International Practice Development Journal

Online journal of FoNS in association with the IPDC (ISSN 2046-9292)

working together to develop practice

CRITICAL REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Towards radical praxis through a new formation in practice development

Toni Wright

Canterbury Christ Church University, Canterbury, Kent, UK
Email: toni.wright@canterbury.ac.uk

Received for publication: 30th January 2017
Accepted for publication: 17th July 2017
Published: 15th November 2017
https://doi.org/10.19043/ipdj.72.006

Abstract

Background: This article argues that social and cultural transformation in healthcare, and beyond, needs to be achieved through an explicit ethical stance around critical awareness and articulation of the affects of historical, political, social and cultural structures of oppression. There is discussion around how practice development language forms a discourse of harm, and how practice development environments reproduce and maintain structures of oppression.

Aim: Drawing on the work of feminist critical social praxis concerned with corporeal experiences and the affects emanating from embodied practices, this article will bring to the fore marginalisations and oppressions experienced by particular bodies, and ask what practice developers need to consider and act on to make practice development more socially just.

Method: The application of feminist critical social praxis, a theoretical dimension unexplored in the practice development field, as a framework for asking what practice development can learn. Particular attention is drawn to the benefits of orientating a new formation in practice development around the work of black feminists and feminists of colour – of looking to the margins and bringing those to the centre.

Findings: The illumination of new insights into how to build a feminist critical social justice oriented practice development is possible through the explicit practice of naming and raising consciousness around the lived experiences and materiality of oppressed and marginalised peoples.

Conclusion: Radical cultural, social, political and economic transformation can be achieved from an orientation of explicit critical awareness and recognition of the politics of affects from neoliberal, neo-colonial capitalist systems.

Implications for practice:

- A feminist critical social justice ethical stance can enable practice development as a methodology, and practice developers as implementers of that methodology, to respond to this article's invitation to stand in solidarity against systematic structural oppressions and form a new, more reflective, critical and socially just practice development.

Keywords: Feminist, critical social justice, practice development

Introduction

The critical question at the foundation of this article is: what can we learn from black feminists and feminists of colour, in particular working in critical social theory and activism (a praxis of feminism), to bring up new insights towards creating a feminist critical social justice oriented practice development?

It is important to issue a caveat that the philosophy underpinning the critique offered in this article comes from Butler's (2001) understanding of critique. Of critique not as judgement or criticism, but as virtue, of seeing the potential for progression towards a greater illumination of truth. Of critique that is ethically imbued, that is about revealing the relationship of knowledge to power on a path, potentially involving uncertainty and insecurity, but nevertheless a path full of possibilities for radical transformation.

This article is structured in the following way: first, it explores feminist critical social theory with particular reference to the work of black feminists and feminists of colour, before foregrounding the underpinnings of practice development in traditional critical social theory. From there it asks what a different genealogy of critical social theory, namely the work of black feminists and feminists of colour, can offer in enabling practice development to be more reflexive, critical and socially just. In this opening section particular attention is drawn to the language used to describe practice development's philosophy and principles, as this will be returned to later in the discussion section in identifying some limitations to it. Second, the article provides some contextualisation of local and global health inequalities, focusing on the most marginalised and oppressed peoples, to illustrate these have not diminished and require consideration and action. This contextualisation draws together local and global examples to illustrate how they are interconnected and cannot be treated as mutually exclusive. Third, bringing together the previous two sections, there is an analysis of practice development language and how as a discourse it has concerning affects for oppressed and marginalised peoples. There is also exploration of how conditions/environs/affects form a politics of practice development that can be harmful for oppressed and marginalised peoples. The conclusion invites a feminist critical social justice oriented practice development that is open to explicit recognition of systemic structural injustices and inequalities, and to bringing that truth into its theory and practice.

Situating the knowledges

Feminist critical social praxis

Feminist critical social praxis is theory and activism that articulates and raises consciousness around oppression and marginalisation. It pays particular attention to the lived experiences of the most marginalised in society, namely women experiencing the multiple and interlocking oppressions of being black, of colour, poor and/or LGBTQIA+ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, questioning intersex, asexual+) (Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016). It is also interested in being attentive to corporeal experience and to materialisms such as the non-human, the natural world and explorations of ways of being in the world that focus on the body and its relation to social spaces (Fannin et al., 2014; Frost, 2014). It is a consideration of bodies and how they are affected, of how bodies take up and experience spaces, and how they are affected by ecologies (environs and bionetworks) and the resultant social structures encountered within them (Ahmed, 2006). It illuminates and explores the affects (the material affects of oppression) of systemic structural inequalities by pointing to those structures and showing how they are felt and how they materially affect the lives of the most marginalised and oppressed (Ahmed, 2017). Berlant's (2007) work has illuminated how environments, and specifically in the context of this article healthcare environments, are repetitions of everyday practices that become normalised. So what appears as singularity, as a phenomenon somehow produced away from and outside social environments, is in fact a reproduction of pre-existing wider social conditions stemming from systematic structural oppression. Berlant's (2007) work helps us to recognise that microsystems are reproductions of macrosystems, smaller versions of wider social systems.

Taking a feminist critical social perspective illuminates those pre-exiting oppressive conditions. By seeing, acknowledging and naming those oppressions, bringing them front and centre (Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016) it is possible to reimagine and transform them (Davis, 2016). Such a perspective can help us foreground a new formation in practice development.

