Exploring How Social Workers Experience and Perceive the Participation of Care Experienced Children and Young People: A Qualitative Pilot Study

Tonimarie Benaton

The last few decades have seen increased recognition of the importance of involving children and young people in all matters relating to their care experience, yet despite a range of opportunities, this population continues to feel unheard. Social Workers are involved in supporting, promoting, and advising Care Experienced Children and Young People (CECYP) and as such may have experience into why this area remains difficult. This research sought to understand how social workers experience and perceive the participation of CECYP. Qualitative methodology used semi-structured interviews from a sample group of three to gain the experience of the participants. Thematic analysis generated four themes: Social workers' experience of the voice of CECYP, oversight and impact, creating ways to engage and internal and external dialogue. The value of the study emphasises the experience of the participants in understanding their own perceptions of conflict when hearing and responding to the voice of CECYP, the potential pitfalls, and any changes needed in practice. The findings highlight that while the voice of CECYP is heard, the message itself is difficult to decipher or acted upon, due to the circumstances of CECYP at that moment in time and the constraints imposed on both parties.

Introduction

The rights of children to be involved in decisions affecting their everyday lives is a core feature of social work and embedded into law, (Children Act 1989 andUnicef 1994). Inquiry reports in the UK consistently highlight that Care Experienced Children and Young People (CECYP) feel unheard and that their

wishes and feelings need to be at the centre of practice and that participatory processes need to be inclusive (Munro 2001, 2011; Caldwell, McConvey, and Collins 2019; Children's Commissioner 2019). In advocating participation all CECYP are entitled to an allocated social worker to exercise the local authority's parental responsibility. Several authors (Diaz, Pert, and Thomas 2018; Kriz and Roundtree-Swain 2017; Kennan, Brady, and Forkan 2018) consider the role of professionals, in developing trusting relationships with CECYP and acting as a powerful instrument, in understanding and promoting their experience of participation. Research also notes that the quality and strength of the relationship between the child and the social worker is an important factor to consider and can be the difference between a child being heard or not, (Ellis 2016; Jackson et al. 2020). Provision under Section 7 (Local Authority Social Service Act, 1970) and Section 22 (Children Act 1989), provide a range of platforms to support and aid CECYPs' involvement in their day-to-day care. However, the past two decades have seen an increase of neo-liberalist policy initiatives, increasing the role of managerial oversight and accountability, adversely impacting how the voice of children is obtained and heard (Parton 2014; Munro 2001, 2011). This has led to an increased level of professionally instigated constructs and oversight, generating antagonistic reactions from CECYP, impacting on the purpose of participation (Munro 2001; Caldwell, McConvey, and Collins 2019; Children's Commissioner 2019). In this context it is important that social workers recognise the significance of understanding the child's reactions to approaches when involving them in participation. There is a need for social workers to be mindful, in acknowledging their own and the child's internal and external factors impacting on the process at any moment in time and to source the most appropriate opportunities available. However, there remains concern that this continues to be a contested area of practice, subjecting social workers to moral injury, (Fenton and Kelly 2017). The social workers ability to uphold social values, ethics and moral integrity is constantly impacted upon by the nature of neoliberalism within social work: the rise of performance indicators and outcomes to manage welfare cuts, reduced assessment timescales, high volumes of work and a the rhetoric of quantity over quality. Ultimately, this creates an atmosphere of individual blame, leading to deficit approaches, authoritarian interventions and risk averse decision making, (Parton 2014; Rogowski 2021; Clapton 2022). This undermines, positive environments, industrial innovative practice, and autonomous working causing social workers to experience ethical stress in seeking and giving voice to CECYP (BASW 2023). This, intern increases the discourse between the ethics of justice and the ethics of care (Botes 2000), compounding the participatory process for CECYP.

The study aims below, sought to explore how the social worker experiences and perceives the reactions of CECYP, when involving them in their care and why CECYP continue to feel unheard.

1. To gain an understanding of how the social worker experiences and perceives the participation of CECYP.
2. To provide insight into the social workers experience and perception of how, CECYP react to participation and approaches used.
3. To consider the social workers experience and perception of any difficulties or challenges faced by CECYP.

