

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/95590/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Ruch, Gillian, Winter, Karen, Cree, Viv, Hallett, Sophie , Morrison, Fiona and Hadfield, Mark 2017. Making meaningful connections: using insights from social pedagogy for statutory social work practice. *Child and Family Social Work* 22 (2) , pp. 1015-1023. 10.1111/cfs.12321

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12321>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



## **Making meaningful connections: insights from social pedagogy for statutory social work practice**

### **Abstract**

Reports into incidents of child death and serious injury have highlighted consistently that a cause for concern has been the capacity of social workers to communicate skilfully with children. In response, there has been a growing emphasis on training social workers in their communication skills. While a welcome development, training can often be perceived and experienced in terms of obtaining practical tips to aid the verbal and non-verbal communication process. We argue that more fundamental to 'connected' communicative encounters are intrinsic qualities that are difficult to identify, define and 'package'. Using a social pedagogical approach and drawing on data collected as part of an Economic and Social Research Council funded UK-wide, four nations, qualitative study exploring social workers' communicative practices with children, this paper will consider how social workers manage to connect, or not, with children. The social pedagogical concepts of 'haltung' (attitude), 'head, heart and hands' and 'the common third' are outlined as potentially helpful approaches for understanding the intimacies of inter-personal connections and enhancing social workers' capacity to establish and sustain meaningful communication and connections with children in the face of austere organisational contexts.

**Key words:** communication, connection, statutory child and family social work, social pedagogy,

## **Communicating with children: Contemporary policy and practice**

As highlighted in reviews of UK-based child abuse inquiries, concerns regarding social workers' capacity to communicate with children are by no means new and have exercised the profession over a significant period of time (Ofsted, 2011; Reder & Duncan, 2004; Winter, 2011). A persistent theme has been the quality and nature of social workers' relationships with children and in particular the lack or poor quality of communication between the social worker and the child. In response, and under various UK governments, there have been significant developments in law and policy aimed at addressing gaps in social work practice most recently culminating in the Children and Families Act (2014) in England, the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act (2014), the Social Services and Well-being (Wales) Act (2014) and in Northern Ireland new draft guidelines for cases coming to the attention of social services (DHSSPSNI, 2015). These developments emphasise: placing the child at the centre of all that is done and never losing sight of them; listening to the child and understanding their perspective, and respecting and responding to the views and experiences of the child as legitimate in their own right. In England, for example, supported by government guidance, most recently updated in 2015 (see Department of Education, 2015) there is a clear expectation that social workers should have the ability to communicate with children, that they should be creative and imaginative in finding ways to communicate and that they should make available a range of methods to children to facilitate the communicative process.

On closer inspection, these legal and policy developments, which primarily focus on listing what should be done and with what methods, raise broader questions about what is really meant by the term effective communication and how its underpinning processes can best be identified, described and conveyed to social workers through their professional education and continuing professional development. Reports and guidance (Oliver, 2010; Munro, 2011a, b) define effective communication as combining several key components namely: activities (speaking, listening, observing, negotiating, persuading, advocating); purposes (assessment, information sharing, offering support and guidance); qualities (warmth, empathy, clarity, confidence, authority); ideal conditions (calm, quiet, uninterrupted, safe); and methods (tools,

aids and prompts). How all these diverse dimensions of the communicative act are effectively reconciled and realised is not so readily addressed. Achieving effective communication is further complicated by the challenges associated with the widespread adoption of a New Public Management (Gruening, 2001) model of practice within the child and family social work sector. Despite attempts to identify, understand and minimise the negative impacts that have accompanied these developments notably increasingly bureaucratised and prescriptive practices, these trends persist (Munro, 2011a, b).

With the exception of recent work undertaken by Ferguson (2014a, 2014b), surprisingly little research has been conducted that has generated detailed empirical data of everyday, live, communicative social work practices. This paper responds to this significant knowledge gap and draws on empirical data from two phases of an Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) funded project – the Talking and Listening to Children (TLC) project. By applying social pedagogical principles and concepts to data derived from observation of live, communicative encounters between children and their social workers and interviews with the same social workers, the paper develops theoretically-informed insights to equip practitioners to make meaningful connections and to undertake the relationship-based work they need and want to undertake, in what are still widely-recognised to be challenging, overly-bureaucratised, prescriptive and authoritarian professional contexts.

