

ARTICLE

Denaturalisation and Norma-tension: two demands on contemporary social intervention

Desnaturalización y Norma-tensión: dos demandas a la intervención social contemporánea

Juan Saavedra¹

Universidad del Bío – Bío, Chile.

Received: 31/10/2024

Accepted: 14/03/2025

132

How to cite

Saavedra, J (2025). Denaturalisation and Norma-tension: two demands on contemporary social intervention. *Critical Proposals in Social Work* *Critical Proposals in Social Work*, 5 (9), 132-152. DOI: 10.5354/2735-6620.2025 .76506

Abstract:

The initial question of this article is how social work can prevail in an adverse neoliberal regime. This neoliberal context tends toward individuation, the disciplinary control of the most vulnerable groups, and the contraction of the institutions responsible for addressing these issues. In search of an answer, a theoretical argument is constructed, based on the assumption that social intervention is a relevant topic for the profession-discipline. Through a review of texts published by P. Garret, G. Muñoz-Arce, R. Cortés, among other sources, it is suggested that social intervention should transition towards a space of active resistance in favour of social justice and the inclusion of marginalised groups. The reflection shows how social intervention is conceived as a device of institutional power, subjected to neoliberal logics that prioritise efficiency over social justice. It proposes the denaturalisation of these discourses to challenge uncritical

Keywords:
Social interven-
tion; neoliber-
alism; device;
denaturalization;
norm-tension

¹Contact: Juan Saavedra, Chile  : juan.saavedra@ubiobio.cl

intervention and promote reflective practice in social work. Additionally, norm-tension emerges as a contradiction that enables strategies to foster resistance to normative control, reorienting the profession-discipline towards the pursuit of structural transformations. It concludes that both discursive denaturalisation and norm-tension allow for a departure from intervention notions aligned with neoliberal grammars.

Resumen

La pregunta inicial de este artículo es cómo el trabajo social puede prevalecer en un régimen neoliberal adverso. Este contexto tiende a la individuación, el control disciplinario de los grupos más vulnerables y la contracción de las institucionalidades responsables de afrontar dichos problemas. En busca de respuesta, se construye una argumentación teórica, bajo el supuesto de que la intervención social es un tópico relevante para la profesión-disciplina. A partir de la revisión de textos publicados por P. Garret, G. Muñoz-Arce, R. Cortés, entre otras fuentes, se plantea que la intervención social debería transitar hacia un espacio de resistencia activa en favor de la justicia social y de la inclusión de los grupos subalternizados. La reflexión muestra cómo la intervención social es concebida como un dispositivo de poder institucional, sometido a lógicas neoliberales que priorizan la eficiencia por sobre la justicia social. Se propone la desnaturalización de estos discursos, con el fin de impugnar la intervención acrítica y fomentar en el trabajo social la práctica reflexiva. Además, la norma-tensión surge como una contradicción que posibilita estrategias para promover la resistencia al control normativo, reorientando a la profesión-disciplina hacia la búsqueda de transformaciones estructurales. Se concluye que tanto la desnaturalización discursiva como la norma-tensión, permiten abandonar las nociones de intervención afines a las gramáticas neoliberales.

Palabras Clave:
Intervención
social; neoliberalismo; dispositivo; desnaturalización; norma-tensión



Introduction

As we commemorate one hundred years of social work in Chile, revisiting the recognisable theoretical links between the discipline and social intervention is interesting. A quick review of indexed bibliographic databases shows that intervention provides a field of meaning shared by the social sciences. However, in social work it has been argued that in this concept lies a sense of identity, as the traces of intervention are inscribed in various moments of professional history (Castañeda-Meneses, 2024).

In this sequence, the anchoring of social intervention can be observed at different moments in the century-long trajectory of social work, from its beginnings in 1925 to the present day. This itinerary is delimited by different junctures, from the crisis of the oligarchy in the second decade of the 20th century through the partial implementation of the welfare state model in the middle of the previous century to the events that mark the last quarter of the last century. This temporal review cannot avoid the fact that a turning point in the history of social work in Chile is the fateful times of Pinochet's civil-military dictatorship (1973-1990) and the subsequent transitional process that followed once the authoritarian government ended. For this reason, the historical illation of social work must consider the socio-political regime as a key analytical dimension. This framing confers theoretical and factual assumptions linking social work and intervention. For this reason, understanding the weight of neoliberalism in the 21st century is important for understanding social intervention. This condition of contemporaneity should imply the continuity of the neoliberalisation of public policy and the institutions where social work professionals are inserted. The question that arises is how social work can prevail in the neoliberal context, which tends towards the individuation of structural problems and the disciplinary control of the most vulnerable groups and, at the same time, reduces the public-institutional role to face such scenarios.

