

## Digital social work

Pink, Sarah; Ferguson, Harry; Kelly, Laura

DOI:

[10.1177/14733250211003647](https://doi.org/10.1177/14733250211003647)

License:

None: All rights reserved

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Pink, S, Ferguson, H & Kelly, L 2021, 'Digital social work: conceptualising a hybrid anticipatory practice', *Qualitative Social Work*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14733250211003647>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## Qualitative Social Work

### **DIGITAL SOCIAL WORK: conceptualising a hybrid anticipatory practice**

Journal:	<i>Qualitative Social Work</i>
Manuscript ID	QSW-21-0010.R3
Manuscript Type:	Main Paper
Keywords:	Technology, Child protection, Visual methods, Digital social work, Digital intimacy, Covid-19 pandemic
Abstract:	<p>While the use of digital media and technologies has impacted social work for several years, the Covid-19 pandemic and need for physical distancing dramatically accelerated the systematic use of video calls and other digital practices to interact with service users. This article draws from our research into child protection to show how digital social work was used during the pandemic, critically analyse the policy responses, and make new concepts drawn from digital and design anthropology available to the profession to help it make sense of these developments. While policy responses downgraded digital practices to at best a last resort, we argue that the digital is now an inevitable and necessary element of social work practice, which must be understood as a hybrid practice that integrates digital practices such as video calls and face-to-face interactions. Moving forward, hybrid digital social work should be a future-ready element of practice, designed to accommodate uncertainties as they arise and sensitive to the improvisatory practice of social workers.</p>

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## DIGITAL SOCIAL WORK: conceptualising a hybrid anticipatory practice

### Abstract

While the use of digital media and technologies has impacted social work for several years, the Covid-19 pandemic and need for physical distancing dramatically accelerated the systematic use of video calls and other digital practices to interact with service users. This article draws from our research into child protection to show how digital social work was used during the pandemic, critically analyse the policy responses, and make new concepts drawn from digital and design anthropology available to the profession to help it make sense of these developments. While policy responses downgraded digital practices to at best a last resort, we argue that the digital is now an inevitable and necessary element of social work practice, which must be understood as a hybrid practice that integrates digital practices such as video calls and face-to-face interactions. Moving forward, hybrid digital social work should be a future-ready element of practice, designed to accommodate uncertainties as they arise and sensitive to the improvisatory practice of social workers.

**Keywords:** digital social work; trust; anxiety; digital intimacy; digital materiality; Covid-19 pandemic.

### Introduction

This article argues for greater attention to, and acknowledgement of, digital media and technologies in social work. Drawing on research into child protection, it critically analyses existing academic and policy references to ‘virtual social work’, which emerged in the United

1  
2  
3 Kingdom during the Covid-19 pandemic. It argues for a concept of ‘digital social work’ as a  
4 hybrid practice, understood as an inevitable and necessary element of social work practice.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Conventionally child protection social work has involved face-to-face practices of assessing  
11 children’s safety and risk in their homes. Social workers’ feelings of trust or anxiety that  
12 emerge from these intimate encounters are pivotal in their evaluations. Thus, social work is  
13 inevitably an anticipatory practice. There is a continual movement between professional  
14 categories and sensory engagement as social workers anticipate what could happen next, and  
15 put processes in place to mitigate both their anxieties and risks to children. During the Covid-  
16 19 pandemic, home visits created new risks and anxieties and child protection social work  
17 was improvised and performed in new ways using digital technologies and media. The ways  
18 social workers sensed trust and evaluated safety shifted correspondingly.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 This article has two purposes. First, to advance the concept of Digital Social Work as a  
34 hybrid form of social work practice, that incorporates and anticipates the physical, in-person  
35 home visit, rather than being separate to it. Second, to engage this concept to present the  
36 findings and implications of research into the use of digital technologies and media in child  
37 protection social work practice during the Covid-19 pandemic in the United Kingdom. Our  
38 approach builds on ethnographic-theoretical dialogues generated in digital anthropology  
39 (Horst and Miller, 2012) and digital ethnography (Pink et al., 2016a) to define the digital as  
40 never separate from either our material (i.e. physical) environment and objects or our social  
41 relations. We argue that, even when a social work visit takes place entirely through video  
42 calls, it is nevertheless deeply informed by what occurs in the physical world and everyday  
43 life . In contrast, the notion of the ‘virtual’, used to describe exclusively online encounters, is  
44 treated by leading social scientists, as ‘no longer helpful’ for understanding how the internet  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 is embedded in everyday life (Hine, 2015). Following these distinctions, we argue that the  
4 digital (rather than virtual) social work we witnessed in 2020 has had greater benefit and  
5 potential than is currently acknowledged. The UK Department of Education's  
6 conceptualisation of 'virtual' social work visits (Department for Education, 2021) does not  
7 account for or properly acknowledge the value of the new forms of social work – which  
8 flexibly combine in-person visits, video calls and other digital practices..  
9

10  
11 As we elaborate below, digital social work should be understood and developed as a hybrid,  
12 anticipatory and flexible practice. By 'hybrid' we mean that digital social work is both digital  
13 and physical simultaneously. By 'anticipatory' we refer to how social workers engaged with  
14 digital media and technologies while thinking ahead towards future in-person visits in  
15 relation to the safety or risk of the families they worked with. The real physical home visit  
16 was thought of and imagined as part of digital encounters. Moving forward, digital social  
17 work could be a future-ready element of practice, designed to flexibly accommodate  
18 uncertainties as they arise and sensitive to how social workers improvise as they navigate  
19 emerging possibilities.  
20  
21

