



**Projective Identification and the Fear of Failing: Making Sense of Practice Educators' Emotional Experiences of Failing Social Work Students in Practice Learning Settings**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Social Work Practice</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	failing students, practice educators, emotions, projective identification, containment, reflection

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## ***Projective Identification and the Fear of Failing:***

### ***Making Sense of Practice Educators' Emotional Experiences of Failing Social Work Students in Practice Learning Settings***

#### **Abstract**

The paper focuses on emotions and processes that may arise for practice educators when working with a struggling or failing student in a practice learning setting.<sup>1</sup> The paper firstly documents a previously undertaken thematic review of the literature, which explored why practice educators appeared to find it difficult to fail students in practice learning settings. Secondly, the paper draws on two UK qualitative studies that highlighted the emotional distress experienced by practice educators when working with a marginal or failing student. The paper documents key findings using a case study approach from both studies. We argue that the concept of projective identification offers a plausible and illuminating account of the states of mind experienced by practice educators and in making explicit, unconscious states of mind, our aim is that practice educators will feel confident to make appropriate assessment decisions when required.

#### **Key words:**

**Failing students, practice educators, emotions, projective identification, containment, reflection**

#### **Introduction**

There is a growing body of international and inter-professional research that explores the difficulties and challenges faced by supervisors when confronted with a struggling, or failing student in a field placement (see for example, Hughes and Heycox, 1996; Raymond, 2000; Duffy, 2004; Gizara and Forest, 2004; Vacha-Haase et al, 2004; Bogo et al, 2007). Whilst various reasons have been proffered to explain the challenges and the apparent reluctance on the part of supervisors to fail students (Finch, 2010; Finch and Taylor, 2013); there has been less focus on the emotional and relational aspects of the

---

<sup>1</sup> In recognition of an international readership it is important to clarify terms. The term *practice educator* is employed consistently in the present discussion although it is recognised that other terms are used internationally. For example *field instructor* is the term that is used in North America. The term *practice learning setting* is used here to describe the placement or practicum – i.e. an assessed period of practice in the field. It is recognised that these are UK specific terms.

1 process. The limited research that explores the emotional responses to emerge when  
2 assessors are confronted with a struggling or failing student in practice learning settings,  
3 highlights the strong, difficult and conflicting emotional responses that can occur (Samec,  
4 1995; Gizara and Forrest, 2004; Vacha-Haase et al, 2004; Bogo et al, 2007; Basnett and  
5 Sheffield, 2010; Finch, 2010).

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12 Consequently, in an attempt to extend the research base, the present discussion begins  
13 with a thematic analysis of existing research exploring the various reasons put forward as  
14 to why practice educators, from social work and other professions, may find it difficult to  
15 fail students in practice learning settings. The limited extant research into the emotional  
16 aspects is also explored and new lines for enquiry in the area are identified. The  
17 discussion then focuses on two empirical studies previously undertaken by the authors  
18 (Finch, 2010; Schaub and Dalrymple, 2011); whose original findings highlighted the  
19 considerable emotional impact on practice educators when working with a struggling or  
20 failing social work student. Our aim however, is to do more than describe the range of  
21 feelings that can emerge, rather, to theorise the reasons for the emergence of these strong  
22 emotional reactions using a key concept within psychodynamic theory – the ego-defensive  
23 mechanism known as projective identification.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 In proffering this concept as a means of articulating hitherto unconscious processes, it is  
34 hoped that practice educators might become increasingly aware of uncomfortable feelings;  
35 reflect on the dynamics that might emerge between themselves and their student; (and  
36 often with the affiliated university); and use these feelings reflexively to consider how the  
37 student might be feeling, with the aim of aiding their learning. Most importantly, we argue  
38 that by becoming conscious of emotional experiences and understanding ego-defensive  
39 processes, practice educators will be more confident to fail a student if required; as our  
40 concern is that the uncomfortable array of difficult feelings experienced, appear to render  
41 some practice educators reluctant, unable or unwilling to fail students.

## 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 **Background**

52 There is a limited but internationally consistent interest in the issues raised by students of  
53 a range of professions who are struggling or failing in practice learning settings and the  
54 attendant challenges for their practice educators in reaching determinations of failure.  
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

Indeed, the last decade has seen the emergence of a substantive body of work in the fields of nursing and social work particularly, on the phenomenon of “failure to fail” (Duffy, 2004; Shapton, 2006; Rutkowski, 2007; Basnett and Shepherd, 2010; Lawson, 2010; Jervis and Tilki, 2011; Finch and Taylor, 2013). In the English social work context, concern with the topic has been particularly long-standing, Brandon and Davies (1979) having first explored the issue some thirty-four years ago, establishing key parameters for much of the ensuing discussion.

Explorations of the issue often proceed from concern about the perceived low numbers of students failing the placement (Hughes and Heycox, 1996; Sharp and Danbury, 1998; Raymond, 2000; Finch and Taylor, 2012). Indeed, in 2006-7 the failure rate on social work programmes in England was a mere 3.2% (GSCC, 2008), and still lower at 2.5% in 2008-9 (GSCC, 2010). The question then follows as to how far this might be attributable to practice educators’ reluctance or difficulty in failing social work students (Evans, 1995; Finch, 2010; Schaub and Dalrymple, 2011).