### **Social Pedagogy – key concepts and principles**

Social pedagogical principles can be traced back through history (Hämäläinen, 2003; Lorenz, 2008; Eichsteller & Holthoff, 2010) and have been applied in a variety of ways. In the context of child and family social work, a social pedagogical framework offers a way of exploring and engaging with what have become the neglected emotional dimensions of relational and communicative encounters between social workers and children (Hämäläinen, 2003; Smith & Whyte, 2008; Stephens, 2009). It is not, however, 'a method' or 'a set of methods' but rather *an approach* that is best represented by describing its underlying principles. Derived from the work of Natorp

(1898) and Pestalozzi (1907) and comprised of several core tenets, detailed below, social pedagogy, metaphorically speaking:

is concerned with the theory and practice of creating a ‘thriving garden for children’, and indeed for all human beings – a fertile environment conducive to their well-being and learning, developing their inherent resources and connecting them to their surroundings (Eichsteller & Holthoff, 2010, p. 33).

Characteristics include respect for individuals’ inherent worth; a belief in people’s potential; interconnectivity - of thought, feelings and actions and of the professional, personal and private selves; and the fundamental importance of trusting relationships. Key social pedagogical concepts that further explain these characteristics include ‘haltung’, ‘head-heart-hands’ and ‘the common third’. Each are now explained in turn.

#### *‘Haltung’*

Closely translated ‘haltung’ means ‘disposition’ and refers to the overall mindset, attitude and demeanour of an individual. Complementing how social pedagogy adopts a holistic perspective on children and their development, ‘haltung’ requires practitioners to engage holistically, bringing all aspects of their being – rational, emotional and practical - into their professional relationships. As outlined by Smith (2010, p. 6), ‘a social pedagogue’s ‘haltung’ is intrinsic to their ‘self’. It is that ‘self’ that the social pedagogue utilises in working with others and which contributes to the development of suitably close and authentic relationships.’ On a practical level, ‘haltung’ is concerned with the congruence between one’s actions, values and beliefs.

#### *‘Head-heart-hands’*

Linked to ‘haltung’ is the emphasis, as noted above, to the ‘head-heart-hands’ motif that defines a social pedagogical approach and represents the engagement of professionals with individual children or adults through the application of thinking, feeling and doing, each being of equal importance in professional relationships. At a practical level, this is concerned with the idea that, in their daily practice, social

workers use a combination of 'intellectual, practical and emotional qualities' (Smith, 2010, p. 6). The holistic use of self underpins the development of authentic and trusting relationships. It requires the practitioner to exercise high levels of self-awareness and self-reflection to ensure that the professional and personal selves are on display in the workplace, but that the private self is not.

### *The 'common third'*

Using shared activity-based encounters also forms part of the basis for developing trusting relationships and are considered pivotal to a social pedagogy approach. Known as the 'common third', the activity represents a shared interest, a common point of contact around which a series of tasks are organised from start to finish, creating a sense of shared ownership, shared vision and shared interests (Smith 2010)

Informed by the work of Garfat (2004) and Krueger (1994) and the idea of 'connectivity' - that is, both internal connectivity (the inter-relationship between how we think, what we do and how we feel) and external connectivity (the inter-relationship between ourselves and those around us - these three social pedagogy concepts and practices combine to facilitate the creation of 'meaningful connections.'

### **The research project**

The data we have drawn on for this paper were gathered as part of the ESRC TLC project, conducted between 2013 and 2015. The project involved fieldwork conducted in local authority children's services teams across England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales and specifically researched what happens in everyday communicative encounters between social workers and children, exploring the factors that help or hinder the making of connections. Ethical approval for the project was obtained from the principle investigator's institution (Cardiff University) and the participating local authorities, with the Northern Ireland jurisdiction having additional ethical requirements that were met.

To research these issues, the project had three phases (see Winter *et al*'s forthcoming paper and Appendix One for more detail). In brief, phase one involved researchers being embedded in eight fieldwork teams (for between six to eight weeks in each), accompanying social workers on their visits, conducting pre-visit and post-visit interviews in the car (or on foot) and observing and taking notes of the visit as it unfolded. Data from 82 visits were collected as well as extensive field notes from the team-based observations. Phase two involved the use of the video-stimulated recall (VSR) method where we recorded interactions between social workers and children (nine in total) and then played back the recording separately to each of the participants to ascertain their views about the nature and content of the communicative encounter. Whilst widely used in other professional development and research contexts (Haw and Hadfield, 2011; Theobald, 2012) the utilisation of the VSR model in social work research is a significant methodological innovation. Phase three of the TLC project (on-going at the time of writing) involves the development of digital professional development materials for social workers.

