TEACHING AS CONVERSATION: THE METHODS ADOPTED BY AN INSIDE INQUIRER OF SOCIAL WORK RELATIONSHIP BASED TEACHING

Sharon Walker

Senior Lecturer in Social Work, Anglia Ruskin University, Chelmsford, Essex, England

Abstract

The focus of the article is an attempt to answer my question of how I develop a relationship based practice as a social work educator (Walker, 2014). There has been recognition in the UK of a need for social workers to develop effective relationships with service users and professionals. In response, I am inquiring into how I can teach using a relationship based approach. The approach is built on a combination of Edwards and Richards (2002) Relational/Cultural model, the Matching Principle introduced by Ward (2010), the metaphor of "teaching as conversation" McNamee (2007), theoretically underpinned by systemic practice. I intend to capture the naturally occurring dialogue in the teaching environment by audio recording teaching sessions and analyse the recordings using Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM). This provides a framework of analysis incorporating interactive patterns between emotion, meaning and action.

Key words: *coordinated management of meaning, relational teaching, relationship based teaching, social work, social work education, systemic approach, systemic practice*

INTRODUCTION

Sadd (2012:957) suggests underpinning relationship based practice are three theoretical frameworks, psychodynamic, attachment and systems theories. I have chosen to situate my practice from a systemic approach as understood by Kevin Barge (2006) when quoting Campbell (2000) as 'the connectedness of people, things and ideas: everything connects to everything else' (p30). The connectedness in the learning process extends far beyond the teacher/student/s relationship; it is affected by each community that has an influence or involvement in social work education. The student group, the teaching team, the university, the Higher Education Academy, and Government are examples of communities that influence knowledge production and knowledge emergence. Trevithick noted "social work tends to shift ground on key issues, often in response to the demands of its critics and government" (2003, p165). This was evident when the outcomes from the Serious Case Review of Peter Connelly (Laming 2009) which led the then Government to request a national reform of social work education in the UK (The Social Work Task Force, 2009, The Social Work Reform Board 2010, The College of Social Work, TCSW, (2011). It also led to the commissioning by the then Education Secretary to look at Child Protection Systems, (Munro 2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2012). Guidance from TCSW stated the importance of "working effectively through building a relationship with individuals, families, groups and communities as appropriate" (2011, p30).

The Health and Care Professions Council, HCPC which regulates the standards of the Social Work profession in the UK, set Standards of Proficiency, 9.1 note social workers must 'Understand the need to build and sustain professional relationships with service users, carers and colleagues as both an autonomous practitioner and collaboratively with others' (2012, p11). I felt the guidance that focussed on the importance of relationships resonated with the Munro reports which recognise the need for social work to return to a professional practice in which relationships play a central role. She argues that 'this tradition in social work appears to have been gradually stifled' (2011b, p86). Munro emphasised the need to develop relationship based practice to at least be able to engage children and explore their wishes and feelings. Ferguson (2011) introduced the phrase 'intimate practice' in social work; referring to what is akin to relationship based practice with service users. Ferguson asks what it would mean to have authentic, close relationships with children in child protection where we see, hear and touch the truth of their experience and are able to act on it. He argues that child protection has become static, immobile and non-relational. This was very different to the practice that existed when I

qualified as a social worker in the early 1990's, there was an emphasis on anti-oppressive and anti discriminatory practice (Brown, 1996) which meant building even closer relationships with families to understand their cultural and religious norms and values. After ten years of practice primarily with children and families, I left social work and returned a decade later. On my return I noticed a change to what Munro (201, p86) recognised as 'a managerialist approach where the emphasis has been on the conscious, cognitive elements of the task of working with children and families, on collecting information, and making plans.' I observed social workers writing reports *about* children, who had spent more time with support workers or family centre staff than the social worker themselves. Ruch, Turney and Ward suggest for social workers to adopt a relationship-based approach, they 'require a distinctive kind of support and development in terms of training, supervision and leadership', (2010, p9). However, guidance on training, or teaching from a relationship based approach, or any other model is missing from TCSW and the HCPC)Standards of Education and Training (2012); both tell you what social workers need to learn but not *how* they should be taught. I decided to teach from a relationship based approach to match the relationship based social work the students should use when they begin practice.

