

## Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Relational practice, a critical component for successful social work
Type	Article
URL	<a href="https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/55130/">https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/55130/</a>
DOI	<a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2492402">https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2492402</a>
Date	2025
Citation	Cleece, Katie, Cheneler, Bethany, Harrison, Joanna and Hill, James Edward (2025) Relational practice, a critical component for successful social work. Cogent Social Sciences, 11 (1).
Creators	Cleece, Katie, Cheneler, Bethany, Harrison, Joanna and Hill, James Edward

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2492402>

For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

# Relational practice, a critical component for successful social work

Katy Cleece, Bethany Cheneler, Joanna Harrison & James Edward Hill

To cite this article: Katy Cleece, Bethany Cheneler, Joanna Harrison & James Edward Hill (2025) Relational practice, a critical component for successful social work, Cogent Social Sciences, 11:1, 2492402, DOI: [10.1080/23311886.2025.2492402](https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2492402)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2025.2492402>



© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 24 Apr 2025.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)







View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

## Relational practice, a critical component for successful social work

Katy Cleece<sup>a</sup> , Bethany Cheneler<sup>b</sup> , Joanna Harrison<sup>c</sup>  and James Edward Hill<sup>c</sup> 

<sup>a</sup>Social Work Leadership Team, Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust, Preston, UK; <sup>b</sup>School of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK; <sup>c</sup>Synthesis Economic Evaluation and Decision Science Group (SEEDS), University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK

### ABSTRACT

Relational practice describes the value and development of relationships or connections with others and is a key concept across the different systems of health, education, criminal justice, and social work. Lamph et al. undertook a scoping review of the literature to support a shared understanding of 'relational practice' in organisational and systemic contexts, noting the impacts and benefits reported. They identified that relational practice may be beneficial to both the service users and the workforce across different sectors. The review authors also found that variations exist in the terminology used for 'relational practice.' This commentary describes the importance of relational practice for social work, building on the review by Lamph et al. and the implications of the findings for social work practice and research. Relational practice is pivotal to social work and is vital for meaningful intervention, yet there is a need for more scientific effectiveness studies if relational practice is to receive the recognition it deserves and for it to become fully embedded within different sectors.

### ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 12 November 2024  
Revised 10 March 2025  
Accepted 8 April 2025

### KEYWORDS

Relational practice;  
relationship; trust; social  
work


### SUBJECTS

Social Work and Social  
Policy; Social Work  
Practice; Social Work  
Research

## Introduction

Globally, social work is defined as a practice-based profession, underpinned by academic theory, supporting the liberation and empowerment of people to achieve social change, social cohesion and founded in principles of social justice, human rights, collective responsibility and respect for diversities (International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW), 2014). Registration to practice social work in the UK is dependent on adherence to practice guidance set by the Department of Health and the British Association of Social Work (British Association of Social Workers (BASW), 2018; Department of Health (DoH), 2015). Each place significance on the quality of the relationship with the individuals accessing social work, the intervention, the authority social workers hold, and their responsibility to acknowledge and address the power differentials within the relationship (BASW, 2018; DoH, 2015).

The ability and commitment to build safe and trusting relationships with people who are vulnerable, have history of abuse or maltreatment, or are fearful and rejecting of intervention is a skill pivotal to social work, and reducing harmful outcomes (Frederick et al., 2023; Healy, 2017, Ingram & Smith 2018; Rollins, 2020). For social workers, relationships are key to working collaboratively with individuals and families to share understanding of what needs to be done and by whom (Ruch, 2020). Recognising a person's history of trauma and applying trauma informed approaches helps to establish trusting relationships, vital for meaningful social work intervention (Levenson, 2017). Conversely, the absence of trust in the relationship with a social worker makes meaningful involvement less likely (Cossar et al., 2016). It should be highlighted that in the instance of high-profile serious case reviews of abuse, that have received much public attention, such as the Daniel Pelka and Victoria Climbié cases, relationship-based practice appears to have been lacking, with the case reviews identifying insufficient efforts from social

**CONTACT** Joanna Harrison  [jharrison12@uclan.ac.uk](mailto:jharrison12@uclan.ac.uk)  Synthesis Economic Evaluation and Decision Science Group (SEEDS), University of Central Lancashire, Brook 445, Preston PR1 2HE, UK.

