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Abstract

Art sits at the heart of social work and is central to social change. This thesis provides a beginning evidence base for this long held disciplinary view by examining the role of art in social change within communities. A shared history and common ground between art and social work was established using mixed methods within a creative heuristic methodology to define art and its relationship to social work. Inspired by the need identified by Hugh England for a theory of social work which incorporated a theory of art, this thesis redefines art in social work, from a bi-ethological perspective against a list of criteria for art, to suggest social work is art. It distinguishes this from the art of social work, which it locates in practice. Situated within the context of community practice, that is, art in community and arts-based community development, this thesis proposes a model of creative community practice able to accommodate both disciplines. Extensive literature findings were examined empirically to ascertain the effectiveness of art as an intervention through the ‘Safe at Home’ project. This nested study tested the effectiveness of arts-based community development in raising community awareness of and changing attitudes to domestic and family violence within a real-world context, and the implications for practice. This is a unique study in that no empirical research could be found which had been designed to determine if art raises awareness of or changes attitudes to domestic and family violence. Blending art with science, a social intervention research model was used to gather baseline data via a community-wide survey, implement eight art-based interventions using an embedded art practice as research method to collect data, and gather post-intervention data via a neighbourhood survey. Limited to the early phases of the social intervention research process, findings suggest art is not effective in achieving short-term attitudinal change, but establishes a climate conducive to change. The difference between disciplines in community practice centre on ethics and findings support the inclusion of ethics in art education. Findings indicate art is a form of unconscious knowledge which opens the potential for greater understanding of the tacit workings of social work practice.
Chapter 1

Introduction

Art, Social Work, and Social Change
Social work has always been an art but over the years, the acceleration toward professionalism that began with Mary Richmond (1917) has driven the evolving profession ever more vigorously toward systematic, scientific models of practice. The art has increasingly given way to technique and the language of skills and competencies (Gambrill, 1983) with practice focused around identifiable tasks (Reid & Epstein, 1972). The systematisation of practice accelerated with the research-based practice movement, which gained momentum in the 1970s, and, more recently, received an added push from evidence-based practice as social work continues to look to science to reduce uncertainties and minimise authority-based practice (Gambrill, 1999, 2001). The claim that social work has always been an art is not an argument that science and systematic approaches to practice are unimportant but rather that art sits at the heart of social work and is central to its concern with social change (Siporin, 2009; Weick, 1999; see also Figure 1). The principal province of this thesis is the role of art in social change (Rapoport, 1968). This pivotal consideration made it necessary to define what is meant by social work as art and to consider whether social work is an art and, if so, to delineate what the art of social work might be. What makes it possible to say that social workers are artists in the same way artists are artists? Could it be that there is such a thing as the art instinct as Dennis Dutton (2009) and others have claimed? Do people have varying degrees of the art instinct and, if so, might artists have more of it than social workers? These then, are some of the important questions addressed in this study. Additionally, moving the locus of art to the heart of social work raises the question of whether science and scientific approaches serve as a form of critique and assessment of professional practice. Alternatively, given that fine or creative art sits within a broader construction of art and the arts, and within this framework constructs the notion of art as life (Kaprow, 1993) and art for art’s sake (Gautier, as cited in Lambourne, 1996), might it not be possible to consider social work in similar ways thus opening up new avenues for critique and assessment of professional practice?
The seed for this thesis was sown in 1986 when, as a new graduate social worker, I read Hugh England’s *Social work as art: Making sense for good practice*. Over the years, this slender volume has become increasingly important to me in thinking about the practice of social work. In fact, it took over twenty years before I returned to this volume and took up the challenge to explore the idea of social work and its relationship to art. Teasing out the possibility of social work as an art in light of the more established ideas of social work as art, the art of social work, the artistry of social work, and the work of art in social work began this process. By extending the process to developing ‘a theory of social work which incorporates a theory of art’ (England, 1986, p. 85), I began to build a new view which might offer greater understanding of ‘the problem of subjectivity’ which social workers find ‘so consistently bewildering’ (England, 1986, p. 85). England (1986) identified this potential for social work believing art criticism offered ‘a genuinely viable approach to the criticism and assessment of practice’ (p. 108). In this way, he foreshadowed the movement towards practice evaluation (Gray & Webb, 2009), which has

---

1 Max Siporin (2009) talked about *love* as part of social work and sparked a connection with the idea for *art at the heart*.

2 All drawings, diagrams, models, and tables are the Author’s unless otherwise indicated.
developed further into evidence-based social work over the intervening years (Gray, Plath, & Webb, 2009).

How then might social work’s journey as an art, challenged by science-based practice, be mapped over time? The first step – presented in Chapter 2 – is an examination of definitions of art, which have been brought to bear on social work, followed by the challenge of offering a new definition, which might support a dialogical relationship between art and science. In Chapter 3, the focus turns to art and its connections with social work through a body of contemporary art literature. The search is for a workable theory of art, which might throw light on the centrality of art in social work. Much of this literature is about art within a community context, that is, art in community and arts-based community development, which offers a context for art in practice as developed in Chapter 5. Chapter 4 returns to the social work literature, examined through the lens of art developed in Chapter 3. It presents a chronological and thematic history of ideas and surrounding debates to art within the social work canon. The findings from this exploration of the literature were extended and tested through an empirical study – the ‘Safe at Home’ Project – which attempted to answer three research questions:

1. Is art an effective intervention in community development as a method of change?
   In order to answer this question, several related questions were first addressed regarding the definition of art in social work and of community arts practice in art:
   a. What is meant by ‘art’ in social work?
   b. How does this relate to the idea of ‘artful practice’ within social work?
   c. What is meant by ‘community art(s) practice’?
   d. What are the differences and similarities between artists and social workers in the process of community engagement?
   e. What does the literature in social work and in art say about the relationship between art and social change?
   f. Can social workers learn from artists in relation to communication, advocacy, activism, and change?
2. Is arts-based community development an effective means of raising community awareness and changing attitudes about domestic and family violence?

3. What are the implications for practice?
   a. What are the implications for social work and social work education?
   b. What are the implications for art and art education?

Table 1 identifies where each of these questions is addressed within this thesis.

An empirical project was incorporated in order to begin to answer questions which had been posed about how the arts could improve social work practice and in what ways and, in so doing, move from the conceptual to the empirical (Damianakis, 2007). Following Thecla Damianakis (2007), this study was also ‘concerned with how and where the arts and social work intersect[ed]’ (p. 25). The empirical project was called The Safe at Home Project, and was conducted in collaboration with the Cessnock Anti Violence Network. Prior to the commencement of the empirical work, ethics clearance for this study was obtained through the University of Newcastle, Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval number: H-613-1007, see Appendix A – Ethics approval, participant information statements and consent forms). The ethical issues that arose in this study, are discussed in Chapter 7. Transparency was exercised in all aspects of the project in that all participants were explicitly informed and acutely aware that they were participating in a PhD research study. Participants, including the Cessnock Anti Violence Network’s members, who first suggested this collaborative project, participated voluntarily. Network members participated in the process of drafting the Information Statement, consent and referral forms, and the survey questionnaire (see Appendix A – Ethics Approval, Participant Information Statements and Consent Forms). They were aware from the outset that their involvement would itself be a subject of analysis in order to understand the dynamics of community participation and the use of art in practice. They were thus aware that they were simultaneously co-researchers and subjects of participant observation. These participants came from different professional backgrounds and in the discussion of findings are grouped into four categories: artists, social workers, human service professionals (welfare), and human service professionals (non-welfare). Observations made were discussed with individual
participants during critical reflections on the intervention process.

The methodological thinking surrounding the approach taken in this study – and the empirical project – forms the subject of Chapters 6 and 7 respectively. Chapters 8, 9 and 10 turn to the presentation of the study’s findings pertaining to the crossover between art and social work and the outcomes of the ‘Safe at Home’ arts-based community development project. Chapter 8 focuses on the pre-intervention phase, Chapter 9 turns to the intervention and Chapter 10 examines the post-intervention and comparative findings. Chapter 11 discusses the findings and draws together the conclusions and implications of the study.

Having provided an overview of the subject, the discussion below traces the ‘dominant story’ (White, 1986; White & Epston, 1990) of the various modes of thinking about art and social work and the long raging debate over the art and science of social work. These two – imaginary – parallel lines struggle to find a space for interaction and dialogue. Dualistic thinking about science and art has undermined the relational, humanistic side of social work, that is, the art at the heart of social work. This study reopens the space for a different kind of dialogue underpinned by a long history of working with narrative ideas in Australian social work (Bird, 2000, 2004; Morgan, 2000; White, 1986, 1988, 1998, 2000; White & Epston, 1990), an appreciation of the historical beginnings of social work, as well as more recent understandings of relational (Bourriard, 2002) and dialogical (Kester, 2004) art practices, which are discussed in Chapter 3. Thus begins the process of telling an alternative narrative or a ‘preferred stor[y]’ (White & Epston, 1990, p. 14).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Questions</th>
<th>The Sub-Questions</th>
<th>Addressing the Question</th>
<th>Location within Thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is art an effective intervention in community development as a method of change?</td>
<td>What is meant by <em>art</em> in social work?</td>
<td>State-of-the-art literature review on social work</td>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does this relate to the idea of <em>artful practice</em> within social work?</td>
<td>State-of-the-art literature review on social work</td>
<td>Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is meant by <em>community art(s)</em> practice?</td>
<td>State-of-the-art literature review on art</td>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the differences and similarities between artists and social workers in the process of community engagement?</td>
<td>State-of-the-art literature review on art and community</td>
<td>Chapters 3 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What does the literature in social work and in art say about the relationship between art and social change?</td>
<td>State-of-the-art literature review on art, social work and community</td>
<td>Chapters 3, 4 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can social workers learn from artists in relation to communication, advocacy, activism and change?</td>
<td>State-of-the-art literature review on art, social work, and community</td>
<td>Chapters 3 and 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is arts-based community development an effective means of raising community awareness and changing attitudes about domestic and family violence?</td>
<td>Design, development, implementation and evaluation of the intervention – Baseline study.</td>
<td>Methodology Context of study</td>
<td>Chapter 6, Chapter 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the implications for practice?</td>
<td>What are the implications for social work and social work education?</td>
<td>Findings, discussion and conclusion</td>
<td>Chapters 8, 9, 10 and 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the implications for art and art education?</td>
<td>Findings, discussion and conclusion</td>
<td>Chapters 8, 9, 10 and 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The dominant story of social work**