THE MATCHING PRINCIPLE

Ward (1998) presents a Matching Principle suggesting the training in professional education should match or reflect the model of practice the students are being trained to work in. Hence I made the decision to teach from a relationship based model anticipating the students will practice from a relationship based approach when qualified. Ward poses several key elements that apply to teaching from a relationship-based approach. These include attending to the emotional and cognitive elements in practice, maximizing the opportunities for helpful communication, the need for reflection, focusing on the self of the worker, an emphasis on personal qualities and values and experience of the helping relationship, (2010, p185). Egan (2014) suggests anyone in a helping relationship is likely to be seeking life enhancing outcomes. For the student social worker, the life enhancing outcome is to gain a professional qualification, whereas the service user is seeking to change an issue or complexity of issues affecting their life. Egan and others (Muran and Barber, 2010; Norcross, 2011) suggest the relationship between the service user and "helper" has to be one of a collaborative team in order to achieve the life enhancing desired outcome. Egan notes it is up to the service user and helper "in their dialogue to orchestrate the mix of ingredients that leads best to targeted life enhancing outcomes" (2014, p18). This concept of collaboration and dialogue (or conversation) resonates with McNamee when she suggests "refiguring teaching – and consequently learning – in collaborative conversation might open new forms of practice" (2007, p316). McNamee's sees conversation as a teaching activity and discusses the importance of collaboration with all participants, to create a community between the teacher and students. She suggests teachers can invite students into "generative and transformative conversations where we can create what counts as knowledge together" (2007, p317) and sees knowledge as emerging within communities of people working together. This connects to Ward's (2010) key element of attending to the emotional and cognitive elements in practice. I suggest, the greater the sense of community and collaboration, the more able the teacher feels to both recognize and attend to the emotional and cognitive elements of the students. I argue empathy, which I will return to, is needed to recognize the emotional and cognitive elements of the students. Ward highlights the use of self is needed to attend to the emotions of service users, but this can have a detrimental impact on the social worker, the same is true when teaching social work "working explicitly with the relationship dynamic in social work practice: the potential cost is to the individual worker's self and morale" (2010, p186). Ward states that to prevent a cumulative toll, the learning environment has to be safe for students to discuss their anxieties and fears in a space where there is mutual trust and respect, where everyone can contribute on an equal footing. He warns against not breaking professional boundaries by pretending to be a friend or an equal. I envisage that Wards other key features such as the need for reflection, focusing on the self and an emphasis on personal qualities and values are crucial to building the personal resilience needed to show empathy, and attend to the emotional and cognitive elements of the students. Ward suggests maximizing the opportunities for

helpful communication is another key feature of the matching principle. I turn again to Egan (2014) to explore the phrase "helpful communication". Because I am looking at teaching as conversation, I draw on Egans four requirements for true dialogue to enable me to make sense of what helpful communication might look like; turn taking, connecting, mutual influencing and co-creating outcomes. Egan suggests dialogue is interactive; "Monologues breed isolation. Dialogue demands engagement. Turn taking opens up the possibility of mutual learning (2014, p73). However, the turn taking has to occur in the context of a connection. Egan argues each response should connect to the others comments, otherwise alternating monologues are happening. This concept of connection appeals to my systemic position as does the turn taking and mutual influencing in relation to another. Egan suggest, each person has to be open to be influenced by the other in order to learn. However, his concept of co creating outcomes fits more within the social constructionist position where meaning is made, (Burr 1995; Gergen 1999; McNamee and Gergen 1992). It echoes McNamee's reason for using conversation as a metaphor for teaching when she suggests, "It shifts teaching and learning from a focus of method for conveying knowledge to a process that is attentive to the ways in which participants create meaning together" (2007, p334). I suggest the most effective way for students/teacher to make meaning together is within the context of relationship based teaching.

EDWARDS AND RICHARDS' KEY COMPONENTS

Edwards and Richards (2002) present relational teaching as a pedagogy based in Relational/Cultural Theory (Miller and Stiver, 1977), which focuses on the development of self with others. Edwards and Richards suggest the goal of relational teaching is to "provide a learning context that enables students to learn and grow, and incorporates the knowledge that emotions are involved in learning" (2002, p36). They stress the importance of communication, noting communication influences how emotions are expressed and experienced in the learning environment. The key components of Relational theory are mutual engagement, mutual empathy, and mutual empowerment, which all need to be evident in the classroom to form the basis of relational teaching.

