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Abstract

Purpose
The aim of this paper is to present an analysis of media reactions to the BBC Television Panorama programme, ‘Behind Closed Doors’ and to set this in the context of interviews with care staff about their reflections on publicity about poor practice in the care sector.

Design/methodology/approach
This paper reports on an analysis of media reactions to recent exposes of abuse in social care in England and data from an interview based study of care workers. The interviews were analysed to consider the impact of such media reports on staff and to explore their views of action that might be need to be taken about care failings.

Findings
There are mixed reactions to exposes of poor care on television and to the debates that precede and follow their broadcast. Debates occur in print and on television, but also in social media. The particular expose of care home practices by the Panorama programme, ‘Behind Closed Doors’, led to debate in England about the potential role of covert cameras in care homes. The interviews revealed that while care staff are affected by scandals in the media about social care; they do not necessarily focus on themes that the media stories subsequently highlight. Overall some are disenchanted while others have ideas of what needs to change to improve practice. Care staff consider that there remain problems in raising concerns about practices and some staff feel unable to stay in workplaces where they have made complaints.

Research limitations/implications
The care workers interviewed may not be representative of the sector and they may have wished to provide socially acceptable answers to the researchers. Practice was not observed.

Practical implications
Local Safeguarding Adult Boards may wish to develop a communications strategy to deal with requests for reactions to media reports locally and nationally. Safeguarding practitioners may wish to prepare for increased referrals following media coverage of poor care in their areas. They may later be able to use media reports to discuss any local differences of interpretation over matters such as prosecutions for abuse. Trainers and educationalists may wish to clarify the importance given by care providers to raising concerns, the ways in which difficult conversations can be held, and the protections available to whistle-blowers or those raising concerns – with local examples to provide assurance that this is not mere rhetoric.
Originality/value
Television reports of problems with social care attract wide media interest but we know very little about how care workers respond to depictions of their work and their occupational grouping. This paper links media and expert commentator reactions to television exposes with data acquired from interviews with those on the frontline of care.
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Introduction

On 30th April 2014 at 9 pm, the BBC televised an investigative documentary entitled Behind Closed Doors: Social Care Exposed as part of its long-running current affairs series, Panorama. The programme showed, through covert filming, the apparent abuse and neglect of care home residents by care workers, and commentaries were provided by social care experts. Incidents had been filmed in two independent care homes, Oban House in South Croydon then owned by HC-One Company and the August Equity-backed care village The Old Deanery in Essex. The undercover filming at The Old Deanery appeared to show some residents being mocked repeatedly on separate occasions, roughly handled, and one resident was shown apparently being physically assaulted. At Oban House a secret camera in a resident’s room recorded her calls for assistance to help her get to the toilet, apparently without anyone coming to offer assistance in time.

Four Panorama programmes have featured the mistreatment and poor care of vulnerable adults by health and social care workers in recent years. An expose of Winterbourne View Hospital was aired on Tuesday 31 May 2011, with the title Undercover Care: The Abuse Exposed and an update on political reactions and service changes following responses to the Winterbourne View report followed on 29th October 2012, with the title Winterbourne View - The Hospital That Stopped Caring.
In between the two programmes covering Winterbourne View, a further Panorama programme was broadcast on 23rd April 2012, entitled *Undercover Elderly Care*. This used secret footage obtained from a hidden video camera disguised as an alarm clock that had been placed by a suspicious daughter in the bedroom of her mother, a resident at *Ash Court Care Home* in Kentish Town, North London. She was concerned about the frequent physical bruises on her mother’s upper arms and signs of emotional distress. Extracts from the two day’s film footage were broadcast (see Greig 2012 for a critical account of what he saw as the superficiality of the analysis of care quality).

Prior to the broadcast of *Behind Closed Doors* the content was released to the wider media by the BBC. The story both focused on poor quality of care and how this had reportedly been declining over time in the two homes (and in Winterbourne View), numerous attempts to notify the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and the management by the two homes of their problems.