In this theoretical review, two social work demands will be examined to think about the scope of intervention on the horizon of the 21st century. This article is based on a relevant and comprehensive literature review using material from indexed databases (Scopus, Wos-Isi, Erih Plus, Scielo). We also accessed books in digital and printed formats available in libraries. The purpose of this reflection is to problematise the way in which social work intervention is thought of, taking into account the contradictions that arise from the neoliberalisation of contemporary public policy. The paradoxical link between social work and intervention (Saavedra, 2017) helps to understand why this discipline is advantageous for critically observing the phenomena of intervention in

society. Based on the centenary, and thinking about the projection for the coming years, it could be believed that the neoliberal substratum generates ethical, theoretical and methodological discomfort for social work. As a result of this task, two possibilities were explored in the conceptual displacement of social intervention in the usual mutations of neoliberalism. For this purpose, access will be gained through the notion of *demand*, as it expresses those requirements posed by that identity character that represents the intervention for social work. This polysemic expression has meanings in diverse fields such as law, psychology and economics. In this reflection, it will be understood that the demand is an illocutive speech act, inviting debate and recognising the scope of social intervention. This idea seeks to make visible in social work the contextual requirements that entail some urgencies for academic discussion and curricular training plans in the coming years. The first of these demands refers to the denaturalisation of statements in intervention devices, while the second alludes to the resistance expressed in the quality of the norm-tension. This proposal invites us to rethink social intervention as an analytical category, both from the perspective of social policies and in articulating a critical university education for the coming decades.

Thinking about social intervention in (un)mediated neoliberal contexts

Social intervention is a common topic for the social sciences, given its theoretical and methodological ramifications. Several Latin American authors in the field of social work have studied the concept of intervention, such as Carballeda (2002; 2019), Ortega (2015; 2017), Saavedra (2015; 2017; 2023), Falla (2019), Muñoz-Arce (2020), Camelo (2024), among others. The various bibliographical sources include a diversity of definitions, ranging from those that highlight it as a formal and organised practice (e.g. Fantova, 2018; 2019) to forms of restructuring power relations in socio-spatial contexts (Saravia, 2019). In this account, we find those that relate social intervention to the notion of *dispositif* (e.g. Carballeda, 2002; Hernández, 2020). As Moreno and Molina (2018) point out, intervention is imbricated in diverse historical-contextual coordinates, which have focused on understanding this issue from the perspective of devices. The same authors point out that the classic tools of social assistance have mutated in neoliberal frameworks. In this sense, immersed in neoliberal regularity, the intervention would gradually weaken its capacity to sustain social cohesion.

Neoliberalism encompasses economic, political and cultural dimensions (Harvey, 2007), so it must be called a *socio-political regime* (Han, 2022), given its totalising

character. This term captures its complexity better than words such as model, system or ideology, all encompassed within the meaning of regime. Brown (2015) argues that neoliberal economic rationality absorbs politics, subjecting democracies to rules that economise social life, a position shared by Muñoz-Arce and Pantazis (2019). From this perspective, Sánchez (2016) indicates that in neoliberalism, a) the market is the locus of truth, and b) governmentality transfers the risks of living and biographical responsibilities to individuals, reducing state capacities. Globally, neoliberalism has managed to adapt to its crises. This helps to understand that this regime has skilfully integrated the conservative and dehumanising theses that resurfaced during the 21st century in the United States, Europe and recently in Latin America. Garret (2019, p.9), in this regard, notes that a “rhetorically recalibrated neoliberalism” has emerged. Santander (2024) believes that, although representative democracies are maintained in the countries, neoliberal radicalisation uses authoritarian and communicational techniques to prevail. Following Katz’s (2023) opinion, the rhetoric of *Trumpism* is key to analysing the emergence of an ultra-conservative right-wing in the continent, with authoritarian traits that promote punitive and xenophobic actions in public policy.

Global social work is immersed in these modern problematic contexts described by Donnelly (2004), while Morley and O’Bree (2021) have pointed out that the profession is influenced by neoliberalism. The same is observed by Hyslop (2016), who study in social work practice through neoliberal efficiency and political control that tend to restrict, among others, the pursuit of social justice. This pushes professional collectives to prioritise the performance of institutional management indicators over addressing structural inequalities. Garret (2021), for his part, denounces the dominant narratives in contemporary social work, insofar as neoliberalism has transformed social work. In this context, management efficiency prevails over ethical principles, affecting the dynamics of support for vulnerable families and the possibilities of increasing gender equity. In Latin America, neoliberalisation scenarios maximise collective uncertainties in the face of accelerating financial deregulation. This, coupled with fierce power struggles in the various territories of the continent, contributes to the social deterioration of these countries (Costantino and Cantamutto, 2018).

