



Draft Manuscript for Review. Please complete your review online at <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/oup/bjsw>

From Communal Duties to Individual Rights: The Migration of Indian Social Workers to England

Journal:	<i>The British Journal of Social Work</i>
Manuscript ID	BJSW-21-186.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
ETHICS, VALUES AND CULTURE:	Multi-cultural, Minority ethnic, Cultural competence
FAMILIES, CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE:	Parenting
HEALTH AND ILLNESS:	End- of- life care
INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES AND GLOBAL ISSUES:	Asia, UK
POLICY, POLITICS AND LEGISLATION:	
PRACTICE INTERVENTIONS:	
RESEARCH AND EVALUATION:	
SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL CARE WITH ADULTS:	
SOCIAL WORK PROFESSION:	

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

From Communal Duties to Individual Rights: The Migration of Indian Social Workers to England

Abstract

The demand for social workers in England has been outstripping supply for more than a decade. As a result, social work continues to be on the UK Shortage Occupation List, ensuring the migration of social workers will continue. While several studies have examined the experiences of migrating social workers, these studies largely neglected the impact culture plays in this transition. This article will focus on the experiences of social workers who were trained in India and migrated to England. It is part of a much larger study that used a mixed method approach to explore the migration to England of social workers from eight different countries. Indian social workers highlighted the significant differences between the individualistic character of English culture and the much more collectivist Indian culture. This difference shaped a range of attitudes towards the family and parenting, the distinctions between what is 'public' or 'communal' and what is 'private'. Other differences raised were regarding communication resulting from the more hierarchical tendencies of Indian society. In the final section, implications for practice are discussed and recommendations are made for the induction required to help future migrating social workers make a smoother transition.

Teaser Text

- This article focuses on the experiences of Indian social workers who migrated to England, and on the impact of culture on their migration.
- Participants highlighted the significant differences between the individualistic English culture and the much more collectivist Indian culture. This difference shaped a range of attitudes towards the family and parenting, the distinctions between what is 'public' or 'communal' and what is 'private'.
- Other differences raised were regarding communication resulting from the more hierarchical tendencies of Indian society and culture.
- The implications for practice are discussed in the final section and an induction programme to help future migrating social workers make a smoother transition is recommended.

36 Introduction

37 The social care sector in England has been experiencing an ongoing shortage of
38 care professionals. In some countries, including England, “recruitment of
39 internationally qualified social workers has...become an important strategy to meet
40 staffing demands and to fill shortages” (Pullen-Sansaçon *et al.*, 2012, p.1032).
41 About 10 percent of the total number of social workers registered to practice in the
42 UK completed their qualifications abroad (Husseini *et al.*, 2010). England’s demand
43 for social workers has created opportunities for transnational social workers with the
44 “assumption that the principles, values and theoretical approaches [underpinning]
45 social work are sufficiently common...” (Bartley and Beddoe, 2018, p.2) to ‘ease’
46 these migrants into their new environments without difficulty. For over 10 years,
47 social workers have remained on England’s ‘shortage occupation’ list, with no
48 apparent change envisaged. Bartley and Beddoe (2018) describe Social Work as “an
49 increasingly transnationally mobile profession” (p.2); highlighting some challenges
50 that migrant social workers have to navigate personally and professionally, including
51 “the complexity of [a] new socio-political and cultural environment” (*ibid.*). While
52 scholars such as Bartley and Beddoe (2018) have pointed out some potential
53 challenges of migration, studies that explored the migration experiences of social
54 workers did not pay close attention to culture and, more particularly, to the ways the
55 culture social workers internalise in their countries of origin shape their interactions
56 within the country they migrated to. This article will help to close this gap by
57 exploring the experiences of Indian social workers who migrated to England.

58 Context:

60 Indian Culture and Social Work

61 India is the second most populous country in the world, with approximately 1.39
62 billion people, representing 17.7% of the world population (Worldometer, 2021).
63 Europe came to India through trade and for almost 200 years India was under British
64 rule, resulting in revolutionary changes in its social, political, and economic life.
65 Indian military troops helped the British to control their empire and played a key role
66 up to the 20th century (Metcalf and Metcalf, 2006). On August 15, 1947, Britain
67 withdrew from India leaving two separate independent nations – India (largely Hindu)
68 and Pakistan (mainly Muslim).

69 While great diversity exists in India, there are also major commonalities shared by
70 our participants. Some of these cultural preferences create tension with the English
71 culture: India’s caste system makes it one of the most hierarchical societies
72 worldwide, and according to Hofstede (2021) this hierarchy is significantly more
73 accepted and embedded compared with England. Also, in comparison with England,
74 India is much more community oriented. A third major difference between the two
75 countries according to Hofstede (2021) is regarding ‘indulgence’ defined as the
76 extent to which people try to control their desires and impulses. India scores very low
77 on this scale compared to England meaning that Indian is a culture emphasises of
78 restraint much more.

79 **Gandhian Philosophy**

80 *Gandhian Philosophy* in Indian social work emanated from the religious and social
 81 ideas of Mahatma Gandhi and is based on the “twin cardinal principles of...truth and
 82 nonviolence” (Murphy, 1991, p.23); where “nonviolence [a.k.a. love] is regarded as
 83 the highest law of humankind” (ibid.). Gandhi believed in “self-sacrifice, *Satyagraha*
 84 [insistence on truth]...” (p.307). Known to abhor India’s caste system, Gandhi
 85 acknowledged that to thrive, society needs all types of labor, street sweeper through
 86 to prime minister, and only equality of wages will ‘free’ men to choose whatever work
 87 they desired or were fitted for. Only then will men be truly ‘equal’ (Nikam, 1954).
 88 Indian social work practice therefore evolved as an act of free, selfless service based
 89 on Gandhi’s social-activist Gandhi’s philosophy - a (simple) life dedicated to serving
 90 humanity. *Gandhian philosophy* became an integral part of the Indian social work
 91 curriculum and is still very relevant to today’s local practice.