A recent inter-professional and international thematic review by Finch and Taylor (2013)-supplemented in Finch and Poletti (forthcoming) - sought to identify those factors which constrain assessors in reaching failure determinations for students in practice learning settings. The review identified five central themes. The first contends that assessment frameworks are used incorrectly or inappropriately (Kemshall, 1993; Shardow and Doel; 1996, Furness and Gilligan, 2004; Shapton, 2006) and linked to this, that placement procedures are not properly observed with concerns not addressed in a timely fashion (Burgess et al, 1998a, 1998b; Duffy, 2004; Kaslow et al 2007; Vacha-Haase et al, 2004). Secondly, practice educators can feel isolated and unsupported by their agencies or the university in making a fail recommendation (Sharp and Danbury, 1999; Finch, 2004; Vacha-Haase et al, 2004; Schaub and Dalrymple, 2011). Thirdly, practice educators report experiencing 'role strain' or confusion (Fisher, 1990; Owens, 1995; Cowburn et al, 2000, Duffy, 2004; Bogo, et al, 2007), *i.e.* the practice educator perceives their role as encompassing two potentially conflicted positions: nurturer and enabler of learning on one hand and assessor/manager on the other (Shardlow and Doel, 1996; Finch, 2010). Fourthly, the fear of litigation impinges on assessment judgements - this consideration appears more significant in a North American context (Cole, 1991; Cole and Lewis, 2003; Duffy, 2004; Raymond, 2000; Royse, 2000; Vacha-Haase et al, 2004). Finally, practice

1 educators attest to the emotional cost and accompanying psychological disruption that can  
2 emerge when working with a struggling or failing student (Burgess et al, 1998a; Burgess et  
3 al, 1998b; Beverley and Worsley, 2007; Basnett and Shepherd, 2010; Waterhouse, 2011).  
4  
5  
6  
7

8 This last consideration has been well documented across a range of professions. Samec's  
9 1995 study of a cohort of North American psychotherapy supervisors identified the stark  
10 emotional responses elicited when working with failing trainees, embracing guilt, anger  
11 and shame. Similarly, Gizara and Forest (2004) explored American supervisors'  
12 narratives of failing counselling psychology students. They report that the experience for  
13 supervisors was "horrible...painful...very sad...a gut wrenching experience" (2004:136).  
14 Likewise, from a Canadian social work perspective, Bogo et al (2007) comment on the  
15 emotional difficulties and conflict experienced by practice educators when having to give  
16 negative feedback and assess competence; while the discomfort and unease experienced  
17 by social work practice educators has also been attested in a recent UK study (Basnett  
18 and Sheffield, 2010) .  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Yet when it comes to accounting for the psychological processes *underlying* the 'failing to  
29 fail' phenomenon, the extant research base is limited. The few studies which have  
30 considered the rationalisation process undertaken by practice educators in this position,  
31 note the common recourse to hopeful expectation as a means of reconciling concerns  
32 about practice with a resistance to reaching failure judgements. Educators adopting this  
33 stance nurture the 'hope' that problems manifested by a struggling placement student will  
34 sort themselves out without intervention (Hoffman et al. 2004; Good et al, 1995) or the  
35 'hope' that students will eventually become satisfactory practitioners in other settings  
36 (Finch, 2010). Arguably such a strategy offers release rather than resolution of the  
37 tensions experienced by practice educators of failing students. The rationale is thus clear  
38 for evolving a more nuanced model for recognising and articulating the psychological cost  
39 to practice educators in this unenviable position.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **The preceding studies**

54 The first empirical study undertaken (Finch, 2010) focused on why practice educators  
55 appeared to find it difficult to fail social work students. The study was qualitative in design  
56 and utilised practitioner-researcher and narrative paradigms. In-depth interviews were  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 undertaken with twenty practice educators from across England and Wales. The sample  
2 was purposive in that the research participants were recruited on the basis that they had  
3 worked with a struggling or failing student; although not all the respondents went on to fail  
4 the student. The participants were all qualified practice educators and worked in a variety  
5 of social work settings, statutory and voluntary; with adults as well as children and families.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 What emerged was a concern that the unpleasant emotional reactions, including guilt,  
12 anger and anxiety for example, experienced by practice educators, potentially got in the  
13 way of a robust assessment process. The emotional distress appeared to instate or reflect  
14 an atmosphere of uncontainment, which also appeared to affect the dynamic between the  
15 practice educator, student and university tutor. It appeared that some practice educators  
16 struggled to make sense of the reasons for these emergent feelings, and that there was a  
17 missed opportunity to make use these feelings to understand and aid the student in their  
18 learning. Further, in terms of psychological processes, it was hypothesised that practice  
19 educators might also internalise the student's failure as their own, making it difficult, or  
20 even impossible, to fail a student. To fail a student therefore, would be to fail oneself; what  
21 we term here 'compound failure', a theme we will return to later.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 The second study undertaken (Schaub & Dalrymple, 2011) ostensibly focused on what  
34 support practice educators required from universities when working with struggling or  
35 failing students. A dual strand qualitative methodology was used, comprised of semi-  
36 structured interviews with 15 participants, including practice educators and tutors from  
37 across the South-East of England, and two corroboratory focus groups of practice  
38 educators to further explore themes developed from the interviews. The sample was  
39 drawn purposively to interview those practice educators who had previously assessed a  
40 struggling or failing student.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 Though the aim of the study was to focus upon support and provision for practice  
49 educators, what also emerged from the interviews were the strong emotional reactions  
50 experienced by practice educators. The participants identified feelings of isolation,  
51 frustration, anxiety, immobilisation or indecision, and even persecution. It was noted that  
52 practice educators were not always able in the discursive space of both the interview and  
53 within focus groups to demonstrate insight into the dynamics that emerged between  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 themselves and the students, as well as their relationships with universities. Practice  
2 educators in this study, also articulated an anxiety of being judged and reported feeling a  
3 pressure to pass students, although they were not able to identify its source. Intersecting  
4 concerns about the adverse impact on individual practice educators, the host team and  
5 service users were represented by emergent feelings of being overwhelmed and  
6 powerlessness. The intersection of themes and concerns in the two independent studies  
7 is patent.  
8  
9