The concept of dispositif in social intervention is significant for this review. This notion reveals the conjunction of a series of discursive and non-discursive elements connected through multiple formats, which aim to exercise various forms of power over the population. Castro (2017), from his in-depth readings of Foucault’s work, distinguishes sovereignty devices from more disciplinary ones, assigning the family and the asylum as their respective archetypes. Raffnsøe et al. (2014), for their part, indicate that the basic

modalities of the devices are law, discipline and security arrangements. This responds to the Foucaultian conception that attributes dispositional capacity to a heterogeneous set of elements (Raffnsøe et al., 2014). For Gil-Claros (2020), social intervention operates as a strategic device that functions at the edges of the social. Following Foucault's proposal, the author thinks that the discursive capacity of intervention provides possibilities for the institutional reintegration of individuals. In this, it must be considered that ideological and methodological criteria mediate social intervention, as it is not limited to an interpersonal relationship between the professional collective and those who access its services (Karsz, 2023). Therefore, Moreno and Molina (2018, p.20) point out that the intervention deals with "forms of relationship that are developed within devices that constrain the possibilities of action and are oriented towards the control of divergences". In agreement with Villadsen (2021), this implies understanding that social intervention devices allude to certain discursive and subjectivation practices.

Social intervention mechanisms are part of the repertoire of power strategies, even when the socio-political regime changes. However, neoliberalism has co-opted the more traditional welfare mechanisms. It is reformulating them, as happened, for example, with the social security health institutions that existed before the dictatorship in Chile. But it has also created new dispositive forms for the disciplinary control of the population, resignified in technological tools (Rubio, 2020). In this sense, Castro (2023) points out that the devices are genealogically reconstructed in space, health and subjectivity. The strategic character of these devices is visualised in the configuration of neoliberalism as a technology of power.

In the current neoliberal scenario, it is relevant to discuss the identity references, methods of action and axiological frameworks of social work. Under the assumption that social intervention is one of these disciplinary identity categories, it should contain disruptive transposition options that allow it to face future societal challenges. From this place of displacement, the following demands are made from social work towards the concept of intervention.

Denaturalisation of social intervention discourses

The first demand for social intervention refers to the *need to denaturalise discourses*. For this purpose, it will be understood that the naturalised character refers to the enunciative assignment of negative attributes to specific individuals, groups or undesired situations.

Naturalisation is related to the establishment of certain discursive hegemonies. In the 1960s, Alvin Gouldner identified that discriminatory narratives are sustained in legitimised discourses, such as politics or science (Fraga, 2022). According to Angenot (2010), discourses are shaped by enunciative prescriptions that delimit what can be thought and said at a given historical moment. Discursive naturalisation belongs to such argumentative schemes, which eventually allude to different forms of stereotypes and prejudices that are related to social cognition and the reinforcement of self-image (Baron and Byrne, 2005). This strains the profession, which has historically promoted ethical integrity in society. Although there are controversies about how these topics were addressed in the founding of Mary Richmond and Jane Addams (Verde-Diego, 2022), social work has historically opposed pernicious rhetorics that are connected to racism, violence and discrimination based on gender, age or social class, among others (e.g. Sherwood and Kattari, 2023; Silva-Córdova et al., 2024). There is a broad international consensus on the relationship between social work and human rights, as it is a globally shared purpose (Rubilar-Donoso, 2018). Despite the above, this aspect should be critically reviewed to amplify better results in discursive denaturalisation from the profession-discipline. For example, in research carried out by the team headed by Reyes-Pérez, the social work curricula in the country were analysed, concluding that “human rights education is rather scarce and diffuse” (Reyes-Pérez et al., 2020, p. 278).

It should be noted that these discursive naturalisations do not only operate in the spheres of everyday life. These forms are also expressed in the enunciations provided by governmentality, affecting the different specificities in which social intervention is observed. Examples of this problem can be found in Riedemann et al. (2020) and Ortega et al. (2022), among others. In this regard, Healy (2001), following Foucault’s view, understands discourse as contextual, linked to power and having practical implications. Therefore, for welfare/social control institutions, its performative efficacy lies in its capacity to provide order and circulation to the statements desirable by the socio-political regime. These discursive forms are coupled with other rhetorics based on stereotypes and prejudices that manage to infiltrate the technical argumentation of neoliberal social policy as a substitute.

For Alzola-Molina (2022), discourses in society are legitimised by institutions. These define what kind of truth is capable of securing governmental power and dominating the behaviours of the population. In this process, discourse in social intervention responds to dominant models of sovereignty – such as neoliberalism – by limiting issues that

can be questioned and avoiding counter-hegemonic enunciations. At this point, it is interesting to identify how social work is subjected to the rules of the new public management. Renau et al. (2023) highlight these changes in professional practice due to the penetration of neoliberalism in its practices. The intrusion of managerialism in public institutions has meant a change in the priorities of intervention processes. According to the authors, the emphasis on fulfilling performance indicators generates demotivation in professional teams in the face of the need to bring about structural social changes based on social justice. Similarly, Hozven and Sisto (2021) conclude that this neoliberal discursive framework transforms professional practice when efficiency is prioritised and depersonalised action is favoured. This leads to the limitation of critical perspectives in disciplinary training.