The origins of social work tend to be identified in the traditions of charity (see, for example, Chenoweth & McAuliffe, 2008; Lewis, Williams, Webb, & Stuart Daley, 1938; Woodroffe, 1962). Generally this history focuses on poor laws, friendly visitors, charity organisation societies, and settlement houses as the precedents of
social work. These historical antecedents have shaped social work’s history in
important ways, not least in its attempts to distance itself from its nonscientific
aspects, as ideas about professionalism were increasingly embraced by the evolving
profession, and in so doing, veiling the potential connections which might support
the consideration of social work as an art rather than a science. To limit history in
this way is to tell only a partial story. In an attempt to address this narrow historical
view, a re-envisioned historical perspective is herein presented which opens space
for embracing a range of much earlier influences connected with the idea of social
work as an art. This was an important part of creating an alternate, preferred story.
But, before turning to this, the landscape of debate, which has long served the
dominant story of social work between art and science, is briefly outlined.
Essentially, the debate was underpinned by differing approaches to knowledge
development. During the Enlightenment, an appreciation for the scientific method
commenced its influence on many disciplines. This approach to knowledge has
continued to hold currency in many areas, including contemporary Australian social
work and the human services (Chenoweth & McAuliffe, 2008) and its resultant focus
on systematic, scientific approaches.

The divide between art and science

A division between art and science in social work emerged in the wake of Abraham
Flexner’s (1915/2001) questioning of whether or not social work was a profession.
Subsequent to this, Mary Richmond (1917) set about establishing the social work
skill base for working with individuals and families (Gibelman, 1999). These two
events, to a large extent, sparked the ensuing long-standing debate which effectively
established a dichotomy within the profession, that is, the debate over whether social
work practice should be considered an art or a science (O’Brien & Leneave, 2008).
The scientific, positivistic side of the debate dominates the contemporary social
work literature. Mel Gray and William Powell (2006b) identified the key social
work thinkers influenced by the positivistic, scientific approach as including Perlman
(1957), Hollis (1966), Smalley (1970), Fischer (1973), Bloom and Gordon (1978),
Germain and Gitterman (1980), Germain (1981), Bloom and Fischer (1982),

Over forty years ago, Lydia Rapoport (1968) posited that the high level of importance given to the scientific approach was a consequence of the ‘profession’s urgent need to find better ways to fulfil its social purpose’ (p. 140; also cited in Martinez-Brawley & Mendez-Bonito Zorita, 1998, p. 199). This is not unlike the struggle for social purpose currently found in art. Rapoport (1968) further identified this approach as an ‘attribute of all helping professions’ (p. 139). She drew attention to the problem of separating science and art and the tendency to promote an ‘additive approach to defining practice and thereby do violence to the sense of wholeness and process’ (p. 139) thus altering the balance between these two value positions across time. For example, within the contemporary Australian human services and the social work profession, scientific knowledge has come to be the dominant paradigm – in theory if not in practice (Chenoweth & McAuliffe, 2008).

Adoption of the systematic, scientific approach diminished examination of art in social work. Art became ‘lesser than the essential importance of science and technology, which was viewed as the driving force for explanation’ (Palmer, 2002, p. 600). Simultaneously, with Flexner’s (1915/2001) questioning of social work’s professional status, at the 1915 National Conference of Charities and Corrections, Porter Lee (as cited in Palmer, 2002) indicated ‘the real conception of the social worker is of a person technically trained’ (p. 600). Following Howard Goldstein (1997), Melvin Delgado and Keva Barton (1998) suggested the exclusion and devaluation of the art of practice was a direct result of adopting the scientific paradigm. The call for a more scientific approach to practice by Bertha Reynolds (1932) and others during the 1930s and 1940s was viewed by Ann Weick (2000) as an ‘appeal for method’ which attempted to articulate the nature of social work practice more clearly and, in so doing, produce the ‘structure and rationale for social work as a professional entity’ (p. 396). During this period Weick (2000) also noted a shift in language use within social work from concern about helping to academic and medical terminology, such as treatment and intervention.

Emilia Martinez-Brawley and Paz Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) clearly articulated the mainstream view that art and creativity in social work lay ‘outside the scope of the profession and [was] … regarded not only with suspicion but also with
outright contempt’ (p. 199). In the dominant paradigm, ‘emotions are replaced with studied disinterest; complexity is resolved by narrowing the point of study; mystery evaporates in the face of calibrated instruments and precise numbers’ (Weick, 2000, p. 400). As an active critic of the prevailing scientific paradigm, Weick (2000) offered an understanding of the totalising impact of the dominant story on social work when she said:

Nowhere to be found are the living tissues of human drama and human triumph. In choosing the dominant voice as the official voice of the profession, social work has let slip through its fingers the language that fills its veins with the fullest expression of human experiences and that most essentially gives social work its distinctive character as a profession (p. 400).

Additionally, Weick (2000) saw this situation as a consequence of the ongoing inability to define clearly what social workers did and the subsequent need for authentication of action through scientific arguments. Significantly, as a result, social work began to examine human interactions in an increasingly reductive manner.

The art-science divide has also been characterised as hard (science) and soft (art). Mel Gray and Stephen Webb (2008) articulated most aptly:

Those who picked up the ball handed to them by England tended to focus discussions of social work’s ‘art’ on its soft [emphasis in original] side embedding it in notions of ‘creativity’, ‘meaning’, ‘self-expression’, ‘intuition’, and ‘quality’ all of which were said to characterise the ‘aesthetic dimensions’ of social work practice as a counterpoint to the rising tide of hard [emphasis in original] empiricism, proceduralism and managerialism (p. 182).

On what basis was the softness of art determined here? This remains unclear. Further, is all art soft? Consider the counter position whether science is ever soft? The reverse might also be contemplated. How might these things be determined? Do artists perceive their work as soft? I suspect not, and if not, what invites social workers to do so? It is unlikely all of these questions will be answered immediately. Nonetheless, it seemed important to pose them as a starting point for further exploration.
The most recent addition of contemporary authors perpetuating the dualist approach were Toyin Okitikpi and Cathy Aymer (2008) who clearly stated: ‘[s]ocial work is not only a science, it is also an art’ (p. 1). However, they qualified their statement: ‘[a]rt and science are not incompatible, but in fact do and can complement each other’ (p. 10).

**Beginnings of a preferred story: Arguing for art and science**

There would seem to be growing strength among scholarly voices within social work promoting a moderate view that both elements are required in equal measure (O’Brien & Leneave, 2008). Early voices who stressed art and science were required for practice included Werner Boehm (1961, as cited in Siporin, 1988) and Stanley Kaplan (1968) who expressed concern Rapoport’s (1968) description of the duality made ‘science father to art’ (p. 162-163). Further, she conceptualised science and art as part of the creative process with the primary difference being found in the materials they used (Kaplan, 1968).

Following Kaplan (1968), the word *marriage* gained a degree of currency to describe the relationship between science and art. It implied a more equal partnership. Among those promoting this view, Bradford Sheafor and Charles Horejsi (2003) sought a marriage between ‘one’s art and the profession’s [emphasis added] science’ (p. 27). They saw this approach as foundational – interestingly a positivistic notion – to social work education and integral to lifelong learning as one continued to enjoin life experience and social work knowledge. In a similar vein, Powell (2006a) preferred the term *wedded* to describe the relationship between the ‘art of practice … knowledge and the findings of science’ as social work sought to rediscover ‘its humanity and its imagination to affect change’ (p. 156). Similarly, Helm Stierlin (in Ringel, 2004) referred to *wedded bliss* when ‘clinical practice [could] be both a science and an art, producing both empirical knowledge and a creative process’ (p. 20) while Dominique Steinberg (2006) advocated good group work needed a blend of science and art.

In questioning the kind of thinking surrounding the science-art divide, Powell (2006a) used the metaphor of a box and asked two important questions: What kind of thinking was present in the art-science debate and was it important?
What thinking might be inside or outside this metaphorical box? These ideas were extended in further work where Gray and Powell (2006b) argued for a balance between social work’s ‘scientific (rational-technical) and artistic (humanistic-expressive) sides’ (p. 82) to prevent potential disconnection from its ‘moral commitments’ (p. 139). This built on the prior idea of approaching intervention as entirely ‘scientific and evidence-based pursuits significantly limit[ed] the scope of social work’ (Gray & McDonald, 2006, p. 60; also cited by Patni, 2008, p. 81). Powell (2007) has subsequently moved to the view that arguing which was best – art or science – was ‘to miss the point’ (p. 507).

Clay Graybeal (2007) argued considerable evidence promoted the art of social work practice suggesting ‘science and art in social work must do more than coexist in order for the profession to reap the full benefits of either’ (p. 521). He saw art and science as ‘two dimensions of the coherent and integrated whole’ (p. 521). He viewed the embrace of the art of practice, which he equated with ‘improvisation’ (p. 152), as an opportunity to improve and develop understanding of the artistic component of social work practice and thus contribute to science as a legitimating force. Karen Healy (2008) argued these positions tended to lead social work to the challenge of initiating a fusion of the artistic and the scientific aspects of social work practice and the possibility that fresh approaches might emerge from this relationship.

