers a starting point for future research and practice on healthcare logistics in nursing home care.

Two books are discussed in the book review section. First, Ton Notten discusses *Een beroep op de burger. Minder verzorgingsstaat, meer eigen verantwoordelijkheid? Sociaal en Cultureel rapport 2012* [An appeal to the citizens. A smaller welfare state, more individual responsibility? Social and Cultural Report 2012], edited by Vic Veldheer, Jedid-Jah Jonker, Lonneke van Noije and Cok Vrooman of the Netherlands Institute for Social Research (SCP). As is the case in many European countries, the economic crisis and the aging population are putting the Dutch welfare state under pressure. The Dutch government hopes to be able to achieve its far-reaching social and welfare-related ambitions by stimulating active participation and responsibility on the part of citizens. Notten offers a critical discussion of the various themes that are cited in the report, including

## EDITORIAL

family interventions, education, childcare, healthcare, neighbourhoods and neighbourhood safety, integration and cultural policy.

The second book review is by the newest member of our editorial board: Josje van der Linden. She discusses *Meedoen gaat niet vanzelf. Kwartiermaken in theorie en praktijk* [Motivating people to participate is not easy. How to get the ball rolling in theory and practice], by Doortje Kal, Rutger Post and Gerda Scholtens. As stated above, the Dutch government is encouraging citizens to actively participate in society. In her discussion of this book, Van der Linden asks whether the method described is a relevant approach at a time when people, in all their diversity, are already being encouraged to participate in modern society.

In the News from Higher Social Education section, Jan Bekker discusses the teacher in transition. Bekker argues that the fields in which the teacher operates will change in the coming years, and that teachers working on policy and implementation will be faced with new policy questions, requests and results.

Nol Reverda, Editor-in-chief

Karin Dangermond, Managing editor