**Commentary on:** Lamph, G., Nowland, R., Bolland, P., Pearson, J., Connell, C., Jones, V., Wildbore, EL., Christian, D, Harris, C, Ramsden, J, Gardner, K, et al. 2023. 'Relational practice in health, education, criminal justice, and social care: a scoping review' *Syst Rev.* 13;12(1):194.

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

care staff to forge trusting relationships directly with the children in concern (Coventry Safeguarding Children Board (CSCB), 2014; Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Children Board (RBSCB), 2013; Rustin, 2004).

Hence, the imperative need for relational practice in social work. As a construct, relational practice has many parts, an integral one being the ability to reflect and, in doing so, evidence self-awareness of how one relates to and responds to service users (Department for Education (DfE), 2020; Ruch, 2020). It recognises the balance of power between worker and client and utilises a more personal and intuitive approach, such as employing the attributes of helping and compassion rather than compliance and intervention. (Ingram & Smith, 2018). Effective relationship-based and reflective practice requires vision, understanding, commitment, and perseverance and should be embedded in social work organisations from top to bottom (Ruch, 2020).

A scoping review by Lamph et al. (2023) aimed to interpret how relational practice is used, defined, and understood with a focus on organisational and systemic practice, across health, criminal justice, education and social work, including reported impacts and benefits. The authors defined relational practice within these contexts as a practice and/or intervention that prioritises interpersonal relationships in service provision for both external (organisational contexts) and internal (service user/worker experience) aspects. Given the significance of relationship-based practice for the social work profession, it is timely and relevant to critically review and explore Lamph et al. (2023) in this context. This commentary will critically appraise the methods used by Lamph et al. (2023) and discuss the findings, with a specific focus on social work including the implications for social work practice, training and future research.

### Findings of Lamph et al. (2023)

From 11,490 articles initially identified, 521 remained for full-text review, and 158 were included in the synthesis. Most of the included articles were from the UK (30%), the USA (20%), and Canada (16%) but included a broad and global spread of literature. Most literature came from the health sector (38%), followed by education (26%), social work (25%), and criminal justice (11%). Most included papers were theoretical or opinion-based (39%), reported qualitative findings (28%), or were case studies (17%). A small number of included studies used a quantitative design (4%), and 6% were mixed methods. A further 4% were narrative reviews, and 2.5% were systematic or scoping reviews.

Across the different organisational sectors, there were commonalities in the terms used to define relational practice, but equally different terms were used for specific sectors. For social work/care, terms were more unique to relational social work practices such as relational theory or practice, relationship-based practice, *guanxi* (Chinese term meaning relationships), family-centred inclusive practice, relational authority and strength, and restorative practice.

Seventy-six articles (48%) reported impacts or benefits of relational practice. Of these, workforce or client impacts were the most reported (54%) with the benefits of this way of working including enhanced knowledge, insights, healthy working environments, enhanced team cohesion, shared experiences and understanding of interpersonal dynamics. Some articles also reported enhancement of interpersonal skills including communication and empathetic listening. Other gains included personal benefits such as those relating to confidence, increased employee satisfaction and making more of an impact for clients in terms of their progression and achievements.

In terms of client health, impacts were found in relation to enhancement of well-being, physical, psychological, and social impacts, and various educational attainments. Recovery from client difficulties, including substance misuse and improved child custody, were also reported, alongside enhanced interpersonal relationships with service providers and carers/families. Further health impacts included reductions in trauma and re-traumatisation, emotional regulation skills, and buffering of stress. There were also reductions in re-offending and violent incidents in criminal justice contexts. Other positive impacts included a reduction of health inequalities, engagement with society, and community belonging. Where relational practices were not used, it was identified that promoting a sense of belonging could be overlooked.

Organisational impacts were less frequently reported but referred to poignant and important learning, including the development of healthy, sustainable communities. Relationship and interpersonal work were often described as invisible but crucial to working with people facing services, as well as the importance of

collaboration. Relational practice was also valued for its potential to create an environment with a focus on interagency working and emotional availability, enhancing the well-being of both clients and the workforce.