During this time we were conducting an ongoing study of the social care workforce in England. Media attention to social care provided an unexpected element during fieldwork since, not surprisingly, many participants made reference to external perceptions of the sector. While retaining our focus on the key elements of our study (recruitment and retention) we adapted our interview schedules to capture data on contemporary concerns. While our research is not being undertaken in the localities covered by the Panorama programmes, it was evident that across England reactions to the TV transmissions and subsequent media debates were affecting the whole sector. It is in this context that this article is set; starting with a synthesis of some of the press and social care community’s reactions (as reported in the media) to the programme.

**Background**
In this section we focus on the numerous and vociferous reactions to *Behind Closed Doors*. We collected an illustrative sample of national newspaper headlines (see Box 1) to communicate the essence of media reactions. The media responses to subsequent stories were similar in content.

**Box 1: Media headline reports of the Panorama programme *Behind Closed Doors***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of National Newspaper</th>
<th>Headline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The Guardian               | **Essex care home worker sacked over elderly abuse claims**  
BBC's Panorama says undercover reporter filmed staff mocking residents and ignoring their calls for help  
*Wednesday 30 April 2014*  
**Essex care home worker arrested on suspicion of assaulting elderly resident**  
Police detain woman after Panorama broadcast shows resident being bullied and slapped at Old Deanery in Braintree  
*Saturday 3 May 2014*  
| The Independent            | **Elderly care home abuse: Shocking footage shows elderly residents being taunted and assaulted at Essex care home,**  
*Wednesday 30 April 2014*  
| The Daily Mail             | *'Will you help me, please?’ Bedridden great-grandmother, 98, cried out 321 times in an hour - but her carers ignored her, reveals shocking secret film taken inside homes*  
*30th April 2014*  
| The Mirror                 | **Woman arrested over 'assault on care home resident uncovered by Panorama investigation’**  
*May 03, 2014 11:05*  
[http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/old-deanery-care-home-woman-3490375#ixzz36tdLwSjS](http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/old-deanery-care-home-woman-3490375#ixzz36tdLwSjS)  
**Eight people suspended after care home mistreatment probe**  
*Apr 30, 2014 00:18*  
[http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/eight-people-suspended-](http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/eight-people-suspended-)**
The initial reactions, as reported in the national press, included statements from politicians and other social care stakeholders, some of whom had been interviewed or provided almost immediate media statements. Minister of State for Care and Support at the time, Rt. Hon. Norman Lamb, MP, argued that the minority of care providers that fail to meet acceptable standards needed to be tackled and that they should be under ‘no illusion’ as having a place as social care providers. He added that collaboration between government, the regulators, local authorities and providers would help improve standards and ensure that ‘our loved ones’ get the best possible care (excerpts from the BBC Panorama 30th April 2014)

http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b042rcjp/panorama-behind-closed-doors-elderly-care-exposed). Later he described the images broadcast as ‘absolutely disgusting’ and said there ‘could be a role’ for the use of closed circuit television (CCTV) in care homes (BBC News UK, 2014).
Chief Inspector of Adult Social Care at the health and social care regulator, the Care Quality Commission (CQC), Andrea Sutcliffe declared:

There are organisations that are running homes and they are getting paid to provide care and to provide support. We are expecting these people who are running services and who are managing these services to deliver, people should not be getting into this business if they don’t care. (Extract from BBC Panorama interview 30th April 2014 http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b042rcjp/panorama-behind-closed-doors-elderly-care-exposed).

She later commented, ‘I’m shocked and really angry about what Panorama has found’ stating that the incidents portrayed, were ‘heartfelt’ by those affected but also to the ‘hundreds of thousands’ of good care workers who had been let down by the ‘small minority’ (BBC News 30th April 2014 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-27229367).

A representative of the owners of The Old Deanery was quoted in the Panorama programme as saying that the incidents involved a ‘small number of staff’ and were not reflective of the high standards of care it demanded from its employees. A further statement provided by the company reported that ‘as soon as the new management team was made aware of the allegations we took immediate action’. These were listed as including hiring an independent law firm to carry out a full investigation, suspending eight staff who had ‘not returned to work, pending a full inquiry’ and dismissing ‘the care worker responsible for slapping a resident’ (as apparently seen on the footage). It added, ‘Our priority remains the health and wellbeing of our residents and we have more than 200 dedicated members of staff who remain committed to the highest standards of care’ (http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b042rcjp/panorama-behind-closed-doors-elderly-care-exposed).
Oban House in South Croydon, owned by HC-One Company, also featured in the programme. Its representative stated ‘The failings in care from that period are totally unacceptable. We apologise unreservedly to (the resident) and her family. We always seek to deliver the kindest possible care’. (http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/episode/b042rcjp/panorama-behind-closed-doors-elderly-care-exposed).