**Continuing the preferred story: Leaning toward art**

Rapoport (1968) was a key advocate for the need to:

redress the balance: to discuss the common links between art and social work both as to their institutional and instrumental nature; and to elucidate some notions of the creative components that are embedded in professional practice (p. 140).

She identified an important voice, which provided a thread back to the 1930s, in the work of Swithun Bowers who had indicated ‘most definitions of social casework classified it as an art’ (Rapoport, 1968, p. 139).

In an important reflective paper *At the edge of the frame: Beyond science and art in social work*, Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) located social
work practice at the fringes, by which they meant the edge of ‘mainstream of scientific discourse’ (p. 197). They described social work as a ‘postmodern … collage where science, art, rationality and intuition, systematic and asystematic knowledge meet’ (p. 197). They advocated postmodernism was a place for a possible ‘convergence of paradigms’ (p. 197), a potential third space (see also Walter, 2003) for ‘possibilities that go beyond the art/science duality in social work’ (Martinez-Brawley & Mendez-Bonito Zorita, 1998, p. 197-198).

Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) observed the lack of significant advancement resulting from the engagement with science and the growing view that it was important to further understand ways of ‘knowing and doing’ (p. 200) within social work. This dissatisfaction during the 1980s and 1990s led to an ‘escalation of writing with the emergence of England, Siporin and Goldstein … and … the [simultaneous] emergence of Schön’s (1983) notion of reflection-in-action’ (p. 200). The thematic nature of the developments in this body of literature is explored further in Chapter 4. Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998), also identified a key characteristic of the postmodern approach to art – the emphasis on ‘process over product … the ability to make novel use of things to satisfy needs, to stimulate an audience, or to render a composition more moving’ (p. 206). As a consequence of the blurring of binaries, they saw potential for social work to develop a perspective which was broader than science. To this end, they described social work as a ‘composition of bits and pieces, [emphasis in original] a collage of ways of knowing and of varied practices [which] … honours the knowledge of academia and the local knowledge of the streets’ (Martinez-Brawley & Mendez-Bonito Zorita, 1998, p. 208). Thus, they suggested social work extended beyond the duality of art and science or the theory-practice divide. They used an art-based metaphor to argue for a postmodern approach ‘validate[ing] the fringes, the edge of the frame, the building of quilts and collages, the blurring of the genres. Beyond being only art or only science, social work is a collage of perspectives and opportunities’ (Martinez-Brawley & Mendez-Bonito Zorita, 1998, p. 210).

Creating a more expansive space for the emergence of a preferred story, Nancie Palmer (2002) looked to ‘the prevailing epistemology that limits explanation and validation of the art of practice and the practice of art making’ (p. 191). In so doing, she encouraged social workers to expand their horizons by considering the
ways in which they used language and promoted a diverse range of alternative paradigms to support their search for new possibilities.

Rachana Patni (2008) viewed social work simply as ‘the art of being human and dealing with the dilemmas of humanity’ (p. 106). She saw social work decision making as based on experimentation, trial and error, and feeling generated from the experience of practice, rather than on sound evidence, and argued ‘there is no science to communicating, it is much more of an art’ (Patni, 2008, p. 81).

Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) highlighted Rapoport’s key role in advocating for the artistic: ‘she has vehemently argued that, in the social work literature, the artistic “has not been made the subject of serious inquiry, nor has it been endowed with values, dignity, and institutional supports which a genuine commitment would demand”’ (p. 199). They also noted international developments supporting the re-emergence of art in social work in the 1970s, particularly the work of British authors David Millard (1977) and Noel and Rita Timms (1977), who also identified the lack of attention given to the artistic qualities of social work.

The pervasiveness of social work as art has been long term. Science, by comparison, has exerted a relatively recent but powerful influence. Without naming it as such, Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) identified the zeitgeist – spirit of the times – as influential to ‘highlighting or downplaying’ (p. 198) the artistic scope of social work. They suggested that the dichotomy of art and science ‘has been apparent through recent decades’ (p. 198). Their conception is extended and further developed in Chapter 4.

Damianakis (2007) identified several key authors who have, over time, conceptualised art in social work, including Chambon, Irving, and Epstein (1999), Damianakis (2001), Goldstein (1990, 1992, 1999), Gray (2002), Moffatt (2001), Papell and Skolnik (1992), Powell (2003, 2004), and Reynolds (1934, 1942, 1988). Graybeal (2007), too, argues convincingly that ‘cumulative evidence supports a comprehensive, artistic, improvisatory, and relational conception of practice, informed by structured feedback and evaluation’ (p. 514). Interestingly, he drew this evidence from the casework and counselling literature overlooking community and social concerns. To explore beyond this single practice domain was to expand the evidence base regarding art in relation to social work. This exploration is pursued in Chapter 4.
However, the evidence to which Graybeal (2007) and others referred would be questioned by those who see the importance of basing practice on empirical research. This study sought just such a basis by exploring the concrete practices of social workers and artists in using art as a means to raise awareness of domestic and family violence in a disadvantaged community with high levels of this social problem. Called the ‘Safe at Home’ project, it took a social intervention research approach to examining whether art could be an effective intervention within a community context. Chapter 7 discusses the ‘Safe at Home’ project – a nested empirical study – that tested the effectiveness of art as an intervention in a social context within the examination of the concerns of social work, art, and social change of this thesis.

This chapter has sketched the terrain of this thesis and drawn a map to guide the reader’s journey through the multilayered story of the art at the heart of social work it represents. The next chapter takes the first step and charts a course through the definitions of art which have been brought to bear on social work, and takes up the challenge of offering a new definition, which might support a dialogical relationship between art and science.
Chapter 23

What is Art?

Art, Social Work, and Social Change

A version of this chapter has been submitted to the British Journal of Social Work for review as Schubert, L. & Gray, M. ‘Looking to science to define the art of social work’ in mid 2010. Revisions have subsequently been made to the text.
The challenge of defining art is equally present in social work and art. As noted in Chapter 1, the first step to moving the locus of art to the heart of social work is to hold a clear understanding of what art is and how it is used in social work. Thus, this chapter begins with an examination of definitions of art which have been brought to bear on social work. The strengths and limitations of the various approaches are identified with two key aspects of the definitional work noted for further development in this chapter as follows: First the biological–evolutionary aspects of art explored by Ellen Dissanayake (1988, 1995, 1998, 2000) provide a more strongly scientific basis for social work as art. Secondly, the criteria approach to art developed by Dennis Dutton (2009) offers the greatest potential for opening dialogue and new understandings regarding art’s place in social work. Dutton (2009) extended Dissanayake’s (1988, 1995, 1998, 2000) idea of art as necessary for human evolution, attended to critiques of her work, and produced a comprehensive, flexible cluster of criteria for defining art. In the final section of this chapter, social work is reviewed against Dutton’s (2009) cluster of criteria to support two new positions with regard to social work as art: (i) that art is an instinct which all social workers have to varying degrees, and (ii) social work is art. Despite the growing number of references to social work as art, formal discussions of art are rare within the literature and overall art has been poorly defined. Thus, the extent to which social work practice meets accepted criteria for what constitutes an art form has been little examined (Reamer, 1993). The majority of authors making reference to art in social work make little or no attempt to define the ways in which they are using the term. Most rely either on a descriptive set of characteristics or metaphors, especially from fine arts, to convey their understanding of social work as art (Palmer, 2002). This is not surprising given the difficulty artists, art historians, philosophers of art, and art critics also have in defining art. Art historians Marcia Pointon and Lucy Peltz (1980) suggested there was no single answer to the question what is art? Social work and art share the struggle for a clear, simple definition (Storey, 2008). A brief survey of the key definitional approaches to art within the social work literature and consideration of their limitations follows.
Problems in defining art in social work

Sheafor and Horejsi (2003) and Palmer (2002) referred to the definition of art in the *American heritage dictionary of the English language* (2000). Hence Sheafor and Horejsi (2003) defined art as ‘skills arising from the exercise of intuitive faculties’ (p. 37), suggesting one ‘need not look far to observe successful helpers who rely entirely on their artistic or intuitive abilities’ (p. 37). Palmer (2002) cited the *American heritage dictionary* definition of art in full as ‘a specific skill in adept performance conceived as requiring the exercise of intuitive faculties that cannot be learned solely by study … [as this was] a non-scientific branch of learning’ (p. 194). In effect, Sheafor and Horejsi (2003) focused on practitioner skill and intuition while Palmer (2002) did not add much in reference to the nonscientific other than saying it involved more than ‘the observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of natural phenomena’ (p. 1162). For her the scientific approach could not accommodate art while social work’s earlier religious roots:

> could comfortably cradle a conceptualization of artistic practice … science diverted further examination of artistic practice, acknowledging it as lesser than the essential importance of science and technology, which was viewed as the driving force for explanation (Palmer, 2002, p. 1162).

Sheafor and Horejsi’s (2003) and Palmer’s (2002) narrow definition of skill was problematic given the broad base of vitally important skills – scientific and nonscientific – constituting the social work repertoire. Further, it might be more helpful to conceive art as empirical, as sense experience, needing elucidation and exploration. It is no longer sufficient to claim art is intuitive thus implying the experience of it cannot be expressed in words, nor is it helpful to see science and art as incompatible as Palmer (2002) does. In short, dictionary definitions are limited. While skill is vitally important to art and social work, both are much more than the mere exercise of skill or skillful activity and intuition. Thus, it might be useful to return to earlier connotations of art in the social work literature to develop a more comprehensive understanding of what art might be, beginning with Rapoport’s (1968) multifarious approach to defining art.