10 This is not to say that all practice educators experienced strong and uncontained  
11 emotional responses or were unreflective. In both studies, there was evidence of  
12 emotionally measured narratives that were reflective and revealed clarity of understanding  
13 roles and assessment tasks. We noted that these practice educators did not appear to  
14 register an inordinate emotional cost when failing the student, although it was,  
15 nonetheless, an unpleasant experience.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Methodological Approach**

29 Our methodological approach in synthesizing these studies and proposing a new  
30 theoretical stance is to draw key narratives from both studies that appear to evidence the  
31 process of projective identification. The analysis will focus on the narratives of Daisy and  
32 Lily from the Finch (2010) study and Mary and Carol from the Schaub and Dalrymple  
33 (2011) study. A strength of this approach is to offer an in-depth and rich analysis from two  
34 similar but methodologically distinct empirical studies. While a possible limitation of such  
35 an approach is the potential for determinism, i.e. finding evidence within the data to  
36 support a pre-existing theory, we argue that there is a pressing need to offer fuller and  
37 more nuanced accounts of the psychological processes underlying the 'failure to fail'  
38 phenomenon as part of supporting practice educators in reaching informed and  
39 appropriate failure determinations without undue emotional cost.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

### 50 **Projective Identification**

51 The Freudian concept of projective identification was elaborated by Klein, and  
52 subsequently deployed by Bion and theorists within the object relations tradition (Frosh,  
53 2012). Projective identification is understood as an unconscious defensive mechanism  
54 that, like all defensive responses, protects us against psychological harm (Trevithick,  
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

2011). Whilst the concept of projective identification is contested (see for example, Frosh, 2012; Joseph, 2012; Sandler, 1988), a helpful explanation is offered by Frosh (2012) who argues that projective identification concerns the process of unconscious communication from one person to another, in the form of affects or emotion. Projective identification however is more than transference, rather it is the process of an individual's expulsion of "unwanted or threatening ideas into their environment" (Frosh, 2012:162). Projective identification is thus understood as an unconscious mechanism in which a person rids themselves of their unwholesome parts that they themselves cannot bear or "are very deeply denied in the self" (Segal, 1992:36) onto others. In a clinical setting the assumed object of the projection would be the therapist; in the context at hand we suggest that the practice educator is the object into which the students may project deeply troublesome or unwelcome parts of themselves; indeed, there is widespread acceptance that these defensive mechanisms take place in organisation settings (see for example Halton, 1994; Moylan, 1994; Trevithick, 2011).

The theory suggests that such projections are sufficiently cogent to compel the object to unconsciously feel or act out the projected attitudes and behaviours (Spillius et al, 2011). Trevithick (2011), describes the process as the object being "*mobilised* by another person to act on his or her behalf" (2011:404). The theory further posits a supplementary process of not only projecting the unwanted aspects of one's own psyche onto the object but also "entering the mind of the other in order to acquire desired aspects of his psyche" (Spillius et al, 2011;126). One can argue that a student who is struggling or failing a placement will be experiencing significant emotional distress. Trevithick (2011) argues that the impact of projective identification on a practitioner can be significant. Once "*mobilised*", the process may cause the practitioner to experience confusion, may limit recognition and articulation of what is happening and, of chief concern, may cause failure "to notice and to respond appropriately to dangerous or threatening situations" (2011:404). Clearly, such a process, if indeed in operation, may impinge upon assessment judgements and inhibit determinations of failure.

The origin of the process of projective identification is found in early infancy where the infant projects anxiety and aggression onto the mother due to their own limited ability to contain such feelings. The mother acts as container for these feelings and projects back to the infant the feelings in a more digestible form. Bion terms this process "*reverie*"



1 (Salzberger-Wittenburg et al, 1983). The container function therefore is important so that  
2 the infant can “internalise a container of feelings but also a mind that can hold thoughts”  
3 (Salzberger-Wittenberg et al, 1983:60). If an infant has an inefficient container for his  
4 feelings, one that cannot understand his feelings, then he will revert to a state of what Bion  
5 terms, “nameless dread” (Bion, 1962). The need for an infant’s primitive feelings to be  
6 contained and transformed into something bearable is therefore vital for a baby’s  
7 development. (Saltzberger-Wittenburg, 2013).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

### 13 **Mobilisation**

14 This notion of projective identification gives shape and coherence to a range of behaviours  
15 and discursive forms observed in the aforementioned narratives. For instance, we noted  
16 that some practice educators reflecting on a challenging placement experience were  
17 inordinately exercised by their recollections, giving vent to hostile feelings and becoming  
18 *mobilised* to voice or act out difficult or uncomfortable feelings – feelings which might  
19 arguably have been projected in part by the failing student. Daisy’s narrative for example,  
20 was one of rage and anger and was far removed from a professional discourse. In one  
21 instance, Daisy imagines a conversation with her student, moving from reported to direct  
22 speech as if prompted to enact the imagined confrontation:  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 ...and I did think the next time you shout at me, I might just actually shout back at you because who  
35 the fuck do you think you are?  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 If the tone and register of this recollection indicate Daisy’s own emotional engagement (or  
41 ‘mobilisation’) in the challenging placement, other sections of her narrative move beyond  
42 mere venting of frustration and anger with the student, to impinge on sensitive, even  
43 taboo, areas. In one scenario, she hypothesizes how aggrieved service-users might insult  
44 the student’s body size (the student was significantly overweight):  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 ...they’ll [service users] call you a fat bitch because you are fat...because it will be their way of  
50 releasing, hurting you.  
51  
52  
53