MUTUAL ENGAGEMENT

Edwards and Richards presentation of mutual engagement reflects the principles of systemic practice in relation to the "ongoing process which develops a special connection between the student and teacher" (2002, p38). Steib (2004) makes a useful distinction between engagement and involvement in social work when she suggests families can be compliant without being engaged. She notes "Engagement is what keeps families working in the long and sometimes slow process of positive change", (2004, para 7). Steib cites spending time with service users and communication as key ways of engagement. Forrester, Kershaw, Moss and Hughes (2007), Munro (2011), Wosu and Stewart, (2010) all emphasise the importance of communication to engage children and/or families. Munro (2011, p 29) specifically discusses the need to talk to children alone and their preference for a face to face conversation. Kadushin distinguishes between the social work interview and conversation. He suggests, "Unlike a conversation, the interview is a bounded setting. The participants in an interview limit what they give their attention to, what they notice and what they include in their interaction. A conversation on the other hand, covers everything but concentrates on nothing". (1999, p7). Kadushins' interpretation of a conversation seems to imply people ramble on without any focus, direction or meaning. However, McNamee suggests it is through the turn taking in conversation that engagement is made, she notes "Conversation suggests a "turning" together. We require (and need) each other to accomplish conversation (the turning together)", (2007, p314). She poses the question, "can we begin to consider teaching as a relational performance (e.g. conversation) engaging both teacher and student" (2007, p317). I can see how the turn taking in conversation has the potential to engage everyone, those taking turns and those listening; furthermore turn taking is the first of Egans (2014) four requirements for true dialogue. However, Kadushins' suggestion that the participants have mutual responsibility for the conversation is purposeful in two ways; firstly, in redressing the power imbalance between those involved in the conversation and secondly, creating the process of

engagement. This is relevant to both social work teaching and social work practice. Wenger (1998, p2) refers to mutual engagement as the amount and pattern of interaction among the members of a community. This is useful when connecting it to McNamee's engagement through conversation; being able to explore the amount and pattern of each persons' contribution to the conversation and how turn taking happens in practice.

MUTUAL EMPATHY

Edwards and Richards cite Surrey when she defines mutual empathy as "a universal capacity to understand the thoughts and feelings of others", (2002, p38). However, I question the examples Edwards and Richards provide to suggest they can engender mutual empathy in relation to this definition. For example, redressing the power imbalance by arriving to class on time, asking students their opinions and responding respectfully seem insufficient to create mutual empathy. Yet, Engelen and Röttger-Rössler, (2012) suggest there is no accepted standard definition of empathy either among the sciences, humanities or in the specific disciplines. The sciences understand empathy as a cognitive process of thinking or mind reading; a cognitive perspective related to theory of mind (ToM), whereas humanities understand empathy as an emotion. Engelen and Röttger-Rössler, (2012) suggest both the cognitive understanding and the emotional understanding of empathy share the basic premise of understanding *the other;* either cognitively or emotionally. When Edwards and Richards (2002, p40) suggest mutual empathy is "essential to the unveiling of the students' critical thinking", that indicates to me a perception of empathy as a cognitive process.