Acknowledging the long history of exploration by philosophers, aestheticians, artists, and art critics, Rapoport (1968) examined some of the more
complex characteristics of art and its relationship to social work, attempting to find a range of criteria for defining the art of what social workers do. First, she suggested art was a perceptual medium ‘communicat[ing] meaning directly, enlarging awareness by penetrating directly to mood as well as mind. Since it is a perceptual rather than conceptual medium, art provides for a quality of experience’ (p. 141). This view is at odds with developing ideas regarding conceptual art in contemporary art theory (see for example Godfrey, 1998; Lippard, 1997a; P. Osborne, 2002). There remains something inviting in Rapoport’s (1968) idea of art as ‘a process involving [the] transformation of perception by a novel ordering of ideas and feelings, or, as in the case of plastic or graphic arts, by transformation of materials which reflect … ideas and feelings’ (p. 141-142). There is also merit in her view of the artistic process as purposeful, controllable, and shaped by the aesthetic sense to create or produce a ‘satisfying result’ (p. 142). However, in drawing on traditional and conventional notions of art, Rapoport (1968) emphasised the product of art over the process of art making and failed to acknowledge not all artists were concerned with the end product. Given she was writing in the late 1960s, and judging from her conservative perspective on art, it is highly likely (although this remains hidden in her work) the dominant fine arts authors writing at that time influenced her thinking (see, for example, Greenberg, 1961, 1973; Myers, 1967; Read, 1957, 1967). It would seem less mainstream avante-garde art did not gain Rapoport’s (1968) attention (see, for example, Cassou, 1968; Kirby, 1965).

Secondly, Rapoport (1968) distinguished between the fine arts that ‘serve a private purpose and may be used as an outlet for personal emotions’ (p. 142) and the scientific arts as ‘expressive of some larger social purpose … generally directed at problem solving’ (p. 142). However, this distinction is not particularly helpful, as it remains unclear how one purpose can be justified as scientific and the other as fine art: In what ways are works of art – privately made – based more in personal emotion than those directed at problem-solving or a larger social purpose? This seems a tenuous claim to make. Despite these concerns, Rapoport’s (1968) ideas

While in a post World War II art historical sense the term avant-garde is problematic, it is used as short-hand in this thesis to refer to the range of art and artists where the focus of the work is one of social engagement and peaceful social change (discussed in Chapter 3). Thus, the earliest uses of the term avant-garde by Claude-Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon in 1824 in his essay, L’Artiste, le savant et l’industriel (The artist, the scientist and the industrialist) (McWilliam, 2004, n.p.) is invoked with the socio-political nature of art the focus of exploration.
foreshadowed trends in describing the purpose of art in terms of its individual, therapeutic effects or its socially transformative nature. Nevertheless, art continues to be used as a therapeutic medium for creating awareness or bringing thoughts and emotions to the surface, to consciousness, thus enabling people to deal with their problems (see, for example, Weir, 2009) and there is less focus on its potential for social change.

The third characteristic Rapoport (1968) explored has a long history in the art literature regarding the difference between artistry (art) and craftsmanship (craft): She distinguished between ‘creative thought’ as a requisite for artistry and ‘ingenuity in execution’ (p. 142) as necessary for craftsmanship and showed how early definitions of art equated with contemporary understandings of skill and technique. However, the art versus craft debate has generally been debunked (Ioannou, 1992) as a result of changes in the status and hierarchy existing between the two, the acknowledgement of historical, regional, and cultural variations of both areas, and increased interdisciplinary practice (Lees-Maffei & Sandino, 2004). Along with the dictionary approach discussed above, the art-craft approach to defining art returns to a focus on skill. Finally, and most importantly, Rapoport (1968) sensed the biological nature of art (see below).

Despite his extensive exploration of social work as art, little definitional effort is evident in the work of England (1986). Like Rapoport (1968), he classified art as ‘an intense form of “ordinary” human communication’ (p. 113) through which people express meaning, believing the ‘skill [emphasis added] of the artist lies in his (sic) transmission [of this communication]’ (p. 113) and its intensity. However, it is not clear how the intensity of communication might be determined or how this intensity made communication art. The inference in England (1986) is either all communication is art or all art is intense. The only other possibility is that England (1986) was mistaken and human communication is not art at all. This critique aside, defining art in relation to ordinary human communication holds some attraction. It opens space for the examination of art historian and critic Grant Kester’s (2004) dialogical practices of art in relation to social work and enables a connection to be made between communication and the biological basis of art, provided communication is seen as more than mere skill.
In his early definitions, Max Siporin (1988) distinguished between aesthetics and art. For him the aesthetic related to a graceful, elegant, creatively performed human action resulting in a product that was a ‘clear, well-proportioned [art] form appropriate to their setting … rich in color and texture’ (p. 178). The making or expression of art was through its medium – sculpture, painting, music, and so on. As an art form, then, social work was a clinical practice that used original, creative, and conventional activities to assist clients and this required the integration of ‘values, knowledge of theory, practice wisdom, and [once again] expert skill’ (Siporin, 1988, p. 178). The difficulty with Siporin’s (1988) definition, as with Rapoport’s (1968) above, is its reliance on the notion of art as a product. However, social work rarely produces anything which equates with a product. In his later definitional work, Siporin (2009) adjusted his focus on the object of art, resulting in a more comprehensive and well-rounded definition. In this later work, he distinguished between artistry, a work of art, genuine art, aesthetic experience, and aesthetics. While in his later definition, Siporin (2009) addressed some of the concerns identified with his earlier 1988 version, several aspects remain challenging. First, the aesthetic pursuit of beauty, truth, and goodness is problematic, especially in light of the postmodernist notion of the anti-aesthetic (Foster, 1998) and ugly (Adorno, 1984; Hohendahl, 2005) in contemporary art. Not all art is beautiful, nor is all social work practice beautiful – nor should either be that way.

The second area of contention is the distinction about the way in which communal agreement is reached (via either functional or institutional means). Not all art is validated via art institutions. This has become increasingly so with contemporary cutting-edge, avant-garde art operating outside art institutions (see, for example, Jacob & Brenson, 1998). The acknowledgement of life as art, and art as non-art, has become increasingly reliant on a community of artists for its recognition as art. This is not a process confined to the institutions of art per se. In short, it is possible something is recognised as art through an internal process by artists not operating within formal art institutions. It is this kind of art that most closely resembles social work practice (for discussions of social work in art see Gablik, 1991, 1995; Jacob & Brenson, 1998; Kaprow, 1993; Kester, 2004; Kwon, 2004; Lacy, 1995; Pinto, Bourriaud, & Damianovic, 2003; Rosler, 2004; Schubert, 2006; Wallis, 1991).
Although Graybeal (2007) did not define art, he claimed:

There is an art to social work practice, but it is an informed art, born of a balance between structured, general knowledge that prepares the practitioner for categories of concern, and the intuitive, improvisatory understanding that is expressed in the immeasurable details of being fully present to another human being (p. 514).

Like Palmer (2002), Graybeal (2007) talked about nonscientific ‘immeasurable details’ all the while giving art an epistemological connection with truth-seeking: ‘the artist endeavours to express a truth about experience … [and] emerges from the dynamic interaction between structure and improvisation’ (p. 514). Presumably, for Graybeal (2007), structure is observable and measurable – it prepares practitioners – while improvisation is phenomenological, immeasurable, and unpredictable. Here again art is defined in terms of a suite of characteristics, albeit limited.

Gray and Webb (2008) took a very different approach when they argued art involved ‘struggle and resolution, soft and hard, joy and grief … social work’s art lies not in the social worker as artist but rather in social work as the “work” of art, which is implicitly a “non-productivist” endeavour’ (p. 182). While art is much more than the qualities described, at least, a move away from the product-focused definition of art is discernible. This approach is consistent with the view of art critic Donald Brook (1969/1974) who identified the ‘flight of the object’ (p. 16) away from the traditionally accorded public, material, real, hermetic, elevated, proper, and immutable qualities previously ascribed to objects. This heralded the development of post-object art (Karshner, as cited in Newman & Bird, 1999, p. 4) during the 1970s and the notion of art as anything an artist wanted it to be. Gray and Webb’s (2008) definition is confusing because of the shift in focus to the work of art, which detracts from a clear understanding of what art is. There is an assumption in the work of Gray and Webb (2008) everyone has a shared understanding of what art is. On the surface, their notion of the work of art has some resonance with that of actor and arts educator Eric Booth (1997) who was also interested in the work of art though with a focus on the relationship between art and play. The difference between these two approaches arises from the differing perspective taken: Gray and Webb (2008) pursued the notion from a philosophical position and Booth (1997)
from an evolutionary, biological one. Hence, they end up in very different places—locating the work of art in political action (Gray & Webb, 2008) versus ‘serious play’ (Booth, 1997, p. 4).

One of the more complex and sophisticated approaches to defining art in social work came from Frederic Reamer’s (1993) understanding of art and aesthetics. His view was, in order for the theory of aesthetics to have relevance for social work, professional practice had to have artistic qualities, despite the difficulties involved in identifying the commonalities between social work and widely recognised works of art. He concluded:

[n]o doubt, no one will ever agree on what, exactly, constitutes art, just as no one will ever agree on what constitutes that which is morally good. Nonetheless, it is worth considering and applying some rigorous speculation to social work, to enhance … understanding of what constitutes artistic practice (Reamer, 1993, p. 161).

The question remains, does social work have to be art or simply utilise it? Or, are both possible? Reamer (1993) also highlighted the importance of the ‘body or “corpus” of social work values, principles, and skills … that provides a measurable degree of unity to the profession … [as] … an essential ingredient of its art’ (p. 161). The discussion of social work values in relation to art is expanded in Chapter 4. Extending the notion of the corpus, Reamer (1993) turned to art theorist Francis Sparshott for the following definition:

The corpus that constitutes an art is one of knowledge and skills. It is because knowledge and skill can be transferred from an operation to other similar operations (defined as similar by this transferability itself) that arts exist. The different things that are made and done are the body of the art, but it is the skill [emphasis added] embodied in this practice that works as a soul to make the body a single organism (as cited in Reamer, 1993, p. 161-162).