In the spirit of feminist critical social methodology this article turns to bring those who live on the margins front and centre (Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016). The autobiographic narrative of black writer, feminist, lesbian, womanist and civil rights activist Audre Lorde works particularly well as a method for this. Womanism is a feminist concept and term given by the African-American writer, poet, feminist and activist Alice Walker (Phillips, 2006). It refers to critical social praxis that centres on the gender and racial oppressions of black women and women of colour. Lorde's pertinent words elucidate the importance of turning to the experiences of the most oppressed in society as a way of working towards securing liberation and flourishing for all.

> *'Those of us who stand outside the circle of this society's definition of acceptable women; those of us who have been forged in the crucible of difference – those of us who are poor, who are lesbians, who are black, who are older – know that survival is not an academic skill. It is learning how to stand alone, unpopular and sometimes reviled, and how to make common cause with those others identified as outside the structure in order to define and seek a world in which we can all flourish'* (Lorde, 2013, p 112).

We will return to Lorde's words at various points throughout this article as a reminder of the importance of what we can learn through the practice of continuously returning to the margins and bringing them to the centre.

The following section looks at the critical social theories underpinning practice development, and by examining that particular genealogy suggests how they may be limiting the possibilities for practice development to be more reflexive, critical and socially just.

Emancipatory practice development

Emancipatory practice development methodology will be familiar to the readership of this article, but it is important to give a general overview to situate it in terms of the article's thesis. *Emancipatory* practice development is systematic and purposeful in working with and through organisations to deliver positive, sustainable change and *transformation* for service users, practitioners and organisations. *Emancipatory* practice development enables *person-centredness*, commitment to action in the long term, involvement of all those with an interest in fostering *collaboration, inclusion and participation*, working with and clarifying values and beliefs, defining issues and best practice locally from the practitioner to the patient experience, and understanding contexts and *cultures* of care to enable *transformation* (Manley and McCormack, 2003).

To offer a brief history, practice development came into existence in the 1980s, with the main objective of focusing on fostering environments that enable *person-centred* and *evidence-based* care. Since 2010 that focus has been extended to incorporate the notion of fostering environments that support *human flourishing* (Titchen and McCormack, 2010) and of creating and sustaining workplace cultures that facilitate and support *flourishing for everyone* (Manley et al., 2011, 2014). At the heart of practice development lies *person-centred,* critically creative research approaches developed from an *emancipatory/ liberation* perspective that focus on questions generated from the front line of practice about what matters to patients, service users and front line practitioners. Successful *emancipatory* practice development and implementation of change also takes account of *evidence*, context and facilitation (Rycroft Malone et al., 2004).

Understanding these aspects of practice development is useful for outlining its approach, and for illuminating some of the language, discourse and conditions/environs/ecologies (in italics) that an alternative genealogy of critical social theory can support to be more critical, reflexive and socially just.

Emancipatory practice development's philosophical, methodological and theoretical underpinnings stem from critical social theory (Manley et al., 2008). While interdisciplinary in nature, critical social theory has traditionally emerged from the fields of sociology and philosophy. It is broadly a critique of society – that is, of social structures, cultural norms and the ways in which power operates in society – with ideological purpose and the intent to drive progressive social change and empowerment for oppressed groups. Practice development has tended towards being influenced and informed by the work of Habermas (Manley et al., 2008, 2013) and Fay (McCormack and Titchen, 2006; Manley et al., 2008; McCormack et al., 2014; Hardiman and Dewing, 2014; Smith, 2016). Although there has been work around expansion and modification of the critical social theories at practice development's foundations (Manley et al., 2008), the lineage of those theories has not yet been explored or critiqued. If we think of critical social theory and traditional lineage, we may think, among others, of Marx, Freud, Gramsci, Habermas, Lacan, Derrida, Foucault and Barthes. The writings of these figures have become identified as the body of work described as critical social theory, as the place we traditionally visit to learn about critical social theory and to find the framework that underpins our work. But, as Ahmed (2017) has recognised, this framework is a structure, it is a very particular type of critical social theory, it is a white male critical social theory. It comes from a history and continuing genealogy of white men. So, it is important to ask what a turn to a different critical social theory family could bring about for practice development? How can a feminist critical social justice praxis genealogy support us in rethinking practice development? Returning to Audre Lorde's words at the end of the previous section helps demonstrate this; what we glean from these words is a glimpse of the materiality of Lorde's life, the life of a poor, black, lesbian, older woman. White male critical social theory comes from the historical, social, cultural and political privilege enjoyed by white men. It is born of and framed by them. It does not come from the voices of those living at the margins, and therefore does not, and cannot, authentically articulate the conditions and experiences of oppressed lives or name the structures that affect those experiences (Ahmed, 2017). It does not talk about the materiality of oppressed and marginalised peoples' lives and so cannot teach us whose needs in particular must be met in order to transform oppressive systems. How can we go to the place we need to go to, connect to, listen to and hear from unless we know where that place is? Feminist critical social praxis is the place where we can find the materiality of the lives of the most oppressed and marginalised (Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016). It is the place practice development needs to go to if it is to be more critical, more reflexive and more socially just.

The next section of this article looks at the similarities in articulations of the values and principles of practice development and feminist critical social praxis.

Feminist critical social praxis and practice development fusion

Much of what practice development stands for, the values and principles of:

- *emancipation* (Manley and McCormack, 2003; Murray et al., 2012; Smith, 2016)
- *flourishing* (McCormack and Titchen, 2006; Manley et al., 2008, 2011, 2014; Titchen and McCormack, 2010)
- *participation* (McCormack and Titchen, 2006; Manley et al., 2008)
- *empowerment* (Manley and McCormack, 2003; McCance et al., 2013; Smith, 2016)
- *transformation* (Manley and McCormack, 2003; Manley et al., 2008)

are not incommensurate with those of feminist critical praxis.