Methodology and Methods

The study took a non-positivist, interpretivist phenomenological approach to explore the lived experience and perceptions of social workers involved with CECYP. A purposeful homogeneous sample, (Smith, Flowers, and Larkin 2012; Smith and Nizza 2022) using eligibility criteria, identified a closely defined set of people: Qualified and registered social workers (SWE 2019), with CECYP case allocation and able to commit to the timescales of the study. Participants also identified as the same gender, worked in the same geographical area with similar practitioner experience. For the purpose of retaining anonymity, the participants identifiable details and agency is not provided. Recruitment was through regional stakeholders: (D2N2) and the British Association of Social Workers (BASW) conforming to ethical guidelines (BASW 2021; SWE 2021) and approved by the University Ethics Research Committee. Participants had sight of the relevant information: Study information, confidentiality, risks, protection from harm, data protection, informed consent, withdrawal process and how information would be stored, anonymised, and disseminated alongside opportunities for questions. Participants were reminded of their duty to maintain confidentiality in line with their professional registration (SWE 2021).

   To address the research question, aims and objectives, a 40-50 minute, semi structured interview with each participant was completed, offering an opportunity for discussion, regarding their own reality and lived experience, (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree 2006). DeJonckheere and Vaghyn's (2019, p. 3), 4 step process was used: designing and conducting semi structured interviews/participant identification/ethical issues/planning, and logistics. Interviews were undertaken in an online environment, 'MS Teams' utilising audio capture and video camera. An interview schedule facilitated structure (Smith, Flowers, and Larkin, 2009) and a grand tour question relating to the participant's current role opened dialogue, developing rapport. Six questions were asked, including: experience and perception of how CECYP react to current approaches of participation, how experiences are perceived by the social worker and exploration of the difficulties and challenges faced. This sought to explore the social workers day to day experience of practice, what they understood by participation and how they perceived its impact on CECYP. This created opportunities for reference to specific cases and events, which stuck a cord, drawing out emotions, feelings and the challenges that existed.

Interviews were transcribed and shared with the participants for accuracy prior to data analysis. Braun and Clarke's (2006), six stages of thematic analysis focused on identifying patterns of meaning across the data set. Researcher bias, reflexivity, positionality, and power (Merriam et al. 2001; Teater 2017), was noted from the researcher's own experience of working with CECYP from the same geographical areas and their role in social work. Selection, interview and reporting bias were acknowledged through the use of reflective journal focusing on the learning process as a doctoral student. The researcher chose to use the voice of social workers, as opposed to CECYP based on the their experience of working with CECYP and how this population had consistently informed them that they were; exhausted, frustrated and angered, by the constant requests for feedback which never seemed to be heard.

Sixteen initial codes (see Table 1) generating four main themes with some crossover between: (1) Social Worker Experience of the Voice of CECYP. (2) Oversight and Impact. (3) Creating Ways to Engage. (4) Internal and External Dialogue.

Table 1. The 16 - codes; generating 4 themes.

16 Codes	4 Themes
1. Social worker acknowledgement process available and fear of the process for CECYP	1. Social worker experience of the voice of CECYP
2. Social worker acknowledges the young person's lack of control and choice	
3. Discussion on the impact of the meeting/s for participation	
4. Different/difference to friendships	
5. Loyalty to family members	
6. Audit	2. Oversight and impact
7. Media portray	
8. Generic form not fit for purpose	
9. Getting young people involved	3. Creating ways to engage
10. Use of meetings	
11. Educate to empower to involve	
12. How social workers experience CECYP reacting to approaches of involvement them in their care	4. Internal and external dialogue
13. Emotions - Social worker positive and negative of thew role/job	
14. Social workers managing the impact	
15. Supervision (crossover to theme 3)	
16. Interprofessional Working positive and negative	

Results and Findings

Social Workers Experience of the Voice of CECYP

The participants referred to different types of corporate provision to participation specifying: Child in Care reviews, Personal Educational Plans (PEPs), statutory visits including other professionals and parents. The social workers referred to their role, responsibility and complexities when working with parents and placing the child at the centre. Meetings with other young people *via* the Children in Care Council, direct work, digital technology and online forums were referred to, highlighting a diverse range of routes open to CECYP.