To allow for the in-depth exploration and analysis of social pedagogical principles in social work practice with children, we have focused on the pre- and post-encounter interviews and the initial part of three encounters, drawn from phases one and two of the fieldwork, when connections were being established. Whilst there was slight variation in the purpose of each of the meetings they were all focused on safeguarding concerns and illustrative of ordinary, everyday social work encounters. It is important to emphasise that these examples are only that - examples from a much bigger dataset -yet we also acknowledge that it is in such encounters – the ordinary, the everyday – that a richly nuanced illumination of social work can be found, providing provenance from well beyond the cases explored. In this way, the practice issues they profile stand up to analytic scrutiny and enable us to defend our choice of them as emblematic of the gathered and analysed data from each of the two phases.

One further, final observation relates to the impact of a researcher or video recorder in these encounters and the representativeness of the data gathered. In completing

the ethics approval processes for each phase of the project, we were mindful of the possible obstacles to engagement that we might encounter, in particular the impact of intrusion into families' lives and the exposure of practitioners to public scrutiny. To our surprise, these obstacles proved to be far less problematic than we had expected. Families overwhelmingly welcomed the opportunity for social workers, rather than them as the family, to be observed and subject to scrutiny. In relation to practitioners' responses, in phase one the majority of practitioners expressed their appreciation at having someone interested in their work and the opportunities afforded by the pre- and post-interviews to reflect on their work. Any concern we had that the 82 phase one encounters we observed and practitioners' behaviours/experiences with the children and families were significantly different from 'normal' practice because of the researcher's presence did not appear to hold up. In phase two those practitioners who participated were able to acknowledge and work with the influence of the video and the researcher on the encounters, in order to minimise its impact. The bigger problem, here, arose in engaging practitioners in the second phase of the project in the first place. As a consequence, the relatively small sample in phase two restricts the scale of claims that can be made in relation to this aspect of the research if considered in isolation. In the context of this paper, however, the choice of data from both phases overcomes this shortcoming and highlights the congruence of the findings across both sources of data.

### **Carly and Maggie**

In phase one of the project, Maggie, a family practitioner with over ten years of experience of working with children and young people in child and family social work was meeting Carly, aged seven, for the first time following a referral from the school, where Carly had arrived with a bite mark which her mother admitted to inflicting on Carly in retaliation for Carly biting her younger brother. Having met earlier in the day with Carly's mother, Maggie's role was to meet with Carly and create a plan for direct work with her and Carly's mother. The observed session was Maggie's first home visit to meet and engage with Carly. From the outset, the researcher's field notes capture Maggie's child-centred approach:

*Maggie comes through and says that we are ready to go and I get my things. She grabs the box of Lego and says that she is planning on making bracelets but she thinks maybe Carly might want to play with Lego. As we walk across to the car she says she always carries lots of things around with her as she is thinking what might they like to do which is going to help them trust her and to feel comfortable. She opens her car-boot and there are puppets and toys and boxes with paper in them in there. I say that I haven't seen a social worker with that amount of toys and things before and she says that she can't imagine how people go about talking to children without them. We get into the car. (Field notes)*

In the course of the car journey to the home Maggie explained how she perceives her work. Acknowledging she is not quite sure how she will work with Carly, Maggie says:

*Maggie: So this is a bit kind of just suck it and see.*

*Researcher: OK.*

*Maggie: But already I'm thinking in my head oh I might use puppets with her, if she isn't a sort of an arts and crafts type... if she isn't a sort of arts and crafts type girl I might do those sorts of activities and obviously I'll chat to her a bit about what she's interested in as well. And then that just gives you a bit of a flavour for what you might want to do (Pre-visit interview).*

On arrival at the house, Maggie witnessed a stressful inter-change between Carly and her mother and entered into a domestic situation that was fraught with emotion. Despite this unexpected beginning, Maggie carefully established a child-centred workspace in the sitting room:

*She [Maggie] sits cross-legged on the floor in the corner of the room by the window, with her pot of beads She opens the pot and Carly comes in and Maggie says in a calm matter-of-fact voice, 'Hello Carly, do you like making bracelets?' Carly says yes and sits down next to her. Maggie says 'I thought so'*

*and gets some elastic out and says that she first needs to make sure that they have the right amount to thread. Carly holds her wrist out and they work out the elastic length together and agree that they will make it a little bit longer than they need so that they have room to tie it. Maggie says 'OK Carly let's decide what sort of bracelet you want to make and then when we are doing that, I'm going to tell you about who I am and why I am here' Carly looks at her and nods. They sit together and discuss what beads Carly will use and what pattern she is going to make. Carly starts making the bracelet and Maggie says 'mummy said it was a stressful day today'. She is sat next to Carly, side on and turns to face her.*