In this definition, Reamer (1993) saw an understanding of what not only ‘artists, writers, painters, dancers, and poets do’ but also social workers. This is particularly so in the use of knowledge and skills to produce change as well as the
'superficial agreement about what gives social work its unique – or unifying – character [derived in large measure, from its value base]' (p. 162). Reamer (1993) did not say exactly what these values were and there is no evident agreement that the values of social work are the values of art beyond those identified in Table 2. This area requires much deeper analysis in order for such a claim to be valid. It is interesting there is no acknowledgement or discussion of the more explicitly evident spiritual aspects of the definition and their relevance to social work.

Drawing on aesthetics to assist in understanding art in social work is most strongly evident in the writing of England (1986), Reamer (1993), and Siporin (2009). The branch of philosophy dealing with beauty and taste simultaneously illuminates and complicates understanding art in social work. This is as problematic for social work as it is for art. Before moving away from a social work orientation, some further observations about the definition of art in social work are necessary. These philosophical concerns are further explored in Chapter 4.

Several qualities of art are largely absent from the definitions of art within the social work canon. First there is the notion all art is a product of the time in which it is made – it has a place in history and is reflective of that period – this is how style is often determined within fine art (see, for example, De La Croix, Tansey, & Kirkpatrick, 1991). The influence of trends and style is also found in social work. One need only examine the trends operating like waves through the history of social work practice (see, for example, Wood (2001) on the history of family work). In this sense, art is temporal, or time related. Secondly, art is also liminal, that is, it is a threshold, a place of transition, ambiguity, and uncertainty. This becomes neglected when the focus is purely on the object or product, which may or may not result from the art making process. Here Victor Turner’s (1969, 1995; 1974) notion of liminality as a manifestation of communitas – of people coming together in a context of intimacy, sharing, and equality to engage in mutual inquiry to bring about a sense of belonging or community – is important. It is in this context that Turner’s suggestion of liminality – as holding unlimited possibilities from which social structure emerges – becomes important, for it is here the potential for transition, transformation, or change is located (La Shure, 2005). While aspects of this definition remain problematic – predominantly the relationship to beauty, truth, and goodness in light of the anti-aesthetic in contemporary art (Foster, 1998) – it
serves as a potential launching pad for a deeper understanding of art in social work and as a connection point for community art and art in community contexts as explored in Chapter 5.

In examining the variety of definitions in social work and their strengths and limitations, two important areas have been noted for further exploration. The first is the need to embrace science. One way to do this is to consider art from a biological perspective and see what this might offer toward understanding the relationship between art and social work. The second is by identifying a set of characteristics signifying the art of ... which might propose a more effective, comprehensive understanding of the relationship between art and social work. The next section addresses these two concerns by examining the bio-ethological approach to art and a new cluster of criteria for identifying art emerging from this way of thinking about art.

Looking to science to explain art

As already noted, Rapoport (1968) considered art a ‘biologically based human impulse, an innate drive through which consciousness can be acquired and refined’ (p. 152). Influenced by ego psychology popular at the time of her writing (see for example Hartmann, 1958; Parad, 1958), she made a connection between the creative impulse and ego functions. Kaplan (1968) too recognised this biological potential but he focused on the developmental process as the locus for creativity. Though they saw this biological process as important, neither developed nor explored it fully. Rapoport (1968) saw the necessity for survival as driven by the need to create order, produce understanding and predictability, and in so doing gain pleasure and harmony. She distinguished between the scientific and fine arts suggesting they were two means by which the survival instinct was expressed. Nevertheless, it remains unclear how she determined scientific from fine. In her discussion, she highlighted the scientific arts as a means of ‘problem solving’ (p. 152) and saw the potential for combining biology and evolution. While, her exploration of the possibility of art as an instinct was limited, this idea has the potential to open new understandings of art, what it might be, and the idea of art’s biological basis, which is now taken up for further exploration.
The work of Dissanayake (1988, 1995, 2000) has been briefly acknowledged but not explored in detail within social work (see, for example, Gray & Powell, 2006b; Powell, 2006b, 2007; Siporin, 2009). Dissanayake (1988, 1995) took an ethological or neo-Darwinian (bio-evolutionary) approach to art noting it is found in all societies that all human groups are predisposed to ‘display and respond to one or more of what are called the arts: dancing, singing, carving, dramatizing, decorating, poeticizing, speech, [and] image making’ (Dissanayake, 1988, p. 6). The ethologist presupposes that the arts ‘have a survival value’ (Dissanayake, 1988, p. 62) meaning art is a biologically evolved part of human nature. Dissanayake (1995) outlined three important factors contributing to her understanding of where art comes from and why. First, variation in what is admired or practised exists across individuals and cultures. Secondly, for the last several thousand years, there has been a tension in the relationship between natural (or given) and cultural (or humanly imposed) characteristics of human nature. Thirdly, humans are attracted to the extra-ordinary and deliberately go out of their way to experience or produce it. Hence, art is biological and cultural, yet, neither humanists nor social scientists have been able to provide a ‘convincing, positive, humanly relevant view of art’ (Dissanayake, 1995, p. xvi). Being universal, art is a characteristic of all human beings rather than one which is rare, special, or unique so art is not limited to the creative genius of some individuals. All human beings have artistic and creative potential. This coheres with Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi’s (1997, 2002) view of creativity. The cultural aspects of Dissanayake’s (1995, 1998, 2000) ideas also accord with those of Howard Morphy (2008) who studied the Yolngu (the Indigenous Australians of north eastern Arnhem Land) whom he described as always having produced art, but noting their work had only recently been recognised as art. He made sense of this paradoxical idea by examining the two implicit definitions of art influencing this view:

On the one hand there is a cross-cultural definition of art that encompasses actions and objects that have something in common that can be referred to as ‘art’ and that places them in the analytic category of artwork. On the other hand there is designation of certain works as ‘fine art’ – works that are bought and sold as such in the art market and that are exhibited in art galleries and museums of fine art (Morphy, 2008, p. xi).
Thus, he recognised the ‘Yolngu have always produced art but only recently has it been recognized [emphasis added] as fine art’ (Morphy, 2008, p. xi). Morphy’s (2008) view was underpinned by a cross-cultural definition of art in which art objects were identified as those with aesthetic and semantic qualities, both of which were used frequently for purposes of representation or presentation respectively. Further, he viewed fine art as a ‘continuously changing category’ (p. xi), which altered through the incorporation of additional works or kinds of works into the category via the art market.

Dissanayake (1988, 1995, 2000) questioned the way in which art was defined in Western society and how to identify where it began and ended. This question remains largely unanswered. In fact, she viewed modern ideas about art as part of the definitional problem. These ideas are evident in social work definitions and part of the problematic discussed above. To reinforce this point, Dissanayake (1988) compared the modern Western way of defining art to diverse understandings of societies with ‘no word for “art” at all’ (p. 35) despite their engagement in and enjoyment of art making, thus resonating with the work of Morphy (2008). Commonly found Western descriptors of art include skill, the sensual quality of things, the immediate fullness of sense experience, order or harmony, innovation, the urge to beautify and decorate, self-expression, communication, the use of symbols to create meaning and significance, make believe, and heightened existence through experiencing intense emotion or the extraordinary (Dissanayake, 1988, p. 36).

However, there is a characteristic of art found in all societies that Dissanayake (1988) believed best captured the unique nature of art embodied in the idea of the everyday plus recognising and conferring specialness or ‘making special’ (p. 126). She saw making special as the core and common denominator of all art and recognised in it a propensity for transformation that involved ‘recognizing and entering an alternative reality’ (Dissanayake, 1988, p. 99). Put more simply, making special was the process of conveying something from its everyday context and use, to something out of the ordinary. Making special required an increased level of care and concern. Generally, social work practice involves care and concern for those it aims to serve. Ironically, care and concern remain central even when social work is exercising statutory functions – where the expression of care and concern reflects
contemporary community standards and expectations and is exercised through an ethical duty of care (Gray, 2010). In extending Dissanayake’s ideas described here, it seems plausible that social work’s caring approach could have evolved from just such a process of making special.

Dissanayake’s (1988) view of values as ‘biologically predisposed and necessary for our survival’ (p. 132) coheres with values as a defining feature of social work. In reinforcing important knowledge and group values, aesthetic experience involves ‘an imposition of culture over nature’ (Dissanayake, 1995, p. 131). The cultural construction of aesthetics helped explain variation in aesthetic preferences and understandings across cultures and time. Importantly, Dissanayake (1988) identified a shift in thinking about art from the time of prehistory acknowledging ‘art [was] no longer a part of life as in the past, when it was the handmaiden of significant and vital activities’ (p. 191). She also saw the legacy of this history in contemporary *avant-garde* art ‘which [was] concerned with giving art back to life’ (Dissanayake, 1988, p. 191).

New Zealand philosopher Dutton (2009) extended the work of Dissanayake in the belief ‘the arts [were] beyond the reach of evolution [which was] a mistake overdue for correction’ (p. 2). To support his view and challenge Dissanayake’s critics, Dutton (2009) turned to evolutionary psychology thus inadvertently providing a link to Rapoport’s (1968) ideas drawn from ego psychology discussed above. He believed the way to understand art was via the exploration of a cluster of features, which ‘allow us to identify art objects and artistic performances throughout history and across cultures’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 4). Most modern philosophers, art critics, and historians have not questioned where ‘the intuitions themselves come from or have simply assumed they are culturally induced’ (p. 40). Dutton (2009) suggested a philosophy of art could not ‘succeed if it ignores either art’s natural sources or its cultural character’ (p. 31). Further, to disregard art’s social nature compounded the potential for failure since ‘a work of art is just to be socially sanctioned as such’ (p. 40). On this basis, it may be necessary to investigate the potential for the social sanctioning of social work as art.