> so I have a responsibility to ensure care planning is progressed for the young people... you primarily work with the children. then the foster carers. liaise with professional network ...... annual reviews ..... CAMHS consultations...... we've got 'mind my own' as well...a app where they can share their views ahead meeting ....I work with closely with the parents...they've got shared parental responsibility.....but it depends on the child circumstances, because its not always safe...... children might not want them included...... you have to make sure you're acting in their best interest (P1).

> We've got children in care council that our young people can participate in (P2).

> there are things like participation forms (P3)

The participants referred to their experience of how CECYP can be and are involved and the challenges they perceived, describing the need to involve CECYP as much as possible while being mindful that not all wanted to be included. The social workers referred to their experience of having to meet statutory obligations, the impact on CECYP and themselves in practice:

> They ask for the contribution paperwork, but you can't also sit down and force them to complete it ...... They kind of just have to go along with the flow of it a and that's why they struggle. (P1).

> Some of them, you can tell, are just very some quite enthusiastic about sharing their views...... others you're taking away from their time on their games console (P2).

Stigma of being in care and lack of control and choice are well documented in social care research (Ellis 2016; Day 2017; Diaz, Pert, and Thomas 2018). Participants spoke about the challenges and barriers and their perception of how negatively these impacted on CECYP and themselves as they became part of the problem. Concerns were raised with reference to fear, describing; that what they, (CECYP) say, is likely to be bought into an open arena and discussed by other professionals, which may be, at a detriment to themselves and that

this caused fear in taking part in processes meant to be supportive. Challenges in practice were considered; the participants referred to the processes and how these could restrict CECYPs' ability to become involved and in exercising an opportunity to have control and choice. Emphasising the complex nature of supporting CECYP.

> I know how damaging it is to the young person because they've spoken to me about it….I feel like I'm the one now doing it to them as well……They have no control about it… they have no control over their life, especially being in care. (P1)

> I think that fear and the insecurity of what you know, and I suppose that is a feeling of loss of control. 'blank' knows the consequence of having disclosed ………. (P2).

The participants described their perception of how the process of participation could lead to CECYP feeling different to their peers. The participants explored their experience of conflict when working with families and the prominence of CECYP's loyalty to parents and how it manifests itself. The social workers perception is that CECYP are torn between telling their story, the conflict and tension it creates which can inadvertently, cause great distress for the children they work with, leaving CECYP feeling conflicted. The social workers questioned their experiences of how they manage the flow of information to protect the young person:

> it feels a little bit unnatural, I think some of them are quite aware that their friends at school……who don't have social workers (P2).

> if they've not got that confidence and they know that if mom's going to be in the meeting, they have to give a certain narrative…. so I think it can be really conflicting for them (P1)

> it's a barrier sometimes having birth family within the meetings, because a lot of our children have massive loyalty to family, which obviously, I totally understand………. it makes it really difficult because it's we're then talking about something that necessarily isn't a true representation of what the young person feels, but you trying to respect their wishes in not wanting to sort of upset the family member (P3).

It is apparent that social workers understand the provisions available for participation. A sense of ownership regarding their role and that of organisation is acknowledged alongside the complexities that arise when involving CECYP and how these may be mitigated.

Oversight and Impact

The rhetoric of the impact of funding and media portrayal in social care is not uncommon. The participants referred to their experience of working within

the sector and the impact on themselves and CECYP. Participants experienced frustration and distress in seeking to manage their statutory functions along-side the individual need of the child:

> And obviously the media don't portray social care very positively … … There's always that extra tension, … … . I'm also totally aware that there's so much red tape within the systems that we work within … … .I do feel like the young person just kind of gets lost within it all (P1).

> Oh, just I find a lot of stuff in social work exhausting because it takes away from what's actually important (P2).

Participants shared their frustration that current approaches are impacted by complex systems, creating contradictions in relation to what is required by the organisation and what is feasible. Emotional responses were reflected upon showing insight regarding their influence and repercussions for CECYP and a sense of bewilderment in how the organisation continues to generate barriers. The participants appeared aware of the pitfalls of neoliberalism referring to tick box exercises and its impact on them and their day-to-day practice and recognition of the importance of auditing and appraisal, demon-strating the potential for increased motivation and moral:

> I suppose budgets … … how is that good use of money?. which ultimately impacts on the children (P2).