22  
23 Digital technologies have 'crept in to' social work practice (Mishna et al., 2012) and brought  
24 new opportunities and challenges (Reamer, 2013). Recent academic discussion has generated  
25 valuable empirical contributions and policy implications concerning: social media and social  
26 work (Cooner et al., 2019; Megele and Buzzi, 2020); e-social work, including 'online  
27 research, patient treatment (individual therapy, group and community dynamics), training and  
28 teaching of social workers and the monitoring of social service programmes' (López Peláez  
29 and Marcuello-Servós, 2018: 801); digital technology use in standardising social work  
30 practice and limiting practitioner discretion (Philips, 2019); technology use of young people  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in care and involved with social services (Sen, 2016); social work students and practitioners'  
4 digital literacy (Turner, 2016; Taylor, 2017); future possibilities of digital therapeutics,  
5  
6 monitoring and communication in gerontological social work (Mois and Fortuna, 2020);  
7  
8 using digital technology in the reconfiguration of offices and mobile, 'agile' working (Disney  
9  
10 et al., 2019; Jeyashingham, 2020); and social workers' experiences of 'virtual social work'  
11  
12 during Covid-19 (Cook and Zschomler, 2020). Where it has engaged with theory, much of  
13  
14 this work has harnessed universal theoretical narratives, including Castells (2010) theory of  
15  
16 the network society (Sen, 2016, López Peláez & Marcuello-Servós, 2018; Megele and Buzzi,  
17  
18 2020), Bauman's (2003) argument that connectivity itself has become more important than  
19  
20 meaning transmission (Sen, 2016), Haraway's (1984) notion of the cyborg, and McLuhan's  
21  
22 (1964) idea that 'the medium is the message' (Mishna et al., 2012, Megele and Buzzi, 2020).  
23  
24 These developments however provide neither a unified approach, nor a mode of  
25  
26 understanding the experiential dimensions of practice. Castells, Bauman, Haraway and  
27  
28 McLuhan's theoretical perspectives are different from each other. Moreover, rather than  
29  
30 emerging from dialogues with first-hand empirical research they focus on sociological units  
31  
32 and processes or the representational and symbolic layers of culture. We argue that to  
33  
34 understand the evolving relationship between social work, and digital media and technology  
35  
36 we need to account for the specificities of how people improvise in their relationships with  
37  
38 media and technologies within the contingent circumstances of continually shifting everyday  
39  
40 life circumstances and experiences, and to harness concepts from digital anthropology and  
41  
42 media studies to achieve this. As Jeyashingham (2020: 239) suggests, in social work practice  
43  
44 'humans, software and machines are all entangled together in the social relations,  
45  
46 communication and sense-making that occur in contemporary work'. Additionally, we  
47  
48 propose digital social work is an emergent hybrid and anticipatory practice, in which  
49  
50 particular digital, material and social configurations are ongoingly reshaped through the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 anticipatory modes that characterise social work as it happens *in practice* and the regulatory  
4  
5 stances of social work *as a practice*.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Methodology**

11  
12 We draw on our qualitative longitudinal study of the impact of Covid-19 on social work,  
13  
14 child protection and families and in particular our question concerning: What innovative  
15  
16 digital methods are being adopted and how can they be most productively used during and  
17  
18 after the pandemic? Twenty-nine social workers, 10 social work managers and 9 family  
19  
20 support workers, all involved in child protection, from four local authority areas in England  
21  
22 were interviewed approximately every month during the Covid-19 pandemic between April  
23  
24 and December 2020. Forty-one were women and 7 men. 7 participants identified as BAME.  
25  
26 We undertook interviews remotely by video call using WhatsApp, FaceTime, Skype, Teams,  
27  
28 and Zoom. In previous research we have adopted ‘sensory ethnography’ involving the  
29  
30 researcher shadowing practitioners and families, observing practice on home visits and  
31  
32 elsewhere (Ferguson 2018). This was impossible since the pandemic made in-person research  
33  
34 encounters unsafe. However, by using ‘digital ethnography’ (Pink et al 2016a) we observed 4  
35  
36 social workers’ video-recorded online meetings with families, followed by a reflective  
37  
38 interview with each social worker. We interviewed 22 family members involved with the  
39  
40 same practitioners in our study. Our existing experiences of researching in-person social  
41  
42 work encounters (Ferguson 2018) and our layered encounters with social workers in our  
43  
44 ‘remote’ or ‘distance’ video-based research (Pink 2021) engendered collaborative and  
45  
46 empathetic learning and knowing with and about participants’ experiences. All interviews  
47  
48 were audio-recorded, transcribed and thematically analysed using NVivo 12 Plus. The study  
49  
50 was ethically approved by the participating universities and social work agencies.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Participants and research sites are anonymised, informed consent was required for all data  
4  
5 collection, and clear data storage and disposal procedures are in place.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **Digital Media and Technology and Social Work**

11  
12 Megele and Buzzi's (2020) important work reveals the complexities of the relationship  
13  
14 between social work and social media as it crosses public-personal and online-offline  
15  
16 contexts, and calls for further investigation. Growing interest in uses of digital and social  
17  
18 media and technology in social work with children and youth, has led researchers to argue  
19  
20 that dominant assumptions about how marginalised or vulnerable youth engage with digital  
21  
22 media are problematic in their focus on the negative and risk. Based on empirical research  
23  
24 with young people associated with the care system, Sen (2016) reports this group's uses of  
25  
26 digital media and technologies are similar to others of their age, albeit with lower access to  
27  
28 technology. Wong's research with Scottish and Hong Kong youth (2020: 1231, 1241) queries  
29  
30 depictions of 'hidden youth as self-isolated', to highlight positive elements of digital media in  
31  
32 mediating the connections of marginalised young people. Drawing on empirical evidence of  
33  
34 social workers using Facebook to investigate families, typically without their consent, Cooner  
35  
36 et al. (2019) show how using digital platforms can infringe human rights to privacy, while  
37  
38 also revealing risks to children. Philips (2019) auto-ethnographic work shows how  
39  
40 professional judgement and practices are increasingly framed by standardised digital tools  
41  
42 and technologies. This growing knowledge about how digital and social media and  
43  
44 technologies are emerging in the professional work of social workers and amongst groups of  
45  
46 young people cared for in child protection social work is shaping a critical agenda towards  
47  
48 recognising the potential of the digital in these contexts. This agenda broadly concurs (but  
49  
50 engages little) with an extensive body of ethnographic and qualitative research about social  
51  
52 media (e.g. Miller, 2016) and digital technologies (e.g. Fors et al., 2019) in adult and family  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 everyday life, in young people's and children's lives online (e.g. Livingstone and Sefton-  
4 Green, 2016), and about teenagers' hidden digital technology and media skills and practices  
5  
6 (Scolari, 2018).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 This context, where digital and social media are to varying degrees inextricable from, rather  
13 than separate to, the lives of both social workers and families is fundamental for  
14  
15 understanding how everyday realities and politics of digital technologies and media were  
16  
17 implicated in social work during the pandemic and beyond it. Media scholar Madianou  
18  
19 identifies the Covid-19 pandemic as a disaster beyond the 'presence of the pathogen itself',  
20  
21 revealing and causing 'underlying inequalities' and how its course is determined by 'social,  
22  
23 political, economic, environmental, and cultural factors' (Madianou, 2020: 1). She argues  
24  
25 that in the United Kingdom the lack of public scrutiny of the digital practices that emerged as  
26  
27 part of the public health response to Covid-19 'amplified' social inequalities in a context  
28  
29 where statistics reveal that 'virtually all (97%) privately schooled children had access to a  
30  
31 computer at home [while], one in five of those on free school meals—a common indicator  
32  
33 used to measure disadvantage in the United Kingdom—had no access' (Madianou, 2020: 2).  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 The Covid-19 pandemic accelerated uses of digital media and technologies in child  
41  
42 protection social work, raising such concerns both about social work itself and the young  
43  
44 people impacted by social inequalities, and who are most likely to be supported by child  
45  
46 protection social workers. Indeed such digital inequalities are impacting on communities  
47  
48 around the world and are constituted within global power relations (Lavalette et al. 2020).  
49  
50  
51