### Critical appraisal of the review by Lamph et al. (2023)

Using the Joanna Briggs Institute checklist for systematic reviews and research syntheses (Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI), 2024), the scoping review achieved all relevant criteria (see Table 1). Three criteria were non-applicable primarily due to the nature of scoping reviews (critical appraisal of primary studies is non-essential (Peters et al., 2020), and no assessment of publication bias due to primary studies being of a qualitative nature). Therefore, based on the JBI checklist, the scoping review can be deemed to provide a comprehensive synthesis or mapping of the extant relational practice literature. It is worth noting that the review authors acknowledge the focus of the review on organisational rather than individual practice as a limitation. However, it is suggested that this is in response to a gap in the literature for reviews that focus on organisational practice, and also to feasibly conduct the review within existing resources.

### Discussion: implications for practice

#### *Workplace benefits of relational practice*

The Professional Capabilities Framework (PCF), an overarching framework of social work education and professional development in England, describes knowledge from social work practice and research and

**Table 1.** JBI Critical Appraisal of Lamph et al. (2023) using the JBI Checklist for systematic reviews and research syntheses (JBI, 2024).

JBI critical appraisal checklist items	Responses
1. Is the review question clearly and explicitly stated?	Yes. A well-articulated research question is defined. The scoping review aimed to map how relational practice is used, defined and understood across health, criminal justice, education and social work, and reported impacts and benefits.
2. Were the inclusion criteria appropriate for the review question?	Yes. Inclusion criteria were clearly reported for: Population: any patients or service users accessing face to face health, education, justice or social care/social work services. Concept: relational practices or interventions from a systemic and organisational perspective. Context: people facing services across education, health, criminal justice and social care/work. All types of studies were included if published in English and from 2000 onwards (to focus on recent practice).
3. Was the search strategy appropriate?	Yes. The search strategy reported a comprehensive search of keywords.
4. Were the sources and resources used to search for studies adequate?	Yes. Electronic searches were conducted in eight electronic databases of relevance up to 27th October 2021. Grey literature was also included if reported.
5. Were the criteria for appraising studies appropriate?	Non-Applicable (n/a). Review authors report they were unable to conduct critical appraisal due to the scale of included papers. However, as this is a scoping review, critical appraisal is generally not performed and so we have classified this item as n/a (Peters et al., 2020).
6. Was critical appraisal conducted by two or more reviewers independently?	n/a. As above.
7. Were there methods to minimize errors in data extraction?	Yes. Data extraction was completed via a specifically designed tool and following a pilot by authors on ten studies. Following sufficient agreement using the tool, the authors applied the data extraction tool to the remaining studies independently.
8. Were the methods used to combine studies appropriate?	Yes. Extracted data was charted and the literature mapped using narrative synthesis. Consultation with steering group committee throughout this process to support interpretation and synthesis of findings.
9. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?	N/A. Not applicable to systematic reviews of qualitative evidence.
10. Were recommendations for policy and/or practice supported by the reported data?	Yes. The review highlights that relational practice has good applied value for organisations and is increasingly being used, yet the lack of definition is problematic. The authors suggest there is a need for conceptual standardisation of relational practice that draws upon evidence from across the different sectors.
11. Were the specific directives for new research appropriate?	Yes. The review authors report that empirical evidence for relational practice in organisational contexts is limited and therefore there is a need for more research to test implementation and effectiveness.

people who use services as key domains of social work practice that social workers are expected to develop (BASW, 2018). The findings from Lamph et al. (2023) suggest that using relational practice may enhance knowledge, insights and understanding of interpersonal dynamics, helping to meet these expectations. This could include being culturally competent, an umbrella term that revolves around the principles of self-awareness, acceptance, and the ability to adapt and learn from colleagues' individual lived experiences (Ferdman & Deane, 2013). This, in turn helps to enhance shared experiences and a cohesive workforce, which Lamph et al. (2023) comment upon, with evidence suggesting that effective teamwork in healthcare is associated with job satisfaction, improved worker outcomes, staff retention, and improved clinical practice. (West & Lyubovnikova, 2013). This is even more important given the current climate where social workers are struggling to cope with challenging caseloads, mounting pressures including the impact of the pandemic, longer hours, significant levels of chronic stress and poor staff retention rates (Beer & Asthana, n.d; Curtis et al., 2010; Kinman & Grant, 2016; Preston, 2022), compromising the continuity and quality of service provision.