Faced with discursive naturalisation, social work should aspire to the persistent questioning of those dehumanising enunciations that are in tune with neoliberal culture. Critical reflexivity is the basic condition to address this problem, as it helps to deliberate on oppression in social work (Aguilar, 2023). It is important to address the questioning of professional reflection on both its conceptual categories and emerging practices. In recent years, scholarly efforts have been made to forge reflexivity from the history of practice. For example, Castañeda-Meneses and Salamé-Coulon (2022) contribute to rescuing the memory of social work based on the events of the dictatorship and the practices of forgetting the trauma experienced.

In contrast to Ferguson (2018), social workers should not respond to the deficit of reflection by invoking the emotional aspects of professional practice related to the stressful situations they must process. Rather, reflexivity would be absent with respect to the power-related aspects inscribed in discourses of institutions and their consequent juxtaposed narratives. In agreement with Hall (2019), it is more feasible for social workers to link different narratives of power from the intervention site. He points out that narratives are discursively adjusted over the population through selective framing and ethical-emotional appeals, whereas the Foucauldian conception of power is interactive and relational. It is in this purposeful framing of discursive denaturalisation of social intervention that denser frames are required to help observe the necessary unveiling and displacement of statements.

Standard-voltage

The second demand for social intervention is the production of *norm-tension* as a form of resistance. This issue is related to the normalising function of intervention, which is externalised in the institutional contexts in which social work is carried out. This characteristic has been studied indistinctly in various disciplinary contributions, such as García (2017), Saavedra (2022), Manthorpe and Samsi (2023), among others. The category of norm-tension is proposed as a complement to the options of professional resistance expressed, among others, by Cortes-Mancilla (2018), Muñoz-Arce (2020) and Garret (2021). This condition seeks to examine those discourses that shift the discourses of intervention into a field of contradicting forces. This demand for intervention is inscribed in the relationship between frameworks of normality and social work practices. Institutions sustain their operational definitions around standards for intervention that tend to homogenise the population, which are deployed to ensure social order and hinder the risk of subversion.

From Foucault's (2021) reading, it is possible to approach the ideas of norm, normality, and normalisation. The *norm* is a juridical-instrumental attribute of power necessary to differentiate what is normal from what is considered abnormal. The latter can be seen as a deviation that legitimises certain types of individuals' separation and disciplinary control (Martín-Rojo, 2020). *Normality* operates as a pattern or measure that allows the classification of individuals and populations according to a specific indicator. *Normalisation* produces both individual and collective conciliation concerning the framework of norms that regulate the order and cohesion of society (Carballeda, 2002). Through this triad, power ensures its survival in society, mediating the constant individual and collective adjustment to the regular order. In this, the various institutions present in the public offer play important roles, including those of the school, psychiatric and prison types. According to García (2017), social workers participate in these processes through double-sided strategies that combine the punitive with the educational in their professional action. It has been indicated that one of the functions associated with social intervention is normalisation (Saavedra, 2022). This aims to produce socially adequate individuals for economic, political and moral integration. In contrast to the other functions (transformation and adjustment), this function has a more intense semantic charge, attentive to its theoretical and political connotation. In this sense, it is illustrative to understand the normalising potential of intervention based on the ideas outlined by Jacques Donzelot.



Donzelot (1998) points out that the *guardianship complex* comprises a system that safeguards potentially at-risk subjects (mainly children) through judicial and educational intervention. Donzelot thinks that social work represents one of these available mechanisms for control assistance, which intervenes in the groups labelled as most vulnerable. The author points out that the action of the guardianship complex is limited to the exhaustive recording of information. For this purpose, complete research processes are carried out on the families that have been defined as being at risk. The information collected and systematised has the strategic purpose of serving as an interface between repressive and assistance actions. In this way, Donzelot points out that assistance measures adapted to the case are identified to limit the tendency of power towards acts of kindness and the use of judicial sanctions to regulate certain behaviours. In this respect, Donzelot developed a critical view of the configuration of European welfare states in the 20th century. According to the author, a blocking strategy was implemented in France to defend the foundations and beliefs that supported a cultural and political order: “The state had imposed progress outside society, without its participation” (Donzelot and Cardozo, 2007, p.152). This reasoning is relevant to understanding the recent political crises in Chile. The last decades have implied that the neoliberal imprint functions, as Garret (2019) points out, as a kind of counter-revolution to welfare capitalism. As a result, 21st century neoliberalism generates limited policies in favour of the population, increasing inequality and financial debt, leading to the poorest groups only surviving (Sagredo, 2022). Chaves-González (2023) points out that, in the configuration of the neoliberal subject, dialectics are neutralised, and distinctions between transgression and norm are eliminated, preventing the rise of forms of resistance to this regime. As Guadagno (2022) warns, neoliberalism implies an ethic of individualism, flexible markets and personal self-management. Social life is commodified (Brown, 2015), reducing it to living in a fiction of freedom. The events of October 2019 in Chile showed the need to reach avenues for emancipation from the neoliberal regime. The possibilities of social unblocking were thwarted after the constituent process, where the communicative tactics of sectors aligned with neoliberalism were emphatic in the criminalisation of protests, the justification of police repression and the defence of the totalising hegemony of the market (Basulto et al., 2023).