52  
53  
54 Golightly and Holloway (2020: 1297) emphasise the threat that social distancing restrictions  
55  
56 pose to the 'relationship-based skills' of traditional social work. Their comments articulate  
57  
58 some of the concerns of social workers we interviewed at the beginning of our study, in  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 describing '[h]ome visits using visors and other personal protection equipment; the  
4 prohibition of reassuring touch with fearful, distressed or confused individuals; online  
5 conferencing and meetings replacing more inclusive and potentially supportive multi-  
6 professional decision-making fora' as 'changes forced upon us which challenge our preferred  
7 modes of interaction' (ibid). Publications related to social work and child protection during  
8 Covid-19 commonly cite difficulties involved in shifting from the sensory intimacy of the  
9 home visit as a central pillar of child protection practice (Ferguson, 2011; Cook and  
10 Zschomler, 2020; Golightly and Holloway, 2020); multi-agency working, video calls and  
11 conferencing (Baginsky and Manthorpe, 2020); safeguarding young people at risk of  
12 exploitation (Racher and Brodie, 2020); effects on staff of working from home (Cook et al.,  
13 2020); and innovative and humane ways of working, online and in person, including 'e-  
14 mentoring' (Munro, 2020).

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Organisational policies and practices differed across our studied sites. Several social work  
34 organisations in our sample made WhatsApp available for use on organisation-issued mobile  
35 phones in the early weeks of the first national lockdown, which began on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2020.  
36 This allowed social workers to make video calls to families with suitable devices. Skype,  
37 Teams and Zoom were variously used for group meetings and conferences, and sometimes  
38 also to call families directly. While SMS text messaging is an established method of  
39 communication in social work (Mishna et al. 2012), our findings suggest the introduction of  
40 WhatsApp messaging sometimes encouraged richer, more informal and more reciprocal  
41 communication than text-based exchanges. Social workers shared examples of text messages,  
42 images and videos sent to keep in regular contact with them or to share children's significant  
43 events and achievements. However, the social workers in our study also emphasised how in  
44 online interactions they missed the sensory experience of being in service users' homes and  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 they searched for a new language to account for the modes of intimacy that participated in  
4 these assessments (Pink et al 2020: 29). This led to feelings of anxiety that they were unable  
5 to make accurate or reliable assessments of families and their homes without a home visit,  
6 and to feelings of distrust of service users when they were unable to view the wider context  
7 of who was in the home, or feel and sense what it was like to live in on a video call.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Cook and Zschomler's (2020: 4-5) research highlights 'virtual home visits' as missing the  
18 sensory and atmospheric elements of the in-person visit, questions of confidentiality, safety,  
19 establishing relationships with new service users and digital exclusion. They also note  
20 advantages whereby social workers became more available to families through shorter but  
21 more frequent video calls with them, in place of travelling for home visits, and that some  
22 younger people preferred this less invasive mode of communicating (Cook and Zschomler,  
23 2020: 3-4). The first stage of our fieldwork revealed how social workers had started to  
24 create 'the sense of intimacy required to support their practice digitally' (Pink et al 2020: 28)  
25 involving generating new modes of closeness, ways of sensing, understanding, care,  
26 responsiveness and support through video calls, as social workers and families improvised  
27 during an incremental process of learning how to do social work with digital technologies  
28 and media. Despite their reservations, some social workers and local authorities worked to  
29 counter digital exclusion by providing devices and broadband costs and to create new ways  
30 of being close to service users using digital technologies and media, and to know when to  
31 respond to a risk assessment by visiting wearing Personal Protective Equipment (PPE).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 As our nine months of fieldwork progressed, the relationship between video calls and in-  
55 person visits became increasingly blurred, as some social workers recognised some 'face-to-  
56 face' elements in video calls, or made video calls in combination with in-person visits. We  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and social workers themselves started to ask if digital home visits and online conferencing  
4 are necessarily or always less inclusive, reassuring or untrustworthy than face-to-face social  
5 work visits and meetings. The answer is contingent (ie it depends), since in a world where  
6 there is a digital element to almost everything we do, even when it remains unapparent to us,  
7 digital social work can be differently, rather than less, reassuring and effective than its face-  
8 to-face counterpart. We saw new feelings of familiarity, trust and confidence emerge for  
9 some social workers and families. While this does not suggest that face-to-face social work  
10 should be replaced by digital alternatives, it renders the UK Government's dismissal of video  
11 calls and digital visits as only a last resort deeply problematic:  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 During periods of national lockdown, the use of virtual visits should be the exception  
27 and can be used as a result of public health advice or when it is not reasonably  
28 practicable to have a face-to-face visit otherwise for a reason relating to the incidence  
29 or transmission of coronavirus (COVID-19) (Department for Education, 2021)  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Such a stance does not acknowledge the possibilities offered by digital social work as a  
39 hybrid, rather than virtual, practice.  
40  
41  
42  
43