54 Elsewhere, she refers to another difficult interchange with the student where poor practice  
55 has been accounted for in terms Daisy finds unpersuasive:  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 ...I just thought...I thought 'Fuck you!' You are not going to apologise for your fucking  
3 behaviour with a period. Every fucking woman in the world gets a period, yes some have  
4 difficulties, some get emotional [ . . . ] you've like resorted to like fucking bottom of the barrel...  
5  
6  
7

8 This reference to menstruation is particularly suggestive as projective identification  
9 processes are often associated with bodily fluids and the expulsion of "dangerous  
10 substances (excrements) out of the self" (Klein, 1931:8).  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Daisy it might be argued, was here, in addition to her own emotional engagement,  
18 vicariously experiencing negative aspects of student's unconscious self that the student  
19 herself could not acknowledge, encompassing intense rage and self-loathing. However  
20 conceptualised, the situation was patently unsustainable and Daisy terminated the  
21 placement after seven days. Consequently her decision to fail the student could not be  
22 upheld due to lack of evidence.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 A comparable instance is found in Lily's account of a failing student, her retrospective  
29 account apparently evoking or mobilising some of those feelings experienced at the time:  
30  
31

32  
33 ...she was absolutely terrible, she was appalling, she was abysmal and no way should she  
34 ever be near clients...there were a million difficulties with her...she was incredibly arrogant and  
35 rude...she was also very aggressive.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Mary, whilst more experienced, and suggesting she was able to manage these difficult  
41 circumstances, nonetheless found them noteworthy for the presentation of aggression or  
42 intimidation from a student when faced with potential placement failure. She stated:  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 At the end, when he didn't complete what he was to have completed, I explained, again, that I  
48 was going to fail him, and he became sort of aggressive, you know that sort of silent  
49 aggression? Intimidation, like, you know, what are you doing failing me? It was very  
50 unpleasant in his reactions to me...  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

## 56 **Compound Failure**

57  
58  
59  
60

1 We suggest that in recollecting (and in so many instances, re-enacting) these challenging  
2 encounters and experiences, practice educators might helpfully reflect further upon their  
3 own states of mind when working with a struggling or failing student and consider whether  
4 these might be influenced by defensive projections from the student, prompting them to  
5 experience further difficult emotions vicariously. This would go some way to account for a  
6 marked phenomenon in the preceding studies – a phenomenon we might term as  
7 “*compound failure*”, involving a process of internalisation of the student’s failure as the  
8 practice educator’s own. For example, Mary, a practice educator, based in a Children and  
9 Families statutory setting states:  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 I think when you start off with students...it makes you challenge, am I...was it something  
22 that I did or didn't do.  
23  
24  
25

26 Mary goes on to state:  
27  
28

29 What was it that we *weren't* doing that didn't enable her [the student] to learn, and questioning  
30 our practice, and our methods.  
31  
32  
33

34 Likewise Lily, an experienced assessor of both nursing and social work students, relates  
35 how she terminated a placement when a student made offensive homophobic comments.  
36 Rather than viewing the episode as a positive instance of her own appropriate gate-  
37 keeping practice, Lily internalises it as her failure, stating:  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 ...I still felt I must have done something wrong with that one because I couldn't enable him or  
43 work with him to see why his way of thinking was inappropriate in social work, never mind in  
44 society.  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Daisy also experiences this process of compound failure. She describes the process of a  
50 meeting with the tutor and student, where she is required to state explicitly that the student  
51 is failing. She imagines the sacrifices the student has had to make. She states:  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 “Oh my God! She [student] has been on this course a couple of years, the sacrifices she’s  
57 made...this is her livelihood, her career and its all my fault”.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Daisy thus acts and feels like a failure herself and enacts a process of identification with  
4 the student.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 **Lack of Reflection**

12 Both studies confirmed once again how there is mitigation of reflective capacity when  
13 professionals are overwhelmed with a range of intensively distressing and disturbing  
14 emotions that they cannot process. In the case of the practice educators in these studies,  
15 those feelings included anger, rage, guilt, fear, hopelessness and dread. Daisy, in between  
16 her discourses of rage, often reverted to a guilty state of mind, stating how 'the guilt set in'  
17 once her decision to fail a placement was formalised by the processes of the affiliated  
18 university:  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 ...when I heard the tutor say, 'and if it's not going well, we'll move straight into a disruption  
28 meeting', that's the time you need to say whether you're going to fail the student...and then  
29 the guilt set in.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Daisy continues with this theme, she states:  
35  
36

37 Because at that time I made the decision, the guilt, it was unbearable...but at the end of the  
38 day, it's her livelihood, it could have been the end of her career, oh my god, what about her  
39 children...I felt like I am a rotten shit.  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 It is striking that the last line conflates both past and present tense – suggesting that the  
45 retelling of the narrative is invoking the very state of mind previously experienced.  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Other evidence of the inability to make sense of and process the dynamics involved in a  
51 failing placement, derive from the narrative of Lily who worked within a voluntary drugs and  
52 alcohol agency. Lily assessed a student who had very limited knowledge of drugs and  
53 alcohol, was a Muslim and had recently moved to the UK. Lily relates how she passed the  
54 student despite reservations about general conduct and competence. In the interview  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 space, Lily acknowledged that this 'was the worst career decision I have ever made' and  
3  
4 emphasises how the determining factors were that she felt threatened by the student, and  
5  
6 was worried what her university colleagues would think of her if the student made an  
7  
8 allegation of racism. It was interesting to note that in the research interview Lily kept  
9  
10 repeating the following phrase:

11  
12 I was out of my depth...I felt really out of my depth...I was completely out of my depth at that  
13  
14 point.