The arguments above would indicate that the function of normalisation in intervention devices constitutes a substantive problem for social work. This is aggravated because “neoliberal rationality is a specific form of normative reason” (Muñoz-Arce, 2018, p.35). It is essential to mention that the pressure of routine in professional practice prioritises the semi-automatic verification of requirements and indicators of entry to welfare



services. Following Peralta's (2020) opinion, professional training should visualise in this scenario the teaching of forms of intervention with critical capacity, with the aim of enhancing ethical commitment to social transformations. Cortés-Mancilla (2018), for his part, proposes ways to destabilise the devices of power in social work. The idea of *political bodies* is helpful for critically disputing the discursive space with those dominant narratives to rethink the ideation of normality in social intervention.

The *norm-tension* is a contradiction that evidences the ethical-theoretical conflict that is visible between the normalising function of social intervention and the historical and intrinsic values of social work. In order to produce this contradiction, the norm is not only a set of standards contained in legal norms or protocols of technical action. Its meaning must be projected towards the shaping of specific instruments of power, aimed at establishing what will be accepted as usual. With this extension, the behaviour of individuals and collectives is moulded through governmental institutions. In social work, the tensional component is generated when the dissonance between the professional-ethical reservoir and the institutional pressures contained in the devices constructed for intervention is unleashed. The interest in the norm-tension lies in reflexively confronting this rigidity. Otherwise, the ideals of social justice and transformative action risk being permanently reduced by the tasks of bureaucratic management in social programmes. This requires social work to be aware that its action operates in a place of contradiction with the neoliberal regime. On the one hand, there is the governmental structure, which needs to be in charge of the tools of regulatory control of the population. On the other hand, the professional collective assumes as an ethical obligation principles such as human dignity, the emancipation of people and the defence of human rights.

Discussion and Conclusions

Social intervention is the disciplinary subject of social work, whose functions are transformation, adjustment and normalisation (Saavedra, 2017). In the traditional imaginary of the profession, intervention is represented as a tool linked to practical work. However, social intervention in the 21st century is part of the strategic repertoire of disciplinary power (Foucault, 2021). In the context of present-day Chile, this concept faces significant tensions in the face of the deepening of neoliberal policies. In accordance with this assessment, Castro-Serrano et al. (2023) argue that *cartographic intervention* calls for new epistemological approaches that refute the rigidity and homogeneity of more traditional forms of intervention. This approach is close to the ideas proposed in the demands on social intervention for the coming decades, as it is also presented as acts of resistance and strategic conciliation to the current neoliberal context.

In agreement with Garret (2021), it is necessary to study the purposes and contradictions relevant to social work in the neoliberal framework. As Cortés (2017) points out, it is possible to rethink social intervention as a rupture with the established order, which positions social work on the stage of mobilisation of new and urgent transformations in society. Social work should assume this view to the extent that it distances itself from the nostalgic impulse about the professional past (Colin et al., 2018), which immobilises the exploration of new disciplinary routes. Therefore, this article proposes to discuss the denaturalisation of the discourses of intervention, recognising that the norm-tension provides a new category that contributes to making this contradiction visible in social work.

The literature review revealed a consensus on the negative consequences of the neoliberal culture on the design and implementation of social policies. In this scenario, social intervention increases the risk of being undermined by this socio-political regime. Following Morley and O'Bree (2021), neoliberal rationality hinders the possibilities for transformation. This aspect is also addressed by Urquieta et al. (2021), who warn that social intervention is reduced in Chile's public policies to implement technical procedures.

For this reason, it is essential to denaturalise the statements of intervention to rescue it from the alienation to which neoliberalism subjects it. From a social work perspective, this implies a resistance to the frameworks rooted in technocratic views that provide a highly bureaucratic and decontextualised form of normative intervention. Denaturalisation suggests a critical approach to university social work training. Instead of teaching unreflectively about the functions assigned to the profession from neoliberal politics, it is proposed to encourage a more complex reflection that allows us to understand that social intervention can become an uncomfortable category (Danel, 2020) in constant tension with the structures of power. This also requires learning other ontological and epistemological keys, which, in the terms proposed by Aguayo and Marchant (2020, p.16), have "linguistic capacities that seek in dialogue with the other a form of communication in solidarity".