In extending Dissanayake’s ideas and countering ego psychology’s notion of art as merely a by-product of evolution, Dutton (2009) identified an important cluster of innate, universal features, and capabilities of the human mind, which he
believed was ultimately influential to the evolution of the arts. He did this by looking
to natural selection and the development of human language and associated mental
traits. He saw these developments as linked to values in a similar way to that noted
in Dissanayake’s work discussed above. For Dutton, art was an instinct. He saw the
possibility for a substantial theory of the origins of art in combining natural and
sexual selection and concluded:

[A]rt in the most general sense is also an extension of this capacity into
imaginative realms of storytelling, picture-making, crafting artifacts, music,
poetic language, joke-telling, dance, and ordinary banter. Art is not the only
extension of displays of human skill and expressiveness: areas as diverse as
politics, sports, and science have all taken human expressive intelligence in
radically different directions (Dutton, 2009, p. 152).

Dutton (2009) observed that while aesthetic theories claimed universality for art, the
aesthetic debates, and issues evident at the time of their writing shaped these
theories. This was an important claim because it places aesthetic theory within the
context of history. He posited as techniques and art forms develop and change, so
too do artistic fashions and theories. Consequently, art changes its focus and values.
As noted earlier, a similar pattern is evident within social work. Dutton (2009) saw
a further complication in the tendency of philosophers to theorise from their own
aesthetic preferences bound by the limitations they entailed. The problem of
philosophy Dutton (2009) identified in relation to art lay in the ‘character of
philosophical rhetoric’ (p. 49). His concern was the focus on ‘endless analysis of an
infinitesimally small class of cases … [stemming from] … a hidden presupposition
that is never articulated: the world of art, it is supposed, will at last be understood
once we are able to explain art’s most marginal or difficult instances’ (Dutton, 2009,
p. 50). For him, the philosophy of art required an approach that ‘begins by treating
art as a field of activities, objects, and experience that appears naturally in human
life’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 50-51). This approach, to some extent, already evident in the
social work literature in characteristics-oriented definitions, might be helpful in
expanding social work’s understanding of art. To this end, Dutton (2009) proposed
a set or cluster of criteria he saw as necessary for the identification of art. Of this set
of criteria, he said:
Some items single out features of works of art, others, qualities of the experience of art. The items on the list are not chosen to suit a preconceived theoretical purpose; to the contrary, these criteria purport to offer a neutral basis for theoretical speculations. The list could be described as inclusive in its manner of referring to the arts across cultures and historical epochs, but it is not for that reason a compromise among competing, mutually exclusive positions. It reflects a vast realm of human experience that people have little trouble identifying as artistic (Dutton, 2009, p. 51).

This creates space to take up Reamer’s (1993) recommendation for the examination of social work in light of an established set of criteria. Does social work measure up as art or as being artistic?

In acknowledging the many marginal cases of ‘art’ and ‘arts’, Dutton (2009) included ‘artifacts (sculptures, paintings, and decorated objects, such as tools or the human body, and scores and texts considered as objects) and performances (dances, music, and the composition and recitation of stories)’ (p. 51). He was aware there were various ways of speaking about art – focusing on acts of creation, objects created, and the experience of those objects. He viewed these differences as distinct, separate issues. He saw the list as a set of pointers. Though characteristic of universal, cross-cultural art, these pointers were not necessarily ‘unique to art or its experience [and m]any of these aspects of art [we]re continuous with non-art experiences and capacities’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 51-52). Importantly, compared to social work approaches to defining art Dutton’s method allowed consideration of non-art objects, notwithstanding his strong object orientation. His list of criteria included direct pleasure, skill and virtuosity, style, novelty and creativity, criticism, representation, special focus, expressive individuality, emotional saturation, intellectual challenge, art traditions and institutions, and imaginative experience (Dutton, 2009). In addition, Dutton (2009) assumed there were two important preconditions for art: First it was an artifact and could include found objects. Secondly, it was an intentional artifact, a work usually made or performed for an audience that was ‘substantially important in understanding art’ but also applied to many other situations outside the arts. For example, he saw ‘every social or communicative act [a]s essentially connected to the idea of an audience’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 60). Thus, further consideration is needed to determine whether social
work is simply a social or communicative act – and ask the question – might social work be an intentional artifact? While it is easy to identify an audience for social work, social work as an intentional artifact is more challenging – but no more or less so than identifying social work as art. Unfortunately, Dutton (2009) did not provide an adequate definition of what constituted an intentional artifact to determine whether social work did or did not fit the description. Conceivably, as England (1986) suggested, it is the social worker’s intention that determines this. Within his cluster-criteria approach, Dutton (2009) made no clear stipulation regarding the number of criteria, which should be met to justify something as art. Rather, he viewed the list in its totality as a definition of art. Nevertheless, his criteria provide a means of identifying whether something, like social work, is art. Further, if we were to take his premise of art as an instinct all humans have, then, by extension, this would also be true for all social workers. What is in question then is the potential for differing strengths of the art instinct within individual social workers. Dutton (2009) certainly suggested the instinct was stronger in some individuals than in others. Surely, this must not only be true for artists, but for social workers too. If the art instinct were biological, and all humans had it to varying degrees, there would be no logical reason why social workers would have it any less than the general population. Imaginably social workers would be more likely to choose a dialogical or relational medium with which to make their work. Does the degree of art instinct social workers hold influence their perception or ways of seeing their work as art? Does this art instinct also influence their identity as artists? In light of the possibility of an art instinct, these all seem to be reasonable possibilities. Therefore, an area opens where social workers can claim their art instinct. However, what of social work in the context of Dutton’s (2009) cluster-criteria? It is this, which is now examined.

**Is social work art according to Dutton’s criteria?**

If social work as an art-like object, performance, or activity within Western culture were to meet ‘the most common and easily graspable “surface features” of art, its traditional, customary, or pretheoretical characteristics that are observed across the world’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 59), calling it art would be justified. Dutton’s (2009) approach is encouraging for he believed the answer to the question ‘is it art?’ should not rest in the domain of experts. He perceived his list as a ‘useful guide for assessing
hard, marginal, or borderline cases of art’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 61-62). Social work fits such a description and the following is a brief analysis of social work against his criteria.

**Direct pleasure**

The art object, including narrative or story, crafted artifact, or visual and aural performance is valued as a ‘source of immediate experiential pleasure’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 52) rather than a utility producing a useful or pleasurable product. He equated this criterion with ‘aesthetic pleasure’ (p. 52) or the pleasure derived from beauty. Dutton’s premise might be questioned as to whether all art is the source of immediate experiential pleasure. How can strong negative emotions like pain, sorrow or chaos be described as pleasure in the immediate sense? Dutton does not make this clear. Despite this critique this criterion must be considered in relation to social work.

For social work the most important idea was the multilayered nature of pleasure, where each layer was distinguishable from and simultaneous with or proximal to the other. Dutton (2009) noted this kind of aesthetic enjoyment was often described as being ‘for its own sake’ (p. 52). It was referred to as aesthetic pleasure when it derived from the experience of art, but not in other life domains, like sex or enjoyment of sweet and fatty foods which also derived from ‘ancient, evolved causes that we are unaware of in immediate experience’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 52).

It is not possible to argue pleasure is automatically experienced within all social work contexts. However, social workers and clients frequently describe the helping experience as pleasurable. The source of pleasure may vary. The worker may derive pleasure from the satisfaction of concluding a well-executed, successful piece of work, such as accurately reflecting a person’s experience with second-level empathy. Clients might experience pleasure in telling their story to an attentive listener who appears to understand the problem. These distinctive, multiple layers of social work practice can, on occasion, be a reciprocal pleasure for workers and clients. Social work interactions have been described as contributing to harmony (Sheppard, 2006) and beauty (Siporin, 2009, 1988) from which pleasure is assumed to derive. While it is difficult to argue all direct pleasure is ‘for its own sake’ within
social work, there are those who actively seek out the direct pleasurable empathic experience social workers offer. It may be more effectively argued social work shares many of the pleasures experienced in daily life, with art-like pleasures evident in some aspects of (predominantly interpersonal) practice. Thus, on this criterion social work must, at best, receive a mixed review.

**Skill and virtuosity**

Dutton (2009) believed making an object or performance needed and demonstrated the use of specialised skills. He noted in some cultures these skills were learned through an apprenticeship with the learning of skill less formalised in other cultures. Even where all members of a culture acquired a skill, Dutton (2009) believed there tended to still be individuals who demonstrated special talent or mastery. Further, he viewed the display of skill as a ‘deeply moving and pleasurable aspect of art’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 53). He also acknowledged almost all regularised human activities had a technical skill aspect which could be emphasised. Thus, there is a connection with the pleasure experienced within the application of micro-skills in social work, noted in the first criterion above, within this second criterion.

Skill is extensively discussed within the social work literature and is considered central to all forms of social work practice, across all domains. Discussions of skill were evident in the art-oriented literature in the work of Rapoport (1968), England (1986), Goldstein (1986), Siporin (1988, 2009), Gray and Powell (2006a, 2006b), Ringel (2004), Gerald O’Brien and Jana Leneave (2008), and Holly Matto (1998), to name a few. Lucy Seligson (2004) and Uta Walter (2003) examined skill specifically in terms of performance.

Skill is also embedded in the teaching and learning process of social work, particularly in relation to practice via skills-based teaching and the social work practicum. The latter occurs in an apprenticeship-like context. The set of skills required and acquired by the average social worker is vast, with the degree of skill ideally growing from novice to virtuosity (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986) across time. The demonstration of skill at the virtuoso level within the social work context can be a deeply moving and inspiring experience. There has been significant discussion and concern expressed regarding the application of a techno-rational cookbook approach to practice compared to the less structured approaches of experienced practitioners
based in practice wisdom. There are also many social work texts outside of the arts-oriented literature within social work focusing specifically on the skills required for practice (note for example, P. Trevithick, October 28, 2010, personal communication, who recently named some 72 discreet skills required for social work practice). Social work, it would seem, clearly meets the criterion of skill and virtuosity.