> and it's like that I'm having to then go to the placement just so I can tick the box to say yes, I've seen the young person in the placement … . but actually, Id' probably have a more meaningful visit in the college … … … .I had an audit, … … … . they are obviously going to go through all the kind of tick boxes … … .But then it was also more of a reflective arena. And I said, oh, its actually a bit of a breath of fresh air (P3).

Participants referred to the inconsistency of how accessibility and inclusivity is addressed in practice, highlighting that processes remain time consuming, not child friendly and restrictive to individual identity. Participants discussed their experience of how CECYP were angered and annoyed by this, resulting in limited engagement in current participatory approaches. The participants dis-cussed their own experience and emotions of frustration and disbelief. The participants referred to feelings of being ashamed of the organisation in its use of outdated participatory approaches in meeting the needs of CECYP in the twenty first century. However, they accepted an intrinsic need to remain professional in managing out of date processes.

> It's very generic … … it's not tailor made for accessibility … … … it's all he and she it doesn't take any differentiation about how … .young people … might be non-binary and use … .'they and there' … … .it doesn't give the option of saying different, (P1).

> I find that quite frustrating, … …. I do think a lot of local authority forms need to be revisited and tailored to the fact that we've changed where in like a developing society, …. it's kind of being quite ashamed, that we've not moved with the times of being able to tailor those forms, (P1).

Participants described their experience of working in an environment of high staff turnover, creating further challenges for CECYP and themselves. The participants perceived that the constant changes meant that CECYP had to keep telling and re telling their story. They discussed their experience of how information, heard by different professionals involved in the child's life could be interpreted differently and the consequences of this. The participants also described their experience of positive interprofessional working, how relationships could be developed and a shared concern for the child's voice to be heard:

> our kids spend a lot of their time with tutors, mentors, class teachers, key workers …. the kids will open up to them about stuff, ….they help the child to see this is a network and we do share information … to support (P2)

> often there is a high turnover of staff, … …. it's almost then having to explain everything all over again … … … … is that a true reflection of what the young person actually thinks, or it is actually a summary of what the young person has said (P3).

Key messages refer to the constant strain of a dysfunctional system in which social work operates and that a one size fits all approach does not work. That, recruitment and retention in social care is at a critical point, impacting negatively on the practitioner and their capacity to keep completing the work that is needed. Ultimately, the implications, result in the child's voice being lost or not heard successfully and the practitioner being subjected to stress in managing complex work with minimal resources.

Creating Ways to Engage CECYP

Participants discussed their experience of supporting CECYP to be involved in decisions affecting their lives. They considered the difficulties for CECYP naming the negative impact of paperwork to be completed. The participants referred to being aware of the verbal and non-verbal clues that CECYP displayed, and their perception of knowing the child's idiosyncrasies and character. The participants discussed different ways of engagement such as, setting the tone and pace of the intervention in meeting the child's age and stage of development. The participants discussed the challenges of making decisions such as; refusing to complete prescribed paperwork regardless of the organisations expectations:

> maybe there needs to be different tools where you can differentiate their needs and how best to utilise getting their views for it rather than trying to stick to paperwork (P1).

> it's almost like you can see the eyes rolling in their head….Whatever meets that child's kind of communication needs and developmental stage…… I'm just really mindful about tick boxes and sometimes I do feel like I'm getting a bit rogue (P2).

> where (blank's) involved in anything, it needs to be pitched at (blank) level (P3).

Participants described different levels of engagement with CECYP, supporting participation, through education on the importance of being involved, developing different packages of support and creating opportunities for all regardless of ability. Participants acknowledged the experience of being out of their depth and that at times providing the right intervention was beyond their knowledge base, with reference to training and support:

> I think you do have to support them in wanting to be included and kind of educate them in understanding the importance of them being included…….it's about changing the paperwork….so that it kind of is tailored more ….make it more accessible. (P1)

> young people who are a bit more mature or they've got that kind of academic ability do understand it……I suppose it's about trying to find creative ways of getting their views P2).