### 44 **Conceptualising Digital Social Work**

45  
46 The theoretical foundations of our approach lie in: phenomenological (Ingold, 2000), design  
47 (Smith and Otto, 2016) and futures anthropology (Pink and Salazar, 2017) which examine  
48 how people experience, sense, learn and improvise in the contingent circumstances of a  
49 continually emerging world; and media phenomenology, where 'by finding new ways to do  
50 things... the contingency of our being-in-the-world is revealed and new ways of being are  
51 made real' (Markham, 2020: 3). This approach sees media and technologies as an inevitable  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 part of continually changing everyday environments, and helps to understanding of what  
4 occurred as social workers and families began to engage digitally during Covid-19.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Design anthropological concepts of trust and anxiety explain how we experience and act in  
11 relation to our feelings concerning immediate or short-term futures. Existing research  
12 suggests we trust when we create or find ourselves in circumstances in which we feel familiar  
13 and confident, often generated through everyday routines (Pink et al., 2018). Concurring with  
14 critiques of transactional or interactional notions of trust (Corsin, 2011) we understand trust  
15 and anxiety as emerging from our wider social, sensory and material circumstances. Thus,  
16 feelings of anxiety surface in moments of crisis, when that sense of confidence cannot be  
17 experienced and where uncertainties cannot be relieved through routine actions. Here we  
18 engage these experiential concepts to express the anticipatory modes of the sensory and  
19 embodied dimensions of home visits identified by Ferguson (2018), including those  
20 undertaken digitally. We examine how social workers' experiences of trust and anxiety were  
21 related to their perceptions of safety and risk.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 To understand the context of these anticipatory experiences we conceptualise home visits as  
41 involving 'digital materiality', whereby the idea of anything being purely digital, physical or  
42 face-to-face is redundant (Pink et al., 2016b). The concept of digital materiality expresses  
43 contemporary times where the digital is integral to how our everyday environments and  
44 social relations emerge and change. Social work practice likewise, in using digital  
45 technologies and media, is always constituted as a digital materiality. An actual or possible  
46 future home visit, for instance – whether undertaken in-person or digitally - is always made  
47 sense of in terms of prior experiences of being physically or digitally present in homes. Thus,  
48 we understand the anticipatory feelings – of trust and anxiety - through which social workers  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 experienced digital social work as pivotal to how this digital materiality and the social  
4  
5 relations associated with it are constituted.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **Digital Intimacy, Safety and Trust**

11  
12 Above we emphasised the intimacy of face-to-face home visits. In media studies the concept  
13  
14 of ‘digital intimacy’ refers to modes of intimacy generated through digital social media apps  
15  
16 and platforms - ranging from public displays of intimacy including webcamming and  
17  
18 youtubers, to private intimacies generated or maintained through commercial platforms,  
19  
20 including texting and sexting (Andreassen et al., 2017; Dobson et al., 2018). Digital intimacy  
21  
22 is constituted within technologically saturated circumstances and practices of everyday life,  
23  
24 where people share what is important to them (Pink and Leder Mackley, 2013). Evidence of  
25  
26 such digital intimacies in digital social work emerged from the outset of the pandemic as one  
27  
28 social worker described her experience of an early video call where she performed what  
29  
30 Ferguson (2011) calls ‘intimate child protection practice’; as she put it, ‘when the young  
31  
32 man, it is hard not to say his name actually ... it feels so personal that you should be  
33  
34 discussing his name but that’s weird’. Other examples included detailed accounts of how  
35  
36 workers interacted with babies through the screen and felt rapport and an intimate connection  
37  
38 was built (Pink, et al, 2020). Sometimes digital intimacy was seen as more beneficial than in-  
39  
40 person visits wearing a mask and other PPE. As a social worker expressed it: “I would rather  
41  
42 have a difficult conversation with somebody over video link ... so that they can at least see  
43  
44 my whole face, rather than going in to the home and having what I would normally always  
45  
46 want to do in person because like half of my face would have to be covered”. Such situations  
47  
48 show how digital intimacies were generated, and that they created meaningful and beneficial  
49  
50 outcomes for families. These insights indicate how social work practice might employ digital  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 intimacies in the future by building on the possibilities they offer for engaging with service  
4  
5 users' through a hybrid approach.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Our later findings after several months of the pandemic confirmed how digital intimacy  
11  
12 enabled social workers to sense relationships of trust that assured them that the families were  
13  
14 safe. Social workers commented on how sometimes video calls were a preferred mode of  
15  
16 communication, even if this did not include all members of the same family. Thus, we can  
17  
18 understand digital intimacy as emerging within an ecology of video calls and in-person  
19  
20 relations. While family members who agreed to participate in our study do not represent all  
21  
22 service users, the positive experiences of (hybrid) social work involvement some had, that  
23  
24 included video calls, WhatsApp messaging, texting and email make the benefits clear.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Sometimes the modes of digital intimacy generated were beneficial to and even preferred by  
32  
33 social workers and families. As one mother put it, before she met her social worker in person:  
34  
35 "It definitely helped. ... In some ways it might have been better? I am a bit of a crier". Even  
36  
37 when expressing reservations concerning not being there in person, social workers often  
38  
39 identified successful video call relationships with parents. For instance, three of the video  
40  
41 calls social workers recorded for us involved women social workers talking one-to-one with  
42  
43 mothers for extended periods. It was striking to witness the degree to which the mothers  
44  
45 engaged with the calls as a platform on which to report in detail about their own experiences,  
46  
47 feelings, their children and their relationships with other family members. They described the  
48  
49 intricacies of different emotions, relationships and incidents with fathers, relatives, schools  
50  
51 and so on, as they sought to address issues they were working on with the social workers.  
52  
53  
54 These deeply socially situated and intimate modes of storying experience, revealed video  
55  
56 calls as potential safe spaces and sites of trust, a finding that resonates with reports of  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 successful online psychotherapy and counselling during the pandemic (Simpson et al., 2020).