For one, this work generates essential debates about how the subsistence of social work is dealt with in the neoliberal framework. These disagreements in the literature explored may affect how the claims of denaturalisation and norm-tension are understood. Maylea (2021) suggests that neoliberalism has already absorbed social work, becoming ineffective in the face of the social question that gave rise to the profession at the end of

the 19th century. The author proposes that abandoning the profession in its current form is necessary, as it operates more as a form of containment of the population than as an identity that enables change. In contrast, Garrett (2024) proposes to reconsider the issue of *common sense* in the language of social work. According to the author, this avenue facilitates reframing the transformative character that has historically inspired the profession-discipline. In agreement with Garrett, it is relevant to challenge the neoliberal hegemonies and ordinary sense that guard the classical view of social intervention. In this vision, the denaturalisation of practices contributes to the empowerment of the critique of the professional status quo. Unlike Maylea, Garrett favours the internal reinvention of social work, insisting on a path that leads to the renewal of the ideological bases and methodological responses that make social change viable. Garrett's position also coincides with the need to denaturalise the discourses of intervention to put tension on the common meanings alluded to by the author.

The answer to the question of the continuity of social work in neoliberal contexts necessarily invites attention to related theoretical aspects. *Firstly, there is a need to denaturalise the enunciation* of social intervention to question the scope of neoliberalisation. Social intervention should be detached from the practical formalism of a technical-normative nature to reconfigure itself as a theoretical category of a critical-reflexive order. In this proposal, enunciative denaturalisation also implies an act of epistemological resistance. Social work is expected to rigorously study the premises that sustain neoliberal governmentality for the design and execution of social programmes. *Secondly, norm tension makes the constant contradiction of intervention in the neoliberal context visible.* The duality between the technical requirements of management efficiency and the ethical-political commitment attributed to social work emerges. This tension, initially uncomfortable for the profession, constitutes an interesting space for broadening political advocacy and epistemological openness. Taking Muñoz-Arce's (2019) approaches as a reference, the normative-tensive contradiction would imply that social work collectives consider the means to negotiate, adapt and challenge the normalising function of intervention circumscribed in neoliberal frameworks. This aims to construct a socially just but, at the same time, effective response to the various specific social problems of the coming decades, taking into account their structural complexity.

Finally, the consideration of discursive denaturalisation and the visualisation of the norm-tension encourage the gradual abandonment of conceptual versions of social intervention that respond more to the management of disciplinary control of the



population. In the light of the first hundred years of social work, what is of interest is to conceive scenarios for future epistemic, ethical and political disputes that contribute to forging new professional-disciplinary resistances. The proposed categories open up an explanatory horizon in which social work will find itself in the coming years, influencing the space of dispute and vindication of the social.

Bibliographical references

- Aguayo, C. and Marchant, P. (2020). Construction of ethical competencies for university training in social work. *Perfiles Educativos*, 43(171). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.perf.2020.100000>.
- Aguilar, M. (2023). Critical reflexivity as a tool for emancipatory social work. *Servicios Sociales y Política Social*, 40(129), 11-26.
- Alzola-Molina, A. (2022). For a new politics of truth: critique, truth and parrhesia in Foucault. *Daimon International Journal of Philosophy*, (85), 23-36. <https://doi.org/10.6018/daimon.274421>
- Angenot, M. (2010). *El discurso social: Los límites históricos de lo pensable y lo decible*. Siglo XXI.
- Baron, R. and Byrne, D. (2005). *Social psychology*. Pearson.
- Basulto, O., Fuentealba, S. and Mendoza, C. (2023). Social signification of violence in traditional Chilean print media narratives: A case study of the social outburst in Chile (18-O). *Prisma Social: revista de investigación social*, (40), 289-326. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=76506>.
- Brown, W. (2015). *The people without attributes: The secret revolution of neoliberalism*. Malpasso.
- Camelo, O. (2024). Intervenir es interpolar: convergences between social pedagogy and social work. *Trabajo Social*, 26(9). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trabajo.2024.100000>.
- Carballeda, A. J. (2002). *La Intervención en lo Social: Exclusión e Integración en Los Nuevos Escenarios Sociales*. Paidós.



