

- | | | | |
|-----|--|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 712 | Nicholas Anthony Halstead | 505 | Silvia Ruth Mulvany |
| 548 | Harold Milton Hecht | 688 | Simon Oakeshott |
| 674 | Maram Jagannadham | 504 | Olusegun Oduwole |
| 561 | Pramod Purshottamlal Jauhar | 679 | Catherine Violet Rosalie Oppenheimer |
| 696 | Ashraf Kahn | 740 | Helen Mary Pepper |
| 718 | Turuvekere Veerappa Kamala Chandrasekhar | 588 | Susan Mary Perry |
| 607 | Mangal Narayan Katti | 681 | John Charles Pomeroy |
| 627 | Deborah Marie Teresa Josephine Keelan | 646 | Anthony Charles Purches |
| 545 | Roger Ian Laurence Kennedy | 613 | Annette Catherine Read |
| 623 | Neal John Patrick Killala | 520 | Adrienne Moore Reveley |
| 629 | Peter James Kirwan | 580 | Michael August Reveley |
| 535 | Niazi Ayoub Fadli Kraya | 720 | James Brian Riddell |
| 565 | Irene Yue Kit Kwok | 585 | Michael Alexander John Rosenberg |
| 677 | Sylvia Latif | 689 | Narayan Saikia |
| 573 | Frederick Christopher Le Gear | 719 | Sivasankaran Pillay Sashidharan |
| 610 | Barbara Vera Lency | 595 | Dayanda Chandrasiri Senaratne |
| 643 | Meng Hooi Lim | 599 | Kenneth Israel Shulman |
| 517 | Roland Martin Littlewood | 587 | Chrissoula Stavrakaki-Stylianides |
| 543 | Michael Brendan Lynch | 547 | Sheila Christine Stewart |
| 727 | William McCrea | 742 | Muthuram Mudaliar Sujana Kumar |
| 606 | Peter McGuffin | 578 | Gillian Valerie Tagg |
| 638 | Joseph Patrick McKeon | 572 | Mo-Shing Paul Tam |
| 628 | Stephen Patrick McKeown | 604 | Jacob Thomas |
| 724 | Janice Miles McKnight | 528 | Morven Elizabeth Thomson |
| 728 | Iain Stewart McNeill | 743 | Margaret Tweddle |
| 570 | Maire Catherine Mallie | 513 | Theunis Jeremia Van de Merwe |
| 537 | Jaswant Kumar Marakani | 593 | Mohamed Veerabangsa |
| 653 | Jonathan Lionel Margo | 721 | Howard Linton Waring |
| 698 | John Angus Marks | 731 | Peter John Whewell |
| 644 | Ibiapuye Soala Martyns-Yellowe | 667 | Peter John Watson Wood |
| 612 | Brenda Mary Motley | 532 | Badruzzaman Zaman |
| 671 | Gerald John Mullen | | |

REPORTS AND PAMPHLETS

A Study of Day Centres by Anne Stephens and Pauline Nattress. Published by MIND, 1978 (pp 65, £1.50).

This report is a description of the work of seven Day Centres in England and Wales. It has been written by two students on the University of Surrey's course for a postgraduate diploma in applied social studies. Part of that course included a full time placement with MIND from December 1976 to March 1977. Those three or four months 'provided enough time . . . for suitable centres to be chosen, lists of basic questions to be drawn up, the necessary visits and interviews to take place and the writing and checking of details to be completed.' One admires such a high work-rate.

The seven Day Centres are inevitably observed too briefly to yield more than a superficial impression, but they have been charitably treated and interestingly described by the authors. The Centres varied widely in all sorts of ways—in size, in premises, in affiliation, in funding, in clientèle, in staff ratio, in management, in sophistication, etc—but common to all was the inclusion of some mentally ill or mentally handicapped people among those who attended, and the fact that each Centre placed some emphasis on retraining and resettling into work.