4  
5 In each of these cases the social workers felt confident that the mothers were not seeking to  
6  
7 conceal anything.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 For example, Margaret is a Black and Asian Minority Ethnicity (BAME) social worker, and  
13  
14 thus more vulnerable to the virus herself. She was anxious about undertaking in-person visits  
15  
16 and had mainly used WhatsApp with families and young people and had Microsoft Teams for  
17  
18 meetings. During the pandemic, she worked from home or in a private room at work to  
19  
20 undertake video calls. Margaret formed part of the team working with Susan, her two  
21  
22 younger children, and her late teenaged son who had become violent at home, and was  
23  
24 subsequently moved to a foster home. The trust between Susan and Margaret was evident  
25  
26 during the recorded call as Margaret guided Susan in a discussion where she considered her  
27  
28 priorities and feelings, as her case would soon be closed. Margaret described how she would  
29  
30 know if Susan was anxious during a video call, as she would be “looking back a lot”, say her  
31  
32 son was coming downstairs, or become quiet. Margaret felt that the one-to-one support Susan  
33  
34 had accessed through texting and video calls had benefitted her by building her confidence  
35  
36 and empowering her through solution-focused questions. When we interviewed Susan  
37  
38 (separately from Margaret) she said “I had to voice it” during the call, meaning openly  
39  
40 express her experience and feelings. The circumstances of intimacy and trust created by the  
41  
42 video call meant she could surface what she felt. Yet, we emphasise that the process involved  
43  
44 was a hybrid mode of digital social work, Susan also had in person meetings at home and  
45  
46 phone calls with another social worker, and phone calls with an organisation providing  
47  
48 support around domestic abuse. In one instance she felt that an in-person visit was crucial  
49  
50 since, in her words:  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Maybe things wouldn't have gone in the right direction if the social worker hadn't  
4  
5 been here. When my son was kicking off I couldn't just quickly get the phone. She  
6  
7 was here and he was kicking off and I was pleased it made her realise the situation.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Another video shared with us, of a social worker's conversation with a young couple and a  
13  
14 newborn baby was similarly intimate, as the couple discussed with her how they were going  
15  
16 about navigating their relationships with family members who were associated with cases of  
17  
18 abuse. A series of in-person visits took place before the pandemic and after lockdown in  
19  
20 March 2020 the social work team had determined that video would be suitable, as the risk  
21  
22 was manageable and this would protect the family from coronavirus. As national restrictions  
23  
24 relaxed, national guidance for social work organisations encouraged visiting in-person even  
25  
26 more strongly, with local services soon following. From 21<sup>st</sup> July 2020, it was advised that:  
27  
28 '[w]e expect social workers to make face to face visits wherever possible' (Department for  
29  
30 Education, 2020). However, some social workers became more skilled at judging where  
31  
32 video calls were beneficial, and where there were risks:  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 some families who we know are sometimes quite deceiving will use that to their  
41  
42 advantage whereas the families that we did video with we did trust them; we knew  
43  
44 and we would ask and we could be really quite forthcoming with what we wanted,  
45  
46 and that was great, but some families will just refuse as you probably can imagine.  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 It should also be stressed that a hybrid approach did work effectively with some families who  
52  
53 were reluctant to be involved with social workers. With respect to working directly with  
54  
55 children, social workers were often apprehensive about using video calls and were offered  
56  
57 little in terms of training from their employers. They reported mixed experiences: younger  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 children sometimes communicated successfully with social workers on video calls, but also  
4  
5 sometimes did not engage or ended calls abruptly when they lost interest. Social workers  
6  
7 reported more successful calls with older children, as the following put it during the first  
8  
9 lockdown:  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 the teenagers that I work with have been much more chatty on the phone like on the  
15  
16 video calls rather than in person and I don't know whether that is to do with the  
17  
18 importance of social media in their lives or it maybe feels like it is less invasive than  
19  
20 a social worker coming in to your home with a badge on ... it has been more  
21  
22 difficult for younger children ... in terms of building those relationships and  
23  
24 maintaining them quite often, especially with kids three or four years old it is a case  
25  
26 of they will grab the phone off Mum and then they will put it on the sofa and go and  
27  
28 play and forget that I am there.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Some social workers continued using video calls with certain children and families when  
36  
37 national restrictions were relaxed and in-person visiting was expected by managers. This was  
38  
39 usually when there were specific concerns about risk of infection or when the social worker  
40  
41 or family were clinically vulnerable. Video calls – when judged to be appropriate – were also  
42  
43 used to enable more regular visits to children in a different geographical area, or occasionally  
44  
45 when a strong preference was expressed by a family member. One social worker continued to  
46  
47 video call a young person anxious about infection risk for several months after she had  
48  
49 resumed in-person visiting for most of her caseload. In September 2020, some six months  
50  
51 into the pandemic, she described how her next visit would entail seeing him in person for the  
52  
53 first time. In the meantime, however she felt video calls had been beneficial:  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the video calls have been working quite well for him, so he's 14 and it's actually  
4 opened up our communication a little bit I feel, so he's actually kind of initiated video  
5 calling me sometimes when something happens in terms of, just like he got a new  
6 kitten and he wanted to show me and that's been quite nice.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 Thus, when video calls become part of the routines of contact and support between social  
16 workers and families, they can create alternative sites for feelings and relationships of trust,  
17 which are differently, rather than always less, valuable than traditional social work  
18 encounters. Video calls can offer family members, including older children with independent  
19 access to mobile phones, more control in the establishment of relationships with social  
20 workers, as they can be refused or rescheduled more easily than in-person visits. Similarly  
21 Munro (2020: 181) comments on the ways professionals kept in touch with young people  
22 during Covid-19 who were in or leaving care, through professional meetings and case  
23 conference held via video calls, concluding that 'in some circumstances, remote meetings  
24 have shifted the balance of power between young people and professionals and given the  
25 former a greater sense of control over their participation in meetings, thus facilitating their  
26 engagement'. As discussed in the next section, this renegotiation of power dynamics can raise  
27 anxieties for social workers in some cases, however when effective it offers children and  
28 families opportunities to experience social work at a time and in a place that best meets their  
29 needs, which in turn can support the generation of trust.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 **Hybrid digital social work, anxiety and risk**

52 Social workers were anxious that by using video calls alone they would not be able to sense  
53 risks to children's safety. Significantly however, the digital home visit was not usually  
54 undertaken in isolation from previous, or hoped for future, in-person visits. Rather it was part  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of the anticipatory practice of hybrid social work: even when a whole case was undertaken  
4 using video calls, it was unavoidably understood and spoken of in relation to the possibility  
5 of an in person visit – for instance, if the risk to the children’s safety was considered  
6 significant, if the social worker did not sufficiently trust in the digital visit, or as continuing  
7 care once the restrictions eased. This meant that the during the pandemic trajectories of social  
8 work practice were improvised to integrate digital and face-to-face encounters relationally  
9 and were played out in the context of what we have above called ‘digital materiality’  
10 whereby social work was a *hybrid practice*.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 For example, one social worker described how she had initially undertaken a home visit, and  
25 had not been sure if a second one would be needed in order to ensure that a mother of an  
26 eighteen-month child was keeping her apartment in order and caring for the child. However  
27 once she had undertaken the next visit as a video call, she felt confident that she would not  
28 need to visit in person on that occasion. In another example a social worker commented how:  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 it is probably better to ... mix the doorstep with the WhatsApp because at least on  
39 WhatsApp or Zoom you can do an activity with them .... But a lot depends on  
40 whether the parents have got the [digital] medium because a lot of parents ... still have  
41 pay as you go phones, so they don’t often have data credit.... I had one family where I  
42 did a window visit so I drove out and saw the little boy through the window with his  
43 Mum and then the last visit I did and that was right at the beginning of lockdown or  
44 just as lockdown was happening, and then I did the next visit via WhatsApp.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