- Carballeda, A. (2019). Apuntes de intervención en lo social: lo histórico, lo teórico y lo metodológico. *Trabajo social*, 21(2), 286-288. <https://doi.org/10.15446/ts.v21n2.80324>
- Castañeda-Meneses, P. (2024). Conformación de la profesionalidad del Trabajo Social chileno a 50 años del golpe de Estado. *Itinerarios de Trabajo Social*, (4), 72-80.
- Castañeda-Meneses, P. and Salamé-Coulon, A. M. (2022). *Retazos de memoria profesional del trabajo social chileno*. Cielo Sur Ediciones
- Castro, E. (2017). Foucauldian devices. *Fermentario*, 11(2), 35-56. <https://ri.>
- Castro, R. (2023). *Dispositivos neoliberales y resistencia*. Herder Editorial.
- Castro-Serrano, B., Ceruti-Mahn, C., Fernández-Ramírez, C. and Garay, J. M. (2023). Social intervention and philosophy of contagion. *Cinta de moebio*, (77), 160-175. <https://doi.>
- Chaves-González, J. (2023). The firm, debt and the challenge: A conceptual map of the neoliberal subject. *RECERCA*, 28(2). <https://doi.>
- Colin, C., Iturrieta, S. and Marchant, P. (2018). Temporalities of disciplinary construction: the nostalgic narratives of social work in Chile. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, (65), 73-84. <https://doi.>
- Costantino, A. and Cantamutto, F. (2018). Naked neoliberalism. Trump, Latin America and the right without contradictions. *Si Somos Americanos*, 18(1), 17-45. <https://doi.org/10.4067/s0719-09482018000100017>
- Cortés-Mancilla, R. (2018). Herencia, acontecimiento y cuerpos políticos en la intervención social: Una deconstrucción desde el trabajo social. *Intervención Journal*, (7), 19-26. <https://doi.>
- Danel, P. M. (2020). Inhabiting discomfort from Social Work interventions. *Escenarios*, (31). <https://revistas.>



- Dominelli, L. (2004). *Social Work: Theory and practice for changing profession*. Polity Press.
- Donzelot, J. (1998). *La policía de las familias*. Pre-Textos.
- Donzelot, J. and Cardoso, H. (2007). *La invención de lo social: ensayo sobre la declinación de las pasiones políticas*. Ediciones Nueva Visión.
- Falla, U. (2019). Social research and professional intervention: central categories in social work praxis. *Tabula Rasa*, (31), 271-288. <https://doi.org/10.17105/201901.271-288>.
- Fantova, F. (2018). Constructing social intervention. *Papeles del psicólogo*, 39(2), 81-88. At: <https://doi.org/10.5964/pdp2018.39.2.81>.
- Fantova, F. (2019). The new social services and the professions of social intervention. *RES. Journal of Social Education*, (29), 11-27.
- Ferguson, H. (2018). How social workers reflect in action and when and why they don't: The possibilities and limits to reflective practice in social work. *Social work education*, 37(4), 415-427.
- Foucault, M. (2021). *Defending society: Course at the Collège de France (1975-1976)*. Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Fraga, E. (2022). Towards a critical theory of communication. Early contributions of Alvin Gouldner and the American sociology of language. *Intersticios Sociales*, (23), 77-114. <https://doi.org/10.5964/intersticios.23.77-114>.
- García, L. (2017). Vigilar y corregir: El trabajo social en las obras de Michel Foucault y Jacques Donzelot. *Cuadernos de Trabajo Social*, 30(2), 357-367. <https://doi.org/10.5209/CUTS.54585>
- Garrett, P. (2019). What are we talking about when we talk about 'Neoliberalism'? *European Journal of Social Work*, 22(2), 188-200. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602559.2019.1644444>.
- Garrett, P. (2021). *Dissenting Social Work. Critical theory, resistance and pandemic*. Routledge



- Garrett, P. (2024). *Social work and common sense: A critical examination*. Routledge.
- Gil-Claros, M. (Ed.) (2020). Perspectives on everyday social intervention. In *Pensando la Intervención Social* (pp. 15-23). Editorial Universidad Santiago de Cali.
- Guadagno, F. (2022). Towards a minimal definition of neoliberalism. *Euphyia*, 15(29). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euphyia.2022.100000>.
- Hall, C. (2019). *Social Work as narrative*. Routledge.
- Han, B. (2022). *Psychopolitics*. Herder Editorial.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Ediciones Akal.
- Healy, K. (2001). *Social work: contemporary perspectives*. Morata.
- Hernández, N. (2020). Social intervention devices from a rhizomatic perspective. A possibility from critical social work. In B. Castro-Serrano, A. Cea and N. Arellano, *Materiales (de) construcción. Crítica, neoliberalismo e intervención social* pp. 165-181). Nada Ediciones.
- Hozven, R. and Sisto, V. (2021). Interpretive repertoires in social work: discipline, profession or service provision? *Social Work Notebook*, 1(16), 12-34. In: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.swn.2021.100000>.
- Hyslop, I. (2016). Neoliberalism and social work identity. *European Journal of Social Work*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejsw.2016.100000>.
- Karsz, S. (2023). What is a social intervention? *Intervención Journal*, 13(1), 156-168. <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5900-1504>
- Katz, C. (2023). Fascism, populism or ultra-right: and the renewed format of the old Latin American right: and the renewed format of the old Latin American right. *Argumentum*, 15(1), 227-244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.argum.2023.100000>.