From the voluntary sector came further reactions of shock and calls for policy reform. Caroline Abrahams, charity director of Age UK, stated: ‘I want to see the elderly and their families given more of a say in the running of care homes and clear avenues to raise the alarm when standards do drop and staff given more protection when they do speak out’ (BBC News 30th April 2014 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-27225318).

The Health and Care Professions Council used the Panorama programme debate to illustrate its case for care workers in England to be registered and thus regulated:

Yet again, we are presented with evidence of appalling treatment of vulnerable individuals in our care homes. Whilst we recognize that the vast majority of people working within this sector are dedicated individuals working in difficult circumstances, there is no individual regulation at present to ensure minimum standards of care. (Seale and van der Gaard, 2014)

Specific themes

One response that emerged in the media was the ‘need’ to set up hidden cameras in care homes, as suggested by Norman Lamb MP, and also the representative of one of the care home chains (HC-One) that was implicated in the programme. The Care Industry News website reported:
One of the homes investigated is part of HC-One who this week announced they were considering installing CCTV into all their homes to prevent care staff from abusing residents. (Care Industry News, 2014)

The CCTV industry also developed this storyline, with the trade expressing positive opinions about the capacity and ethics of CCTV technology. Trade unions were reported as taking this suggestion seriously. Justin Bowden, GMB National Officer for the care sector, said ‘Cameras in care homes is a highly emotive subject which provokes understandably strong views and such a big step requires very careful consideration. HC-One is wise to be approaching this with caution and as part of a wide scale consultation. GMB will be talking to our 6,000 members in 227 HC-One care homes – the experts in providing care to the vulnerable and elderly – and seeking their views’ (Professional Security Magazine, online 2014).

This suggestion was not uniformly welcomed, as some experts argued:

The answer to preventing abuse in any care setting is not an Orwellian vision of society with cameras and computers spying on every person’s movements. Technology is a quick fix, and will not address what happened at the Old Deanery care home in Essex. Society needs to wake up to the changing demographic of increasing numbers of frail older people, in particular those with dementia, and a more sophisticated debate needs to be had about how to manage this frailty and pay for care. (Meyer, 2014)

It is with a heavy heart that those of us in the care industry pick up the headlines to see "staff sacking and suspensions over poor elderly care" and "CCTV could be considered" in the papers. (Smith, 2014)
In response, the CQC (2015) produced a guidance leaflet about covert recording entitled, ‘Thinking of using hidden camera or other equipment to monitor someone’s care?’ This was reported in the Daily Mail (McTague, 2014), and The Times (Bennett, 2014), as families being given the ‘green light to spy’ on care homes.

Significantly, the Royal College of Nursing’s conference passed a resolution on 22 June 2015 opposing covert surveillance with three quarters voting against hidden cameras (Plomin, 2016:194). This development was reported in the Daily Mail as "Ban worried relatives from filming the elderly in care homes" argue nurses who "don’t want to be scrutinised".

Joe Plomin, the investigative journalist (who has made five films about social care and produced the Panorama documentary exposing Winterbourne View Hospital) argues that there is often a ‘fake’ argument for and against covert filming. He promotes the need for a more nuanced and informed discussion about proportionate and effective undercover recording and avoidance of invasion of privacy (Plomin, 2016:16). Other commentators also support this view. Fisk (2015) recommends a move from an overly narrow focus on cameras in care homes to the development of ethical principles about their purpose and use in the light of the different forms of technology available to providers, to residents and their families. As Hayes (2016) notes, feelings of being spied upon by home care workers may provoke great anxiety.