56 Our research suggests that combining the digital and in-person was significant to how social  
57 workers managed their anxieties and risks to families and themselves. It was important for  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the social workers to be able to gather sensory knowledge and physical evidence that the  
4 homes they visited were safe. Being unable to do so created anxiety for them, and their  
5 descriptions of digital home visits emphasised when they felt unsure they had the knowledge  
6 required for an assessment. For example, social workers described how on video calls they  
7 could not sense the smell of a home, see someone with anorexia properly, or to know if a  
8 partner responsible for domestic violence was hiding in a bedroom. These and similar  
9 anxieties made in-person home visits a necessary element of child protection. However,  
10 during the Covid-19 pandemic, video calls, messaging and texting were used in relation to  
11 rather than instead of home visits, as part of a hybrid practice. The anxieties sensed in  
12 practice and the risks formally associated with such cases were often navigated through  
13 modes of sensing and evidence gathering that correspond with our definition of hybrid digital  
14 social work, whereby certain elements of cases were undertaken in person and others with  
15 video calls. This constituted a context where the social workers and families were able to go  
16 forward with their case in such a way that incorporated both modes of anticipatory and hybrid  
17 practice where they could best be used.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 For Alice, a recently qualified social worker, social media was part of her life and  
41 “facetiming or video calling with friends” or family in Europe, was “second nature”. During  
42 our research Alice began undertaking video calls from home and discussed with us her work  
43 with a couple who agreed to be video recorded for our research, with a newborn baby, and a  
44 history of domestic violence and abuse relating to members of their respective families.  
45 Social work with this family combined video calls and in person visits in a number of ways.  
46 A parenting assessment was undertaken in-person by another worker with the parents during  
47 the pregnancy until lockdown. Once the baby was born, social workers undertook doorstep  
48 visits and video calls for the first months, followed by further face-to-face parenting  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 assessment visits. Alice explained the process and her concerns, showing how the digital  
4  
5 visits were always part of a trajectory that included doorstep or in-home visits:  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 We have done doorstep visits but not enough to be able to see baby, see his  
11 environment, go into the house. Yes, we've done videocalls and, you know,  
12 videocalls are really good but a videocall can only give you a certain view of what is  
13 happening in a particular home and it is completely controlled by the person on the  
14 phone. So that was our biggest worry so now what the parenting assessor has stated is  
15 that in order for her to, because it was a positive assessment, in order for her to  
16 continue with the parenting assessment and just say, you know, it is an overall  
17 positive assessment she needs to see the child, so what we've done is we've planned  
18 to do ... weekly visits for six weeks until the review conference.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Here, while digital visits were viewed as less immersive than in person visits, they played a  
34 specific role. Video calls also participated in how families and social workers anticipate and  
35 experience safety and were used to dissipate anxieties and to avoid risk.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Susan, a service user introduced above, already used WhatsApp to call her children when  
43 they were at their dad's and her partner when he was away. The social worker, Margaret's,  
44 work with Susan began using WhatsApp video calls, and moved to face-to-face meetings  
45 once lockdown restrictions were lifted. After initial video calls, the younger children had got  
46 to know Margaret by going for walks with her once the restrictions were partially lifted, and  
47 had continued on video calls later. Susan valued a social worker's in-person visit which had  
48 witnessed the violence, but video calls had also enabled her own safety. She described how  
49 she had improvised, using her car outside her home to call the social workers, "to talk in  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 private. If my son heard me talking about him, he'd have been down and you know  
4 [shouting]". She told us "When things were quite bad, I had to go and sit in my car. I had to  
5 sit in the boot of the car because the charger in the front didn't work [because her phone ran  
6 out of charge quickly]. ...It's lucky that I've got credit and wifi".  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 Susan also described a multi-agency meeting she attended via video call, while her son was  
15 in a foster placement, having weighed up the possibility of attending as follows:  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 First of all I wanted to go there. Then I cancelled it. I thought it is going to be easier  
22 like this [digitally]. It takes away a lot of anxiety. He might want to come home. If he  
23 has an outburst the police could end up being called. It removes that element. When  
24 he was crying and upset I wasn't there for him. But then if I had been there, it  
25 probably would have made things so much worse. ... I do think from a safety aspect,  
26 it was safer. .... When he's stressed and gets anxious, he can say the worst things you  
27 can ever hear. I'd say it was a positive having the meeting online.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Margaret recounted how when the young man had become 'irate' and verbally abusive at this  
41 meeting, she had decided to leave. Later the team asked her to re-join because the young  
42 man, who was physically present with his foster carers and another social worker, wanted to  
43 apologise to her. After the apology, she followed up asking him to work on his self-  
44 management in such situations. Here, Margaret, the social worker agreed that the call had  
45 been easier to leave and safer, and that if she had been present physically she would have left  
46 earlier and suggested re-booking the meeting. Susan, the mother, also agreed that even in a  
47 non-Covid-19 situation, in such circumstances a video call would be better.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 It is important to understand digital social work as hybrid and always involving anticipatory  
4 practice which engages the experience, possibility, potential or imaginary of undertaking an  
5 in-person home visit. When this is acknowledged we can better understand the successes,  
6 benefits and possible enduring legacy of digital social work. We have shown how  
7 participants improvised to accrue the benefits offered by digital social work in which physical  
8 presence was always implicated. These and many other examples from our research set the  
9 ground for the development of guidelines and training to support social workers in setting up  
10 and conducting hybrid meetings where participants might variably be together in-person with  
11 others attending digitally.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 **Digital social work as an applied concept**