- Martín-Rojo, L. (2020). Michel Foucault: Discourse and politics. *Anuario de Glotopolítica*, (3), 35-56. <https://glotopolitica>.
- Manthorpe, J. and Samsi, K. (2023). Implementing the Social Care Workforce Race Equality Standard in England: Early Observations. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 53(2), 866-881.
- Maylea, C. (2021). The end of social work. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 51(2), 772-789. <https://doi>.
- Moreno, M. A. and Molina, N. (2018). *Social Intervention as study object: Discourses, practices, problems and proposals*. *Athenea Digital*, 18(3), 2055. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/athenea.2055>
- Morley, C. and O'Bree, C. (2021). Critical reflection: an imperative skill for social work practice in neoliberal organisations? *Social Sciences*, 10(3), 97. <https://doi>.
- Muñoz Arce, G. (2018). Neoliberal reason and research: resistances from Social Work. *TS Cuadernos de Trabajo Social*, (17), 33-54. Retrieved at: <https://www.tscuadernosdetrabajosocial.cl/index.php/TS/article/view/146>
- Muñoz-Arce, G. and Pantazis, C. (2019). Social exclusion, neoliberalism and resistance: The role of social workers in implementing social policies in Chile. *Critical Social Policy*, 39(1), 127-146. <https://doi>.
- Muñoz-Arce, G. (2020). Social intervention at the neoliberal crossroads: social transformation in the key of resistance. In B. Castro-Serrano, A. Cea and N. Arellano, *Materiales (de) construcción. Crítica, neoliberalismo e intervención social* (pp. 31-60). Nada Ediciones.
- Ortega, M. B. (2015). Social work as transdisciplinary: towards a theory of intervention. *Moebio Tape*, 54, 278-289. <https://doi>.
- Ortega, M. B. (2017). The study and analysis of social interventions are considered political cultures. *Moebio Tape*, (60), 286-294. <https://doi>.



- 150

- Saavedra, J. (2023). The debate on normality in social intervention: Disasters, pandemics and other discontinuities. In V. Yáñez (Ed.), *Trabajo social en contextos de crisis, catástrofes y pandemias: Miradas y desafíos contemporáneos* (pp. 101-112). Ediciones Universidad Autónoma de Chile.
- Santander, L. (2024). El neoliberalismo autoritario en la rearticulación discursiva de la derecha chilena post Estallido Social. *Propuestas Críticas en Trabajo Social*, 4(8), 124-148. <https://doi.org/10.5354/2735-6620.2025.76506>.
- Sánchez, N. (2016). Deprivation, exclusion and vulnerability: a new ethic in the face of neoliberalism. Reflections from Judith Butler and Wendy Brown. *Common Politics*, (10), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.5354/2735-6620.2025.76506>.
- Sagredo, G. (2022). Participation, sustainability and intervention: constraints for civil society in the public management of the Chilean neoliberal state. *Revista Intervención*, 11(2), 189-208. <https://doi.org/10.5354/2735-6620.2025.76506>.
- Saravia, F. (2019). Espacio e intervención en trabajo social a partir de Lefebvre. *Cinta de Moebio*, (66), 281-294. <https://doi.org/10.5354/2735-6620.2025.76506>.
- Sherwood, K. L. and Kattari, S. K. (2023). Reducing ableism in social work education through universal design for learning and policy. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 59(1), 119-132.
- Silva-Córdova, R. M., Banda-Poma, B. P. and Zárata-Castro, N. I. (2024). Social work in the face of inequality and discrimination of GLBTI groups. *Revista Tejedora*, 7(13ep), 327-341. <https://doi.org/10.5354/2735-6620.2025.76506>.
- Urquieta, A., Labraña, J. R. and Salinas, S. (2021). The improbability of effective social transformation: A reflection on public policy deficits in Chile. *Cuaderno de Trabajo Social*, 16(1), 115-132. <https://cuadernots.org/doi/10.5354/2735-6620.2025.76506>.
- Green-Diego, C. (2022). Revisiting the origins of social work: Richmond versus Addams. *Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, 80(156), 81-110. <https://doi.org/10.5354/2735-6620.2025.76506>.
- Villadsen, K. (2021). The dispositive: Foucault's concept for organizational analysis? *Organization Studies*, 42(3), 473-494.



Biography

Juan Saavedra is a Social Worker from the Universidad de Valparaíso, a Master in Human Development from the Universidad de La Frontera and a Doctor in Human Sciences from the Universidad Austral de Chile. He is an academic in the Department of Social Sciences at the Universidad del Bío-Bío, Concepción, Chile.

E-mail: juan.saavedra@ubiobio.cl

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9188-8126>