Engaging in relational practice therefore, can be mutually beneficial for both social worker and service user. Using the client's lived experience to guide and inform practice enables social workers to recognise and utilise their own lived experience, and navigate between their personal and professional boundaries, with a recognition of how prioritising connection over separation can contribute positively to their practice (O'Leary et al., 2013). It is also worth considering however the emotional toil and risks for social workers where organisational culture does not align well with relational practice. Social workers risk burnout or vicarious trauma if not adequately supported in highly emotive relationship based work. Dwindling resources often results in task driven practice with individual worker supervision often being the first to become neglected, risking both the health and psychological wellbeing of the practitioner, but also the quality of practice offered to the service user (Ravalier et al., 2023).

### ***Client benefits of relational practice***

Relationships are central to successful outcomes in social work (Trevithick, 2003; Ingram & Smith, 2018). Therapeutic change can be achieved via helpful relationships being developed and promoted by social workers immersing themselves in the physical lives of service users. This can be termed a "holding relationship" as social workers provide reliability and are emotionally close but simultaneously critical, whilst being aware of power imbalances, to evoke positive change (Ferguson et al., 2022). The review by Lamph et al. (2023) found that by shifting from coercive controlling environments to those that are engaging through negotiation was key to success and that by working in this manner, improvements could be made to client health, recovery and avoid retraumatising clients. This is particularly pertinent as service users frequently have social work intervention imposed onto them, which often occurs at a time of trauma in their lives, creating mutual mistrust and poorer outcomes (Mason et al., 2020).

The review found that positive engagement via enhanced interpersonal relationships saw improvements spanning client's lives and contributed to reducing health inequalities, plus people developing a stronger sense of belonging to their communities (Lamph et al., 2023). Buchanan et al. (2023) identified that social support was the most protective factor following on from childhood adversity. This is best achieved where the organisation fosters a culture to create positive relationship building, with allocation of sufficient time, perseverance and patience to build and sustain relationships (HM Inspectorate of Probation, 2023). Furthermore, the impact of programmed interventions is secondary to the relationship between social worker and service user (Nicholson & Artz, 2003). The scoping review by Lamph et al. (2023) asserts that an approach which centralises positive human relations at a systems level is relevant and transferable across a variety of settings that provide care, support or education.

A further key finding from the review was focused on utilising interpersonal skills, including communication and empathetic listening, both fundamental to achieving trusting relationships. This, in turn, fosters engagement within communities, a sense of permanence and sustainable change, and a reduction of further social work intervention. Social work is designed to improve the lives of individuals and families via addressing the challenges they face, and it is increasingly becoming clear that relationship-based practice is a critical component of positive outcomes in social work, particularly for the service user. For example, adverse childhood experiences are widely understood to impact on the life course and require



some specialist intervention yet the presence of a relationship with a trusted adult has reparative qualities, and social workers are well placed to be that trusted adult or provide connection for child and trusted adult (Frederick et al., 2023).

Social workers are privileged advocates for marginalised groups in society who often suffer social exclusion due to the complexities of their circumstances (Craig, 2002) and the complex interplay often operating between service users' personal situations and their broader socio-economic environment. Developing relational and communication skills helps empower social workers to engage and understand stakeholders, drive social action and advocate for systemic change (Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR), 2024). Relational practice therefore provides an ideal vein by which to address social injustice as it imbibes the principles of communicating in a nuanced, non-judgemental, and unobtrusive manner (Ruch, 2005), encouraging confidence in the service user and providing them with the skills of self-advocacy to enhance their social situation, and thereby reduce the often-perpetual cycle of oppression.

This isn't a simple feat to navigate, however, as complex and sensitive cases can create an environment whereby professionals have to employ their professional boundaries in order to protect both theirs and the service user's safety (Doel et al., 2010). This can strengthen the separation from clients that relational practice strives to break down (O'Leary et al., 2013), so emphasising the need for extensive training, mentoring, supervision, and reflexivity of social workers. Whilst the separation is always likely to exist to some extent, relational practice provides the tools to make it a softer and lesser barrier than it currently stands, which can only serve to address social injustice.