15  
16  
17  
18 Lily explains this as being out of her depth in working with an Asian Muslim student – she  
19  
20 acknowledges her limited interaction with Asian people, having grown up in a monocultural  
21  
22 area in the North of England. Again, we would suggest that this feeling of being 'out of  
23  
24 one's depth' could helpfully be seen as in part a projection from the student – she is a  
25  
26 Muslim student, having recently moved to the UK, from a privileged background and one  
27  
28 who has limited knowledge of alcohol and drugs. Lily expresses narratives of being  
29  
30 victimised and she presents the student as persecutory. When Lily challenges the  
31  
32 student about leaving the placement early with no negotiation, Lily recounts:

33  
34  
35 she immediately started screaming at me, saying I was racist...and I was picking on her and  
36  
37 she just went constantly on about me being racist and that she would sort me out and talk to  
38  
39 the University about me...she was going to go to the Board of Trustees...and she managed to  
40  
41 put the fear of God into me....She beat me down really with threats and I allowed myself to be  
42  
43 beaten down.

44  
45 Likewise, Carol also found it difficult to process the strong feelings that emerged in her  
46  
47 work with a failing students. When she confronted the student about his inappropriate  
48  
49 behaviour, she felt:

50  
51 ... quite traumatised for a week or so, until I could get it into perspective, and [another staff  
52  
53 member involved in the placement] felt very personally attacked by her, and felt quite  
54  
55 intimidated by her. There were kind of trust issues with the rest of the team...

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

Meanwhile, Mary suggested that she was concerned whether her approach was appropriate, and wondered whether she needed to change her methods, stating:

“I had to question myself: was I being too nice, and not hard enough?”

We would suggest that this aspect of projective identification, whereby the object loses their reflective capabilities and experiences the student painful and unbearable emotional projections, is an important insight into why the experience can be so emotionally challenging for practice educators. As alluded to earlier, the unrecognised impact of these projections, and the defensive processes that are their corollary, might well explain why inappropriate assessment decisions are sometimes made. In the case of Lily for example, she passes her student, stating:

[T]o be honest I kind of passed her because I was glad to get rid of her and I know that's dreadful...I feel awful...I've never forgotten her and I have a huge regret to this day.

### **Containment**

If the notion of projective identification provides illumination of some of the challenges faced by practice educators of failing students, the accompanying notion of containment likewise points towards potential interventions and means of resolution. As explored earlier, Bion (1965) stresses the importance of the mother in early infancy in containing the infant's emotions and suggests, in a position later elaborated by Hinshelwood (1994) that projective identification processes can have a normative function whereby the mother regulates emotion and helps the infant to accommodate it, projecting it back to the child in more palatable form in a process of valuable communication. Only where the emotion remains uncontained, unregulated and without reciprocal projection is the process viewed in more negative and problematic terms as a process of attempting to gain “threatening control” (Hinshelwood, 1991;184). Again, in the context of practice educators overseeing struggling placement students, the notion is illuminative: perhaps in the examples considered above there was perhaps a missed opportunity for practice educators to understand the state of mind of the struggling or failing student and to open a process of dialogue to enable regulation and accommodation of some of the feelings evoked. Certainly, Hinshelwood (1994) argues that in a clinical setting, the analyst must be able to contain the patient's intolerable projections, in order to understand it as something the

1 patient is communicating. Perhaps it is the case that practice educators also need to  
2 tolerate the uncomfortable projections that are generated when a student is struggling or  
3 failing in placement, and consider whether beneath the challenging behaviours something  
4 is being communicated.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 Certainly if, projections are indeed in play in the case studies reviewed above, we can  
11 observe a limited capacity for containing and tolerating them and certainly no orientation to  
12 perceive these projections as potentially communicative of a struggling student's state of  
13 mind. Perhaps the respondent known as Carol comes closest when she relates how she  
14 and her colleagues had sought to engage with their failing student:  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 [S]he would never acknowledge that she was the one that wasn't coping, and it was always  
21 about getting someone else into trouble for what they weren't doing... At the time [we] both...  
22 felt very like we'd failed in some way. It didn't feel good, we came here and had a meeting,  
23 and it was all left up in the air. And I felt really really awful about it.  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 Carol goes on to explain that during the placement, she had to contain fears of the student  
29 making damaging claims which might impact on her (or her colleagues') careers. She  
30 stated:  
31  
32

33 It felt like, even my colleague said to me, 'She's dangerous, she's going to come in here and  
34 wreck somebody's career.' Somebody could work their way up for years, and she could come  
35 in and say something, and that could be their career. Tons of people just didn't trust her being  
36 around.  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Mary suggested that having a student that was not passing a placement required that she  
42 contain the information (and the resulting emotions) needed to write an assessment of  
43 failing. She stated that:  
44  
45  
46

47  
48 ... I had ... to follow literally every single thing that she did. So I had a load of evidence. ...  
49 There were two aspects of her, to the failing. There was the values side ... and then there was  
50 the quality of the work. If you had a one-to-one she was able to give really good understanding  
51 of her own values ... but at the same time she wasn't demonstrating it with any service users  
52 that she came into contact with. She just started talking to [service users] without any  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 communication about what she was going to do first, and actually got [them] very distressed,  
2 and then didn't acknowledge this at all. She had no awareness that this was a problem.  
3  
4  
5