- *emancipation* (Davis, 1991; Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000), and *liberation* (hooks, 2000; Lorde, 2013; Davis, 2016)

- *flourishing* (Lorde, 2013)
- *participation* (Hankivsky, 2012; Hole et al., 2015;)
- *empowerment* (Hill-Collins, 2000; Ahmed, 2014, 2017)
- *transformation* (Hill-Collins, 2000; Davis, 2003; Lorde, 2013; Ahmed, 2017)

We can see the same language, expressions and concepts articulated. They seem obvious accomplices.

So, what could this mean in terms of possibilities for practice development? When practice development is looking to enable transformation of workplace cultures by recognising toxicities that result from ineffective systems, it is in effect looking to do similar transformational work to that of feminist theorists and activists struggling for socially just transformation. They are also both ideologically driven in seeking liberation and emancipation of the oppressed. This article recognises the parallels between the work of practice development and the work of feminist critical social justice praxis; the work of upending damaging cultures and systems and transforming them for the benefit of everyone and the liberation of all. But, it also recognises how some of the language, discourse and ecologies of practice development are dangerously close to being contrary to this end. So, it proposes ways in which practice development can be more closely aligned and associated with feminist critical social justice praxis as a way of countering this danger.

The next section discusses local and global health inequalities, positioning these as persistent and interconnected, and as concerns that should be the consideration of any project focused on interrogating social systems, practising emancipatory approaches and creating environs that enable flourishing of all.

Health inequalities – looking to the margins

When he addressed the Medical Committee for Human Rights convention in 1966, Dr Martin Luther King Jr said, '*Of all the forms of inequality, injustice in healthcare is the most shocking and inhuman*' (King Jr, 1966). Some 50 years later, societal and health inequalities persist, and so this article proceeds by providing context and background to current understandings of how and why this is the case. The following statement from NHS England provides a useful starting point for an understanding of the structural and systemic inequalities operating in society that work in deliberate ways to discriminate against the disadvantaged, producing unjustifiable health inequalities:

> *'Health inequalities are the preventable, unfair and unjust differences in health status between groups, populations or individuals that arise from the unequal distribution of social, environmental and economic conditions within societies, which determine the risk of people getting ill, their ability to prevent sickness, or opportunities to take action and access treatment when ill health occurs'* (NHS England, 2016).

This statement recognises health inequalities are created by unequal societies and that there is correlation between societal disadvantages and the health outcomes of those affected. It also recognises those inadequate health outcomes as indefensible. Critical social theorists like Berlant (2007) have been explicit about exactly who the disadvantaged in society are, naming black, minority ethnic, and the working poor from Western industrialised rich democracies as those marked out for 'slow death' (p 754) – those for whom living is mostly about just surviving in an increasingly hostile neoliberal, capitalist system. Just surviving for those living at the margins is an everyday struggle against a socially, culturally, politically and economically interdependent system that, degree by degree, over time, is psychically, emotionally and mentally gruelling for health and wellbeing; that is bodily, emotionally and mentally exhausting (Ahmed, 2017).

Hole et al.'s (2015) article on aboriginal Canadian peoples' experiences of culturally safe and unsafe healthcare discusses how stress, distress and trauma make up the lived experience of marginalised

groups as a result of structural discriminatory care practices, interpersonal relationships and physical environments. Indigenous women, in particular, experience simultaneous multiple and intersecting discriminations based on gender, race and first-nation identity. A sense of being invisible, overlooked and excluded is a commonplace experience for those encountering healthcare systems founded on a biomedical model of care provision that works to reinforce white Western patriarchal, imperialist, capitalist, historical, cultural, social and political 'norms'. Hole et al. (2015) advocate elevating the experiences and perspectives of marginalised peoples because this is central to making visible the discrimination and oppression that have negative consequences for the physical, emotional and mental health of people living at the margins.

Berlant (2007) and Hole et al.'s (2015) research is important because it shows that what is key to more socially just approaches to healthcare is the recognition of health inequalities brought about by systemic structurally based social oppressions. They teach us that by naming and raising consciousness about oppressions – and for Hole et al. of understanding oppressions as often multiple and interconnected – is the way of making visible otherwise implicit and concealed oppressions within, through and across social systems and systems of healthcare.