However, when they then go on to discuss how the teacher should demonstrate empathy, for example by remembering and referring to the students by name and respecting their opinions, this strikes me as having an emotional connection of feeling valued, which would fit with empathy being understood as an emotional process. To make sense of this, I conceptualised Edwards and Richards presentation of empathy as cognitive empathy; empathy based on understanding the affective state of others and imagining or thinking what that state must be like for them, (Stueber, 2012). This also connects to Ward's (2010) key element of attending to the emotional and cognitive elements. If cognitive empathy is the type of empathy needed in the teacher/social work student relationship, I then have to explore if I should model this empathy to my students. In other words, is this the same type of empathy needed in the social work/service user relationship? Since German Psychologist Theodor Lipps (1903) introduced the term "einfühlung" or empathy to describe the inner imitation an observer experiences when observing another person, a range of concepts of empathy have been presented. For example Batson (2009) propoese eight concepts of empathy. Indeed the British Psychological Society published an article entitled "Social Workers need Right Kind of Empathy" (2013), implying the existence of multiple empathies. The article suggests empathetic social workers are at risk of burnout, while those who did not engage emotionally with their service users risk alienating them. However, Grant (2014) supports the notion that empathy is critical to social work practice, as a range of earlier studies have highlighted, (Forrester, et al, 2007; Green and Christensen, 2006; Sale, Bellamy, Springer and Wang, 2008). Ward's (2010) key features such as the need for reflection, focusing on the self and an emphasis on personal qualities and values are required to build the resilience needed to give empathy with less risk of burnout (Grant and Kinman 2012). Gerdes and Segal developed a social work model of empathy with three components, all of which build upon the prior part: 1) the *affective response* to another's emotions and actions; 2) the *cognitive processing* of one's affective response as well as the other person's perspective; and 3) the *conscious decision-making* to take empathic. (2009: 120). The first two components fit with the cognitive empathy I need to demonstrate in my teaching, as deduced from Edwards and Richards (2002) approach. Gerdes and Segal argue "the third component, conscious decision -making is the piece that draws from social work, the need to take action" (2009, p121). Edwards and Richards suggest the action from mutual empathy will lead to empowerment in the teacher/student relationship, therefore the third component of Gerdes and Segals model is connects to the teaching approach I aim to develop. Before moving on to discuss mutual empowerment, it is useful to highlight the importance of context in relation to mutual empathy. Segev and Nadan (2014) found in trying to teach empathy, the context

"helped us, and the students, to go beyond Rogers's (1957, 1975) classic definition that locates empathy in the relational space between two individuals, and to reconceptualise it as mediated and even determined by the context in which this process occurs. Together with our students, we perceived that empathy can not only influence context, but may also be influenced by it, as it is a construct embedded within a context" (2014, p11).

This is significant as Co-ordinated Management of Meaning, CMM, the method by which I intend to analyse the audio recording, suggests the context to which phenomena occurs is crucial to the meaning made, supporting Segev and Nadan's notion that empathy is context dependent.

MUTUAL EMPOWERMENT

Edwards and Richards suggest "The key to empowerment is mutual growth. We believe the growth in social work education is the result of student and teacher experiencing the dynamics of empowerment that come with mutual empathy" (2000, p 43). Freire (1972, 1993) introduced the concept of critical pedagogy whereby teachers teach in a way that empowers students. His concern was with teachers who narrated information which students are required to know and memorise what they hear. The information is neither thought provoking nor enlightening; rather a "banking system" is in process where what is being narrated is a way of maintaining the status quo. Freire argues for an approach to teaching that is problem posing and enlightening in order for students to develop a position questioning and critiquing what they read and are taught, creating the potential for empowerment and change. Freire argues dialogue is essential to the liberation or empowerment of students, he states "The outstanding characteristic of this narrative education, then, is the sonority of words, not their transforming power" (1993, p45). Giroux builds on Freire's ideas and suggests

"Giving students the opportunity to be problem posers and to engage in a culture of questioning puts in the foreground the crucial issues of who has control over the conditions of learning and how specific modes of knowledge, identity, and authority are constructed within particular classroom relations. Under such circumstances, knowledge is not simply received by students, but actively transformed, as they learn how to engage others in critical dialogue and be held accountable for their own views" Giroux, (2010, p1)

Both Friere and Giroux raise the importance of dialogue in this process of empowerment which connects to the teaching as conversation theme. The reference to "classroom relations" within Giroux argument also highlights the cruciality of relationships between the student and educator that will enable the educator to invite students to engage in this transformative learning and potentially lead to empowerment. Edwards and Richards (2000) suggest zest, action, knowledge, worth and a desire for more connection are the five elements of empowerment. They propose zest is an energy that leads to action. When I consider zest in relation to Friere's position, it seems similar to having a passion to change the status quo and challenge oppression. The action that is taken is the use of problem posing questions, which leads to a production of new knowledge; challenging the status quo. The concept of empowerment was introduced to social work by Solomon as:

"a process whereby the social worker engages in a set of activities with the client (...) that aim to reduce the powerlessness that has been created by negative valuations based on member-ship in a stigmatised group. It involves identification of the power blocks that contribute to the problem as well as the development and implementation of specific strategies aimed at either the reduction of the effects from indirect power blocks or the reduction of the operations of direct power blocks."

Solomon (1976, p19).