### ***Organisational benefits of relational practice***

Relational practice was highlighted by Lamph et al. (2023) for its potential to create an environment with a focus on interagency working. Strong interagency working in addition to effective management oversight has previously been identified to overcome challenges and deliver reforms in an impressively efficient manner within the context of family safeguarding (Baxter et al., 2023). Lamph et al. (2023) also identified that practising with a relational approach could enhance employee satisfaction, this being a positive asset. It is recognised by Tugade and Fredrickson (2004) that positive emotions assist in building resilience, which is of key focus in the Social Work Organisational Resilience Diagnostic (SWORD) change project. This project supports the creation of a resilient and sustainable climate in social work organisations by utilising an accessible, research-informed diagnostic tool and workbook to understand, build, and sustain resilience (Grant et al., 2022).

### ***Further implications for training***

The review by Lamph et al. (2023) recognises that social workers entering the profession need to learn more than just classroom-based education. The current UK degree programme incorporates a blend of academia and placement experience, supported by practice education and underpinned by the Professional Capabilities Framework (BASW, 2018). There is evidence to suggest that supporting experiential education, led by people who currently or have previously accessed services as a pre-cursor to progressing through the social work programme, can play a powerful and insightful role in assessing students' readiness to practice and embed the skills and traits which promote relational practice (Skilton, 2011). Similarly, supervision, peer support, and the organisation were identified as significant contributors to reflective practices and relationship based approaches (Russ et al., 2020). Reflective supervision may help ensure that a therapeutic approach is provided in practice, as this style of supervision encourages emotions to be explored and tools elicited to address challenging emotions. This, in turn, leads to greater resilience and an increased emotional reserve that is required when providing effective relational practice (Russ et al., 2020). Reflective supervision requires a supervisor to facilitate conversations about challenging events experienced in practice and to encourage supervisee reflection on these events to gauge how self-aware the supervisee is and, therefore, how well they are demonstrating the skills and characteristics for effective relational practice (Calvert et al., 2017). Also, the use of a 'buddy system' as opposed to a more formal supervision arrangement may be both cost and time saving long term, by identifying any issues in practice quickly as opposed to waiting for a formal scheduled supervision by which time the relationship between social worker and service user may have been negatively impacted.

### Implications for future research

The review by Lamph et al. (2023) concludes that the scientific evidence base for relational practice is still lacking. Challenges lie in measuring and evidencing the impact of relational practice on service users, due to its delivery being comprised of so many differing values and attributes. The review highlights with concern that there is no standardised definition of relational practice, which means there is no common agreement upon the aspects it encompasses. This makes it a challenge to find a research tool that encompasses all the aspects that contribute to an impact. The authors note the considerable focus of relational practice on the professional having a strong self-awareness, reflective capacity, and reflexivity towards the client's emotional responses, considering these as important values in driving forward a standardised definition. Therefore, as it is known that a continuous reflective structure may be utilised to reflect upon one's relational practice (Ornstein & Ganzer, 2005), it is suggested that the Reflective Practice Questionnaire (RPQ) be utilised in research to provide a self-report measure of reflective practice. It is based on four domains: reflection in action, reflection on action, reflection with others, and self-awareness (Rogers et al., 2024). The questionnaire can be taken by a social worker at any stage in their career but is most pertinent to those in training or newly qualified stages to support development of the reflective skills needed to demonstrate relational practice (Rogers et al., 2024). The questionnaire scores can then be analysed to assess the level of social worker engagement with reflective practice and the extent of their self-awareness. Smith (2009) highlight the imperative need to involve service users in social work, so the service user's perspective could be obtained by adapting the 'Patient Evaluation of Emotional Care during Hospitalisation' (PEECH) survey tool to a social care context, which would enable review of the relational aspects of a service users experience (Murrells et al., 2013). By combining the PEECH survey tool and the Reflective Practice Questionnaire it may become possible for researchers to explore an association between a social worker having a high reflective capacity and an improved service user experience. This level of scientific study is now needed in future research to evidence the effectiveness of relational practice, for it to be fully adopted and supported across the sector going forwards.

### Conclusion

Using relational practice in social work has a beneficial impact for social worker, client and organisation. For social workers, enhanced knowledge and understanding of interpersonal dynamics can lead to increased employee satisfaction and confidence. This is of increasing importance due to challenging case-loads and increasing pressures. For client health, enhanced inter-personal relationships with service providers support engagement, therapeutic change, and improved physical, psychological and social wellbeing. Organisational benefits relate to the importance of relational practice learning for inter-agency working and people-facing services. Organisational support for reflective training through supervision and peer support is important for effective relational practice. Future research could utilise measures of reflective practice experience for both social workers and clients, to further evidence effectiveness in social work.