By the end of the visit, Carly had agreed to meet Maggie again in school, Carly's brother had become involved in seeing what was going on and Carly's mother positively affirmed Carly for a Lego panda she had built. Meaningful connections had been created with all three family members and a transformation in relationships had been achieved in a very short space of time. In her post-visit interview, Maggie continued with the theme of being child-centred:

*And she's ok about, you know, me going into school and that um...I think I'll need to explain the confidentiality bit again to her because she was quite focused on doing her beads so I think she only half heard me. Um...I always explain that to children because it's important to know that and it helps with the trust bit... And a lot of it is you know you've got a range of tools to draw on but a lot of it is suck and see...*

### **The Evans Family and Marie**

The Evans family, observed in phase one of the project, was comprised of Elaine (c. 24 years old) and her two children Debra, aged 8 years and Eddie, aged 7 years - both of whom were on the child protection register, a confidential list of children who have been identified as being at risk of harm, held in the UK by local authorities. The register carries no legal status, as such, but is a centralised way of identifying children at risk in a geographical area. Marie, the children's social worker (in her twenties and qualified for 2 years), was accompanied by the researcher on a regular

statutory monitoring visit to the children and their mother, with whom she has worked for a year. As part of this visit, Marie also had to ascertain the children's wishes and feelings regarding a forthcoming child protection review case conference.

In her pre-visit interview, Marie expressed her concerns about the capacity of the children to engage with her:

*I found it really hard to engage with these children when I was first going out to see them. They didn't even...they always wanted their mum there but now they're happy enough for me to speak to them on their own (Research field notes).*

When asked whether the children know the reasons as to why Marie is involved, she said:

*I don't think so. Eddie is seven but he's got mild cerebral palsy and a recent diagnosis of epilepsy....um... he goes to a special school because he has mild learning difficulties though he seems to have really come out of himself confidence wise but I don't think he understands what I'm doing (Research field notes).*

On arrival at the house the researcher recorded:

*The children are in the hallway – Debra [has] a plastic toy in her hand. It is a mini bongo drum with bells. She is shaking it at us and smiling. Eddie has a toy whistle that he blows at us as we enter the hallway (Research fieldnotes).*

In a short space of time, the children had made their presence known and indicated through their hosting of a noisy musical fanfare welcome that they were enthusiastic that the social worker had come to visit and were amenable to being engaged.

Marie's response to the welcome was recorded as follows:

*'Hello Debra what's this you've got?' (pointing to the toy), but does not wait for a reply as she is then lead into the front room by Elaine (Research field notes).*

Once the social worker and Elaine had seated themselves in the front room and started talking, the children continued to demonstrate an ability to make their presence known and a willingness to engage with the social worker. However, it was Elaine, the mother, who drew Marie's attention. As the interview progressed, the children's attempts to engage with their social worker ratcheted up.

In the course of the post-visit interview (that took place in the car on the way back to the office) Marie reflected on the missed connections and considered how these could be addressed in order to become attuned to 'the music' in the room:

*Researcher: One of the things I noticed was they came in with toys, like Debra had the thing that makes a lot of noise and Eddie had the ball and I wondered if you'd thought about engaging with the toy?*

*Marie: Yea, cos it's like a bridge? An icebreaker when it's hard to talk about other stuff, yea. Maybe that's a way they are trying to reach out and...*

*Researcher: talk to you? Cos Debra brought in that little toy that's really important to her?*

*Marie: Yea that's actually true. She brought that in and I didn't really acknowledge it – d'you know what I mean? Just talking to her about it would be making a conversation with her 'cos it's not threatening....*

*Researcher: Yea. It's just interesting 'cos they are making a conversation but on their terms*

*Marie: Yea, yea (laughing) that's a really good point. 'Cos if you notice the football as well and his new football shoes...*

*Researcher: Right, yea*

*Marie: I think that would have been a good thing to talk to him about (Interview transcript).*

## Janet and Stephen

The third example comes from a meeting that was videoed as part of phase two of the project. Although the data drawn on here is from a different methodological phase of the project that involved video recording the encounter, the actual encounter observed and recorded was no different to other encounters observed in phase one, where the social workers were spending time with children in order to get to know them, to assess their circumstances and to ascertain their wishes and feelings.