Relevant to our study was the feeling expressed in the media that portrayals of care homes as described above were having an accumulative and unjustifiably negative effect on the public’s view of the sector. In a public survey conducted for the Demos Commission on Residential Care, three-quarters of participants said they would not consider a care home move (Wood, 2014); just over half (54%) saying they feared neglect or being abused.
Such judgments echoed the Minister’s views, as reported above, and were further articulated by many representatives of the care sector who argued that not all care is abusive and that by implication the abuses portrayed were those of ‘bad apples’. Smith (2014) asked the whereabouts of good practice stories in the media to balance accounts of ‘shocking’ care. The charity Friends of the Elderly stated: ‘We are disappointed that the media continues to broadcast stories of poor standards and incompetence in the elderly care sector with a less than balanced view. Presumably the producers of Panorama believe they are encouraging better care by creating this programme’ (Allen, 2014).

In contrast to portrayals of one-off or personal moral failings in the sector, other related debates touched upon poor care as being part of system-wide problems. British Geriatric Society (BGS) President Elect, Dr David Oliver, for instance, noted the implications of this and other Panorama programmes for his fellow geriatricians:

Some of those older people portrayed in Panorama might not have required so much assistance with continence or mobility, or might not have had such “challenging” behavior if local clinicians or clinical leaders had done their jobs properly. Some might still have been at home. And doctors visiting care homes could be a useful pair of eyes and ears to spot problems earlier and could be involved far more in staff training. (Oliver, 2014)

Scandals potentially create an environment that encourages public debate, a demand for policy reform and may result in policy changes (McCombs, 2004) but this may need to be fostered by other facilitative factors such as agreement over what needs to be done and what is feasible. Initial reactions from key stakeholders in older people’s social care as presented in this background section will need to be tracked over the coming years and decades to see if they
have had single or cumulative effect. Studies of previous exposes have also concluded that there are various impacts from such scandals, some leaving little legacy at all (Stanley, Manthorpe & Penhale, 1999; Manthorpe & Stanley, 2004).

Little is known of the reactions to programmes such as *Behind Closed Doors* other than those reported in the media and through online communications. While these reflect a variety of opinions, there are many stakeholders in social care and not all of them make their views known through social media or public pronouncements. The aim of this article is to broaden this debate by providing views from the frontline of care, drawing on analysis of our interviews with care workers.

**Study design and setting**

The Longitudinal Care Work Study programme of work aims to increase understanding of the factors that facilitate or constrain recruitment and retention in the social care workforce in England through purposive sampling of social care staff in four different sites across England: in North, Midlands, South and London areas. The sample was recruited from a range of settings, including home care, day centres and care homes. These were run by local authorities, not-for-profit or commercial care providers.

**Method**

Interviews were semi-structured with the topic guides covering recruitment, retention, job satisfaction, career development and included opportunities to discuss adverse publicity about social care and any experience of whistleblowing or safeguarding. Participants were interviewed at a venue of their convenience, mostly their place of work or own home. All interviews, except
for those few where notes were taken as there were difficulties with recording, were digitally
recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data analysis

Transcripts were subjected to thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), to identify consistencies
and trends in the data. Each was read thoroughly before data being systematically grouped into
categories or core themes. The interview guide questions served as a starting point for these
themes. A second researcher then examined the larger core themes in order to interpret the
data and interpretive links with other categories. Themes were renamed or re-categorised
iteratively as the analysis continued (the data reported here were from the theme of
safeguarding under which were subcategories of whistleblowing, regulatory burden and
empowering workers). Trustworthiness was ensured through multiple coding and team
discussions to seek out varied interpretations. NVivo 10 was used to manage the data during the
analytical process.

Ethical considerations

Ethical approvals and necessary research governance permissions were secured and renewed
where necessary. The managers of the organisations approved contact with their staff, but did
not know whom we interviewed. We provided information sheets to all participants and offered
token payments to individuals. Ethical considerations included details of our confidentiality
policy and our need to inform authorities if we became aware of potential serious safeguarding
matters. We do not report details of sites or employers to help assure anonymity.

Findings
This article draws on data from 229 interviews with care home and home care managers (n=112) and staff (n=117), which were carried out over two phases. The first round of interviews (T1) took place between 2009 and 2012 and the second round (T2) took place between 2010 and 2014. Those 54 interviews undertaken at the latter end of Time 2 (in 2014) mainly form the basis of this present analysis.