**Style**

Dutton (2009) believed performances and objects across all art forms were made in recognisable styles with set rules about form, composition, and expression. Style could come from a culture, a family, or be invented by an individual. Borrowing from elsewhere, sudden swings, or slow evolution triggered changes in style. Similarly, the degree of fluidity, adaptability, or rigidity in style could vary from ‘tightly circumscribed by tradition’ to ‘free, creative individualistic interpretive variation’ (Dutton, 2009, p. 54).

Rapoport (1968) and Siporin (2009) discussed style in social work. Their discussions were inclined toward the individual social worker and his or her unique approach to practice. It may be important to consider style more generally and incorporate changes in approach (which can also be considered part of style) within social work in similar ways to the discussion of different movements within the art literature. Currently, within the social work literature, these kinds of discussions are more likely to use the term *trend(s)* rather than *style*, and thus are descriptive of changing inclinations in theoretical approaches or models of practice. Such developments might also be considered in terms of fashion, context, and currency. Some fashions diminish, or disappear completely. Others gain credence and grow in strength across time. Examples of recent changing trends within social work include, behavioural and psychosocial approaches, the strengths perspective, postmodern social work, critical social work, narrative practices, motivational interviewing, and acceptance and commitment approaches, to name but a few. Changes in theories and models across time also tend to influence changes in style in a particular area of practice. For example, the principle of normalisation forged a dramatic change in the disability arena in Australia in the 1980s and the social construction of disability has brought further radical changes to that field more recently. Such change is evident
across all levels – macro, micro, and meso – of practice. Thus, style in social work can be considered as a layered entity located in the individual worker and his or her personal style and the trends influencing the profession. This dual approach is more consistent with the way style is considered within the arts where the style of the artist and the emergence of various movements within art are both relevant issues. As Vernon Hyde Minor (2001) suggested, “[s]tyle is a visual pattern … that has served as an instrument used … to create certain groupings … and to explain change’ (p. 128).

Dutton (2009) also mentioned the importance of style in terms of meaningful human activity. This is of particular interest to social work as it relates directly to discussions regarding the importance of relationships and meaning-making (England, 1986; Goldstein, 1999; Gray & Powell, 2006b; Whan, 1979). These occur in tandem with style at the interpersonal communication level and include gestures, intonation, language; manners, courtesy, social norms; and emotional expression and empathy. Not only is this important in terms of the individual worker’s practice but also because communicative interaction is how human beings connect. It is part of what it means to be human as well as part of the professional culture of social work (Epstein, 1999). It is an important frame of reference for social work (see, for example, Scott, 1989) where some authors even highlighted the role of social worker as ethnographer (see, for example, J. Clark, n.d.; de Montigny, 1995). Such discussions are strongly linked to social work’s hermeneutic tradition, its interpretive and meaning-making aspects (Scott, 1989) or relate to ways in which social workers deal with diversity. However, there is room for further exploration of the links between social work’s professional culture and the style of the individual social worker.

**Novelty and creativity**

Art is valued, and praised, for its novelty, creativity, originality, unpredictability, and capacity to surprise its audience. Dutton (2009) believed creativity included this ‘attention-grabbing function of art’ as well as the artist’s ability to explore the depths of a theme or possibilities of an artistic medium. Even so, artists work within conventions of style and genre hence Dutton (2009) viewed creativity and novelty as
an expression of *individuality*, even ‘genius in art’ (p. 54). He linked imaginative talent with the artist’s ability to demonstrate creativity.

Numerous social workers have explored the place of creativity in social work practice and valued creative social work practice for its capacity to explore the deeper possibilities of a medium (for example, relationships) or theme (the client’s problem) (Goldstein, 1986; Gray & Powell, 2006b; Peile, 1993; Rapoport, 1968; Ringel, 2004; Shepherd, 2006; Seligson, 2004; Turner, 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002). Outcomes for social work, too, are unpredictable as it is extremely difficult to anticipate human behaviour. Also important to these discussions is the place of imagination (see, for example, Chamberlayne & Smith, 2009; van Wormer, 2002) but less so novelty, especially within increasingly regulated and highly prescriptive neoliberal contexts. Nevertheless, novelty is an important aspect of critical social work’s agenda to challenge neoliberalism and promote social justice via a return to radical practice (Ferguson, 2008). Whether in direct or radical practice, imaginative talent and creativity go hand in hand. As Csikszentmihalyi (1997, 2002) notes, creativity operates in the same way in all fields of human endeavour. The very premise of social work that every individual is unique requires a degree of originality in every interaction, every previously unheard story. Striving for a response tailored uniquely to an individual and his or her set of circumstances is a creative act as is honouring the value of respect for persons and caring in contemporary punitive and harsh neoliberal environments.

**Criticism**

The language of judgement and appreciation is central to art criticism whether that be the shoptalk of art producers, the public discourse of critics, or the evaluative conversation of audiences. Not only are producers, critics, and audiences critical of the artist, artwork, or performance, they are also critical of one another. Evaluation and critique are central to the art industry just as they are to social work or any other social profession. However, *criticism* is generally not a term used within social work. Critical social work, as noted above, means a radical form of social work practice in which analyses of power and ideology are central. Most approximating the notion of art criticism is professional critique, critical thinking, or critical reflection, the latter an activity in which enlightened social workers engage to enhance understanding and
acceptance. Social workers are generally strengths-based and seek consensus, preferring a critical language of appreciation and judgement, by using constructive criticism. All are open to critique and even critical reflection is examined through a critical lens (see, for example, D'Cruz, Gillingham, & Melendez, 2006; Ixer, 1999). Academic scholarship, too, is evaluative and performative with each social worker’s scholarship actively open to critique and debate. The process of peer review precisely concerns evaluative judgement and criticism. However, social work’s audience is somewhat narrower than that of art and art criticism, being confined to, other social workers and on occasion, other human service professionals. Social work critique is only of interest to a general public audience in critical cases, as when a child dies due to professional negligence, such as Victoria Climbie and Baby ‘P’ in England or ‘Ebony’ in Australia. Thus, while an element of judgement and critique is present in social work the limitations of its audience suggest social work only partially meets this criterion.

**Representation**

In varying degrees of naturalism, art objects, including sculptures, paintings, and oral and written narratives, and sometimes even music represent or imitate real and imaginary experiences of the world. Notions of representation in some instances are connected to skill and pleasure in the subject matter (Dutton, 2009, p. 55). While artists have some license in how they represent or portray the world, social workers strive for accuracy in representing the real experiences of individuals, groups, or communities. This is why critically reflective skills are crucial to the social worker. There is a more direct way in which social workers exercise this reflective capacity as communicative interaction, which requires the ability to demonstrate to the client that the social worker has accurately heard and interpreted what the client is saying. This necessitates active listening, the ability to summarise dialogue accurately, to use self-disclosure as a means to do this, and so on. These are called microskills in social work. Social workers often use metaphor to enhance communicative interaction and to enable the client to see the world anew and open space for possibility and change.

Clinical notes and reports are forms of representation adjusted for organisational consumption. Hence representation alters for different audiences. For
example, a court report may be vastly different to an annual case review written for the same person and circumstances.

Representation is also used in a legal sense in social work in advocating for client, group, or community interests. Its purpose is to give voice to clients’ concerns to promote change. Artists, too, might use art media to highlight the plight of marginalised groups. Hence this is an important consideration for both disciplines and may bring new understandings to the notions of representation currently present in art. While there is a degree of variation from artistic representation, social work has strong representation practices.

**Special focus**

Works of art and artistic performances tend to be bracketed from ordinary life and make a separate and dramatic focus of experience. As noted earlier in this chapter art involves what Dissanayake (1988, 1995) called *making special* in every known culture. Dutton (2009) believed a range of factors could contribute to a work of art or artistic event being special, but at its heart lay the nature of art itself, which could demand attention.

This criterion is possibly the most challenging and contentious for social work. Does social work offer a special focus? The idea of a special focus has been little discussed to date and it is unlikely agreement would easily be reached, given social work’s difficulty in determining its own nature. However, feasibly the international definition of social work may serve as a starting point to best describe the special focus of social work:

> The social work profession promotes social change, problem solving in human relationships and the empowerment and liberation of people to enhance well-being. Utilising theories of human behaviour and social systems, social work intervenes at the points where people interact with their environments. Principles of human rights and social justice are fundamental to social work (International Federation of Social Workers, 2000).

The work of Dissanayake (1988, 1995) invites consideration of the evolution of *making special* and the place of caring within the context of social work.
A reclamation of the humanistic, creative, expressive, humanistic side of social work outlined by Goldstein (1986), Siporin (1988), Rapoport (1968), and others is required. Thus, social work’s values emerging from its art as part of its special focus is worthy of further consideration. Social work meets people at the margins of society. This marginality may be part of a shared special focus with art as working at the margins is present in both disciplines.

The Australian Association of Social Workers (2010) identified a dual focus for social workers in all contexts – of assisting human functioning and identifying the systemic issues which contribute to inequity and injustice. Against Dutton’s (2009) criterion, then, the only conclusion to be drawn is that there are a number of potential special foci requiring further debate in order for a clearer position to be reached.

**Expressive individuality**

The potential for expressive individuality is generally latent in art practices even if it is not fully achieved. In art, even when an activity has a defined output such as when it follows a script, there is always room for individual expression even though this might be constrained by what the director is looking for or seeking to bring out of the artist. In the same way, the social work literature frequently discusses the social worker’s use of self as a medium of expressive individuality. As this creates room for error and poor judgement, the use of self is problematic and is discussed further in Chapter 4. The use of self is present in the teaching of direct practice skills in social work. Practice wisdom (Dybciz, 2004), an idea about which social work is highly ambivalent, also draws upon the concept. Debates abound as to whether practice wisdom is a valid form of knowledge in social work. Nevertheless, the social worker’s use of self as a medium of creativity and expressive individuality remains integral to social work education. In light of this, social work rates well on this criterion.