6 Carol's approach is unusual in the studies, most of the practice educators having instead  
7 exhibited more reactive or symptomatic responses to the projections in acting out some of  
8 the projections (i.e. being abusive about the students) and in showing diminished reflective  
9 capabilities. Practice educators were also engaged in 'splitting', in terms of the student,  
10 i.e. thinking in terms of exclusively 'good' students and 'bad' students, as well as  
11 sometimes adopting an adversarial stance towards the affiliated university. Universities in  
12 general and university staff, were often talked about in hostile and angry ways. It was felt  
13 further, that the relationships between practice educator, student and the university tutor  
14 were often 'uncontained' and reactive with all stakeholders experiencing anger and  
15 blaming one another with the result that the assessment process became even further  
16 obscured and the subsequent decision-making processes polarised.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 The concepts of projective identification and containment thus offer a coherent way into  
27 thinking about the challenges faced by practice educators of failing students. There would  
28 certainly appear to be a plausible case for drawing upon these notions as a framework for  
29 reinstating dialogue and communication when these are failing in the educator-student  
30 relationship and for recognising that the difficult emotions educators in this situation  
31 experience need not represent an end point but instead the starting point for a dialogue  
32 which may prompt failing students to recognise and articulate their own potential issues  
33 and concerns and to become more critically conscious of their own psychological  
34 processes.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

## 45 Discussion

46 This analysis suggests there is an urgent need for practice educators of social work  
47 students, as well as supervisors or assessors of other professionals, to extend the range  
48 of their habitual reflective practice so that the strong, often uncomfortable and often  
49 hidden, feelings that inevitably emerge in a challenging educator-student relationship  
50 (Saltzberger-Wittenberg et al, 1983; Bower, 2005; Hunt and West, 2006) are actively  
51 recognised and explored to enhance that relationship and to aid the student in their  
52 learning and professional orientation (Coren, 1997). Reflective, rather than reactive,  
53  
54  
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

practice educators are best placed to transcend intense emotions of anger, guilt and shame with the consequence that struggling students can indeed be failed if required as part of ethical gate-keeping practice (LaFrance et al, 2004). This concentration on the relational aspect of the situation is key to improving the experience of both practice educators and students in practice learning settings. The work of Mattinson (1992) advocates using a transcendental approach in the context of casework supervision and work with service users and this approach could be utilised effectively by practice educators.

In both of the research studies reviewed above, it is patent that even in retrospect, practice educators were often *reactive* to difficult emotional climates and contexts rather than analytical and reflective, with sometimes far-reaching consequences, often; abruptly terminated placements requiring a further placement for the student to undergo practice assessment; poorly evidenced assessment reports again resulting in the student being given a further placement opportunity; and students being passed as competent when the evidence strongly indicated otherwise. These psychological processes however do not appear to be just experienced by practice educators – indeed, recently undertaken research by one of the authors of this paper, also reveals that university tutors also appear to get caught up in these difficult dynamics when attempting to manage placement breakdown or difficulties.

Utilising a key psychoanalytic concept, namely projective identification and associated ideas as a habitual component in reflective practice and professional development could offer a useful theoretical framework and discursive space to make sense of the above described intense emotional drama. This concept offers a plausible explanation as to why practice educators sometimes describe intense sensations of anger, guilt, anxiety, isolation and pressure and why decision making becomes difficult and challenging. It may well also explain the often difficult dynamics that can emerge between practice educators and the university.

Additionally, the use of Ruch's (2007) containment principles, developed for use in child-care social work, nevertheless has a useful application for this context. She suggests the use of 'safe spaces' where social workers can 'make sense of the uncertainty and anxiety they encounter on a daily basis' (Ruch, 2007: 662). The need for a space to explore

1  
2 contentious or difficult feelings, and potentially poorly defined feelings, as a way of  
3 enhancing practice could be a valuable tool for the practice placement context, and is  
4 echoed in the suggestions of participants in our studies, who feel isolated and are  
5 searching for connection with other practice educators for support in these situations. Our  
6 empirical studies and subsequent analysis revealed some practical recommendations for  
7 practice educators when faced with a difficult practice student. Foremost is the importance  
8 of supervision for practice educators, finding ways of discussing with other practice  
9 educators the issues encountered when working with students, possible use of mentoring  
10 systems, informal networks and formalised practice educator forums held within the field  
11 and within universities. Practice educators therefore, need support and help to work with  
12 resistance and defensive processes.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

### 23 **Conclusion**

24 The findings from the existing research as well as our own empirical studies reveal that  
25 assessors of students in placements may well suffer strong, uncomfortable and difficult  
26 emotions that emerge most starkly when working with a struggling or failing student.  
27 Whilst our research has focused on the experience of working with a failing or struggling  
28 student, it seems imperative that assessors take account of, are consciously aware of, and  
29 understand, the dynamics that arise between themselves, the student and the university  
30 tutor, including the wider practice environment. Practice educators would benefit greatly  
31 from becoming aware of their states of mind and be able to recognise projective  
32 identification processes when they occur. Learning and teaching relationships are thus  
33 complex and can evoke in all of us unconscious feelings associated with our early  
34 attachment patterns (Saltzberger-Wittenberg et al, 1983). These relationships, if utilised  
35 reflectively, can be helpful in enhancing the experience of students on placement; reduce  
36 the concerns of practice educators when assessing struggling students and ensure gate  
37 keeping practice is of the highest quality.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

### 53 **Acknowledgements**

54 We would like thank Professor Stephen Briggs and Professor Pamela Trevithick for helpful  
55 comments and guidance on an earlier draft of this paper.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Bibliography**

Basnett F., and Sheffield D., (2010) The Impact of Social Work Student Failure upon Practice Educators, *British Journal of Social Work*, 40, 2119-2136

Beverley, A. and Worsley, A. (2007) *Learning and Teaching in Social Work Practice*, Basingstoke, Palgrave