Since 2004 in England, for people whose asylum claims have been refused and who have exhausted the appeals process, free healthcare is no longer a right (Taylor, 2009). In 2009 a Palestinian man suffering from chronic liver failure took this policy to the Court of Appeal, but the policy was upheld (*R (YA) v Secretary of State for Health, 2009*). We know that, because of systemic structural poverty and racism, if you are black or from a minority ethnic group living in the UK, you are more likely to be diagnosed with mental trauma/distress. You are also more likely to be admitted to a mental health hospital, be at increased risk of poor mental health outcomes, and experience worsening mental health and social exclusion (Mental Health Foundation, 2017). These are just some examples from England and the UK of structurally based systemic health inequalities, but these do not exist in isolation, as localised and unconnected to the wider world. We know that in the US, Canada, New Zealand and Australia, first nation and indigenous peoples experience systematic structural barriers to accessing healthcare, and even when they do have access they experience poorer outcomes (Reynolds and White, 2012; Hole et al., 2015; Gray, 2016). We know that Palestinians living under Israeli occupation have severely restricted access to healthcare and suffer poorer health outcomes as a result (Watt et al., 2014). We know that multinational companies that produce infant formula promote bottlefeeding over breastfeeding in low-income countries, specifically in the Middle East and Africa, resulting in ill health and the deaths of babies and children, especially those from poor communities; we know they do this for corporate profit not for improved health (Kent, 2015). We know of other, ongoing exploitations. The excessive pricing of HIV and Aids drugs by the pharmaceutical industry means those most in need – those living in the global South – struggle to access medication (Ellis, 2006). We know first nation Standing Rock Sioux are fighting to exercise sovereignty over their land and water in the Dakotas (Davis, 2017). We know poor communities in Flint, Michigan continue to suffer a contaminated water supply resulting from costcutting measures (Davis, 2017). We know that House Bill 2 (a law that prevents transgender people from using government-run bathrooms corresponding to the gender with which they identify) has been approved in North Carolina and is putting at risk the health and wellbeing of transgender, gender non-confirming and non-binary peoples, notably those from the black LBGTQIA+ communities (Cavanagh, 2010; Hunt, 2016). We know that the defunding of international development groups advising on abortion has begun, a move that will disproportionately affect black women, women of colour and poor women around the world, and especially in the global South (Crane and Dusenberry, 2004; Pugh et al., 2017; Singh and Karim, 2017).

Mapping these health inequalities from the local (UK) to global (across international borders) reminds us of how they are interconnected through global capitalism. Global capitalism is a system of neoliberal neo-colonialism, of free markets, of the internationalisation of economies and workforces and of pathological individualism (Puar, 2012), which has created a world built on 'destructive divisions of gender, race, class, sexuality and nation' (Mohanty, 2003, p 43). Understanding this helps us to see

that injustices are not isolated, but are interconnected and relational to each other and to globalised capitalism. Health inequalities exist because the structures (Berlant, 2007; Ahmed, 2017) of racism, heteropatriachy, islamophobia, antisemitism, ableism and capitalist exploitation of the environment exist. The structures of racism and sexism that have been pointed out here – reproductive health, immigration, poverty and so on – constitute a health system that does not work, or care, for oppressed and marginalised peoples (Ahmed, 2017). Transforming this globally destructive force requires collective action and is the responsibility of everyone (Mohanty, 2003; Davis, 2016). Fighting to change only one form of injustice is incompatible with this context of interconnection; fighting for one struggle by necessity means it is incumbent on us to stand in solidarity in the fight against all injustices (Davis, 2016).

Having framed the evidence around inequalities that should be the concern of those working in health and social care environments, this article now moves forward by considering how practice development language, discourse and environs form a politics of affect that can work to exclude oppressed and marginalised peoples.

Discussion

Language and discourse and environs

Acknowledging and naming the inequalities that exist in the social world is a place from which to understand how they are historically constituted, culturally produced, politically oriented and socially maintained (Rimke, 2016). Drawing on theories from feminists writing on social materialisms and the politics of affect (Berlant, 2007; Gregg and Seigworth, 2009; Puar, 2012; Ahmed, 2014, 2017; Fannin et al., 2014; Frost, 2014) provides a useful framework for understanding the ethics and politics of practice development language. Critical awareness of historically constituted, culturally produced, politically oriented and socially maintained oppressions (Rimke, 2016) can come from such an understanding, as can an understanding of practice development's complicity in reproducing them. For practice development to enable, support and transform healthcare communities and collectives so that they are united in solidarity against systemic structural oppressions, it is invited to take an explicit ethical stance oriented around those who live on the margins, bringing them front and centre (Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016).

Language and discourse

Language becomes discourse through patterns of speech acts that create '*ecologies of sensation*' that have affects, and those affects are felt most greatly by oppressed and marginalised peoples (Puar, 2012, pp 150-1, 157). But, we can reclaim language for the marginalised and oppressed by understanding the power underlining it and by using it as a site of action, a site of conscious radical intellectual struggle (Mohanty, 2003). Thinking about the language and discourse used in practice development can help us unpack where it may be complicit not only in maintaining, but also reproducing oppressive *ecologies of sensation*. Taking examples of practice development language, this section will think through how it becomes a discourse, a politics of affect. The language examples drawn on are scattered throughout the principles of practice development (Manley et al., 2008): being *inclusive, person-centred, emancipatory, participatory, practice and evidence based*, and promoting *human flourishing*, *systematic transformation* and *empowerment*. By asking critical questions around whom these terms are orientated towards and whom they are oriented away from (Ahmed, 2006) can illuminate how language becomes a discourse that works to conceal, rather than reveal affects of marginalisation and oppression (Ahmed, 2000).

When we consider the language used in practice development it is unclear whom it includes and for whom that inclusion matters, and therefore what emerges is ambiguity about who matters to practice development. The use of *inclusive* (Manley et al., 2008) signifies all encompassing, being for everybody, and yet feminist critical social praxis (Crenshaw, 1989; Ahmed, 1998; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016; Davis, 2016) is clear that some bodies are marked

out by society as being less worthy of inclusion. It is clear that in the social world a reference to 'everybody' does not extend to all bodies, it only extends to privileged bodies (Berlant, 2007). We need to be clear that our expression of 'everybody' extends in particular to oppressed and marginalised peoples. This means explicitly and unambiguously referencing their experiences and struggles.