Whereas Solomon's definition was influenced by the Black American Civil Rights Movement, the approach to empowerment that developed in the UK was based on self help and mutual aid (Burns, Williams and Winderbank 2004). Thomas and Pierson defined empowerment as "Theory concerned with how people may gain collective control over their lives, so as to achieve their interest as a group, and a method by which social workers seek to enhance the power of people who lack it" (1995, p134). Mutual empowerment was evident in self help groups when emotional support was both given and

received during the process of change and acquisition of new skills (Maton and Rappaport, 1984; Zimmerman and Rappaport 1988).

Edwards and Richards elements of empowerment, which suggest worth and a desire for more connection, apply here. They refer to a circularity, *"consistent with mutuality"* (2000, p43) whereby people feel empowered when they have helped someone and that person is empowered by the intervention they received, consequently feeling able to help someone else.

LISTENING, THEN MAKING MEANING: CMM

With a clearer understanding of how the concepts of the Matching Principle, Relational teaching and the metaphor of teaching as conversation can be interwoven to provide a framework for me to practice as a relationship based educator, the next stage of my research is to capture the naturally occurring dialogue in the teaching environment. I intend to do this by making audio recordings of my teaching sessions. I plan to listen to when I acknowledge the students ideas (Edwards & Richards, 2002), listen for turn taking between the students and myself (McNamee 2007) and the amount and pattern of interaction between me and the students (Wenger 1998) to gauge the amount of mutual engagement. I intended to listen for times when I recognised myself being responsive to the students' emotions and cognitive processing (Gerdes and Segal, 2009) to see if I am being empathetic, and listen for any problem posing questions which challenge the status quo to identify times that are mutually empowering. The audio recordings will not capture how I was carrying out Ward's (2010) key features such as reflection, focusing on the self and an emphasis on personal qualities and values, needed to build my resilience to give empathy with less risk of burnout. Instead, journaling is used as a method to recognise when and how I do this. To help focus my listening and make sense of what I am hearing, I considered a variety of methods to analyse the audio recordings. I considered Conversation Analysis (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974) because audio and/or video recording of talk in action e.g. a natural environment, in my case in a teaching situation, are transcribed and looked at. However, the emphasis is to look at the social order of conversation e.g. turn taking and transition i.e. the point at when the next speaker should prepare to take their turn. I wanted to have a sense of how much turn taking was occurring, but my concern was not necessarily with when the students prepared to take their turn. Also, I wanted to listen for other aspects such as empathy and empowerment, which conversation analysis would not capture. I considered Narrative Analysis because "dialogue" has to be analysed, however, the narratives are generally of a story or the story about a particular event, whereas mine was talk in action. I contemplated Thematic Analysis as it would be a way of picking up on specific themes, placing the emphasis on "what" is said. This would have the benefit of noticing themes across each teaching session, for example empathy. However, this would not capture the turn taking aspects of being in dialogue with the students. I also contemplated Structural Analysis, which looks at *how* the telling/talking happens and applies a specific structure to it. However, this is not particularly relevant to my talk in action. I decided to use CMM, Co-ordinated Management of Meaning, which is a framework for systemic inquiry and analyses (Pearce and Cronen, 1980). Pearce suggests "those who use CMM always look at persons, families, or organizations systemically, as having histories, futures, and networks of relationships" (2002, p1). Oliver (2014) notes CMM facilitates the task of structuring our systemic communication, actions and meaning. CMM aims to facilitate the understanding of the social worlds, contextual and emotional positions people occupy during communication. Not only does it aim to provide a frame for understanding what is said, it also lends itself to consider what has yet been said, or what is unsaid. Pearce states "Using CMM, we have to think of social worlds as extending through time in unfinished processes, as multi-layered, fully reflexive, and having the ultimate shape of a self-referential paradox" (2002, p2).