Janet, an experienced senior social worker in her 40s, had recently started working with Stephen, a 7-year-old boy whose family were experiencing difficulties, which included incidents of domestic violence that were having an adverse impact on Stephen. This was Janet and Stephen's fourth weekly meeting and it took place in a designated playroom in a school, which was their regular meeting place. It was apparent from the way Jane thought about her meetings with children that the child, in this instance Stephen, was the primary focus of her attention. The availability of a well-resourced playroom clearly supported her in this work. That said, from Janet's pre-meeting interview comments, it was clear that at the outset of engaging with a family she prioritised seeing children on their own and would do so regardless of whether appropriate facilities existed:

*Janet told me that whenever she gets a new child/young person to work with, she sees them once a week for about 8 weeks so that they can get to know one another. Thereafter, she can reduce contact to once a month or once a fortnight, depending on what the child's needs and situation are. She said she doesn't like Talking Mats and the other tools that are being promoted just now – she'd rather play real games with the children and get to know them through that. She thinks she might be out of step in this – there's pressure to embrace the new tools (Research field notes).*

Janet went on to say more about her concerns about contemporary practice:

*Hugely critical of the style of social work that is about form filling and ticking boxes – for example, “I consulted the child last week”. Instead she argues that you have to build a relationship and this goes both ways, so she tells kids about herself, her kids, her holidays etc. (Research field notes).*

The field notes illustrate how Janet’s attitude displays both an unquestioning orientation towards the capability of the children with whom she works to engage with her and an awareness of her critical part in achieving meaningful connection and engagement. Janet stated clearly how she uses herself as a key part of the relationship building process and, as illustrated below, very quickly demonstrates in the encounter how she approaches each relationship in a unique and personal manner.

The field notes record that on arrival, Stephen huddled himself on the floor in the corner of the playroom and Janet took off her boots and lay down facing Stephen on her side, so as to be on the same level as him. A few minutes into the meeting, Janet stretched across to Stephen and squeezed his leg. In the post-interview conversation when Janet and the researcher met to review the videoed recording, the researcher commented on Janet’s action:

*Researcher): Because that was very... You stretched right forward and you grabbed his leg and I thought that was quite interesting, he didn’t mind you doing that at all by the way.*

*Janet: It’s a thing we do.*

*Researcher: But you wouldn’t do it with an older young person, I bet?*

*Janet: And I wouldn’t necessarily do it with other children but it’s a thing, it’s a joke that we do because mainly we’re in the car and when we’re having a carry on and I giggle I grab, I do something to him that my dad used to do to me, it’s a kind of grip above the knee and you just sort of crumble into giggles and he loves it and I do it to him all the time and it doesn’t, it’s not sore, but I grab him above the knee and I give him a tickle there and he falls about laughing. So I suppose I was really conscious of the fact he doesn’t sit like this normally ever*

*so I was conscious that that was new for him and I leaned over to do that to him because a) its our thing but b) because I just wanted him to feel a bit connected even though he was sitting so far away. And that even though he was clearly doing that because things were different and he was needing the protection of the corner I was, I was just wanting him to remember that it was still me and it's still us and nothing is different (Interview transcript).*

The authenticity of the connection Janet had made with Stephen under these unusual circumstances was confirmed by the visible change in Stephen's demeanour from the outset of the meeting when he was huddled in the corner to the concluding section of the meeting when he lay sprawled out, in close proximity to Janet, mirroring her body language.

## **Discussion**

So what shared learning and insight can we take from these three encounters to help our understanding of what constitutes effective, connected communication with children? Below we outline how social pedagogy can inform practice with children and enhance practitioners' communication skills. In so doing, we are mindful of how the specific focus of this paper that involves analysing detailed practice encounters could run the risk of pathologising the practice of individual social workers. As researchers who have permission to open up practice to research, we have been mindful throughout the project of our ethical responsibility. It is not our place to make judgements on practice in order to apportion individual blame for shortcomings, but to ensure that that we adhere to our commitment to expanding understanding of effective communication with children, in order to improve practice as a whole. Furthermore, we are mindful of the limitations of this paper in that its predominantly practitioner-focus means that practice is not located and described in detail within organisational contexts and cultures that bring considerable influence to bear. We recognise fully the significance of these aspects of contemporary practice (Winter et al. forthcoming) but also believe that this should not negate the focus on social workers' own internal and external

congruence as reflected through the social pedagogical lens applied to analyse practice in this paper.

### ***Developing practitioner 'haltung' and recognising children's agency***

In each of the three cases presented, the extent to which the individual practitioners demonstrated 'haltung' was visibly different and appeared to be closely associated with their expectations of children's agency. Both Maggie with Carly, and Janet with Stephen, demonstrated in their pre-interviews how they had developed certain *universal* practices with children, whilst at the same time *customised* practices according to each individual child. Maggie's account demonstrated her professional authenticity and ability to adopt an open-minded, 'not knowing' position to what might work best, both core characteristics of 'haltung' and effective connections (Garfat, 2004; Eichsteller & Holthoff, 2010; Smith, 2010). As the field notes record, in the course of the 45-minute visit Maggie managed to turn the difficult initial situation around through a child-centred attitude (haltung) that made sure she spent time discretely in a 'common third' activity with Carly, whilst using her 'head, hands and heart' to empathise with all the other parties involved i.e. Carly's mother and brother.