We need to be cautious of assumptions around the neutrality of language too, and seek to reveal the relationship of knowledge as language to power (Butler, 2001) and how that manifests in practice development. *Person-centred* (Manley et al., 2008; McCormack et al., 2014, 2015; Slater et al., 2015) may be assumed to be a 'neutral' term. A term that can capture and account for all peoples' experiences and situatedness (Haraway, 1991). But, when the terms we use do not explicitly recognise the very particular experiences of subjugated people, then what that supposed 'neutrality' does is collapse and erase their experiences of oppression – indeed, 'neutrality' acts in direct opposition to the definition of the word. It conceals; it does the politics of concealment by actively negating oppressed and marginalised peoples' experiences and voices (Ahmed, 1998). *Person-centred* is un-neutral because using it enables the conflation of identities, ways of being. It works to make inequities and injustices disappear. For practice development, moving away from signifying singular experience has had the tendency to homogenise people rather than focus on differences that matter, and on unity through those differences (Ahmed, 1998; Lorde, 2013). The risk through homogenisation is to be at best disconnected from, and at worst in denial of, the oppressions and violences experienced by marginalised people and complicit in reproducing and maintaining them. Bringing these experiences front and centre is part of doing the work of standing in solidarity with interconnected human, environmental and other species' struggles for liberation (Mohanty, 2003; Davis, 2016).

Human flourishing (McCormack and Titchen, 2006; Manley et al., 2008, 2011, 2014; Titchen and McCormack, 2010) also presents us with a deceptively inclusive language, of all humans mattering. But, proposing that all humans matter entails a failure to see that oppressed and marginalised peoples are often subject to experiences of dehumanisation, and situated as those who in fact do not matter. As Rimke (2016) points out, their experiences and very being are disregarded via historic, social, political and cultural denial of full membership of civic society. What we know from feminist critical social praxis (Berlant, 2007; Rimke, 2016; Ahmed, 2017) is that *flourishing* for oppressed and marginalised peoples is likely to be about just surviving, just maintaining themselves day to day, rather than prospering and self-making (McCormack and Titchen, 2006; Titchen and McCormack, 2010). We see this in the quotation at the beginning of this article, where Lorde (2013) points to how she is not free to flourish because of the oppressions and exclusions she has experienced as a poor, black, lesbian, older woman. *Flourishing* as a term that refers to fulfilling potential and being full members of civic society is not always possible for oppressed and marginalised people because systemic structural barriers experienced as day-to-day living prevent it. *Flourishing* in such cases is about the struggle simply to exist – a process of maintaining yourself in a world that does not want you to prosper (Berlant, 2007; Ahmed, 2017).

When practice development refers to its tenets as *participatory* (McCormack and Titchen, 2006; Manley et al., 2008) and as *practice and evidence based* (Manley et al., 2008; Rycroft-Malone et al., 2014), we have to ask critical questions around who has the social and cultural capital, the power to participate and thereby have their voices and experiences positioned front and centre? Whose evidence and practice are being elevated, held up and supported as the exemplar and referent marker by which all others are measured?

When practice development speaks of *systematic transformation* (Manley and McCormack, 2003; Manley et al., 2008), *empowerment* (Manley and McCormack, 2003; McCance et al., 2013; Smith, 2016), of being *emancipatory* (Manley and McCormack, 2003; Murray et al., 2012; Smith, 2016), we need to ask the critical questions: who is already empowered? Who is already liberated? For whom does the system already work? Who is excluded from the system? For whom do we need to transform

the system? When practice development talks of *culture* (Manley and McCormack, 2003; Manley et al., 2008, 2011; Murray et al., 2012; Sanders and Shaw, 2015), we need to ask the critical questions: What and whose *culture* are we referring to? By doing the work of revealing and naming the affects of dominant cultures on oppressed and marginalised peoples we can begin to orientate practice development towards a more critical social justice praxis.

Returning to the very beginning of this article, and the method of looking to the margins of society and naming the oppressions that are the everyday lived experience of the disenfranchised (Lorde, 2013), provides a methodology and method for practice development – that of elevating marginalised voices and bringing them front and centre (Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Mohanty, 2003; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016). This methodology and method is important because using it validates that all people matter because those who all too often matter least are shown to matter the most (Ahmed, 1998; hooks, 2000) to practice development.

In conclusion of this section, inclusive *gamp* language, gamp because it is shading many things, when used by practice development fails to speak of the experiences of oppressed and marginalised peoples, thereby conflating all lived experiences. It works to flatten out, overlook and conceal the differences that matter, the differences that matter to the bodies that matter, and matter so much more specifically because they experience oppression and violence, oppression and violence that is so often not recognised (Ahmed, 1998; 2006). That language of *gamp* inclusivity is without articulation of whom it excludes.

Environs

When we think about practice development environs (the ethics and politics of affect, of emotional connections across the human and non-human), practice settings and healthcare microsystems (Manley et al., 2013), we need to think about the potential harms of environments, conditions and cultures. Feminist critical social praxis (Berlant, 2007; Gregg and Seigworth, 2009; Puar, 2012; Ahmed, 2014, 2017; Fannin et al., 2014; Frost, 2014) is helpful for framing this new formation in thinking. Puar's (2012, pp 150-1, 157) work in particular is helpful, referring to these phenomena of harm as *ecologies of sensation*, and focusing on marginalised and oppressed bodies as the ones most harmed. In reframing what and whom practice development is for, and how it can embody a new formation towards social justice, feminist critical social praxis helps us to explore what is meant by environments, conditions and culture in different terms: as bodily assemblages (Ahmed, 2017), as affects that have further accumulative damaging affects for oppressed and marginalised peoples (Puar, 2012). One of the most important aspects of feminist critical social praxis is the practice of looking to the margins (Crenshaw, 1989; Hill-Collins, 2000; hooks, 2000; Mohanty, 2003; Hesse-Biber, 2011; Lorde, 2013; Carastathis, 2016). So, when we think about what a radical praxis for practice development looks like, we know it must recognise and explicitly look to raise consciousness about the lived experiences of the most marginalised in society. That is black women, women of colour, lesbian woman, poor women and transgender people (Davis, 2016). This will help us to map power as historically constituted, socially maintained, politically oriented and culturally produced (Rimke, 2016), and to understand the consequences of such structural systems as a politics of affect (Ahmed, 2010, 2014, 2017; Puar, 2012). From an acknowledgement of the politics of affect can come hope and action towards reimagined and transformed healthcare systems and cultures, towards radically transformed antiracist, anti-heteropatriarchal and anticapitalist environments and worlds (Mohanty, 2003).