92 **Professional Social Work in India**

93 ~~1936 was the year that~~ “professionalization of social work in India began” in 1936
 94 ~~(Nadkarni and Joseph, 2014, p.71). ~~With the help of American missionary Clifford~~~~
 95 ~~Manshardt, social work entered India as~~ a diploma course in the newly established
 96 Sir Dorabji Tata Graduate School of Social Work, Mumbai, (present-day Tata
 97 Institute of Social Sciences, TISS). American social work had a heavy influence on
 98 social work practice in post-colonial India. Today, although more contextually
 99 adjusted to India and local practices, students in India are taught using the United
 100 States’ National Association of Social Workers’ (NASW) code of ethics. When
 101 “professional social work was ‘imported’ to India from the West” (Nadkarni and
 102 Joseph, 2014, p.72), like in other nations, the profession was evolving from voluntary
 103 and charitable work rooted in philanthropy led by certain Indian social reformists; a
 104 culture of philanthropy as old as the nation’s 2000-year history (Kamat 2013, pp.5-6)
 105 that “existed in the form of almsgiving and charity to the poor and needy, creation of
 106 shelters and kitchens, and institutions for orphans and elderly people, the destitute,
 107 and beggars” (Nadkarni and Joseph, 2014, p.72).

108 By 1936, Christian missionaries who accompanied the British colonial masters had
 109 started important work with native Indians, especially those of the lowest castes.
 110 However, it was during post-independence India that the “herculean task to address
 111 the multiple dire needs of people” (Soundari, 2018, p.25) began in earnest. Soundari
 112 (2018) noted that only in the last eight decades of freedom did the “wellbeing of the
 113 poor and less privileged” (p.25) begin to take professional centre-stage. Nadkarni
 114 and Joseph (2014) also recorded a “very significant paradigm shift” (p.74) in Indian
 115 social work education influenced by the 1995 World Summit on Social Development,
 116 when social development issues became the focus for the UN. Accordingly, the
 117 Indian curriculum moved to a much greater focus on community development
 118 projects in deprived areas. This was reflected in the work experiences of our
 119 research participants before emigrating.

120 **Theoretical Framework**

121 Most of our participants emigrated from the southwestern Malabar coast of India
 122 (particularly from Kerala) and were strongly connected by social capital (Massey et
 123 al., 1993; Percot, 2012). Massey et al. further described such ‘connection’ or network
 124 as “sets of interpersonal ties that connect migrants, former migrants, and non-

migrants in origin and destination areas through ties of kinship, friendship, and shared community origin... lower[ing] the costs and risks of movement and increase[ing] the expected net returns to migration” (1993, p. 448). Our research participants have drawn heavily on the support, advice and guidance provided by their England-based professional network. India’s ‘community-oriented’ culture meant that most participants migrated also because there was already a group of trusted forerunners, leading to “chain migration” (Arango, 2018, p.292).

132 **Bourdieu’s Habitus**

133 Garrett (2018), Quoting Pierre Bourdieu, Garrett (2018), wrote: “Habitus is ‘society written into the body’: the body ‘does not memorize the past, it *enacts* the past, bringing it back to life” (pp.126-127). Understanding our body, therefore, helps us to understand the ‘life-games’ and social dilemmas that we find ourselves in; including the subtleties associated with class and gender. Bourdieu’s *habitus*, which originally explained the lack of class mobility in the French school system, is the ‘flair’ for what has been culturally developed in us through exposure. He noted that having ‘the feel’ for a particular activity/thing is not a *natural* bent however, but culturally learned over time. Garrett (2018) also notes in this regard:

142 “we are not automatons or mindless vehicles of our governing habitus.
143 Rather, habitus acts as a very loose set of guidelines permitting us to
144 strategize, adapt, improvise...to situations as they arise” (p.128).

145 Therefore, the The question we ask, therefore, is how has the national *habitus* Indian migrant social workers internalized while growing up and studying in India shaped how they perceive, interpret, and respond to the English culture, including the professional culture, they encounter once they migrate?

149 **Methodology**

150 Data collection employed a mixed-method design, incorporating an online survey completed by 41 contributors, a focus group with 10 participants, and 10 individual, semi-structured interviews lasting approximately 90 minutes each. All participants are Indian social workers aged over 21 who qualified in India before migrating to England, and in social work practice until no later than a year before the research commenced. We ‘hand-picked’ (purposive sampling) participants from an existing migrant network, used ‘referrals’ (snowball sampling) from participants to balance out the gender ratio and got some participants through the online survey (voluntary response sampling). Invitations, which included the Participant Information Sheet, were sent to participants directly or through the initial referral sources. The focus group was enabled at the migrant network’s annual general meeting. Key demographical data about those responding to the questionnaire is presented in table 1. Most of our participants are members of a professional network originating from Kerala. Over 95% of the membership of this network are Christians. As table 1 shows, most of our participants arrived more than 10 years ago and more than 80% of them were male. Interestingly, most of the male members are married to female nurses and arrived based on their wives’ work visa (Percot, 2012).

Total number of participants	41
Female %	17.1

Years in the UK (Mean) %

- Under 1 year 9.8
- 1-5 years 0.0
- Over 5 years 24.4
- Over 10 years 65.9

Areas of Practice %

- Children and families 22.2
 - Adult services 55.6
 - Mental Health 11.1
 - People with disabilities 5.6
 - Other 5.6
-

167

168 The main qualitative data set focused on issues around personal and professional
 169 integration into the English culture and adjustments made. The first interview and
 170 focus group were conducted face-to-face. Following the outbreak of CoronaVirus,
 171 nine interviews were conducted online, between May and June 2020. To gain
 172 additional insight into the current social work education and practice in India, we
 173 conducted an online interview with a social work academic teaching in one of
 174 Kerala's leading institutions of higher learning. The qualitative data were scrutinized
 175 using thematic analysis and themes focused on related to cultural issues were closely
 176 explored and will be at the centre of this article.