**Emotional reactions**

For many participants programmes, such as Behind Closed Doors, were distressing and gave rise to strong emotions. A team leader said:

> When I watch those kind of programmes, it just makes me so angry, because I just you know—I haven’t got the words to describe how it makes me feel, because I am in this kind of work and I know what it can be like and I know what it should be like. I think people just, how would they feel if it was a member of their family and I can’t understand why people just haven’t got the empathy these days. I can’t change it. I haven’t got a magic wand. (Team leader, care home for people with learning disabilities)

Most of those had heard about the programmes at Time 2 and felt they had worried residents’ families. Very few were surprised by the abuse that had been televised; many provided accounts of what they had witnessed in their own work, but often these examples came from previous jobs and on some occasions were specifically acknowledged as having taken place at times when attitudes to disabled and older people were very different. Of these accounts of abuse, some were highlighted as having occurred in hospitals; there seemed a strong feeling among some that it was not only in the social care sector that such mistreatment could and did happen. There was support for criminal charges to be brought against those responsible and for
regulators to focus less on minor paperwork, and more on the ‘bad apples’ of the system;
unannounced inspections were much approved by some.

For managers, fear of bad publicity could jeopardise their business, as the following quote
illustrates:

The thing is these days as well; it’s getting trustworthy staff because you’ve got to allow
somebody to go in unsupervised into somebody’s house. They have got to be 100%
trustworthy to do that. That is a difficult call to make. So far, touch wood, we haven’t
had any problems. You’ve only got to employ the wrong person and it can damage your
reputation, dreadfully. Even the stories in the newspaper about care staff being rough
with clients. Families have put a camera in the house. (Home care service manager,
working with older people)

Taking action

Some participants provided accounts of taking action on witnessing poor care or abuse, which
was often referred to as whistleblowing. A home care worker, for example, reported:

I was deputy manager at (specialist) unit for people with (autism) It was absolutely awful
(...) It was so bad. I just couldn’t believe... I ended up being the whistleblower and the
place was closed down. And then I was out of work for several weeks.

INTERVIEWER  Must have been difficult.

It was, yes. I was on my own with (financial commitments).

(Home Care ‘Floating’ (peripatetic) Support Worker)

Those who had whistleblown did not regret it but did not think it had been necessarily effective.

Following taking such an action from which there seemed ‘no return’ many left their employer,
as the next section describes.

Moving on
Reactions to witnessing poor care or abuse included not only whistleblowing but resigning from a job that seemed untenable. One person declared her feelings and concerns to her employer and then resigned:

Everything was done on a budget ... You would complain and complain that standards were going down. They just weren’t willing to do anything about it. From being registered manager at the end of the day, I felt well it’s my neck that’s on the block here. I put it in writing to them that I wasn’t happy with the way things were ... I felt that I had no option but to hand my notice in, because I wasn’t going to leave myself in that vulnerable position. At the end of the day, they held the purse strings, but they weren’t willing and they were in it for a profit and they were not willing to put the money back into the business and see to everybody’s needs. (Night shift working senior care worker, care home)

Several participants spoke of changing jobs when they could no longer tolerate staying with an employer. More broadly, several were aware of local ‘bad employers’ from listening to their colleagues’ accounts of previous employers. A few had heard from care users of places (such as care homes) where treatment was poor. Staff’s views of such providers were typically anger in that they felt these gave the whole sector a bad name. With the benefit of hindsight some felt that they could have done something at the time about certain behaviours they had witnessed, but it was now too late.. Very few participants said they had never seen or heard of poor care.

**Improving practice**

In contrast there were other accounts of trying to forestall the need for whistleblowing, seeing this as potentially divisive and not a way to deal with problems of possible poor practice or concerns. For some, if whistleblowing occurred it damaged relationships with colleagues and
made remedial action almost impossible. Prior to the implementation of the Care Act 2014, which places the responsibility upon care providers to take up matters of concern internally and to address them, some managers found it more effective to let staff address minor behavioural problems themselves:

If a member of staff comes to me and says, oh, you know, ‘That member of staff has done this and that and I’m unhappy about it’ then, I would say to them, ‘Okay, you’ve got two options, either I can deal with it and talk to that person, which means they might feel ‘Oh, you’ve gone behind my back instead of talking to me,’ or we can three of us sit together and just talk it out’. That normally works. Then everyone can sort of group hug and it’s like everyone goes away feeling happy, rather than leaving it to become something serious. (Care home manager)