Bion, W.R (1962) *Learning From Experience*, London, Heinemann

Bion, W.R (1965) *Transformations: Change From Learning to Growth*, London, Karnac

Brandon, J. and Davis, M. (1979) The Limits of Competence in Social Work; The Assessment of Marginal Students in Social Work Education, *British Journal of Social Work*, Vol. 9, pp295-347

Bogo, M., Regher, C., Power, R. and Regher, G. (2007) When Values Collide: Field Instructors' Experiences of Providing Feedback and Evaluating Competence. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 28 (2) pp.178-190

Bower, M (2005) Psychoanalytical Theories for Social Work Practice in Bower, M. (Ed) *Psychoanalytic Theory for Social Work*, Basingstoke, Palgrave

Burgess, R., Campbell, V., Phillips, R. & Skinner, K. (1998a) Managing Unsuccessful or Uncompleted Placements. *Journal of Practice Teaching*, 7, pp 4-12.

Burgess, R., Phillips, R. & Skinner, K. (1998b) Practice placements that go wrong. *Journal of Practice Teaching*, 1, 48-64.

Cole B.S. (1991) Legal Issues Related to Social Work Program Admissions. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 27 (1).pp:18-24

Cole, B. S. & Lewis, R. G. (1993) Gatekeeping Through Termination of Unsuitable Social Work Students: Legal Issues and Guidelines. *Journal of Social Work*, 29 (2) pp:65-73

1 Coren, A. (1997) *A Psychodynamic Approach to Education*, London, Sheldon Press

2  
3  
4  
5 Cowburn, M., Nelson, P. & Williams, J. (2000) Assessment of Social Work Students:  
6 Standpoint and Strong Objectivity. *Social Work Education*, 19 (6), pp.627-637.

7  
8  
9  
10  
11 Duffy, K. (2004) *Failing Students*. London, Nursing and Midwifery Council

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Evans, D. (1999) *Practice Learning in the Caring Professions*, Aldershot, Ashgate Arena

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Finch, J. (2010) *Can't Fail, Won't Fail – Why Practice Assessors Find it Difficult to Fail*  
22 *Social Work Students. A Qualitative Study of Practice Assessors Experience of Assessing*  
23 *Marginal or Failing Social Work Students*, University of Sussex, Professional Doctorate in  
24 Social Work

25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Finch, J. and Taylor, I. (2013) Failing to Fail? Practice Educators' Emotional Experiences  
30 of Assessing Failing Social Work Students, *Social Work Education (Special Edition, Field*  
31 *Education in Social Work)*, Vol. 32 (2) pp:244-258

32  
33  
34  
35  
36 Finch, J. and Poletti, A. (forthcoming) "It's been hell" - Italian and British Practice  
37 Educators' Narratives of Working with Struggling or Failing Social Work Students in  
38 Practice Learning Settings, *European Journal of Social Work*,

39  
40  
41  
42 Fisher, T. (1990) Competence in Social Work Practice Teaching. *Social Work Education*,  
43 9, pp:9-25

44  
45  
46  
47  
48 Frosh, S. (2012) *A Brief Introduction to Psychoanalytic Theory*, Basingstoke, Palgrave

49  
50  
51  
52 Furness, S. and Gilligan, P. (2004) Fit for Purpose: Issues from Practice Placements,  
53 Practice Teaching and the Assessment of Student's Practice. *Social Work Education*, 23,  
54 pp: 465-479.

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

Gizara, S. S. and Forrest, L. (2004) Supervisors' Experiences of Trainee Impairment and Incompetence at APA-Accredited Internship Sites. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35 (2), pp.131-140

GSCC (2008) *Raising Standards; Social Work Education in England*, London, General Social Care Council

GSCC (2010) *A Report on Social Work Education in England, 2009-10*, London, General Social Care Council.

Halton, W. (1994) Unconscious Aspects of Organizational Life in Obholzer and Roberts (Eds) *The Unconscious at Work – Individual and Organisational Stress in the Human Services*, Routledge, London

Hinshelwood, R. D (1991) *A Dictionary of Kleinian Thought* (second edition), London, Free Association Books

Hinshelwood, R. (1994) *Clinical Klein*, London, Free Association Books

Hinshelwood, R.D and Skogstad, W. (2000) "The Dynamics of Healthcare Institutions" in Hinshelwood, R.D and Skogstad, W. (Eds) *Observing Organisations, Anxiety, Defence and Culture in Health Care*, London, Routledge

Hughes, L. and Heycox, K. (1996) Three Perspectives on Assessment in Practice Learning. in Doel, M. and Shardlow, S. (Eds.) *Social Work in a Changing World - An International Perspective on Practice Learning*. Aldershot, Arena (Ashgate).

Hunt, C. and West, L (2006) Learning in a Border Country: Using Psychodynamic Ideas in Teaching and Research, *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 32 (2) pp:160-177

Jervis and Tilki (2011) Why are Nurse Mentors Failing to Fail Student Nurses who do not meet Clinical Performance Standards? *British Journal of Nursing*, 20 (9) pp 582-597

1 Joseph, B. (2012) Projective Identification – Some Clinical Aspects in Spillius, E. &  
2 O'Shaughnessy, (Eds) *Projective Identification – The Fate of a Concept*, East Sussex,  
3 Routledge  
4  
5  
6

7  
8 Kaslow, N. J., Forrest, L., Van Horne, B. A., Huprich, S. K., Pantesco, V. F., Grus, C. L.,  
9 Miller, D. S. S., Mintz, L. B., Schwartz-Mette, R., Rubin, N. J., Elman, N. S., Jacobs, S. C.,  
10 Benton, S. A., Dollinger, S. J., Behnke, S. H., Shealy, C. N. and Van Sickle, K. (2007)  
11 Recognizing, Assessing, and Intervening with Problems of Professional Competence.  
12 *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 38 (5), pp.479-492  
13  
14  
15