> Any sort of learning difficulties or disabilities of any sort? and I've got to be honest, that would be a bit of a minefield even for me. I would need some training and support. (P3)

The above identifies the experience of social workers in acknowledging their own limitations and the perceptions of how CECYP react to current approaches of participation. There is an understanding of what being inclusive looks like and that professional autonomy can mean moving away from comfortable practice.

Internal and External Dialogue

The social workers in the study acknowledged societal perceptions and its impact on them being open about their personal career choice. They described their experiences in how they protect themselves from the negative views of others, by minimising parts of their personal life.

> I don't tell people that I'm a social worker…. when I have told them, they go oh so you're the people who take children away from their families, and I go,

no … … . So, it is frustrating. You feel like you have to kind of hide a part of your life to people, of something that I'm quite passionate about (P1).

The social workers experienced the pressure of working in social care referring to current debates of bureaucracy, retention and recruitment and the challenges for social workers in maintaining the current level of work and its impact. Participants, reflected on university teaching, preparation for the role, referring to current research and shared concerns about working in a climate of austerity. They described its impact on themselves in terms of their emotions, remaining in the sector and how this would impact on CECYP.

when I was at uni … … I feel like the social worker training prepared you for doing casework … the red tape … .you know, Munro … .so, it's almost like just sort of accepted (P3).

with privatisation, is just it's gone mad … . we've got no money for additional social workers to reduce the caseloads, I feel, exhausted, angry, I suppose, as well towards management … .I think about handing my notice in regularly, but I know that none of that, is going to resolve it for me in terms of the frustration that I feel (P2).

The participants described their perception of how they are viewed by CECYP and the impact of emotional burnout. They reflected on their experience of informal discussions in managing the emotional demands of their role. They referred to the importance of supervision to combat the consequences of trauma, relating to the emotional context of the work. The participant's referred to hobbies and interests in developing strategies to alleviate stress:

I think what you have to do is not take it personally … … .that all the anger and the upset you have directed towards you … I think it's frustrating … … you're trying to do what's best for them, even though they hate you at the time (P1).

have a bit of a moan … and then crack on (P2).

you have to use supervision to make sure you're processing … .you can get vicarious trauma from that itself … you have to have the good work life balance … I'll go for a run to run off my bad day and so you can be fresh and ready for the next day (P1).

There was discussion regarding how useful positive appraisal can be in developing self-worth, balanced against feelings of incompetence. The participants discussed their experience of how managers demonstrated a lack of understanding in how long it takes to both carry out high quality work with families and to complete the paperwork in a timely manner. The social workers discussed an acceptance that social work is not an easy craft. There are many conflicting contradictories, such as negative media representation and how friends and family view their profession and this impacts on them both personally and professionally.

> But it's still at times just undoable. … …. it's the system that just functions, based on the expectation that because people care, they'll try to complete the work in their own time … …. (P2).

> … … it's hard not to take things personally because you know yourself how much work you do … … I just feel like in this job, it's just never enough because they always want more … …. it is nice to have a discussion about some of the positives (P3).

It is evident that negative societal views of social work continue to be heard, resulting in social workers hiding part of their work identity, but this can be somewhat counterbalanced, with good supervision and the ability of social workers promoting their own self-care.

Discussion

This pilot study provides context to why CECYP may feel unheard and the impact on social workers as already identified in the literature (Leeson 2007; Munro 2001, 2011). That, despite a range of opportunities and legal processes in place the voice of CECYP can be lost due to bureaucratic changes in policy and the impact of political agendas in social work, which inevitably impact on both the social worker and CECYP with whom, they work. This makes it increasingly difficult for those working closely with CECYP to manage their statutory obligations in meeting individual need, (Bell 2002, Munro 2001, 2011, Rogowski 2011, Parton 2014, Ferguson 2016). The findings highlight that systems and approaches for the active participation of CECYP are often counterproductive. Social workers experience the distress from CECYP and use their autonomy to create meaningful opportunities for engagement, while managing the challenges in upholding professional boundaries and promoting their own self-care. The findings give insight that social workers seek to circumnavigate organisational processes driven by neoliberalism sometimes at a detriment to themselves. Social workers may have an experience similar to the child's experience: when the child experiences distress, so do they, suggesting attunement, to the child's attachment need. There appears to be a re-organising of behaviours and actions to alleviate feelings of distress on both sides in managing how voice is given in context. There are similarities between the findings from this study, and those that have emerged from the work of social workers' communication with children and young people in practice, (Broadhurst and Mason, 2014 and Ferguson 2016). Understanding, limitations in practice and the use of micro communications can be of benefit and increase relationship-based practice and trust. Social workers in this study identified the need to adapt their practice and communication skills in meeting the development need, or idiosyncrasies of the child. The findings give context that the child's voice may well be heard but due to the constraints imposed on the social worker and on CECYP themselves the message is lost or