The three different processes of CMM are; coherence, coordination and mystery. Coherence includes content, episode, relationship, self and culture. Content explores what is said i.e. the Speech Act or Communication Act. It also explores what is meant, e.g. empathy, engagement, sounds or utterances). Coherence additionally includes episode, i.e. the context within which communication is taking place. The relationship looks at the relationship between those communicating while the self focuses on how the person communicating perceives themselves e.g. black, female, teacher. Culture represents a set of

rules for acting and speaking which govern what we understand to be normal in a given episode e.g. Classroom culture; teacher does most of the talking. Power is an essential part of culture as it can create dominant voices while other voices are silenced or marginalized. Co-ordination, the second process of CMM, does not necessarily mean agreement between those communicating, rather co-ordination relates to what happens when the content of what is *said* and the Speech Act or Communication Act, i.e. what is *meant*, come together to produce patterns. Patterns of interaction are linked to what people do in the moment. These patterns, also known as stories lived, influence the episode in the way we to behave, collaborate and respond to each other. Mystery, the third process of CMM is also known as Stories unexpressed, when communication leads to an unexpected outcome. Mystery also involves the ongoing uncertainty and unpredictability of communication and the excitement of the possibility of creating something different through communication. We may communicate with a certain intention or outcome in mind but the consequence is created with other participants in the communication relationship. As CMM is multi layered, there are four different models: Table 1:

Model	Focus	Issue
The hierarchy model	*identifies the way meaning is shaped by the order of priority one attaches to different contexts (e.g. self, cultural, relationship) in a* *particular episode.*	Not relevant to my inquiry
Serpentine model	*The serpentine model depicts how any communication or speech act has a before, an after and a sequence*	Focus on turn taking rather than sequencing
LUUUTT Model. Stories **L**ived, **U**ntold Stories, **U**nheard Stories, **U**nknown Stories, Stories **T**old & Story **T**elling	*This model is ideal for use during the communication process, particularly with the help of a facilitator*	Not relevant, more appropriate for a therapeutic dialogue
Daisy Model 	*It analyzes the other less noticeable communication events that occur simultaneously with the primary conversation . It takes account of the whole system and not just parts of it and looking at things from multiple points of view*	**Relevant:** The primary conversation is on teaching, however my focus will be on the other communication events that occur simultaneously e.g. engagement

I chose the daisy model over the hierarchy, serpentine and LUUUTT models as it appeared to be positioned best to capture and make sense of what I needed for my inquiry. The "episode" is placed in the centre (of the daisy), in my case the episode would the subject I am aiming to teach. The petals are the communication events that go on around the main subject I am teaching. Pearce et al (1999) suggest within the petals there may be conversations that are positioned in the foreground and background and those that are privileged over or are subjugated by others.

CONCLUSION

Ultimately, CMM and the daisy model appears to provide me with the framework to make sense of my audio recording, of which I am hoping to find elements of engagement, empathy, empowerment and lots of turn taking between myself and students in dialogue. However, CMM also allows for mystery and unexpected outcomes, therefore I will be open other possibilities of what my audio recordings may reveal.

REFERENCES

Barge, K. (2006). Living systemic constructionist management research. *Human Systems. Journal of Systemic Consultation and Management, 17*(1), pp 29-52.

Batson, C, D. (2009) These things called empathy: Eight related but distinct phenomena. In J Decety and W. Ikes (eds) *The social neuroscience of empathy.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp3-15.

Brown, H., (1996) "The Knowledge Base of Social Work" in *New Directions in Social Work, Social Work Competencies: Core Knowledge, Values and Skills.* Vass A. A. (Ed.) London: Sage Publications Ltd. pp. 8-35.

British Psychological Society (2013) Social Workers need Right Kind of Empathy. Available online at: http://www.bps.org.uk/news/social-workers-need-right-kind-empathy

Accessed on December 28th 2014

Burns, D, Williams, C and Winderbank J (2004) *Community Self Help*. Basingstoke: Palgrove, Macmillan

Burr, Vivian (1995) *An introduction to social constructionism,* London: Routledge

Edwards J, B and Richards, A (2002) "Relational teaching: a view of relational teaching in social work education" *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, Volume 22 Issue 1, pp. 33-38.

Egan, G (2014) "*The Skilled Helper: A problem Management and Opportunity Development Approach to helping"* 10th Edition, International Edition, Cengage Learning.

Engelen, E and Röttger-Rössler, B, (2012) "Current Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Debates on Empathy". *Emotion Review,* Volume 4, Number 1, pp 3-8.

Ferguson, H. (2011) *Child Protection Practice*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Forrester, D, Kershaw, S., Moss H and Hughes, L (2007) Communication skills in child protection: How do social workers talk to parents? *Child and Family Social Work*, Volume 13, pp 41-51

Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1993) *Education for Critical Consciousness*. New York: Continuum.