177 It is noteworthy that we and our research participants are migrants from minority
 178 ethnic backgrounds. Also, we are all bound by the same professional ethics and
 179 value base. We felt that these gave us instant affinity with the participants; we were
 180 seen as 'safe', 'insiders' and this gave us 'access'. Moreover, having received most
 181 of our initial education abroad, we could relate to most of the frustrations and/or
 182 limitations expressed by our participants. The research received approval from XXX
 183 University's ethics committee. All participants gave their informed consent to
 184 participate and for their data to be analysed and presented. To protect anonymity,
 185 all identifying information have been removed.

186 Findings and Discussion

188 The Individual, the Family and Wider Society

189 We now present and discuss our findings. While India is the second most populous
 190 country in the world and comprised of many different ethnic and religious groups, it
 191 has a collectivist tendency as a whole, certainly compared to England in which the
 192 individual plays a much stronger role, (Hofstede, 2021; Rakesh and Sinha Deb,
 193 2013; Ramamoorthy et al., 2007). As part of that difference, the characteristics,
 194 values, rights, responsibilities and almost every other aspect of family life, as the
 195 migrant Indian social worker knew it, was challenged in their new English
 196 environment. One participant remarked: "It's totally different, I can't even compare. I
 197 needed to learn what's right and wrong here and based on that I have to practice".

198 Below are some of the key issues our participants highlighted as related to these
199 differences.

200 **Defining the Family and its Values**

201 Considering the diversity of cultures and religions in India, generalizations are
202 difficult. However, and despite the changes Indian families go through and the
203 differences between rural and urban families (Jacob and Chattopadhyay, 2016),
204 across many sociological studies, "Indian families are considered classically as
205 large, patriarchal, collectivistic, joint families, harbouring three or more generations
206 vertically and kith and kin horizontally" (Rakesh and Sinha Deb, 2013, p. 300). This is
207 opposed to what a focus group participant described as "a pretty narrow definition of
208 family" for the English. For the Indian, the 'ideal family' includes both the nuclear and
209 extended family structures. Medora (2007) described the desirable joint/extended
210 Indian family:

211 "A joint family includes elderly parents and their children's families often living
212 under one roof. It includes kinsmen of two or three generations, including
213 uncles, aunts, nieces, nephews, and grandparents living together in the same
214 household. The joint family is generally composed of a number of family units
215 living in separate rooms of the same house. These members eat the food
216 cooked at one hearth, share a common income, share common property, are
217 related to one another through kinship ties, and worship the same idols. The
218 family supports and takes care of the elderly, widows, never-married adults,
219 and the disabled; assists during periods of unemployment; and provides
220 security and a sense of support and togetherness" (p.173).

221 In sharp contrast, the average English family is a nuclear family that includes a
222 couple and their children. According to Jenkins and Pereira (2009: 5), due to the
223 relaxation of societal attitudes in Britain in recent decades,

224 "It is no longer seen as unusual to be involved in a 'complicated' family
225 structure. Families are no longer just made up of married parents living with
226 their children. Although seven in ten households are still headed up by
227 married couples, this proportion has been declining... Families are now a mix
228 of cohabiting parents, stepfamilies, single-parent families, those living
229 apart...and civil partnerships, as well as the traditional nuclear family",
230 (Jenkins and Pereira, 2009: 5).

231 Whatever the structure, in predominantly individualistic English culture, the small
232 family unit is preferred. Participants also highlighted related differences in 'language'
233 use: for example, in "collectivistic" India, "we are all connected", everything is "we"
234 (not 'me' or 'I'); "there is no 'I' in family" vs. "individualistic" England where "I" rules;
235 "I" decides, and in the process "I sometimes forgets its responsibilities" which are
236 rarely mentioned. Whereas in England, one's individual rights take centre stage, in
237 India, one's responsibilities towards their family and community take that place. One
238 participant shared her surprise, when she realised that so many of her colleagues
239 eat on their own. Here is how she responded:

240 When I started working in this local authority, I never ate on my own... Before
241 anything, I would ask: 'have you had your lunch? Have you brought anything
242 for lunch? Do you plan to go out to get anything?' I had a tagline that 'if you sit

243 at a desk with [me], she will ask you about your life. If not, she will share her
 244 lunch...’ The lads sitting across (kind of joked) if you're sitting with [me], ‘you
 245 will have Indian lunch today...’ How can you eat when your neighbour is sitting
 246 hungry? Isn't that a kind of a responsibility on you to sort of look after your
 247 next-door neighbour type of thing?

This is a good example of the adaptability and flexibility of our habitus. Our participant realised her communal approach was not the common approach in her workplace, but instead of conforming to the new culture, she decided to challenge it and maintain the approach she brought from her home country. Our participants thought the English culture is “far more liberal”. One participant was convinced that the Indian family “survives because of kinship, the shared or communal caring role” where English “families are not complete, they are dissolving [because there are] no mutual responsibilities”. The Indian family places “responsibility over rights” whereas the opposite is true in England, probably also due to the rights-based social security system in England which somewhat reduces the need to lean on one's family. In India, parents’ caring role/responsibility is reciprocated in old age by their children; in England, care responsibility for older/vulnerable adults rests with the State. Another participant suggested that in England, any discussion about ‘responsibilities’ and ‘values’, which originate in religion, is replaced by a ‘rational’ and secular discussion about rights.