### Acknowledgments

KC: conceptualisation, visualisation, writing -original draft, writing – review and editing. BC: conceptualisation, visualisation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing. JHa: conceptualisation, project administration, visualisation, writing – original draft, writing – review and editing. JHi: writing – review and editing. All authors have read and approved the final work.

### Author contributions

CRedit: **Katy Cleece**: Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Bethany Cheneler**: Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **Joanna Harrison**: Investigation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing; **James Hill**: Writing – review & editing.

### Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).



## Funding

This research was partly funded by the National Institute for Health and Social Care Research Applied Research Collaboration Northwest Coast (NIHR ARC NWC). The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

## About the authors

**Katy Cleece** is an experienced social worker having worked in the voluntary sector, local authority and the NHS. Katy is currently a Social Work Research Lead at Lancashire and South Cumbria NHS Foundation Trust and her research interests centre on children and family, mental health, recovery, substance misuse and relationship-based practice. Katy has a BSc in Sociology and an MA in Social Work. Katy is passionate about embedding research in practice, bridging the gap between academia and the frontline, and increasing research capacity in social work.

**Bethany Cheneler** has a diverse vocational and academic background, stemming from a degree in paediatric nursing. She has experience in both clinical practice and the field of education, with an MSc in Public Health. Bethany is a Lecturer in Healthcare Workforce Professional Development at the University of Central Lancashire. Her research interests are in the academic delivery of reflective practice and its utilisation in clinical practice, professional identity formation, and pedagogical approaches within medical education.

**Joanna Harrison** is a Research Fellow at the University of Central Lancashire with specific expertise in evidence synthesis and summary. She has a BA and MA in Sociology. Joanna collaborates with health and social care professionals to write evidence summaries for practice. Addressing an area of clinical or social need, Joanna supports the appraisal and summary of relevant research evidence, both informing practice of the best evidence available and developing research capacity within the workforce.

**James Edward Hill** is a Senior Research Fellow at the University of Central Lancashire, with specific expertise in evidence synthesis methods and evidence synthesis dissemination. He has a degree in Physiotherapy and a Masters in Health Informatics. His research has led to collaboration across multiple NHS Trusts, local authorities, and voluntary sector groups. James is also a member of the Health Informatics Team where he teaches on the Masters in Health Informatics.

## ORCID

Katy Cleece  <http://orcid.org/0009-0005-4570-8736>  
 Bethany Cheneler  <http://orcid.org/0009-0000-6809-1242>  
 Joanna Harrison  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8963-7240>  
 James Edward Hill  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1430-6927>

## Data availability statement

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analysed in this study.

## References

- Baxter, V., Boydell, V., & McPherson, S. (2023). Multi-disciplinary support for families with complex needs and children on the edge of care in the UK: A mixed methods evaluation. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 45(4), 307–325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2023.2281840>
- Beer, O., & Asthana, S. (n.d). *How stress impacts social workers – And how they're trying to cope*. University of Plymouth. <https://www.plymouth.ac.uk/news/pr-opinion/opinion-how-stress-impacts-social-workers-nil-and-how-theyre-trying-to-cope>
- British Association of Social Workers (BASW). (2018). *Professional capabilities framework: Social worker*. BASW. <https://new.basw.co.uk/sites/default/files/resources/pcf-social-worker.pdf>
- Buchanan, M., Walker, G., Boden, J. M., Mansoor, Z., & Newton-Howes, G. (2023). Protective factors for psychosocial outcomes following cumulative childhood adversity: Systematic review. *BJPsych Open*, 19(6), e197. <https://doi.org/10.1192/bjo.2023.561>
- Calvert, F. L., Crowe, T. P., & Grenyer, B. F. S. (2017). An investigation of supervisory practices to develop relational and reflective competence in psychologists. *Australian Psychologist*, 52(6), 467–479. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12261>
- Cossar, J., Brandon, M., & Jordan, P. (2016). 'You've got to trust her and she's got to trust you': Children's views on participation in the child protection system. *Child & Family Social Work*, 21(1), 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12115>
- Coventry Safeguarding Children Board (CSCB). (2014). *Daniel Pelka review deeper analysis and progress report on implementation of recommendations*. CSCB. <https://edemocracy.coventry.gov.uk/documents/s15753/Retrospective%20Deeper%20Analysis%20and%20Progress%20Report.pdf>