only partly received and actioned upon, and this is dependent on the circumstances of the CECYP at that moment in time. This emphasises the importance of the social worker in advocating the voice of CECYP through relationship-based practice (Ruch, Turney, and Ward 2018). The participants demonstrated empathy in acknowledging the potential dilemmas and implications for CECYP through their experience of being at a loss of what to do; resonating with shame and guilt, (Gibson 2016) in their own sense of self and being unable to do a good enough job. The research refers to the social workers understanding of how CECYP and themselves react to current approaches and how they experience outdated processes and managing external factors. Despite various ways to engage, difficulties remained which prevented inclusive practice, resulting in social workers being perceived as part of the problem. This suggests that the participants are exposed to sustained ethical stress. The sense of embarrassment that current approaches remain stagnant impacts on the social worker, creating frustration and upset. This indicates a continued level of stress leading to moral injury: a concept in social work where the worker can be part of the process in creating damage (Fenton and Kelly 2017). The social worker has statutory obligation's but seeks to manoeuvre around these in order to meet the needs of the child. There is acknowledgment of the conflict and tension that arises from, knowing that the child is wanting to engage, but is stuck by archaic mechanisms and external dynamics and the social workers inability in not being able to change statutory processes. This complex mix of the social workers individual role and structural processes, impact on the lives of CECYP in being able to exercise their participatory rights. Social workers may possess the skill and level of confidence to ascertain the authentic voice of CECYP, but this is restricted by the organisations inability to adapt and change processes, limiting the social workers autonomy in how to provide information for statutory obligations creating conflict.

These noteworthy findings refer to what needs to be completed and what can be or should be done. Botes (2000) explores the 'ethics of justice and the ethics of care'. The former, 'ethics of justice', is the ability to provide a fair and just service to all with appropriate and consistent decision making, based on autonomy, objectivity, and impartiality. The latter 'ethics of care' refers to care and involvement, including empathy while maintaining harmonious relationships, particularly relevant within social care, as identified by Ruch, Turney, and Ward (2018). The participants accounts indicate a sense of care and ownership in relation to the work being undertaken as well as clear frustrations, regarding the lack of support from the organisation. The findings raise the issue of whether social workers working directly with CECYP are sufficiently supported, particularly in relation to engaging CECYP in decisions affecting their lives. It could be suggested that the participants experience of moral injury based on the continued ethical stress that the work entails, is an issue for further investigation (Fenton and Kelly 2017). This was relevant regarding loyalty to parents and the social workers capacity to be able to

circumnavigate conflicting discussions in managing the inner and outer world for CECYP. Their ability to act on verbal and non-verbal clues highlight the complex level of skill CECYP social workers require. This is reiterated by Watts (2021), who explores the impact of negative surveillance and bureaucracy in social work, in understanding and hearing the voice of CECYP, identifying that when methods are accessible, it supports a child centred focus. This resonates with the work of Munro (2001) who identified that work with children in care is complex, requiring high levels of interpersonal skills and that the nature of the relationship is a significant factor in enabling the child's voice to be heard. Relationship based practice is evident here as the participants are reflective displaying empathy to the child's needs and in making decisions which are multi layered and immersed in an invisible negotiation of inherent moral quality (O'Connor and Leonard, 2014). Suggesting, that a CECYP social worker can hold a significant position in the child's life and that, this can be a positive factor (Bell 2002; Kriz and Roundtree 2017). Being, significant is to also be mindful of the level of interaction in the relationship and having the skill to facilitate meaningful conversations (Day 2017; Diaz, Pert, and Thomas 2018; Hood et al. 2019). Finally, the findings identified that there is a sense of privilege in hearing the voice of CECYP, but the sense of ambivalence is not-able in relation to the role of the organisation and its inability to adapt suffi-ciently in being inclusive. Overall, the findings show that professionals can provide a bridge to the inner world of CECYP, but time, relationship based social work and changes in practice are required.

