

FIELDWORKS

Whole-Field Usability Standard

Making regulation-first treatment-fit language usable across the whole recovery field

Project	Fieldworks
Document type	Whole-field usability standard
Status	Public working version
Date	23 July 2026
Author	Murray John Anderson · Fieldnotes.scot
Purpose	To help services, workers, managers, families and people using services apply Fieldworks language without turning it into another hierarchy of jargon.

Core standard: a Fieldworks idea is usable only when the people affected by the route, the workers delivering it, and the managers responsible for it can all understand what is being asked.

1. Why this standard exists

Fieldworks is a regulation-first framework for substance-use treatment fit. It asks services to understand what substance use is doing inside the person's actual field before deciding what treatment, support, expectation or record language is likely to fit.

The framework will fail its own purpose if it can only be read by people already fluent in professional, academic or organisational language.

A senior manager can usually understand a plain route. A person using a service, a peer worker, a family member, a receptionist, a cleaner, a pharmacist or a support worker may be excluded when the route is written only in corporate, clinical or academic code.

Plain language is therefore not simplification. It is route access.

Write for the whole field, not the top of the hierarchy.

2. What whole-field usability means

Whole-field usability means that a concept can travel through the recovery field without losing its discipline or becoming unusable to the people closest to the route.

A usable Fieldworks document should be understandable to:

- people using substance-use services;
- families, friends and informal supporters;
- peer workers and recovery communities;
- support workers, reception, administration, pharmacy and housing staff;
- nurses, prescribers, clinicians, social workers, justice workers and managers;
- researchers, commissioners and policy readers.

This does not mean every version contains the same amount of detail. It means the core meaning remains reachable without requiring the reader to climb a language hierarchy before they can participate.

3. The Fieldworks usability test

If a senior reader can understand the plain version, seriousness is not lost. If the person closest to the route cannot understand the technical version, access is lost.

Before a Fieldworks adaptation is shared, ask:

- Can a person using a service understand what this is asking?
- Can a worker use it on Monday morning without needing a new framework manual?
- Can a manager see what conditions need changed?
- Can the document separate plain language from loss of discipline?
- Can the same core concept be traced back to the full Fieldworks paper?
- Could this language help a conversation become more honest rather than more defensive?

4. Twelve requirements for usable Fieldworks language

1. Whole-field audience

Write as if the whole route is in the room: the person, worker, family, pharmacist, peer supporter, manager and service lead.

2. Clear object

Name what is being described. Is this substance function, treatment usability, medication ecology, conduct, feedback quality, record reliability or practical freedom?

3. Function before verdict

Ask what the use is doing before deciding what it means.

4. Availability versus usability

Do not treat an existing appointment, pathway, prescription or service as proof that treatment is usable.

5. Sequence before judgement

Ask what happened before the visible refusal, relapse, distress, silence, anger or guardedness.

6. Conduct before treatment

Make the route safer for honesty before demanding fuller disclosure.

7. Record discipline

Separate what was said, what was observed, what was inferred, what remains uncertain and what action is needed.

8. Feedback as field-produced

Treat guarded, partial or strategic disclosure as information about the route as well as the person.

9. Practical freedom

Do not assume more options create more freedom. Ask what sustains the person under real conditions.

10. No new jargon wall

Do not turn Fieldworks terms into labels people have to decode before they can speak about their own life.

11. Local adaptation with discipline

Adapt language to the setting, but preserve the sequence, ethical boundary and treatment-fit question.

12. Usable next action

Every practice-facing version should help someone know what to ask, notice, record or change next.

5. What should not happen

Whole-field usability must not become another way of imposing language on people. A service should not use Fieldworks to make people perform a new vocabulary before they are believed.

- Do not use Fieldworks terms as assessment labels.
- Do not use “function” to excuse harm or avoid necessary risk action.
- Do not use “treatment usability” to dismiss difficult but necessary treatment.
- Do not use “whole-field” language to blame every worker for structural pressure.
- Do not remove clinical judgement, safeguarding duties, medication standards or emergency response.
- Do not describe a person through Fieldworks language without preserving their own account.

6. How to use this standard

A service, group or worker can use the standard as a check before sharing Fieldworks material, adapting a section for training, or using its questions in supervision or practice discussion.

A simple use sequence is:

1. Choose the route

Is the audience reading the full paper, the practice-facing version, a one-page tool, a training discussion or a supervision prompt?

2. Protect the core idea

Make sure “regulation before correction” and “function before verdict” remain intact.

3. Remove unnecessary hierarchy

Replace specialist code unless the specialist term is genuinely needed and explained.

4. Check for usable action

Make sure the reader can identify one practical question or conduct change.

5. Keep the boundary

State clearly that Fieldworks is not clinical guidance, diagnosis, legal advice or a replacement for professional judgement.

6. Invite correction

Ask whether the language helped people describe reality more accurately or simply created a better-sounding system phrase.

7. Closing standard

Fieldworks is serious because the field is serious. But seriousness does not require avoidable difficulty of language.

The whole-field standard is therefore simple: make the framework precise enough for practice, careful enough for safety, and reachable enough for the people whose lives the route affects.

If the framework is meant to help the whole field, the language has to be usable by the whole field.