In addition to practice development thinking through the affects of healthcare spaces, places and the encounters that take place within them, reflexivity around the landscape of practice development is also required, so a mapping of who theorises, who researches and who practices practice development is also necessary. To what extent is practice development challenging itself to be more diverse and representative of diverse peoples? Observation at a large practice development conference last year led me to ask why there were so few black people and people of colour present. All the keynote

speakers were white, and for the most part I heard and saw white-authored literature presented and discussed. I *observed* this as a white woman. *Observed* is the right word, as I have no way of knowing the affect all that whiteness would have for a black person, a person of colour; the harmful marginalising and oppressive affect of *gamp* language and discourse, and an environment dominated by white faces (Ahmed, 2017). What we can learn from feminist critical social justice praxis is that such an ecology made for a very exclusive type of practice development conference. Of a white practice development. Of a practice development that was doing the work of excluding those at the margins. Failure to be reflexive, think critically and take action about the 'whitewashing' of the conference constitutes complicity in that whitewashing (Ahmed, 2017). While the intentions of practice development are worthy, the intention to be *all* inclusive, ignoring the differences that matter (Ahmed, 1998) effaces the struggles, histories and materiality of oppressed and marginalised peoples and our own collusion in practising and reproducing these.

Articulated within this article is an invitation for practice development to be a part of the larger project of decolonising healthcare. Doing this work means also being a part of, and standing in solidarity with, the same world-changing projects and struggles for a broader decolonisation (Mohanty, 2003; Davis, 2016; Ahmed, 2017). This new formation in practice development is about structural systemic transformation that can be conducted by adopting a feminist critical social justice praxis. This can be done through acknowledgement of privileges (white privilege, cisgender privilege, straight privilege, class privilege, male privilege, and species privilege), a commitment to deconstructing and being accountable for those privileges, to decolonising minds, and to creating and sustaining socially just spaces, places, cultures and environments (Mohanty, 2003). Such an ethic constitutes a feminist critical social justice practice development. Feminist critical social justice practice development by virtue of seeing the potential for practice development to be praxis that is committed to social justice, wilful in its intent to decolonise itself and doing the work of supporting wider decolonisation, as well as working in solidarity across all projects that fight anti-oppression (Butler, 2001; Ahmed, 2014). So to stand explicitly in solidarity with Palestinian liberation, black liberation, LGBTQIA+ liberation and to join struggles as accomplices against racist, heteropatriarchy, capitalist systems of oppression (Davis 2016).

Conclusion

With its roots in critical social theory, practice development should be able to see the benefits a feminist critical social justice stance could bring in terms of transforming the movement. The current genealogy of critical social theory underpinning practice development has yet to enable it to articulate the materiality of the lives of the most oppressed and marginalised peoples. By reaching within and cracking open normative practice development language, discourse and environs, its relationship to knowledge and power can be revealed, and from revelation transformation can come because such revelation unlocks what has been obscured but has not yet entirely disappeared: the potential in practice development that has always been there.

This article invites a feminist critical social justice practice development to emerge that is open to recognising systemic structural injustices and oppressions. Bringing that truth into its approach will be a clear signal of a more reflexive, critical and socially just ethical praxis. Where is emancipatory practice development without the freedom and liberation of oppressed and marginalised peoples? Only by making visible the particularities and materiality of the lives of marginalised and oppressed peoples can we make visible our own privilege, and until we make visible our own privilege and how it is directly bound up and implicated in the oppression of others, we cannot transform, as an ongoing collective effort, ourselves, our communities, our societies, our worlds.

Achieving radical cultural, social, political and economic transformation in healthcare, and beyond, needs to come from an explicit ethical stance; from critical awareness of the affects of neoliberal neo-colonial capitalist systems, of ecologies of oppression. Such an ethic can enable healthcare communities

to be united in difference and to stand in solidarity with each other, as accomplices in each other's struggles and as part of a movement for change against structural systematic oppressions.

It is important to acknowledge that what is suggested in this article is knowledge mostly learned from black feminists and feminists of colour. There is no claim to uniqueness of thought, just the application of existing knowledge to a context that has yet to benefit from it. Black feminists and feminists of colour already have the knowledge imparted in this article. It is through their generous sharing that I have come to know that their worldview is the truth of this world. I thank all of them for teaching the world about what it is and how it can do and be better. I would encourage all practice developers to seek out and learn from the many texts and writings of black feminists and feminists of colour so that they too can travel to the truth.

This article closes by returning once again to the words of Audre Lorde because her words are an invitation to recognise material differences and to seek alliance through that recognition. Therefore, towards the recognition and articulation within practice development of the differences that matter, the lives that matter we return to Audre Lorde:

> *'Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependency become unthreatening. Only within that interdependency of different strengths, acknowledged and equal, can the power to seek new ways of being in the world generate, as well as the courage and sustenance to act where there are no charters'* (Lorde, 2013, p 111).