263 **‘Sanctity’ of Marriage**

264 Despite an increase in ‘cohabitation’ and 42% of English marriages ending in divorce
 265 (Martin 2016), the institution of marriage is still dominant and highly valued (Cultural
 266 Atlas, 2020):

267 *“[English] people remain committed and dedicated to partnership. Emphasis is*
 268 *placed on a couple’s intimate love for one another, rather than the social*
 269 *expectations of a marriage contract. The average...couple will be in a*
 270 *relationship for multiple years and live together before getting married” (ibid.).*

271 In comparison, India has one of the lowest rates of divorce globally and marriage is
 272 still a universal norm (Dommaraju, 2016; Jacob and Chattopadhyay, 2016). Medora
 273 (2007) writes: “Divorce was not even a remote possibility or ...thought of until recent
 274 times in India; there is a cultural, religious, and social stigma associated with divorce”
 275 (p.184). And while things are also changing in India, less than one in every thousand
 276 marriages ends up in divorce (Jacob and Chattopadhyay, 2016)

277 A divorced research participant shared how her mother stopped her from attending a
 278 major family event because “she was embarrassed that she’d have to tell people that
 279 her daughter is divorced [yet] wearing nice clothes, looking happy. They expect me
 280 to sit and cry”. Corroborating research participants’ views, Medora writes that Indians
 281 believe that marriage is a “sacred and sacramental union” (2007, p.181) and, if need
 282 be, parents and/or the extended family will ‘source’ one for their adult children (who
 283 cannot find a partner by themselves). Marriage is essentially between two ‘families’,
 284 **not** just two individuals (Medora, 2007).

285 Research participants also described differences in terminologies - “Husband” or
 286 “wife”, “Spouse” or “parents” (India) vs. “Partner” or “My mom’s partner but not my
 287 dad” (England). Indian families will do whatever is necessary to get the ‘right’ spouse

288 for their children, including consulting astrologers and placing matrimonial adverts “in
289 major national and international newspapers that are likely to attract wide
290 readership” (Medora, 2007, p.182). However, “many modern youths want to break
291 away from the custom of having their marriages arranged” (2007, p.183). An
292 interviewee added: “[It may be] helpful to know that a major reason for rural debt in
293 India is the expenses incurred when daughters get married and when someone dies
294 in the family! They have to invite the entire village for a meal on both occasions and
295 the debt is often inherited by future generations!”

296 Another aspect of the ‘sanctity’ of marriage in Indian society is the very negative light
297 in which stepchildren are viewed compared to England. One participant explained
298 that a “stepchild is ‘taboo’, a very dangerous thing” in India, and is likely to tarnish
299 the family’s reputation. Whereas “stepchildren are accepted as part of the family and
300 are very welcome” in England.

301 Our participants also shared their knowledge of family life in India, where children
302 live at home free of charge until they marry and have their own children if they so
303 desire. English parents in comparison “stress over their 16/18-year-old still at home,
304 not going out, not paying rent”. Clearly there are major differences between these
305 two cultures in their relation to the family.

306 **Discipline and punishment**

307 A research participant’s failure to spot a safeguarding risk during an assessment,
308 was a cause for concern for his manager. This participant did not see ‘anything
309 wrong’ with corporal punishment of a child. This was a good example of maintaining
310 a perspective rooted in the habitus internalised in the participant’s home country and
311 not being aware that it stands in contrast to local perspectives. In India, despite
312 legislation from the last decade forbidding corporal punishment in schools, it is still a
313 very common practice. A UNICEF study found that among children aged 8, over nine
314 in ten children in India reported witnessing a teacher administering corporal
315 punishment in the last week (Ogando, Portela and Pells 2015). Another focus group
316 participant wondered how this cultural difference may impact practice; especially with
317 Asian parents who, out of ignorance, think it is “okay to beat their kids in this
318 country”. A survey contributor admitted: “...my society does not accept State’s
319 interference in family life and corporal punishment is very common”.

320 **Privacy-Rules and Space Perceptions**

321 One central aspect of the different relations between the individual, the family and
322 wider society are the boundaries formed between those. An understanding of the
323 English ‘privacy rules’ and the “obsession with privacy” (Fox, 2014, p.18) may help to
324 throw some additional light on the negative attitude of the English to anybody who
325 ‘invades’ that privacy, as experienced by Indian migrant social workers who, for
326 example, needed to conduct home visits. Fox (2014) describes that a
327 disproportionate number of English ‘social rules’ have to do with safeguarding their
328 privacy: “we are taught to mind our own business, not to pry, to keep ourselves to
329 ourselves, and never wash our dirty linen in public” (Fox 2014, p.18). These
330 ‘negative politeness’ rules make the English intolerant of any uninvited intrusion.

331 But whereas the English is identified with the saying ‘my house is my castle’ and the
332 English code of polite behaviour requires never turning up at your friend’s house

1
2
3 333 without pre-arranging it, Indian politeness emphasise hospitality. Baldrige (2001)
4 334 describes the values reinforced (usually by the elders) in India's extended family
5 335 structure: "...[we were] taught that every visitor to our home should be fed....Even if
6 336 you have nothing, offer them water." (p.1519). When the speaker Baldrige cited left
7 337 a "salesman...on the porch for a few minutes" (ibid.), she was scolded by her
8 338 grandmother. In England, we leave uninvited/cold callers in no doubt as to what we
9 339 thought of/about them (assuming we opened the door to them at all).

10
11
12 340 In India, another participant explained, there is no expectation that [guests]
13 341 "contribute to food, drink, or snacks, unless it was pre-arranged. It is unthinkable to
14 342 invite people and ask them to pay for their own drinks, like at English birthday
15 343 parties". And although culture, class/social background play a part, Indians generally
16 344 prefer to socialise at home, as opposed to the English's preference for public places;
17 345 plus, "there's greater acceptance for people to 'casually' drop by, without prior
18 346 arrangement/invitation".

19
20
21 347 Regardless, research participants' views amply highlight a context that is indigenous
22 348 to the English social worker, but which required a lot of adjustments on the side of
23 349 the Indian social worker. Serving in the English 'welfare state' generally takes them
24 350 out of their 'comfort zone' and, ideally, would require a process of re-learning and
25 351 adaptation from the concept of *charity/respect for all* to England's *welfare/rights-*
26 352 *based* social work. Valentine (1996) wrote that:

27
28
29 353 "cultures exhibit varying degrees of interactional sociolinguistic [and] studies
30 354 show that a difference in pragmatic conventions such as politeness can lead
31 355 to breakdown in intercultural and interethnic communication and [lead] to
32 356 cross-cultural conflict" (p.281).