Janet described her standard practice when starting work with a family of always initially seeing children over several sessions on their own, in order to get to know them in their own right, recognising that within this standard practice what unfolded in each session was unique to each child. In the initial phase of the recorded exchange with Stephen Janet demonstrated her disposition and 'haltung' towards him by using her knowledge of their relationship (her head), a physical interaction (her hands) and her empathic sensibility towards Stephen being unfamiliar with the videoing process (her heart) to create a safe environment for him to relate to her in.

In contrast, Debra and Eddie displayed enormous amounts of energy and agency that Marie noticed on arrival but was unable to utilise later on. Marie's pre-interview remarks may suggest that she held lower expectations of children's agency and had pre-determined activities she was planning to use to ascertain their wishes and feelings. From her pre-visit explanation and her conduct during the visit, Marie

showed that while she was hearing the children, she was not able to listen to them fully; likewise, while she was observing them, she could not see them, or at least attend to seeing them, an experience widely reported by young people in relation to their encounters with professionals (Author's own, forthcoming). Marie's post-interview comments highlighted her insight into the visit dynamics and her immediate recognition, on reflection, that she could have used the artefacts Debra and Eddie had presented her with (the musical instrument, a sports medal and a football) more effectively to make a connection. This encounter, however, was made harder for Marie by the need to simultaneously attend to the needs of Elaine and of the children. In contrast, Janet had determined to see Jamie separately so did not have to address competing dynamics in the room, whilst Maggie managed this challenge by creating a discrete and bounded space to work with Carly. This common, everyday conundrum for social workers of working out how to respond simultaneously to the needs of children and their parents was a recurring feature of our data and is explored in more detail in a forthcoming TLC paper.

At a very concrete level, it was surprising to note (from all our encounters on the TLC project) how few social workers had any play materials to use with children.

Examples of social workers having boxes of toys and creative materials were rare, but where they existed the practice they demonstrated was frequently impressive. The fact that this was the exception, rather than the rule, suggests two key inter-related and concerning issues. Firstly, the inability of organisations to recognise what practitioners need to do their work; where practitioners did have play materials to hand they had often brought them themselves. Secondly, many of the practitioners we observed did not appear to have a mind set that embraced the idea of children needing varied ways of communication, and perhaps in direct response to the impoverished mindsets of the organisations that many practitioners found themselves located in (see below) there was a lack of creativity in thinking about practice. In contrast, social pedagogic approaches encourage the use of all sorts of 'common third' activities, often, as the examples drawn on illustrate, everyday activities that already exist and can be readily incorporated into the encounter. This

research suggests that the significance of this practical and attitudinal element of the everyday encounter needs to be better understood and addressed.

A noticeable feature of all the encounters we observed was the non-linear nature of the social worker-child communication process. The project findings highlighted the importance of social workers developing both their confidence in the agency and ability of children to say what needs saying/expressing and their ability to recognise that it will be communicated often unexpectedly and not necessarily through direct or straightforward processes. Acquiring and exercising a 'haltung' that has an understanding of and conviction about children's agency and the ability to creatively use the head, heart and hands to respond, we would argue are essential social work skills. Of particular importance is the intuitive sensitivity of practitioners to resist the urge to force a conversation or raise an issue too quickly or directly.

Cars and car journeys have long been noted as conducive spaces and places for conducting conversations with children (Ferguson, 2014, 2014a; Winnicott, 1963), as they avoid direct face-to-face contact whilst creating a sense of safety and intimacy. Creating a safe and appropriately intimate space, such as Maggie and Janet did, that involved activities that allowed eyes to be averted as required, affords similar opportunities for connection and communication to that offered by car journeys. Establishing familiar routines – the same place, same routine, same activities - also creates an importance sense of intimacy, ownership and continuity, which children value greatly (see review by Author's , 2015). Such interactions are in their own right highly skilled and demanding. The challenge of achieving such connected and attuned encounters, however, is further exacerbated by the prevailing organisational and policy context, driven by bureaucratic, as opposed to child-centred, imperatives. In many instance practitioners were restricted to only one or a very small number of opportunities to engage with a child.