References

Berlant, L. (2007) Slow death (sovereignty, obesity, lateral agency). *Critical Inquiry.* Vol. 33. No. 4. pp 754-780. https://doi.org/10.1086/521568.

Butler, J. (2001) *What is Critique? An Essay on Foucault's Virtue*. Retrieved from: tinyurl.com/butler-critique (Last accessed 26th January 2015).

Carastathis, A. (2016) *Intersectionality: Origins, Contestations, Horizons.* Lincoln, US and London: University of Nebraska Press.

Cavanagh, S. (2010) *Queering Bathrooms: Gender, Sexuality, and the Hygienic Imagination.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Crane, B. and Duserberry, J. (2004) Power and politics in international funding for reproductive health: the US global gag rule. *Reproductive Health Matters: An International Journal on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights*. Vol. 12. No. 24. pp 128-137. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-8080(04)24140-4

Crenshaw, K. (1989) Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*. Vol. 1989. Issue 1. Article 8.

Davis, A. (1991) *Women, Race and Class.* New York: Random House.

Davis, A. (2003) *Are Prisons Obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Davis, A. (2016) *Freedom is a Constant Struggle: Ferguson, Palestine, and the Foundations of a Movement*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Davis, A. (2017) *'History cannot be Deleted like Web Pages'*: Angela Davis's speech at the Women's March on Washington. Retrieved from: tinyurl.com/Davis-WMspeech (Last accessed 13th April 2017).

Ellis, J. (2006) The cost of AIDS drugs: a moral imperative. *GU Journal of Health Sciences*. Vol. 3. No. 1. Retrieved from: tinyurl.com/Ellis-imperative (Last accessed 20th July 2017).

Fannin, M., MacLeavy, J., Larner, W. and Wang, W. (2014) Work, life, bodies: new materialisms and feminisms. *Feminist Theory.* Vol. 15. No. 3. pp 261-268. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700114545320.

Frost, S. (2014) Re-considering the turn to biology in feminist theory. *Feminist Theory.* Vol. 15. No. 3. pp 307-326. https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700114545323.

Gregg, M. and Seigworth, G. (Eds.) (2009) *The Affect Theory Reader*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Gray, M. (2016) Pathologizing indigenous suicide: examining the inquest into the deaths of C.J. and C.B. at the Manitoba Youth Centre. *Studies in Social Justice*. Vol. 10. No. 1. pp 80-94. https://doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v10i1.1327.

Hankivsky, O. (Ed.) (2012) *An Intersectionality-based Policy Analysis Framework.* Vancouver: Institute for Intersectionality Research and Policy.

Hardiman, M. and Dewing, J. (2014) Critical ally and critical friend: stepping stones to facilitating practice development. *International Practice Development Journal*. Vol. 4. No. 1. Article 3. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume4-issue1/article3 (Last accessed 20th July 2017).

Harraway, D. (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. London: Free Association Books.

Hesse-Biber, S. (2011) Feminist research: exploring, interrogating, and transforming the interconnections of epistemology, methodology and method. Chp 1 *in* Hesse-Biber, S. (Ed.) (2011) *Handbook of Feminist Research: Theory and Praxis.* (2nd edition). Los Angeles: Sage. pp 2-26.

Hill-Collins, P. (2000) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment.* (2nd edition). New York and London: Routledge.

Hole, R., Evans, M., Berg, L., Bottorff, J., Dingwall, C., Alexis, C., Nyberg, J. and Smith, M. (2015) Visibility and voice: aboriginal people experience culturally safe and unsafe health care. *Qualitative Health Research*. Vol. 25. No. 12. pp 1662-1674.

hooks, b. (2000) *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center.* Cambridge, US: South End Press.

Hunt, J. (2016) *North Carolina's HB2: Assessing the Impact on the Black LGBTQ Community*. Social Science Research Network. Retrieved from: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2846120 (Last accessed 13th April 2017).

King Jr., M.L. (1966) Chicago press conference in connection with presentation at the Second National Convention of the Medical Committee for Human Rights. Chicago. 25 March.

Kent, G. (2015) Global infant formula: monitoring and regulating the impacts to protect human health. *International Breastfeeding Journal.* Vol. 10. No. 6. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13006-014-0020-7.

Lorde, A. (2013) *Sister Outsider*. New York: The Crossing Press.

Manley, K. and McCormack, B. (2003) Practice development: purpose, methodology, facilitation and evaluation. *Nursing in Critical Care*. Vol. 8. No. 1. pp 22-29. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1478-5153.2003.00003.x.

Manley, K., McCormack, B. and Wilson, V. (2008) Introduction *in* Manley, K., McCormack, B. and Wilson, V. (Eds.) (2008) *International Practice Development in Nursing and Healthcare.* Oxford: Blackwell. pp 1-16.

Manley, K., McCormack, B. and Titchen, A. (2013) *Practice Development in Nursing and Healthcare*. (2nd edition). Chichester, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Manley, K., O'Keefe, H., Jackson, J., Pearce, S. and Smith, S. (2014) A shared purpose framework to deliver person-centred, safe and effective care: organisational transformation using practice development methodology. *International Practice Development Journal*. Vol. 4. No. 1. Article 2. pp 1-31. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume4-issue1/article2 (Last accessed 26th January 2017).