Conclusion

The value of this study is the experience of the participants' voice and their perception in understanding the pitfalls for CECYP and their attempt to navi-gate the child's world.

   This small-scale pilot study provides some insight into the experience of social workers and how CECYP react to current approaches to involving them in their care. While not generalised, the results present an observation that social workers and CECYP may experience moral injury and that for social workers the constant strain creates conflict between their personal and pro-fessional congruence and that their sense of self could be damaged. The par-ticipants revealed aspects of inherent moral quality which is to practice in a holistic way which touches all types of social work interventions in meeting the needs of this very large and diverse group of young people who are sub-ject to multiple processes which imped their participation. Further analysis in this area potentially offers the opportunity for a more balanced relationship with this population which reduces barriers and creates greater levels of par-ity in how CECYP and the allocated social worker are supported.

Acknowledgements

Disclosure statement

References

Bell, M. 2002. "Promoting Children's Right through the Use of Relationship." *Child & Family Social Work* 7 (1): 1–11. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2206.2002.00225.x.

Botes, A. 2000. "A Comparison between the Ethics of Justice and the Ethics of Care." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 32 (5): 1071–1075. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2648.2000.01576.x.

Braun, V., and V. Clarke. 2006. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3 (2): 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa.

British Association Social Work. 2021. Code of Ethics for Social Work. Accessed 14 August 2021. https://www.basw.co.uk/about-basw/code-ethics

Broadhurst, K. and C. Mason. 2014. "Social work beyond the VDU: Foregrounding copresence in situated practice—why face to-face practice matters." *British Journal of Social Work* 44(3): 578–595.

Caldwell, Jason, Vivian McConvey, and Mary Collins. 2019. "Voice of the Child – Raising the Volume of the Voices of Children and Young People in Care." *Child Care in Practice* 25 (1): 1–5. doi:10.1080/13575279.2019.1552447.

Children's Commissioner. 2019. Advocacy for children. Children and young people's advocacy in England. Accessed 10 August 2021. https://www.childrenscommissioner.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/CCO-Advocacy-for-children-June-2019.pdf.

Clayton, G. 2020. "The Tyranny of Outcomes." *Practice Social Work in Action* 33 (3): 223–231.

DeJonckheer, M., and L. M. Vaughn. 2019. "Semi-Structured Interviewing in Primary Care Research Balance of Relationship and Rigour, British Medical Journal." *Family Medicine and Community Health* 7 (2): E 000057. doi:10.1136/fmch-2018-000057.

Diaz, C., H. Pert, and N. Thomas. 2018. "Just Another Person in the Room': Young People's Views on Their Participation in Child in Care Reviews." *Adoption & Fostering* 42 (4): 369–382. doi:10.1177/0308575918801663.

DiCicco-Bloom, B., and B. F. Crabtree. 2006. "Making Sense of Qualitative Research." *Medical Education* 40 (4): 314–321. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2929.2006.02418.x.

Ellis, K. H. 2016. "He's Got Some Nasty Impression of Me he Has': Listening to Children in Secure Estate." *British Journal of Social Work* 46 (6): 1553–1567. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcv114.

Fenton, J., and T. B. Kelly. 2017. "Risk is King and Needs to Take a Backseat!' Can Social Workers' Experiences of Moral Injury Strengthen Practice?" *Journal of Social Work Practice* 31 (4): 461–475. (doi:10.1080/02650533.2017.1394827.

Ferguson, H. 2016. "How Children Become Invisible in Child Protection Work: Findings from Research into Day-to-Day Social Work Practice." *British Journal of Social Work* 0: 1017.

Gibson, M. 2016. "Social Worker Shame: A Scoping Review." *British Journal of Social Work* 46 (2): 549–565. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcu140.

Hood, R., M. Brent, S. Abbott and D, Sartori. 2019. "A Study of Practitioner-Service User Relationships in Social Work." *British Journal of Social Work* 49: 787–805.