Gerdes, K and Segal, E (2009) A Social Work Model of Empathy, *Advances in Social Work* Volume 10, Number 2, pp 114-127

Gergen, K. (1999) *An invitation to social construction*. London Sage

Giroux, H. A (2010, October 17) Lessons from Paulo Freire. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Available online at http://chronicle.com/article/Lessons-From-Paulo-Freire/124910/   accessed on February 13th 2014

Grant, L. and Kinman, G. (2012) Enhancing wellbeing in social work students: building resilience in the next generation. Social Work Education: *The International Journal Volume* 31, Issue 5. [DOI .org/10.1080/02615479.2011.590931]

Grant, L (2014) Hearts and Minds: aspects of empathy and wellbeing in social work students. *Social Work Education, The International Journal,* Volume 33, Issue 3 pp 338-352.

Green, E.J and Christensen, T.M (2006) Elementary school children's perceptions of play therapy in school settings. *International Journal of Play Therapy, Volume 15, Issue 1*, pp 65-85.

Health and Care Professions Council (2012) *Standards of Education and Training*

Available at http://www.hcpc-uk.org/assets/documents/1000295EStandardsofeducationandtraining-fromSeptember2009.pdf accessed on July 13th 2014

Health and Care Professions Council (2012) *Standards of Proficiency: Social Workers*

Online at https://www.hcpc-uk.org/assets/documents/10003B08Standardsofproficiency-SocialworkersinEngland.pdf accessed on July 13th 2014

Kadushin, A (1997), *The Social Work Interview: A guide for Human Service Professionals*. Columbia: University Press.

Laming, H. (2009) *The Protection of Children in England: A Progress Report.* London: The Stationary Office. Available at: https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationdetail/page1/HC%20330

Accessed on December 15th 2013

Lipps, T (1903) Einfühlung, inner Nachahmung, und Organaempfindaungen. *Archiv für die gesamte psychologie*, 1, 465-519 (Translated as "Empathy, Inner Imitation and Sense-Feelings" in M.M. Rader (ed, 5th edition), 1979, *A modern book of aesthetics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp 374-382

Maton K, and Rappaport, J., (1984), Empowerment in a religious setting: A multivariate investigation. *Prevention in Human Services*, Volume 3 pp 37-70.

McNamee, S., (2007) "Relational Practices in Education: Teaching as Conversation" In *Collaborative Therapy: Relationships and conversations that make a difference*. H. Anderson & D. Gehart (Eds), New York: Taylor and Francis Group, pp. 313-355.

McNamee, S and Gergen K (Eds) (1992) *Therapy as Social Construction*. London: Sage

Miller J, B., and Stiver I. (1977) *The Healing Connections* Boston: Beacon Press

Munro, E. (2010) *The Munro review of child protection: Part One, a systemic* analysis. Online at: http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/munro-review-of-child-protection-part-1-a-systems accessed on February 1st 2014.

Munro, E. (2011a) *The Munro review of child protection: Interim Report: The Child's Journey* Online at: http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/munro-review-of-child-protection-interinm-report-the-child's-journey accessed on February 1st 2014.

Munro, E. (2011b) *The Munro review of child protection: Final Report: A Child centred* system. The Stationary Office, London. Online at: http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/munro-review-of-child-protection-interinm-report-the-child's-journey accessed on February 1st 2014.

Munro, E. (2012) *The Munro review of child protection: Progress Report: Moving towards a child centered system.* Online at: http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/progress-report-moving-towards-a-child-centered-system accessed on February 1st 2014.

Muran, J, C. And Barber, J P. (2010) eds. *The Therapuetic Alliance: An evidence- Based Guide to Practice.* New York, NY: Guldford Press

Norcross J. C (ed) 2011. *Psychotherapy relationships that work* (2nd ed). New York: Oxford University Press.

Oliver, C (2014) 'Using CMM to define systemic reflexivity as a research position' in G Simon & A Chard (eds) *Systemic Inquiry: Innovations in reflexive practice research.* Everything Connected Press, Farnhill, pp 266-29.