27  
28 Writing before the Covid-19 pandemic struck, Taylor (2017) identified significant gaps in  
29 social workers' digital literacy and awareness relating to ethical boundaries and relationships  
30 on digital platforms. She argued that 'social work should pause to consider 'digital  
31 knowledge gaps' before rushing to drive technology enhanced practice methods forward'  
32 (Taylor, 2017: 869). The spread of Covid-19 immediately brought horrendous risks that made  
33 such a pause inconceivable, and accelerated the use of digital practice methods. We have  
34 drawn on empirical findings to show how digital social work was practiced during the  
35 pandemic, to critically analyse those methods and the policy responses, and to make new  
36 concepts available to the profession to help it make sense of these developments and the  
37 emerging nature of digital social work. Our central argument is that social work has emerged  
38 from this pandemic as a hybrid practice that integrates digital practices – such as home visits  
39 through video calls, WhatsApp messaging, texting, email – and face-to-face in-person  
40 interactions. We have introduced the concepts of 'digital materiality' and 'digital intimacy' to  
41 show how these were integral to the generation of social workers' feelings of trust and  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 anxiety, as they anticipated and evaluated safety and risks during the uncertainties of Covid-  
4  
5 19, and subsequently shaped successful digital child protection social work practice. While  
6  
7 our focus has been on child protection, our argument for promoting a hybrid, material and  
8  
9 flexible digital social work practice is relevant to all fields of practice.  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 Digital social work cannot replace the in-person home visit. However, we argue that a home  
15  
16 visit can never be exclusively ‘virtual’ – neither theoretically nor empirically. Rather than  
17  
18 seeing the in-person visit as always being a more inclusive and ‘better’ option, it is better  
19  
20 situated as a reference point around which to weave the qualities and possibilities afforded by  
21  
22 digital visits. We have shown practical evidence of an anticipatory hybrid digital social work  
23  
24 practice, where both face-to-face and digital visits are possibilities and can be effective, and  
25  
26 demonstrated how our argument is supported by established social science concepts and  
27  
28 theory. Social workers improvised within the ongoingly emergent, highly contingent  
29  
30 circumstances of the Covid-19 pandemic to work confidently, in response to perceived risks.  
31  
32 The sensory and anticipatory experiences of trust and anxiety were mobilised in a hybrid  
33  
34 digital social work in ways that could be as effective as they were in face-to-face practice.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 It is a mistake to ask if digital technology provided a solution to social work practice during  
43  
44 the pandemic, and to subsequently analyse where ‘virtual social work’ has failed. Doing so  
45  
46 simply ascribes to what Morozov (2013) has identified as technological solutionism – the  
47  
48 mistaken assumption that technologically driven change will solve societal and individual  
49  
50 problems. We must be aware of the politics of solutionist uses of new technology, their  
51  
52 tendency to obscure the rise of digital capitalism and the need to ‘collectively reimagine the  
53  
54 future after the pandemic’ (Madianou, 2020: 4). Social work is no exception. We should learn  
55  
56 from the creative and improvisatory modes of engagement with technology demonstrated by  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 social workers, children and families during the pandemic and through the concepts we have  
4 engaged to surface and understand their success. These insights can be effectively mobilised  
5  
6 to shape a framework for an adaptable digital social work practice and training that will  
7  
8 enable social workers to better evaluate when and how digital technologies and media will  
9  
10 best support their practice and judgments. Such a framework would both benefit social  
11  
12 workers and families in the present digital environments of everyday life and should be  
13  
14 future-proofed for rapid responses to as yet unknown situations of disaster, like pandemics.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 **Acknowledgements**

22  
23 The research this article is based on was funded by the Economic and Social Research  
24 Council, Grant Number ES/V003798/1. We are deeply grateful to the local authorities,  
25  
26 managers, social workers, family support workers and families for their generosity in  
27  
28 allowing us to research their experiences.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

### 37 **References**

- 38  
39 Andreassen R, Nebeling Petersen M, Harrison K et al. (eds) (2017) *Mediated Intimacies:  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60* *Connectivities, Relationalities and Proximities*. United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis.
- Baginsky M & Manthorpe J (2020) *Managing through COVID-19: the experiences of  
children's social care in 15 English local authorities*. London: NIHR Policy Research  
Unit in Health and Social Care Workforce, The Policy Institute, King's College  
London.
- Bauman Z (2003) *Liquid Love: On the Frailty of Human Bonds*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Castells M (2010) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