Jackson, R., B. Brady, C. Forkman, E. Tieney, and D. Kennan. 2020. "Influencing Policy and Practice for Young People in Foster Care: Learning from a Model of Collective Participation." *Children in Youth Services Review* 113: 1–11.

Kennan, D., B. Brady, and C. Forkan. 2018. "Supporting Children's Participation in Decision Making: A Systematic Literature Review Exploring the Effectiveness of Participatory Processes." *The British Journal of Social Work* 48 (7): 1985–2002. doi: 10.1093/bjsw/bcx142.

Kriz, K., and D. Roundtree-Swain. 2017. "We Are Merchandise on a Conveyor Belt": How Young Adults in the Public Child Protection System Perceive Their Participation in Decisions about Their Care." *Children and Youth Services Review* 78: 32–40. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2017.05.001.

Leeson, C. 2007. "My life in care: experiences of non-participation in decision making processes." *Child and Family Social Work*, 12: 268–277.

Merriam, S., B. Johnson-Bailey, J. Lee, M. Kee, Y. G. Ntseane, and Muhamad, M. 2001. "Power and Positionality: Negotiating Insider/Outsiders' Status Within and Across Cultures." *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 20 (5): 405–416. doi:10.1080/02601370120490.

Munro, E. 2001. *"Empowering Looked after Children."* *Child & Family Social Work* 6 (2): 129–137. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2206.2001.00192.x.

Munro, E. 2011. *The Munro Review of Child Protection: Final Report a Child-Centred System*. Accessed 18 July 2021. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175391/Munro-Review.pdf

O'Connor, L., and K. Leonard. 2014. "Decision Making in Children and Families Social Work: The Practitioner's Voice." *British Journal of Social Work* 44 (7): 1805–1822. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bct051.

Parton, N. 2014. "Social Work, Child Protection and Politics: Some Critical and Constructive Reflections." *British Journal of Social Work* 44 (7): 2042–2056. doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcu091.

Rogowski, S. 2011. "Managers, Managerialism and Social Work within Children and Families: The De-Formation of the Profession?" *Practice* 23 (3): 157–167. doi:10.1080/09503153.2011.569970.

Rogowski, S. 2021. "Neoliberalism, austerity and social work with children and families: challenges and critical/radical possibilities." *Critical and Radical Social Work*, 9(3): 353–367. https://doi.org/10.1332/204986021X16109919707738.

Ruch, G., D. Turney, and A. Ward. 2018. *Relationship-Based Social Work: Getting to the Heart of Practice*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Smith, J., A. Flowers, and M. Larkin. 2012. *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory Method and Research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Smith, J. A. and I. E. Nizza. 2022. *Essentials of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis*. Washington: American Psychological Association.

Social Work England. 2021. Professional Standards. Accessed 12 August 2021. https://www.socialworkengland.org.uk/standards/professional-standards/ ().

Teater, B. 2017. "Social Work Research and Its Relevance to Practise: "The Gap between Research and Practise Continues to Be Wide." *Journal of Social Service Research* 43 (5): 547–565. doi:10.1080/01488376.2017.1340393.

Unicef. 1994. United Nations Convention on the rights of the Child, Resolution A/RES/44/25. Accessed 19 March 2023. https://www.unicef.org.uk/what-we-do/un-convention-child-rights/

Tonimarie Benaton is a qualified and registered Social Worker with over 16 year of practice experience working with children and families within the areas of: Care Experienced Children and Young People (CECYP), Adoption and Fostering, Training and Education and as an Independent Reviewing Officer. Tonimarie moved into academia in 2016 initially with the University of Derby as a Senior Social Work Lecturer on the BA (Hons) Social Work Degree Program. She moved to Nottingham Trent University in 2022 as the Course Leader: Level 6 Integrated Social Worker Degree Apprenticeship BA (Hons) program. Tonimaire is a committee member for BASW (Notts/shire and Derby/shire) supporting the experience and training of Social Workers. Her research is within the areas of: Interprofessional learning and working, contested care for CECYP, the impact of placements on social work students, emotional resilience and understanding Ph.D. study as a dyslexic student through autoethnography. Her Doctoral study is focused on the arena of participation for CECYP and how Social Workers experience and perceive the voice of CECYP. Email: tonimarie.benaton@ntu.ac.uk