Pearce, W.B and Cronen V (1980) *Communication, action and meaning: The creation of social realities*, New York: Praeger

Pearce , W.B. and Associates (1999) 'Using CMM, "The Coordinated Management of

Meaning'*,* (Version 1.1 Revised January 7, 2004). *San Mateo, Ca: Pearce Associates.* Available at:

http://www.pearceassociates.com/essays/cmm_seminar.pdf accessed on May 17th 2015

Pearce, B. W (2002) A Brief Introduction to "The co-ordinated management of meaning (CMM) (Revised, June 25, 2001 revised, January 21, 2002). *San Mateo, California, Available at:*

http://www.russcomm.ru/eng/rca_biblio/p/pearce.shtml accessed on May 17th 2015

Ruch, G., Turney, D., Ward, A., (2010) *Relationship-Based Social Work*, London: Jessica Kingsley.

Sale, E., Bellamy, N., Springer, J., & Wang, M. (2008). Quality of provider-participant relationships and enhancement of adolescent social skills. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, Volume 29, Issue 3, pp 263-278.

Sadd, J (2012) "Relationship-based Social Work, Social Work Education". *The International*

Journal, Volume 31, Issue 7, pp. 955-957.

Sacks, H., Schegloff E. A., and Jefferson, G., (1974), A Simplest Systematics for the Organisation of Turn Taking for conversation. *Language,* Volume 50 pp 696-735.

Segev E, and Nadan Y, (2014) Facing Reality: Context-oriented reflection in Social work Education

British Journal of Social Work (2014) 1–17 : bcu138v1-bcu138. Available at: http://bjsw.oxfordjournals.org/   accessed on November 24, 2014

Solomon, B.: (1976) *Black Empowerment: Social Work in Oppressed Communities*, New York, Columbia University Press

Social Work Task Force (2009) *Building a safe, Confident Future* – The Final Report of the Social Work Task Force, London Department for Education. Available at:

https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationdetail/page1/DCSF-01114-2009. Accessed on March 17, 2014.

Social Work Reform Board (2010) *Building a safe, Confident Future: One year on.* Department for Education. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/180787/DFE-00602-2010-1.pdf   Accessed on 17th May 2015.

Steib, S. (2004). Engaging Families in Child Welfare Practice . [Online].Available at:

http://66.227.70.18/programs/r2p/cvarticlesef0409.htm accessed on January 4th 2015

Stueber, K (2012) Varieties of empathy, neuroscience and the narrativist challenge to the contemporary theory of mind debate". *Emotion Review*, Volume 4, Issue 1, pp 55-63.

Surrey, J. (2000) "What do you mean by mutuality in therapy? Some misconceptions and recommendations of a Relational Approach. *In Work in Progress.* Wellesley: MA Wellesley College/ The Stone Centre.

The College of Social Work (2011) *Reforming social work qualifying education The social work degree.* Available at:

http://www.tcsw.org.uk/uploadedFiles/TheCollege/Social_Work_Education/ReformingSWQualifying Education%28edref1%29%281%29.pdf accessed on May 17th 2015.

Thomas, M and Pierson, J. (1995) *Dictionary of Social Work*, London Collins, Educational.

Trevithick P. (2003) Effective Relationship Based Practice: A Theoretical Exploration. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, Volume 17, Issue 2, pp. 163-176.

Walker, S. (2014) Inside Inquiry: Developing a Relationship based practice when teaching social work students. *Educational Alternatives*, Volume 12, Issue 1, pp 985-992. Available at:

http://www.scientific-publications.net/en/article/1000579/ accessed on 17th May 2015.

Ward, A. (1998) "The matching Principle: Connections Between Training and Practice". In *Intuition is not enough: Matching Learning with Practice in Therapeutic Child Care*. A Ward and L. McMahon (eds) London: Routledge, pp. 75-87.

Ward, A. (2010) "The learning relationship: Learning and Development for Relationship-Based Practice". *In Relationship-Based Social Work*, Ruch, G., Turney, D., Ward, A., (eds) London: Jessica Kingsley. pp. 183-199.

Wenger, E (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wosu, H and Stewart, J (2010) Engaging with Involuntary Service Users: A Literature Review and Case Study. Available at http://www.socialwork.ed.ac.uk/__data/assets/word_doc/0020/56432/Edinburgh_PRP_Wosu_and_Stewart_final_report.doc. accessed on January 4th 2015

Zimmerman, M., and Rappaport J., (1988). Citizen Participation, Perceived Control and Psychological Empowerment. *American Journal of Community Psychology,* Volume 16, Number 5.