- 1  
2  
3 Cook LL and Zschomler D (2020) Virtual home visits during the COVID-19 pandemic:  
4  
5 Social workers' perspectives. *Practice* 32(5): 401–408.  
6  
7  
8 Cook LL, Zschomler D, Biggart L and Carder S (2020) The team as a secure base revisited:  
9  
10 Remote working and resilience among child and family social workers during Covid-  
11  
12 19. *Journal of Children's Services* 15(4): 259–266.  
13  
14  
15 Cooner TS, Beddoe E, Ferguson H and Joy E (2019) The use of Facebook in social work practice  
16  
17 with children and families: Exploring complexity in an emerging practice. *Journal of*  
18  
19 *Technology in Human Services* 38(2): 137–158.  
20  
21  
22 Corsin Jimenez A (2011) Trust in anthropology. *Anthropological Theory* 11(2): 177–196.  
23  
24 Department for Education (2020) Safe working in education, childcare and children's social  
25  
26 care. Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/safe-working-in-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care-settings-including-the-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-ppe)  
27  
28 [education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care/safe-working-in-education-childcare-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care-settings-including-the-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-ppe)  
29  
30 [and-childrens-social-care-settings-including-the-use-of-personal-protective-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care-settings-including-the-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-ppe)  
31  
32 [equipment-ppe](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care/safe-working-in-education-childcare-and-childrens-social-care-settings-including-the-use-of-personal-protective-equipment-ppe) (accessed 28 August 2020).  
33  
34  
35 Department for Education (2021) Coronavirus (COVID-19): guidance for children's social  
36  
37 care services. Available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-childrens-social-care-services/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-local-authorities-on-childrens-social-care#virtual-visits---local-authorities)  
38  
39 [covid-19-guidance-for-childrens-social-care-services/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-childrens-social-care-services/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-local-authorities-on-childrens-social-care#virtual-visits---local-authorities)  
40  
41 [for-local-authorities-on-childrens-social-care#virtual-visits---](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-childrens-social-care-services/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-local-authorities-on-childrens-social-care#virtual-visits---local-authorities)  
42  
43 [local-authorities](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-childrens-social-care-services/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-for-local-authorities-on-childrens-social-care#virtual-visits---local-authorities)  
44  
45 (accessed 8 January 2021).  
46  
47  
48 Disney T, Ferguson H, Warwick L, Leigh J, Cooner TS and Beddoe L (2019) 'Isn't it funny  
49  
50 the children that are further away we don't think about as much?': Using GPS to  
51  
52 explore the Mobilities and Geographies of Social Work and Child Protection Practice.  
53  
54 *Children and Youth Services Review* 100: 39–49.  
55  
56  
57 Dobson AS, Carah, N and Robards B (2018) Digital intimate publics and social media:  
58  
59 Towards theorising public lives on private platforms. In: Dobson AS, Robards B  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Carah, N (eds) *Digital Intimate Publics and Social Media*. Cham: Palgrave  
4  
5 Macmillan, pp.3-27.  
6  
7  
8 Ferguson H (2011) *Child Protection Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.  
9  
10 Ferguson H (2018) Making home visits: Creativity and the embodied practices of home  
11  
12 visiting in social work and child protection. *Qualitative Social Work* 17(1): 65–80.  
13  
14 Fors V, Pink, S, Berg M et al. (2019) *Imagining Personal Data*. Oxford: Routledge.  
15  
16  
17 Golightly M and Holloway M (2020) Editorial: Unprecedented times? Social work and  
18  
19 society post-COVID-19. *British Journal of Social Work* 50(5): 1297–1303.  
20  
21 Haraway D (1984) *A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology and Socialist-feminism in the*  
22  
23 *Late Twentieth Century*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.  
24  
25  
26 Hine C (2015) *Ethnography for the Internet: Embedded, Embodied and Everyday*. London:  
27  
28 Bloomsbury.  
29  
30  
31 Horst HA and Miller D (eds) (2012) *Digital Anthropology*. London: Bloomsbury.  
32  
33  
34 Ingold T (2000) *The Perception of the Environment*. London: Routledge.  
35  
36 Jeyashingham D (2020) Entanglements with offices, information systems, laptops and  
37  
38 phones: How agile working is influencing social workers' interactions with each other  
39  
40 and with families. *Qualitative Social Work* 19(3): 337–358.  
41  
42  
43 Lavalette M, Ioakimidis V and Ferguson I (eds) (2020) *Social Work and the COVID-19*  
44  
45 *Pandemic: International Insights*. Bristol: Policy Press.  
46  
47  
48 Livingstone S and Sefton-Green J (2016) *The Class: Living and Learning in the Digital Age*. New  
49  
50 York: NYU Press.  
51  
52 López Peláez A and Marcuello-Servós C (2018) e-Social work and digital society: re-  
53  
54 conceptualizing approaches, practices and technologies. *European Journal of Social*  
55  
56 *Work*, 21(6): 801–803.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 McLuhan M (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Cambridge, MA: MIT  
4  
5 Press.  
6  
7  
8 Madianou M (2020) A second-order disaster? Digital technologies during the COVID-19  
9  
10 pandemic. *Social Media + Society* July-September: 1–5.  
11  
12  
13 Markham T (2020) *Digital Life*. Cambridge: Polity.  
14  
15 Megele C and Buzzi P (2020) *Social Media and Social Work: Implications and Opportunities*  
16  
17 *for Practice*. Bristol University Press: Policy Press.  
18  
19  
20 Miller D (2016) *Social Media in an English Village*. London: UCL Press.  
21  
22 Mishna F, Bogo M, Root J et al. (2012) ‘It just crept in’: The digital Age and implications for  
23  
24 social work practice. *Clinical Social Work Journal* 40: 277–286.  
25  
26  
27 Mois G and Fortuna KL (2020) Visioning the future of gerontological digital social  
28  
29 work. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work* 63(5): 412–427.  
30  
31  
32 Morozov E (2013) *To Save Everything, Click Here: Technology, Solutionism, and the Urge*  
33  
34 *to Fix Problems that Don’t Exist*. London: Penguin Books.  
35  
36  
37 Munro E (2020) Promoting the welfare, protection and care of children during the  
38  
39 coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. *Journal of Children’s Services* 15(4): 177–184.  
40  
41  
42 Philips, CR (2019) The computer social worker: Regulatory practices, regulated bodies and  
43  
44 science. *Qualitative Social Work* 18(3): 443–457.  
45  
46  
47 Pink S, Ardevol E and Lanzeni D (eds) (2016b) *Digital Materialities*. Oxford: Bloomsbury.  
48  
49  
50 Pink S, Horst H, Postill J et al. (2016a) *Digital Ethnography*. London: Sage.  
51  
52  
53 Pink S, Lanzeni D and Horst H (2018) Data anxieties: Finding trust and hope in digital mess.  
54  
55 *Big Data and Society* 5(1) DOI: 10.1177/2053951718756685.  
56  
57  
58 Pink S and Leder Mackley K (2013) Saturated and situated: Rethinking media in everyday  
59  
60 life. *Media, Culture and Society* 35(6): 677–691.

- 1  
2  
3 Pink S and J. F. Salazar (2017) Anthropologies and futures: Setting the agenda. In Salazar J,  
4  
5 Pink S, Irving A and Sjoberg J (eds) *Anthropologies and Futures*. Oxford:  
6  
7 Bloomsbury.  
8  
9  
10 Pink, S, Ferguson, H. and Kelly, L, (2020) Child Protection Social Work. In COVID-19:  
11  
12 reflections on home visits and digital intimacy. *Anthropology in Action* 23(3).  
13  
14 Racher A and Brodie I (2020) Joining the dots? Tackling child exploitation during Covid-19.  
15  
16 *Journal of Children's Services*. 15(4): 275–285.  
17  
18  
19 Reamer FG (2013) Social work in a digital age: Ethical and risk management  
20  
21 challenges. *Social Work* 58(2): 163–172.  
22  
23  
24 Scolari CA (2018) *Teens, Media and Collaborative Cultures: Exploiting Teens' Transmedia*  
25  
26 *Skills in the Classroom*. Barcelona: Universitat Pompeu Fabra.  
27  
28  
29 Sen RN (2016) Not all that is solid melts into air? Care-experienced young people, friendship  
30  
31 and relationships in the 'digital age'. *British Journal of Social Work* 46(4): 1059-  
32  
33 1075.  
34  
35  
36 Simpson S, Richardson L, Pietrabissa G et al. (2020) Videotherapy and therapeutic alliance  
37  
38 in the age of COVID-19. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*. Epub ahead of  
39  
40 print 10 October 2020. DOI: 10.1002/cpp.2521.  
41  
42  
43 Smith RC and Otto T (2016) Cultures of the future: Emergence and intervention in design  
44  
45 anthropology. In: Smith RC, Vangkilde KT, Kjærsgaard MG, Otto T, Halse J, and  
46  
47 Binder T (eds) *Design Anthropological Futures*. London: Bloomsbury Academic,  
48  
49 pp.19-36.  
50  
51  
52 Taylor A (2017) Social work and digitalisation: Bridging the knowledge gaps. *Social Work*  
53  
54 *Education*. 36(8): 869–879.  
55  
56  
57 Turner D (2016) 'Only connect': Unifying the social in social work and social media. *Journal*  
58  
59 *of Social Work Practice* 30(3) 313–327.  
60

1  
2  
3 Wong M (2020) Hidden youth? A new perspective on the sociality of young people  
4

5 'withdrawn' in the bedroom in a digital age. *New Media & Society* 22(7): 1227–1244.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Peer Review