33
34 357 Valentine's claim perhaps explains why an interviewee would find it "traumatic" that
35 358 her manager suggested that a service user might be lying about needing
36 359 "emergency fund" to tide them over the weekend. This concept of "lying" to get
37 360 welfare money was "incredible" to this Indian migrant who saw things from a different
38 361 viewpoint, where lying would endanger one's honour which, in a community-oriented
39 362 society, would be highly risky and therefore less conceivable.

40 363 **The 'Indian Credit Check'**

41
42
43 364 Where the English would go to lengths to safeguard their privacy, the 'Indian credit
44 365 check' is how an interviewee described the extent to which Indians will go to solicit
45 366 information, disregarding many of the English personal space/privacy rules. Whereas
46 367 the English **emphasise** privacy, the extended Indian family structure allows "no clear
47 368 defining boundaries between *mine* and *ours*" (Medora, 2007, p.181). To highlight the
48 369 importance of the English 'privacy rule', Fox cited Paxman who wrote: "The
49 370 importance of privacy informs the entire organization of the country, from the
50 371 assumptions on which laws are based, to the buildings in which the English live."
51 372 (2014, p.19). For the Indian however, "the need for psychological and physical space
52 373 and privacy is not as important...The notion of privacy, the need to desire it, to value
53 374 it, and the thought of intruding on another person's privacy is not understood by most
54 375 Indian[s]", (Medora, 2007, p.181).

55
56
57
58 376 Research interviewee confessed that she would have returned to India years ago,
59 377 but she developed health challenges and rather cherishes the privacy and "super

independence” the English health service affords her. In India, her health issue would be “a family drama, a community event”. She explained:

“...there’s a different sense of one’s personal space, confidentiality is very different. So, if I was unwell...I would have my [medical] file with me and every auntie/uncle/their dog/cat visiting would want to see and give their opinion, whether they were medics or not. ...Suddenly, as an ‘unattached’ woman, your family thinks they’re responsible for you...[No], I value my [English] independence too much.”

Participants agreed that in India, one’s personal space is much more limited than in England. People can “walk right up close, even touch you, without your consent” explained one participant. There is also the other ‘space’: “how much credit you are given...to handle your own affairs”. This is gendered; “as a woman, it’s okay for people to meddle, ask very poky questions”, explained another participant. So, England gives this participant “a lot more space...a sense of confidentiality. In the English office/professional environment, no one will ask for the gory details [of my life]; no need to endure the Indian Credit Check”. Contrary to a previous example, in which a participant decided to maintain her communal practices of sharing lunch with her colleagues - a part of her Indian habitus - this participant much preferred to remove herself from that habitus and adopt local practices offering her greater autonomy.

‘Family Knowing’

Another key aspect of the different way in which boundaries are drawn, and which attracted the attention of our participants is what interviewees described as the very strong and rigid emphasis on separating ‘personal’ from the ‘professional’ in English social work. Indian social workers introduced us to the concept of “Family Knowing”: practices which allow social workers, who often live and work in the same rural community as service users, to develop much more informal and outside-of-work relationships/rapport with them, with a view to better understand their situation. “Family Knowing” involves going to service users’ homes and attending family events and celebrations even if outside of working hours. Whereas “here [England], it’s only working relationship, during work hours...” Our interviewee was “really shocked” at the lack of “family knowing” and it caused him to “struggle” initially: “I want that connection with people...I want to settle with them very well.” He also confessed that even now, 14 years on, he tries to encourage members of the team he now manages to offer just that little bit of extra support whenever they can: “I try to leave the real me outside the gate (at work), but it is still inside” he explained, referring to the tension between much stricter professional boundaries accepted in England and the looser version he was familiar with in India. The emphasis on strict boundaries separating the professional from the personal in English social work is strongly linked to its modern and ‘scientific’ attempt to ensure ‘objectivity’, and the fear that developing closer relations with service users will obscure professional judgment. It is potentially also connected to the profession’s middle class and colonial heritage where ‘us’ – the middle class (i.e., charity worker, social worker or someone taking part in the colonial enterprise) and ‘them’ had to be sharply separated (Wing Sue, 2016). Other possible influences relate to the “risk society” and the public’s growing awareness of risks, some of which are caused by professionals (Beck, 1992).

424 **The Social Worker as a Public Servant and the State**

425 Adapting to the very different social worker-service user relationship in England was
 426 another major challenge, as declared by several research participants. One focus
 427 group participant put it this way:

428 *“(In India), you are going into the society as somebody who is kind,*
 429 *benevolent...the service user will accept you as someone who is genuinely*
 430 *coming to help them... So, there is an aura of being helpful and...selfless and*
 431 *empathetic and all that...There was a nice burden of expectation. Whereas*
 432 *here...We come to a welfare state – that in itself is a strange concept for us,*
 433 *you know, because it is surprising to think, why would somebody pay you*
 434 *(benefit) to look after your own child(ren)?...That’s strange. Then from*
 435 *that...everything is free – education is free, health is free. So, because the*
 436 *state gives citizens the right to access that, and you are going in to ensure the*
 437 *welfare of a child from that rights-based approach...the child(ren) have the*
 438 *right to be protected from a child protection (CP) point of view and you are*
 439 *going in as the long arm of the state, an enforcement officer... Therefore, you*
 440 *are an enemy, treated literally like dirt – ‘I don’t want you knocking on my*
 441 *door; f-off! ... go away.’...It perplexed and shocked me... why? ...”*

442 The Gandhian philosophy mentioned previously, which shapes the image of the
 443 Indian social worker as a selfless public servant whose community’s interest is at the
 444 centre of what they do, helps to explain why social workers in India are seen in a
 445 positive light. This selfless devotion as a professional ethos is accompanied by the
 446 impact of major statutory differences. In the absence of social security legislation in
 447 India, the State is not obligated to provide welfare. Any support provided is therefore
 448 seen as an act of charity, a gift that must be returned by the citizen in the form of
 449 compliance with the political order and remaining indebted to the State. Unlike
 450 charity, social justice does not position the beneficiary in an unbalanced relationship.
 451 Hakak and Anton (2020) remarked that a system built on principles of social justice
 452 is not based on the gift, therefore minimizing social interactions around it:

453 *“The gift is replaced by social benefit... defined as an expression of a*
 454 *fundamental right. The one who receives social benefits is not the subject of a*
 455 *favour. ...The gift [becomes] a kind of moral and financial reparation; an act of*
 456 *justice done to its beneficiary. This approach is based on a philosophy that*
 457 *implicitly recognises the unjust and arbitrary nature of this world and tries,*
 458 *through the tools available to it, to mitigate the consequences of the*
 459 *fundamental injustice of the world. ...Social justice is not institutionalised*
 460 *mercy, nor compassion managed by the state, but a radically different*
 461 *approach to human relations which emphasises the rights of the one who*
 462 *receives, not the virtues of the one who gives” (p.5).*

463 In India however, for the same foregoing reasons, the image of social workers
 464 creates “a nice burden of expectation”. The English social worker functions within
 465 totally different legislations. Our rights-based social security turns the social worker,
 466 in the words of our participant, into “*the long arm of the state, an enforcement officer*”
 467 who ensures that such rights are maintained. This often requires social workers to
 468 enforce certain decisions on families and/or individuals, making them so unpopular
 469 that they are “treated literally like dirt”. Our participant explained these major

1
2
3 470 differences they encountered following migration, the bafflement they felt at the time,
4 471 and the difficulty in adjusting. Based on our participant's comment one might think
5 472 that, back in India, social workers are always perceived positively. However, as
6 473 mentioned earlier, India is a highly stratified society with a long-lasting caste system.
7 474 Assuming that access to higher education will more likely be available to those from
8 475 groups at the higher end of the social stratification, and that their service users are
9 476 more likely to be from the lower end of it, we can ~~assume-suppose that~~ tensions exist
10 477 on this basis.

11
12
13 478 The issue of Parental Responsibility (PR) also perplexed participants and connects
14 479 directly to the rights-based social security approach. It makes the 'State' responsible
15 480 for safeguarding and protecting the vulnerable. Research participants found it difficult
16 481 to adjust to the idea that parents in England may not be 'legally' responsible for their
17 482 offspring and that PR is not automatic to the child's father/mother: "how can you be
18 483 parents but have no PR?" Many saw this as an extreme example of State intrusion
19 484 into areas which would be out of bounds in India.

20
21
22 485 Some of our research participants described the top-down procedural social work
23 486 practice they encountered in England and its impact on professional autonomy. A
24 487 focus group participant bemoaned the "loss" of their "Indian freedom" of 'genuine'
25 488 direct work with families where they had the 'autonomy' to create "localized
26 489 solutions" for service users' issues. Another participant stated, "One main weakness
27 490 is that the English systems are very hesitant to learn from others, be flexible in their
28 491 approach... it is an arrogant system".

29
30
31 492 A survey contributor followed a similar line and expressed his frustration at the lack
32 493 of autonomy and the drastic reduction in the role of social workers in England, where
33 494 they often mainly act as case managers. From this participant's perspective, social
34 495 workers in England are not authorized to "try to fix" anomalies unilaterally; "*rather*
35 496 *you bring it back to the office [and] ask someone else (to fix it) or [you] tell the police,*
36 497 *tell the psychiatrist. Then you bring in the whole paraphernalia; what is that about?"*

37
38
39 498 Other research participants bemoaned the narrowing focus on risk assessment and
40 499 its mitigation, and the rising thresholds for accessing services. This means that
41 500 resources are directed only at those at the greatest levels of risk, and no funding is
42 501 left for working with individuals and communities at much earlier stages before things
43 502 escalate. One survey contributor compared the situation in both countries: "*social*
44 503 *work is more action-oriented and preventative back home. Here in England, it is*
45 504 *more about addressing problems...once they have reached an unsafe situation".*

46
47
48 505 Conversely, other contributors were especially positive about the legislation existing
49 506 in England ensuring equality to minority groups and safeguarding vulnerable children
50 507 and adults. One participant thought that it was "*hugely worrying*" that India did not
51 508 have any "*formalized system to minimize risk to vulnerable groups... or anything*
52 509 *remotely comparable to DBS checks, registration and fitness to practice tribunals*".

53 54 510 **Hierarchies and the 'Unspoken' Language**

55
56 511 All participants approved of what ostensibly appeared, compared to India, to be a
57 512 'non-hierarchical' office set up characteristic of English local authorities. An
58 513 interviewee thought that it was "quite refreshing that everybody sat on the same
59 514 floor" and were on first-name terms, different from "very stratified" India where

1
2
3 515 participants could not “imagine” calling their superiors by name. In the same breath,
4 516 however, the interviewee announced, “within a month [of starting] it was pretty
5 517 clear... I understood the rules of the game: that there’s a lot of language that gets
6 518 spoken here, but the old set of structures are pretty much intact.” She felt there was
7 519 “a lot of lip service”, bordering on hypocrisy, in the English ‘system’. According to
8 520 Hofstede (2021) India scores very high on the power-distance dimension measuring
9 521 attitude toward social hierarchies and indicating high level of acceptance of
10 522 hierarchies. The English, despite their renowned class system, score much lower on
11 523 that scale (Hofstede, 2021).

14 524 Notwithstanding the hierarchical debate, there is also the culturally different ways of
15 525 addressing senior colleagues and ~~the~~ elderly people in India compared to England.
16 526 Our participants agreed that regardless of their title or socio-economic status, an
17 527 Indian would never address an older person by first name; “it is culturally
18 528 inappropriate”. Valentine (1996) referred to this issue when she wrote: “in Indian
19 529 languages, politeness is defined in terms of structural and cultural appropriateness”
20 530 (p.282). An utterance cannot by itself be culturally polite/suitable or otherwise without
21 531 viewing it in the context of the speaker’s position in that social situation and society’s
22 532 expectations of the speaker in the relevant context. So, your ‘position’ decides what
23 533 spoken ‘language’ you can get away with or not, and with who. Different from the
24 534 English’s use of ‘negative politeness’, Indians use *honorifics* which Valentine (1996)
25 535 describes “as a pan-Asian feature of showing deference and politeness in Indian
26 536 languages” (p.290). The English do not have this “hierarchical structure...or
27 537 strategies to soften...possible disagreement” (Valentine, 1996, p.290). Hofstede
28 538 (2021) also provided a possible explanation for this issue; he wrote that in societies,
29 539 all “individuals are not equal” (no page) and the ‘less powerful’ must accept that
30 540 power distribution is unequal.