- Craig, G. (2002). Poverty, social work and social justice. *British Journal of Social Work*, 32(6), 669–682. <https://academic.oup.com/bjsw/article/32/6/669/1690675?login=true#no-access-message#no-access-message> <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/32.6.669>
- Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). (2024). Essential skills for social workers engaged in social action. <https://csr.education/community-organisation-management/essential-skills-social-workers-social-action/>
- Curtis, L., Moriarty, J., & Netten, A. (2010). The expected working life of a social worker. *British Journal of Social Work*, 40(5), 1628–1643. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcp039>
- Department for Education (DfE). (2020). *Knowledge briefing: Practising relationship-based social work*. DfE. <https://practice-supervisors.rip.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/KB-Practising-relationship-based-social-work.pdf>
- Department of Health (DoH). (2015). *Knowledge and Skills Statement for Social Workers in Adult Services*. DoH. <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5a808324ed915d74e622ee26/KSS.pdf>
- Doel, M., Allmark, P., Conway, P., Cowburn, M., Flynn, M., Nelson, P., & Tod, A. (2010). Professional boundaries: Crossing a line or entering the shadows? *British Journal of Social Work*, 40(6), 1866–1889. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcp106>
- Ferdman, B. M., & Deane, B. R. (Eds.). (2013). *Diversity at work: The practice of inclusion*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ferguson, H., Warwick, L., Disney, T., Leigh, J., Cooner, T. S., & Beddoe, L. (2022). Relationship-based practice and the creation of therapeutic change in long-term work: Social work as a holding relationship. *Social Work Education*, 41(2), 209–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2020.1837105>
- Frederick, J., Spratt, T., & Devaney, J. (2023). Supportive relationships with trusted adults for children and young people who have experienced adversities: Implications for social work service provision. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 53(6), 3129–3145. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcad107>
- Grant, L., Kinman, G., Alexander, K., & Sharples, A. (2022). Research in Practice: The Social Work Organisational Resilience Diagnostic (SWORD) tool and workbook (2nd ed.). <https://sword.researchinpractice.org.uk/media/xobpd3eq/sword-tool-workbook-2nd-edition-2021.pdf>
- Healy, K. (2017). Becoming a trustworthy profession: Doing better than doing good. *Australian Social Work*, 70(sup1), 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2014.973550>
- HM Inspectorate of Probation. (2023). Our research: Relationship-based practice framework. *HM Inspectorate of Probation*. <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/research/the-evidence-base-youth-offending-services/general-models-and-principles/relationship-based-practice-framework/>
- Ingram, R., & Smith, M. (2018). Relationship-based practice: Emergent themes in social work literature. *Insight 41*. [https://new.basw.co.uk/sites/default/files/resources/basw\\_95107-2.pdf](https://new.basw.co.uk/sites/default/files/resources/basw_95107-2.pdf)
- International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW). (2014). 'Global definition of social work.' <https://www.ifsw.org/what-is-social-work/global-definition-of-social-work/>
- Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI). (2024). Checklist for Systematic Reviews and Research Syntheses [internet]. JBI. [https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI\\_Critical\\_Appraisal-Checklist\\_for\\_Systematic\\_Reviews2017\\_0.pdf](https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI_Critical_Appraisal-Checklist_for_Systematic_Reviews2017_0.pdf)
- Kinman, G., & Grant, L. (2016). Building resilience in early-career social workers: Evaluating a multi-modal intervention. *British Journal of Social Work*, 4, bcw164. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcw164>
- Lamph, G., Nowland, R., Boland, P., Pearson, J., Connell, C., Jones, V., Wildbore, E., L Christian, D., Harris, C., Ramsden, J., Gardner, K., Graham-Kevan, N., & McKeown, M. (2023). Relational practice in health, education, criminal justice, and social care: A scoping review. *Systematic Reviews*, 12(1), 194. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-023-02344-9>
- Levenson, J. (2017). Trauma-informed social work practice. *Social Work*, 62(2), 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sw/swx001>
- Mason, C., Taggart, D., & Broadhurst, K. (2020). Parental non-engagement within child protection services—How can understandings of complex trauma and epistemic trust help? *Societies*, 10(4), 93. (4): <https://doi.org/10.3390/soc10040093>
- Murrells, T., Robert, G., Adams, M., Morrow, E., & Maben, J. (2013). Measuring relational aspects of hospital care in England with the 'Patient Evaluation of Emotional Care during Hospitalisation' (PEECH) survey questionnaire. *BMJ Open*, 3(1), e002211. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2012-002211>
- Nicholson, D., & Artz, S. (2003). Preventing youthful offending: Where do we go from here? *Relational Child and Youth Care Practice*, 16(4), 32–46.
- O'Leary, P., Tsui, M.-S., & Ruch, G. (2013). The boundaries of the social work relationship revisited: Towards a connected, inclusive and dynamic conceptualisation. *British Journal of Social Work*, 43(1), 135–153. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcr181>
- Ornstein, E. D., & Ganzer, C. (2005). Relational social work: A model for the future. *Families in Society: The Journal of Contemporary Social Services*, 86(4), 565–572. <https://doi.org/10.1606/1044-3894.3462>
- Peters, M. D. J., Marnie, C., Tricco, A. C., Pollock, D., Munn, Z., Alexander, L., McInerney, P., Godfrey, C. M., & Khalil, H. (2020). Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBI Evidence Synthesis*, 18(10), 2119–2126. <https://doi.org/10.11124/JBIES-20-00167>
- Preston, R. (2022). Caseloads bigger, more complex and harder to manage, say children's social workers. *Community Care*. <https://www.communitycare.co.uk/2022/03/25/caseloads-bigger-more-complex-and-harder-to-manage-say-childrens-social-workers/>
- Ravalier, J. M., Allen, R. E., & McGowan, J. (2023). Social worker working conditions and psychological health: A longitudinal study. *The British Journal of Social Work*, 53(8), 3818–3837. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcad144>