Manley, K., Sanders, K., Cardiff, S. and Webster, J. (2011) Effective workplace culture: the attributes, enabling factors and consequences of a new concept. *International Practice Development Journal.* Vol. 1. No. 2. Article 1. pp 1-29. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume1-issue2/article1 (Last accessed 26th January 2017).

McCance, T., Gribben, B., McCormack, B. and Laird, E. (2013) Promoting person-centred practice within acute care: the impact of culture and context on a facilitated practice development programme. *International Practice Development Journal*. Vol. 3. No. 1. Article 2. pp 1-17. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume3-issue1/article2 (Last accessed 24th July 2017).

McCormack, B. and Titchen, A. (2006) Critical creativity: melding, exploding, blending. *Educational Action Research*. Vol. 1. No. 2. pp 239-266. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650790600718118.

McCormack, B., McGowan, B., McGonigle, M., Goode, D., Black, P. and Sinclair, M. (2014) Exploring 'self' as a person-centred academic through critical creativity: a case study of educators in a school of nursing. *International Practice Development Journal*. Vol. 4. No. 2. Article 3. pp 1-18. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume4-issue2/article3 (Last accessed 24th July 2017).

McCormack, B., Borg, M., Cardiff, S., Dewing, J., Jacobs, G., Janes, N., Karlsson, B., McCance, T., Mekki, T., Porock, D., van Lieshout, F. and Wilson, V. (2015) Person-centredness – the 'state' of the art. *International Practice Development Journal*. Vol. 5. Special Issue on Person-centredness. Article 1. pp 1-15. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume5-person-centredness-suppl/article1 (Last accessed 24th July 2017).

Mental Health Foundation (2017) *Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) Communities*. Retrieved from: tinyurl.com/BME-MHF (Last accessed 13th April 2017).

Mohanty, C. (2003) *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity.* Durham, US: Duke University Press.

Murray, S., Magill, J. and Pinfold, M. (2012) Transforming culture in the critical care environment – the building block of the journey. *International Practice Development Journal.* Vol. 2. Issue 1. Article 5. pp 1-14. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume2-issue1/article5 (Last accessed 24th July 2017).

NHS England (2016) *Reducing Health Inequalities Resources.* Retrieved from: tinyurl.com/NHSE-inequality (Last accessed 26th January 2017).

Phillips, L. (2006) *The Womanist Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Puar, J. (2012) The cost of getting better: suicide, sensation, switchpoints. *A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*. Vol. 18. No. 1. pp 149-158.

Pugh, S., Desai, S., Ferguson, L., Stockl, H. and Heidari, S. (2017) Not without a fight: standing up against the global gag rule. *Reproductive Health Matters: An International Journal on Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights*. Vol. 25. No. 49. https://doi.org/10.1080/09688080.2017.1303250.

R (YA) v Secretary of State for Health [2009] EWCA 225 Civ 225. Retrieved from: tinyurl.com/RYAvsSSH (Last accessed 13th April 2017).

Rimke, H. (2016) Introduction. Mental and emotional distress as a social justice issue: beyond psychocentrism. *Studies in Social Justice*. Vol. 10. No. 1. pp 4-17. https://doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v10i1.1407

Reynolds, V. and White, J. (2012) *Hate Kills: A Social Justice Response to 'Suicide'*. Retrieved from: tinyurl.com/Reyolds-hatekills (Last accessed 13th April 2017).

Rycroft Malone. J., Seers, K., Titchen, A., Harvey, G., Kitson, A. and McCormack, B. (2004) What counts as evidence in evidence based practice? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. Vol. 47. No. 1. pp 81-90. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03068.x.

Sanders, K. and Shaw, T. (2015) Creating Caring Cultures: using animation to help people to get started. *International Practice Development Journal.* Vol. 5. Issue 1. Article 12. pp 1-3. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume5-issue1/article12 (Last accessed 24th July 2017).

Singh, J. and Karim, S. (2017) Trump's 'global gag rule': implications for human rights and global health. *The Lancet Global Health*. Vol. 5. No. 4. pp e387-e389. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(17)30084-0.

Slater, P., McCance, T. and McCormack, B. (2015) Exploring person-centred practice within acute hospital settings. *International Practice Development Journal.* Vol. 5. Special Issue on Person-centredness. Article 9. pp 1-8. Retrieved from: fons.org/library/journal/volume5-person-centredness-suppl/article9 (Last accessed 24th July 2017).

Smith, K. (2016) Reflection and person-centredness in practice development. *International Practice Development Journal*. Vol. 6. No. 1. Article 12. pp 1-6. https://doi.org/10.19043/ipdj.61.012.

Titchen, A. and McCormack, B. (2010) Dancing with stones: critical creativity as methodology for human flourishing. *Educational Action Research: An International Journal*. Vol. 18. No. 4. pp 531-554. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2010.524826.

Taylor, K. (2009) Asylum seekers, refugees, and the politics of access to health care: a UK perspective. *The British Journal of General Practice*. Vol. 59. No. 567. pp 765-772. https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp09X472539.

Watt, G., Giacaman, R. and Zurayk, H. (2014) Palestinian health research. *The Lancet*. Vol. 383. No. 9914. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62234-5.

Acknowledgments
Many thanks are due to the group of people known as the KJs. They know who they are. I thank them for being a source of solidarity, inspiration, hope and humour.

Thank you also to the reviewers of this paper for their comments.

Toni Wright (PhD, MA, MA, BA), Principal Research Fellow, England Centre for Practice Development, Faculty of Health and Wellbeing, Canterbury Christ Church University, Canterbury, Kent, England.