34 541 One participant who initially came to England to study for his 2nd Master’s degree
35 542 told of how his (English) lecturer “reminded” him numerous times to stop calling him
36 543 “sir”; in India you dared not call your lecturer by any other name/title. Plus, he “found
37 544 it very strange” that his teacher wore “half trousers” and carried a bottle of Coke to
38 545 class: this differed from what he was used to “back home”.

41 546 Another gesture that may be more specific to the Keralites was greeting people with
42 547 a smile, which differed from what some participants experienced in England and as
43 548 expressed her by one of our interviewees:

45 549 *“When we [Indians] meet, I come with a smile...That is how we actually greet*
46 550 *people. If it is an official one, a **Namaste** will be the best. ...There are also*
47 551 *some gender issues ...if it is male to male greeting, it will usually be smiling or*
48 552 *shake of hands. But if it is a male to a female, **Namaste** will be the greeting”.*
49 553 Then he added, “There’s no smile here [in England]”.

52 554 Kate Fox (2014) explained that the English emphasis on privacy is often perceived
53 555 as arrogant, cold, and unfriendly. She described it as a symptom of ‘social dis-ease’
54 556 and connected it with negative politeness. Hitching (2013) expatiated on this when
55 557 she stressed that the restraint, cautiousness, and contact-avoidance of, for example,
56 558 English public-transport passengers that foreigners often complain about, are all
57 559 features of negative politeness which emphasize not intruding or impinging on
58 560 others’ space, time, or privacy.

561 Conclusions

562 Our findings ~~highlight explored~~ some of the key cultural tensions experienced by our
563 participants after migrating from India to England. They spoke about the tensions
564 between India as a more community-oriented society compared with the stronger
565 emphasis on individualism in England and the many implications such difference had
566 on a wide range of spheres of life and practices. They highlight the differences in
567 perceptions and attitudes towards the family, marriage and parenting, and the
568 differences in the boundaries between the individual, the family and community, the
569 private and the public, and the private and the professional; they also spoke about
570 differences resulting from the more hierarchical character of Indian society and from
571 differing concepts with regards to politeness and hospitality. These differences have
572 direct impact on the interactions social workers have with service users, colleagues,
573 and managers, and becoming aware of them is therefore of great importance. Most
574 of our participants are from Kerala, India, and considering the size of the country,
575 social workers coming from other regions might experience other challenges.
576 Regardless, this study has highlighted an issue that needs further exploration. The
577 importance of understanding how cultural differences between India and England
578 impact migrant social workers—~~professionals~~ cannot be overlooked or
579 overemphasized. ~~As a nation, England stands to gain from familiarizing itself with the~~
580 ~~cultural capital/habitus that Indian social workers bring to practice and leveraging~~
581 ~~that to its advantage. And for the migrants, a~~ An understanding of the impact of the
582 culture and habitus they have originally internalised and of the culture and habitus of
583 the country they migrated to, as well as the implications of these for their practice,
584 will support their successful transition and help them improve their practice. Such
585 understandings are likely to require more time and effort currently provided for
586 induction purposes. The findings in this study will not only contribute to learning but
587 also provide evidence for further studies, including workplace education and
588 adaptations that will influence future social work policies.

589

590 REFERENCES

- 591 Arango, J. (2018) 'Explaining migration: a critical view', *International Social Science*
592 *Journal*, 68(227-228), pp. 105-117. doi: 10.1111/issj.12183.
- 593 Baldrige, D. (2001) 'Indian Elders: Family Traditions in Crisis', *American Behavioral*
594 *Scientist*, 44(9), pp. 1515-1527. doi: 10.1177/00027640121956953.
- 595 Bartley, A. and Beddoe, L. (2018) *Transnational social work: Opportunities and*
596 *challenges of a global profession*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- 597 Beck, Ulrich (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, Sage Publications.
- 598 Cultural Atlas (2020) *British Culture: Family*. Available
599 at: <https://culturalatlas.sbs.com.au/british-culture/british-culture-family>
600 (Accessed: 24 July 2020).
- 601 Das, D.K. (2012) 'Relevance of Gandhian Philosophy in Contemporary Period', *A*
602 *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(2), pp. 307-318.