- Rochdale Borough Safeguarding Children Board (RBSCB). (2013). *The overview report of the serious case review in respect of Young People 1,2,3,4,5 & 6*. RBSCB.
- Rogers, S. L., Van Winkle, L., Michels, N., Lucas, C., Ziada, H., Da Silva, E. J., Jotangia, A., Gabrielsson, S., Gustafsson, S., & Priddis, L. (2024). Further development of the reflective practice questionnaire. *PeerJ*, 12, e16879. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.16879>
- Rollins, W. (2020). Social worker–client relationships: social worker perspectives. *Australian Social Work*, 73(4), 395–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0312407X.2019.1669687>
- Ruch, G. (2005). Relationship-based practice and reflective practice: Holistic approaches to contemporary child care social work. *Child & Family Social Work*, 10(2), 111–123. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2005.00359.x> <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2206.2005.00359.x>
- Ruch, G. (2020). PSDP – Resources and tools: Practising relationship-based social work. *Department for Education*. <https://practice-supervisors.rip.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/KB-Practising-relationship-based-social-work.pdf>
- Russ, E., Lonne, B., & Lynch, D. (2020). Increasing child protection workforce retention through promoting a relational-reflective framework for resilience. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 110(Pt 3), 104245. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chabu.2019.104245>
- Rustin, M. (2004). Learning from the Victoria Climbié inquiry. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 18(1), 9–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0265053032000183679>
- Skilton, C. (2011). Involving experts by experience in assessing students' readiness to practise: The value of experiential learning in student reflection and preparation for practice. *Social Work Education*, 30(3), 299–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2010.482982>
- Smith, R. (2009). *Doing social work research*. (1st ed.). Open University Press.
- Trevithick, P. (2003). Effective relationship-based practice: A theoretical exploration. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 17(2), 163–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026505302000145699>
- Tugade, M. M., & Fredrickson, B. L. (2004). Resilient individuals use positive emotions to bounce back from negative emotional experiences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 86(2), 320–333. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.320>
- West, M. A., & Lyubovnikova, J. (2013). Illusions of team working in health care. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 27(1), 134–142. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14777261311311843>