16  
17  
18 Kemshall, H. (1993) Assessing Competence: Scientific Process or Subjective Inference?  
19 Do we really see it? *Social Work Education*, 12, pp: 36-45.  
20  
21

22  
23 Klein, M. (1931) *Love, Guilt and Reparation and Other Works 1921-1945*, London, Hogarth  
24 Press.  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 Lafrance, J., Gray, E. & Herbert, M. (2004) Gate-keeping for Professional Social Work  
30 Practice. *Social Work Education*, Vol 23, (3) pp: 325-340  
31  
32

33  
34 Lawson, S. (2010) Nurse Mentors Still Failing to Fail Students, *Nursing Times*,  
35 [http://www.nursingtimes.net/whats-new-in-nursing/acute-care/nurse-mentors-still-failing-to-](http://www.nursingtimes.net/whats-new-in-nursing/acute-care/nurse-mentors-still-failing-to-fail-students/5013926.article)  
36 [fail-students/5013926.article](http://www.nursingtimes.net/whats-new-in-nursing/acute-care/nurse-mentors-still-failing-to-fail-students/5013926.article) (accessed 17/7/11)  
37  
38

39  
40 Moylan, D. (1994) The Dangers of Contagion – Projective Identification Processes in  
41 Institutions in Obholzer, A. and Roberts, V.Z (Eds) *The Unconscious at Work – Individual*  
42 *and Organisational Stress in the Human Services*, Routledge, London  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Owens, C. (1995) How the Assessment of Competence in DipSW is Changing the Culture  
48 of Practice Teaching, *Social Work Education*, 14 (3) pp:6-78  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 Raymond, G. T. (2000) Gatekeeping in Field Education, in Gibbs, P. and Blakely, E. H.  
54 (Eds.) *Gatekeeping in BSW Programs*. New York, Columbia University Press  
55  
56  
57

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

Royse, P. (2000) The Ethics of Gatekeeping. IN Gibbs, P., Blakely, E.H (Ed.) Gatekeeping in BSW Programs. New York, Colombia University Press

Ruch, J. (2007) Reflective practice in child care social work: the role of containment. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 37, (4), pp 659-680.

Samac, J.R (1995) Guilt, Anger and Shame: Failing the Psychotherapy Candidate's Clinical Work, *The Clinical Supervisor*, 13 (2), pp.1-17

Sandler, J. (1988) The Concept of Projective Identification in Sandler, J. (Ed) *Projection, Identification and Projective Identification*, London, Karnac (Books) Ltd

Ruch, G. (2007) Reflective Practice in Contemporary Child-care Social Work: The role of containment, *British Journal of Social Work*, 37, 4, 659–680

Rutkowski, J. (2007) Failure to fail: assessing nursing students' competence during practice placements, *Nursing Standard*, 22 (13) pp: 35-50

Salzberger-Wittenderg, I., Williams, G. & Osborne, E. (1983) *The Emotional Experience of Learning and Teaching*, London, Karnac Books, London

Salzberger-Wittenberg, I. (2013) *Experiencing Endings and Beginnings*, London, Karnac Books

Samac, J.R (1995) Guilt, Anger and Shame: Failing the Psychotherapy Candidate's Clinical Work, *The Clinical Supervisor*, 13 (2), pp.1-17

Schaub, J. & Dalrymple, R., (2011). "She didn't seem like a social worker": Practice Educators' Experiences and Perceptions of Assessing Failing Social Work Students on Placement. <http://www.swapbox.ac.uk/1151/>. (accessed 1/12/12)

Schaub, J. and Dalrymple, R. (2013)

Segal, J. (1992) *Melanie Klein*, London, Sage

1 Shapton, M. (2006) Failing to Fail: Is the Assessment Process Failing the Caring  
2 Profession, *Journal of Practice Teaching and Learning*, 7 (2) pp39-54  
3  
4

5  
6  
7 Shardlow, S.M and Doel, M (1996), *Practice Learning and Teaching*, Macmillan,  
8 Houndmills, Basingstoke.  
9

10  
11  
12 Sharp, M. and Danbury, H. (1999) *The Management of Failing DipSW Students - Activities  
13 and Exercises to Prepare Practice Teachers for Work with Failing Students*, Aldershot,  
14 Ashgate.  
15

16  
17  
18 Trevithick, P. (2011) Understanding Defences and Defensiveness in Social Work, *Journal  
19 of Social Work Practice: Psychotherapeutic Approaches in Health, Welfare and the  
20 Community*, Vol 25 (4) pp:389-412  
21  
22

23  
24  
25 Vacha-Haase, T., Davenport D. S. and Kerewsky, S. D. (2004) Problematic Students:  
26 Gatekeeping Practices of Academic Professional Psychology Programs. *Professional  
27 Psychology: Research and Practice*, 35 (2), pp.115-122.  
28  
29

30  
31  
32 Walker, J., McCarthy, P., Morgan, W. and Timms, N. (1995) *In Pursuit of Quality:  
33 Improving Practice Teaching in Social Work*, Newcastle Upon Tyne, Relate Centre for  
34 Family Studies, Newcastle Upon Tyne  
35  
36

37  
38  
39 Waterhouse, T., McLagan, S. & Murr, A. (2011) From Practitioner to Practice Educator:  
40 What Supports and what Hinders the Development of Confidence in Teaching and  
41 Assessing Student Social Workers? *Practice*, Vol. 23, pp: 95-110  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60