The authors use the term 'members' to cover 'all the client groups attending the Day Centres' and hope to imply by that term 'an active participation rather than being a passive recipient of help'. They

also supply two definitions, which is as well for these are unusual. 'We define resettlement as achieving open employment and rehabilitation as achieving the social and relationship skills needed to cope with life.'

There are eight pages of Conclusions, Suggestions and Recommendations, and whatever importance the report earns will lie there. Ways are suggested of supplementing funds by running a Day Centre in conjunction with a Group Home and using the surplus income from the latter to support the former, by the use of Nearly New shops which members can help to run, and by 'imaginative production of craft goods'. 'Profitable work does not necessarily involve subcontracting . . . nor does profitability undermine the therapeutic ethos of the centre.' 'Optimum use of available staff volunteers and members themselves as well as exploiting local community resources . . . all contribute towards minimizing costs. Whatever the overall costs in day centres are, there is no doubt that they are one of the most effective and cheapest forms of care for the mentally ill and mentally handicapped people.'

The authors recognize the importance of atmosphere, attribute it to the attitude of the staff, recommend 'a light-hearted approach' and list five factors that were evident in centres which were offering more to members and staff. Staff were willing to undertake a variety of functions and explore new possibilities. Staff were not overprotective but prepared to let members experiment. All staff shared in management and decision-making. Staff went out from the centre to build up community contacts and outside projects. Each staff member's skills were fully used.

Volunteers were especially valuable if 'they had something very positive to offer in terms of practical skills'. Otherwise volunteers evidently tended to underrate the capabilities of members and to restrict their initiative and responsibility. To allow and encourage members to graduate into volunteers is highly recommended but sounds to me to be of questionable value to the erstwhile member, rather like an up-to-date community variant of the dwindling practice of exploiting chronic patients in hospital departments.

Centres are recommended to emphasize what their members *can* rather than cannot do. Members should take part in deciding and organizing things. Meetings provide a setting for this and leisure activities afford a suitable medium. Involvement is increased if members can be let to do staff jobs such as cooking or learning to cook or running that Nearly New shop or helping with the clerical work or helping fellow members.

The authors make a valuable point about assessment in recommending that the member be involved in the process. Too often only the staff's need for the results of assessment is considered. But the personal development of members includes their need for self-assessment and that demands participation, say the authors.

Though some staff are apprehensive about it, the mixing of different diagnostic types of disability in what the authors call generic centres is found to work satisfactorily, which is an important step forward.

The report is weakest on the subject of work. It is true that work was provided but usually in small amounts with an apologetic air as if the whole idea rather lets the side down. 'Most centres felt that work was not only a reality of life but also provided a sense of purpose which justified its inclusion as an integral part of the activities of the centre.' It says a lot for the treatment value of work that it commended itself even to people who were merely playing at purveying it. Yet the authors correctly recognize that 'it was not a particular skill that got people jobs, but an ability to cope with the working day'.

'In every area we visited there was a deplorable lack of sheltered employment without which a lot of the potential of day centres is lost.' There was dissatisfaction with the DRO's performance of his statutory functions, and some centres had sensibly resorted to getting their own staff to help place patients in jobs. On systems of payment there was much diversity and disquiet. Piece-rate earnings were said to lead sometimes to 'a harmfully competitive atmosphere' while flat rate payments 'can create bitterness between those who are working harder than others'. One suggested solution was to pay nothing to individual members but pool the money to buy shareable amenities, which leads, it is said, to 'a co-operative spirit in work'. The other was that 'members should receive a fair rate for the jobs undertaken'.

Altogether I found this a readable and valuable report. It should help those newish Day Centres which are having to learn the hard way the expertise that hospitals were beginning to acquire twenty years ago. As Kathy West says on behalf of MIND in her Foreword: 'We hope both the descriptions and recommendations will encourage new thinking and development in day centres and the expansion of training and work opportunities for the mentally ill and mentally handicapped in general.' Anyone keen to visit the centres would be wise to check the addresses first; two of those listed on an enclosed green sheet are wrong.

ROGER MORGAN