- 1
2
3 603 Dommaraju, P. (2016) Divorce and Separation in India, *Population and Development*
4 604 *Review*, Vol. 42 (2): 195-223 Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/44015635>
5
6 605 Fox, K. (2014) *Watching the English: the hidden rules of English behaviour revised*
7 606 *and updated*. London: HODDER & STOUGHTON.
8
9 607 Garrett, P.M. (2018) *Social Work and Social Theory 2e: Making Connections*. 2nd
10 608 edn. Bristol: The Policy Press.
11
12 609 Hitching, H. (2013) *Sorry! The English and Their Manners*, Hodder & Stoughton
13 610 General Division
14
15 611 Hofstede, G. (2021) *What About India?* Available at: [https://www.hofstede-](https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/india,the-uk/)
16 612 [insights.com/country-comparison/india,the-uk/](https://www.hofstede-insights.com/country-comparison/india,the-uk/) (Accessed: 27.05.21).
17
18 613 Hussein, S., Manthorpe, J. and Stevens, M. (2010) 'People in Places: A Qualitative
19 614 Exploration of Recruitment Agencies' Perspectives on the Employment of
20 615 International Social Workers in the UK', *The British journal of social work*, 40(3), pp.
21 616 1000-1016. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcn131.
22
23 617 Jacob, S. and Chattopadhyaya, S. (2016) Marriage Dissolution in India Evidence from
24 618 Census 2011, *Economic & Political Weekly*, vol LI (3): 25-27.
25
26 619 Jenkins, I. and Pereira, I. (2009) *Families in Britain: The Impact of Changing Family*
27 620 *Structure and What the Public Think*, Ipsos MORI and Policy Exchange
28
29 621 Kamat, A. (2013) 'Preface', in Cantegreil, M., Chanana, D. and Kattumuri, R.
30 622 (ed.) *Revealing Indian Philanthropy* London: Alliance Publishing Trust, pp. 5-6.
31
32 623 Maharana, D.K. (2010) 'IN DEFENCE OF INDIAN PERSPECTIVE OF
33 624 MULTICULTURALISM', *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, 71(1), pp. 69-83.
34
35 625 Martin, A. (2013) Factsheet: Separation and Divorce - A Summary of Statistics for
36 626 the UK, Relate Policy and Research Team
37
38 627 Massey, D.S., Arango, J., Hugo, G., Kouaouci, A., Pellegrino, A. and Taylor, J.E.
39 628 (1993) 'Theories of International Migration: A Review and Appraisal', *Population and*
40 629 *Development Review*, 19(3), pp. 431-466. doi: 10.2307/2938462.
41
42 630 Medora, N.P. (2007) 'Strengths and Challenges in the Indian Family', *Marriage &*
43 631 *Family Review*, 41(1-2), pp. 165-193. doi: 10.1300/J002v41n01_09.
44
45 632 Metcalf, B.D. and Metcalf, T.R. (2006) *A Concise History of Modern India*. 2nd edn.
46 633 New York: Cambridge University Press.
47
48 634 Murphy, S. (1991) *Why Gandhi is Relevant in Modern India: A Western Gandhian's*
49 635 *Personal Discovery*. Gandhi Peace Foundation; Academy of Gandhian Studies New
50 636 Delhi : Hyderabad
51
52 637 Nadkarni, V.V. and Joseph, S. (2014) 'Envisioning a professional identity:: charting
53 638 pathways through social work education in India', in Noble, C., Strauss, H. and
54 639 Littlechild, B. (eds.) *Global social work: Crossing borders, blurring*
55 640 *boundaries* Australia: Sydney University Press, pp. 71-84.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 641 Nikam, N.A. (1954) 'Gandhi's Philosophy', *The Review of Metaphysics*, 7(4), pp. 668-
4 642 678.
- 5
6 643 Nowicka, M. (2015) 'Habitus: Its Transformation and Transfer through Cultural
7 644 Encounters in Migration', in Costa, Cristina, Murphy, Mark & Martin, Reginald
8 645 (ed.) *Bourdieu, Habitus and Social Research: The Art of Application* London:
9 646 Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 93-110.
- 10
11 647 Ogando Portela, M.J. and K. Pells (2015). *Corporal Punishment in Schools:
12 648 Longitudinal Evidence from Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam*, Innocenti Discussion
13 649 Paper No. 2015-02, UNICEF Office of Research, Florence.
- 14
15 650 Percot, M. (2012) Transnational masculinity: Indian nurses' husbands in Ireland, *e-
16 651 Migrinter* (8): 74-86. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/e-migrinter.630>
- 17
18 652 Pullen-Sansfaçon, A., Spolander, G. and Engelbrecht, L. (2012) 'Migration of
19 653 Professional Social Workers: Reflections on Challenges and Strategies for
20 654 Education', *Social Work Education*, 31(8), pp. 1032-1045. doi:
21 655 10.1080/02615479.2011.609543.
- 22
23 656 Rakesh, K. Chadda, R. K. and Sinha Deb, K. (2013) Indian family systems,
24 657 collectivistic society and psychotherapy, *Indian J Psychiatry*, 55(2): S299–S309. doi:
25 658 10.4103/0019-5545.105555
- 26
27 659 Ramamoorthy, N., Kulkarni, S.P., Gupta, A., Flood P. C. (2007) Individualism–
28 660 collectivism orientation and employee attitudes: A comparison of employees from the
29 661 high-technology sector in India and Ireland, *Journal of International Management* 13
30 662 (2007) 187–203.
- 31
32 663 Shortage Occupation List (2021), available at:
33 664 [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/immigration-rules/immigration-rules-appendix-shortage-
34 665 occupation-list](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/immigration-rules/immigration-rules-appendix-shortage-occupation-list) (accessed on 26.05.21)
- 35
36 666
37 667 Soundari, H. (2018) *Emergence of Social Work Profession in India: From
38 668 Intercultural and Decolonial Perspective*, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-21090-
39 669 8_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-21090-8_3): Springer.
- 40
41 670 Tharoor, S. (2000) *India: From midnight to the millennium*. India: Penguin Books.
- 42
43 671 Turner, A. (2017) *Why councils are looking overseas for social workers*. Available
44 672 at: [https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2017/07/20/councils-looking-overseas-social-
45 673 workers/](https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2017/07/20/councils-looking-overseas-social-workers/) (Accessed: 18 June 2020).
- 46
47 674 Valentine, T.M. (1996) 'Politeness Models in Indian English', *LFE: Revista de
48 675 lenguas para fines especificos*, 3, pp. 279-302.
- 49
50 676 Walz, T. and Ritchie, H. (2000) 'Gandhian Principles in Social Work Practice: Ethics
51 677 Revisited', *Social Work*, 45(3), pp. 213-222. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/45.3.213>.
- 52
53 678 Wing S. D. (2016) *Race Talk and the Conspiracy of Silence: Understanding and
54 679 Facilitating Difficult Dialogues on Race*, New Jersey: Wiley
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

680 Worldometer (2021) *India Population*. Available at:
681 <https://www.worldometers.info/world-population/india-population/> (Accessed: 01
682 March 2021).

683

Draft Manuscript for Review