Such practice was argued to be most effective because whistleblowing either led to confrontations between staff or because individuals were just too afraid of taking such matters outside the care setting and so did nothing. Whistleblowing has many definitions – including both going outside the organisation or going to authority within the organisation. For some participants if members of staff reported their concerns to managers then this too would be whistleblowing, bringing with it fear of reprisal even if their manager’s reception of this news was not criticism. One care home manager conveyed the considerable problems of getting staff to report their concerns:

The most important thing really is trying to emphasise about safeguarding and about whistleblowing policies really. And as much as you drum whistleblowing policy even into long-term staff they are still scared, because they’re scared ... it’s going to come back on them. As much as I say, “You’re protected. You will be protected. You are safe. There will be no reprisal because if there is, then there’s further disciplinary actions that can be
“taken.” But there’s still an element of fear. (Manager, care home for people with learning disabilities)

Discussion and conclusion

The limitations of the present study are its size and the risk of bias of possibly recruiting people who were willing to talk to researchers and may feel positive about their practice. The method of an interview study means there is no opportunity to observe practice. Acknowledging these limits, this study heard views and experiences in confidential interview from those at the frontline of care services, and those responding were not media or professional commentators.

Through the internet we located examples of the press and social media coverage of reactions to the programme to inform the background to this article and to chart the development of storylines such as the CCTV theme and regulatory reform that may be the legacies of the Panorama care home programme. From the interview findings it was evident that most respondents were positive about the role of media in exposing cases of abuse of care that had apparently gone unchallenged. They saw this as a way to constructively highlight some of the failings of the care sector but were aware that there would consequentially continue to be damaging of care home reputations and also personal distress at the potential undermining of their professional and caring image. Monitoring of their work by CCTV was not a major concern; in contrast to some frustrations with raising concerns and to their feeling that the sector did indeed have poor quality care providers and personnel, albeit a minority. None of the participants in this study considered cameras in care homes to be the solution to such deficits – they saw problems lying in broader system of care and support that failed older people, as well as care sector cultures in which raising concerns was seen as a risky activity. Plomin (2016:200)
highlights how similar debates about appropriate levels of surveillance are arising across the public sector:

In almost every setting where I see secret cameras used, whether it is in care homes or nurseries, hospitals or animal sanctuaries, neighbourhoods where racist neighbors are victimising people or landlords or debt collectors are terrorising folk, the problems could have been avoided.

The media’s role in publicising abusive practice has encouraged discussion of social care’s shortcomings and debates around what can and should be done. Some participants predicted other similar media exposes would follow. However, there were expressions of disenchantment among some who felt there may be little or no lasting positive effect from such programmes on social care practice and policy. Such impressions chime with studies of media reportage of long-term care facilities in other jurisdictions, such as nursing homes in the United States. Miller et al (2012) observed that media reporting of nursing homes was predominantly negative in tone, and, not surprisingly, considered that this contributed to the public’s poor opinion of nursing homes and those staffing them. There was substantial support for the prosecution of abuse among our participants some of whom felt that expose programmes should convey the potential for criminal prosecutions of abusive care (see Manthorpe and Samsi, 2015) and that not all care provision is abusive or contains poor practice.

For the safeguarding community there are several messages from this study; the first being that there are mixed reactions to exposes of poor care as portrayed in Behind Closed Doors which should be recognised, and second, that debate is created in the print and on television, but also in social media so this too needs monitoring. Local Safeguarding Adult Boards may wish to develop a communications strategy to deal with requests for reactions to media reports locally and nationally. Board members may wish to contribute to ‘positive’ reports of safeguarding as
part of such a strategy. Safeguarding practitioners may wish to prepare for increased referrals following media coverage of poor care. They may be able to use media reports to discuss any local differences of interpretation over matters such as prosecutions for abuse. Trainers and educationalists may wish to clarify the importance given in agencies to raising concerns, the ways in which difficult conversations can be held, and the protections available to whistleblowers or those raising concerns – with local examples to provide assurance that this is not mere rhetoric. Those working with people using care services and their family carers will doubtless be aware of their concerns about care quality; professionals’ strategies for assuring them that there is good social care could be more widely shared and their effectiveness evaluated.
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