Social pedagogic approaches that encourage 'head-heart-hands' approaches run counter to the dominant managerialist mindset that currently pervades the organisational domain and which appears to marginalise interpersonal contact. Nonetheless, if adopted, they have the potential to establish meaningful and

effective relationships that ultimately, for a bigger investment in inter-personal contact early on, can be cost effective in the long run by contributing to the creation of more accurate assessments, informed decision making and appropriate interventions. Janet's resolve to see Stephen regularly is a powerful statement of her pedagogically-informed professional commitment to human need over economic efficiency, but one which has potential, in the long run, to be both humanely effective and economically efficient. Under such conditions practitioners need to be professionally assertive, as exemplified by Janet's professional resolve to practise in this way, in order that the best interests of the child can be both promoted and protected. Understandably, less experienced practitioners may find such an approach harder to mobilise, particularly if their organisational context does not endorse and support it, but recognition of its importance begins to create the possibility for such sites of professional agency and assertion to develop.

***Promoting social worker agency and establishing organisational support***

These examples from the research highlight the importance of individual practitioners' values, beliefs and practices for effective communication with children. That said, this individual perspective does not entirely account for the quality of communicative practices as organisational contexts were found to have a considerable impact on what social workers felt they could or could not achieve. For practitioners to be able to establish and sustain meaningful encounters with children requires them to be attuned to the harsh realities of human need and impoverishment and able to draw on a breadth of approaches to communicate and relate effectively (Lefevre, 2010). As Janet's behaviour demonstrates communication and connections are multi-faceted and involve a complex series of inextricably inter-related intimate interactions - words, facial and hand gestures, body positions, touches, sounds and silences. Eichsteller and Holthoff (2010, p. 184) capture this need for sensitive flexibility:

The relational aspect of social pedagogic practice means that every day brings something new and unforeseen as every child is unique and brings all their uniqueness into that relationship. As it is impossible to have a rulebook

that would adequately cover the complexity and endless possibilities enshrined within each relationship, all that social pedagogy can do is give professionals the confidence needed for each new encounter, to trust their own and the other's abilities.

As social pedagogic theoretical approaches recognise (Cameron and Moss, 2011) to offer an attuned response to a child requires practitioners to be experiencing attuned responses to their own professional needs from supervisors, managers and peers. The significance for effective, connected practice of practitioners feeling heard and understood was brought home to us through the organisational observation data gathered in the course of this project. It was widely observed that there was a lack of space for social workers to plan effectively in relation to forthcoming encounters. Caseload demands, responding to emerging crises and organisational preoccupations with responding to and/or managing risk dominated their practice, resulting in a lack of opportunity for social workers in some teams to attend to the intimacies of inter-personal connections that occur within the space of an encounter.

This finding underlines the crucial importance of attending to the organisational-individual interface for effective practice. This claim is further substantiated by the finding from our observations that social pedagogic principles did not explicitly inform the practices of any of the wider organisational contexts in which the teams that were observed were located. As a consequence, a social pedagogic mindset did not filter down through the organisations to practitioners in the field. Whether social pedagogy was a feature of individual or team level practice, therefore, was largely idiosyncratic and contingent on the motivation, knowledge and skills of individual practitioners or managers. This was vividly illustrated across the research project where teams located in the same organisational contexts, and even in some instances individuals within the same team, demonstrated contrasting approaches to practice. Suffice to say here that how practitioners understood their role and engaged with the children and families on their caseloads was dependent on the extent to which their organisation had a child-centred outlook, the nature of teams'

structures and cultures and the quality and quantity of the supervision available to practitioners. This is another aspect of our research that will feature in a forthcoming TLC project publication.

## **Conclusion**

Social pedagogy invites all involved to attend to the intimacies of inter-personal connections. In the context of social workers' relationships with children and families who are invariably experiencing heightened levels of anxiety and financial and emotional austerity, this makes establishing such connections a challenging undertaking. One of the biggest challenges, however, is the financially driven, short-termism that is integral to current welfare policies and practices. Re-discovering a relational stance in social work is crucial if children's best interests are to be promoted and the worst effects of managerialism are to be averted. Social pedagogy appears to offer a fruitful theoretical and practical framework for assisting practitioners, working in a hostile political climate, to make meaningful connections with children and families. Bringing social pedagogy into social work practice encourages all relationships, however fleeting, to be shaped by a 'haltung' that embraces and builds on children's agency. The findings of this research suggest that this, in turn, will increase the likelihood that a meaningful connection and more effective practice, even in difficult circumstances, can be achieved. The promotion and development of social pedagogically-informed practice must, however, be accompanied by shifts in policy to ensure that the organisational context in which practitioners operate, protects and promotes their professional agency in order that effective practice can be sustained.

## **References**

Author's own 'An uncomfortable comfortableness': 'care', child protection and child sexual exploitation, *British Journal of Social Work* .

Author's own (2015) *Supporting Positive Relationships for Children and Young People who have Experience of Care. IRISS Insights, No 28*, The Institute for Research and Innovation in Social Services (Iriss), Glasgow, Scotland.

Authors' own. (2015) 'Social work home visits to children and families in the UK: a Foucauldian perspective', *British Journal of Social Work*, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcv069, first published online: August 25, 2015.

Authors' own (forthcoming) 'Exploring communication between social workers, children and young people', *British Journal of Social Work*.

Department of Education (2015) *The Children Act 1989 Guidance and Regulations. Volume 2: Care Planning, Placement and Case Review*, Department for Education, London.

Cameron, C and Moss, P. (2011) *Social Pedagogy: Current Understandings and Opportunities*, C. Cameron and P. Moss.(eds) *Social Pedagogy and Working with Children and Young People: Where Care and Education Meet*, London: Jessica Kingsley.

Eichsteller, G. & Holtoff, S. (2010) *Social Pedagogy Training Pack*, ThemPra Social Pedagogy Community Interest Company, Allithwaite, Cumbria.

Ferguson, H. (2014a) 'What social workers do in performing child protection work: evidence from research into face-to-face practice', *Child & Family Social Work*, DOI: 10.1111/cfs.12142, article first published online: March 21, 2014.

Ferguson, H. (2014b) 'Researching social work practice close up: using ethnographic and mobile methods to understand encounters between social workers, children and families', *British Journal of Social Work*, doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcu120, article first published online: November 7, 2014.

Garfat, T. (2004) 'Meaning-making and intervention in child and youth care practice', *Scottish Journal of Residential Care*, vol. 3(1), pp. 9-10.

- Gruening, G. (2001) 'Origin and theoretical basis of New Public Management', *International Public Management Journal*, vol 4 pp. 1–25.
- Hämäläinen, J. (2003) 'The concept of social pedagogy in the field of social work', *Journal of Social Work*, vol. 3(1), pp. 69-50.
- Haw, K. & Hadfield, M. (2011) *Video in Social Science Research: Functions and Forms*, Taylor and Francis, Abingdon.
- Krueger, M. (1994) 'Rhythm and presence: connecting with children on the edge', *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Problems*, vol. 3(1), pp. 49-51.
- Lefevre, M (2010) *Communicating with Children and Young People: Making a Difference*, Policy Press, London.
- Lorenz, W. (2008) 'Paradigms and politics: understanding methods paradigms in an historical context: the case of social pedagogy', *British Journal of Social Work*, vol. 38(4), pp. 625-644.
- Munro, E. (2011a) *The Munro Review of Child Protection. Part. 1. A Systems Analysis*, The Stationery Office, London.
- Munro, E. (2011b) *The Munro Review of Child Protection: Final Report. A Child-Centred Approach* (Vol. 8062), The Stationery Office, London.
- Natorp, P. (1899) *Sozialpädagogik. Theorie der Willenbildung auf der Grundlage der Gemeinschaft*, Frommanns, Stuttgart.
- Ofsted (2011) *The Voice of the Child: Learning Lessons from Serious Case Reviews. No. 100224*, Ofsted, London.

Oliver, C. (2010) *Children's Views and Experiences of their Contact with Social Workers: A focused Review of the Evidence*, Children's Workforce Development Council, London.

Pestalozzi, J. H. (1907) *How Gertrude Teaches her Children. An Attempt to Help Mothers to Teach Their Own Children and an Account of the Method. A Report to the Society of the Friends of Education*, Burgdorf (4th edition), Swan Sonnenschein & Co, Ltd, London.

Reder, P. & Duncan, S. (2004) 'Making the most of the Victoria Climbié inquiry report', *Child Abuse Review*, vol. 13(2), pp. 95-114.

Smith, M. (2010) *Social Pedagogy. A Briefing Paper*, Centre for Excellence in Looked After Children in Scotland (Celcis), University of Strathclyde, Strathclyde.

Smith, M. & Whyte, B. (2008) 'Social education and social pedagogy: reclaiming a Scottish tradition in social work', *European Journal of Social Work*, vol. 11(1), pp. 15-28.

Stephens, P. (2009) 'The nature of social pedagogy: an excursion in Norwegian territory', *Child & Family Social Work*, vol. 14(3), pp. 343-351.

Theobald, M. (2012) 'Video-stimulated accounts: young children accounting for interactional matters in front of peers', *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, vol. 10, pp. 32-50.