**Emotional saturation**

In varying degrees, the experience of works of art is infused with emotion. According to Dutton (2009), there are two forms of emotion in art:
First are the emotions provoked or incited by the represented content of art ... These are the normal emotions of life, and as such are the subject of cross-cultural psychological research outside of aesthetics ... There is a second, alternative sense, however, in which emotions are encountered in art: works of art can be pervaded by a distant emotional flavour or tone that is different from emotions caused by represented content. This second kind of embodied or expressed emotion is connected to the first but not necessarily governed by it. It is the emotional tone we might feel in a Chekov story or a Brahms symphony. It is not generic, a type of emotion, but usually described as unique to the work – the work’s emotional contour, its emotional perspective, to cite two common metaphors (p. 57).

The work of social work is surrounded by and immersed in emotion. Social workers are able to appreciate the differing approaches to emotion described above. Working with the interpersonal minutiae of people’s lives requires an ability to respond to a diverse range of emotions. This is central to the everyday experiences of social workers within all forms of direct practice. Whether responding to emotion within the practice context is simply part of the everyday, ordinary, non-art life experience or art is difficult to discern yet it certainly responds to the fabric of life. How this is determined, or by whom, remains unclear in art and Dutton provides inadequate clues. What Dutton (2009) meant by ‘emotional saturation’ (p. 122) was an artwork’s overall ability to explore and express a range of emotional experience. It also remains unclear at what point or even how ‘saturation’ is determined. Despite this limitation it would appear social work practice rates highly on the criterion of emotional saturation.

**Intellectual challenge**

Works of art tend to be designed to use the combined variety of human perceptual capacities to the full extent with the best works stretching them beyond ordinary limits. The full exercise of mental capacities can be a source of aesthetic pleasure. Dutton (2009) suggested this could include working through a complex plot, putting evidence together to recognise a problem or solution before a character in a story recognises it, balancing and combining formal and illustrative elements in a complicated painting, and following the transformations of an opening melody
recapitulated at the end of a piece of music. He believed the pleasure of meeting intellectual challenges was most obvious in very complicated art but could also be found in simple works defying easy explanation.

Social work uses a variety of human perceptual capacities and complex work can stretch workers, and those with whom they work, beyond their ordinary limits in all manner of ways. There can be aesthetic pleasure in the exercise of mental faculties as part of the social work process. Complex, real-life plots are core to social work practice. Mastery can be highly challenged and challenging in the context of working with the unknown and at times, unknowable. There can be direct pleasure in a problem well solved or change well accomplished. While social work is described as anti-intellectual, there is a growing body of intellectually challenging social work knowledge and theory (Gray & Webb, 2009). Social work draws from a variety of disciplines as part of its natural approach to practice and this might be considered as presenting a particular kind of intellectual challenge. I posit that the intellectual challenge in art is equal to that in social work in practice and in scholarly terms. On this basis, social work along with a range of other intellectually challenging disciplines have equal claim to intellectual challenge and meet this criterion. Ultimately, this criterion may be unhelpful in discerning whether something is art or not.

**Art traditions and institutions**

Art objects and performances which occur in oral cultures and literate civilisations, are created and given significance through their place in history and tradition, by being linked to their precedents. Alternatively, artworks gain meaning by being part of the art world through socially constructed art institutions. Thus knowledge of art history or the contemporary art context is required for appreciation to be possible. Dutton (2009) believed most organised social activities, including medicine, warfare, education, politics, technologies, and sciences, were also ‘built up against a backdrop of historical and institutional traditions, customs, and demands. Institutional theory as promoted in modern aesthetics can be applied to any human practice whatsoever’ (p. 57-58). Following this logic then, modern aesthetics can also be applied to social work.
There is evidence of social work being accepted within the contemporary, *avant-garde*, dialogical traditions of art, which until recently, have sat largely outside the traditional art institutional network. There is increasing evidence of these art practices being acknowledged and incorporated into the institutional realm and it is just possible that if social workers recognised their profession as part of this tradition, it could be located more directly within art. Chapter 3 undertakes a detailed exploration of the relationship of social work to contemporary art practice of this kind. An interesting and unique development in the relationship between social work and creative arts is the emergence of The University of Creation, Souzou Gakuen University in Takasaki, Gunma Prefecture in central Japan. This university is exclusively comprised of social work and creative arts (incorporating art and music) where the focus is *sōsai*, or the development of creative talent. All of this would suggest social work is increasingly aligned with and being incorporated into the traditions and institutions of art and is therefore well placed to meet this criterion.

**Imaginative experience**

In Dutton’s (2009) view, conceivably the most important of all characteristics on his list, is the ability of art objects to provide an imaginative experience for producers and audiences. What he means here is that an artistic experience takes place in the theatre of the imagination.

Imagination is written about within the social work literature directly in relation to art (see Finn & Jacobson, 2003; Gray & Powell, 2006b; Palmer, 2002; Ringel, 2004; Rapoport, 1968; Siporin, 2009). The imaginative experience is relevant for social workers and audiences. An imaginative response is required from the social worker in responding to and co-creating alternative narratives for those with whom they work. Disinterested contemplation might be considered equivalent to the neutrality and nonjudgemental position in which social workers frame their practice. The difference between art and social work is that social work largely operates in the real rather than make-believe world. However, make-believe can be required when a person has difficulty in perceiving available options or alternatives.

---

1 [http://english.souzou.ac.jp/index.htm](http://english.souzou.ac.jp/index.htm)
While this is part of everyday problem-solving, planning, hypothesising, inferring the mental states of others, and so forth, the imaginative act is also inextricably linked to feeling and responding, free of the constraints of the logical and rational, at the edge of knowing. The intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project discussed in Chapter 7 is an example of the use of imagination in social work practice.

**Conclusion: So does social work measure up?**

Ten of Dutton’s (2009) twelve categories are strongly evident within social work:

The presence of imaginative experience, a growing link to art traditions and institutions, intellectual challenge, expressive individuality, representation, criticism, emotional saturation, novelty and creativity, style, plus skill and virtuosity are all strongly represented within the social work literature and evident in practice. The remaining two categories – direct pleasure and special focus – are more contentious. Either they do not occur across all aspects of social work or, in the latter case, require further discussion and exploration. This does not mean there is no evidence for each of these criteria, for within each, some supporting evidence is noted. Clearly, in terms of Dutton’s (2009) criteria, social work is not the equivalent of an art icon. However, some evidence is indicated across all criteria, with stronger indicators for ten of the twelve suggesting social work can be firmly located on the spectrum of art represented by these criteria. In short, based on Dutton’s (2009) criteria, social work is art.

This chapter has demonstrated, despite its limitations, the historical approach to defining art in social work and has opened a space for dialogue about art in social work. In so doing, two important discoveries have surfaced: Engagement with a more scientific approach to defining art in social work in the form of the bio-evolutionary (Darwinian) understanding of art, combined with a comprehensive cluster-criteria approach to determining what is and is not art, has extended understanding of art in social work. In the first instance it has been argued art is an instinct common to all human beings in varying degrees and, therefore to social workers in varying degrees. Secondly, in light of Dutton’s (2009) cluster of criteria, it has been argued that social work is art. What remains is for this view of art to gain greater social sanction from within the profession. The endeavour has been to provide a view of art derived from science and the evidence to support the position...
that the art of social work is observable in what social workers do and thus its effectiveness can be determined through research. This is important because, in today’s risk-saturated, highly regulated practice environments, social work could all too easily lose its artistic elements: the presence of imaginative experience; intellectual challenge; expressive individuality; a critical edge; creativity; innovation; a caring helping style; skill; and virtuosity. I take the position that these elements enrich practice as much as they do research and make for good practice and sound research.
Chapter 3

Locating Social Work in Art?

Art, Social Work, and Social Change

---

6 This is a revision of a peer-reviewed journal article prepared when working on an early draft of this chapter: Schubert, L. (2006). Is social work art or is art social work? [Electronic]. The International Journal of the Humanities, 4(5), 43-52.
This chapter examines the literature on contemporary avant-garde art practices where social engagement is present. It attempts to locate social work or its component features and processes related to social change by looking for references to and similarities with social work in contemporary art literature. It proceeds by examining this literature relating to: connective aesthetics; ‘Happenings’; the blurring of art and life; new genre public art; space, time, place, and the politics of location; art as therapy; relational aesthetics; intervention; littoral art; dialogical art; art as community development; activism; and participation identifying key aspects relevant to social work. The focus then shifts to the shared territory and examines implications for practice.

**Locating social work within art**

Hugh England (1986) noted the absence of a theory of social work incorporating a theory of art: ‘If there were, social work would not continue to find the problem of subjectivity so consistently bewildering’ (p. 85). The process of examining art in social work commenced in Chapter 2 and is extended in Chapter 4 in light of the conclusions drawn within this chapter, which explores the relationship between art and social work by looking for references to social work in art. This idea is explored in an attempt to take up England’s challenge to link art theory to social work. This sparks the question: In which area of art and its theory would one begin to look? Further, if social work were art, according to Dutton’s (2009) criteria, as suggested in Chapter 2, where might it best be located within the art historical canon? It seems the most likely answers might be found if one were to investigate forms of art most resembling social work. In taking this step, locating the shared territory between art and social work might also lead to new considerations of theory relevant to both disciplines.

In looking to art theory, reference is made to social work most frequently within the contemporary avant-garde art literature. This occurs most notably with
regard to the work of artists operating outside mainstream art (gallery) contexts. Artists have a long history of working in communities and demonstrating generosity in times of adversity, ‘giving of their time and talent in the hope of making the world a better place for someone else’ (Aids Community Research Initiative America (ACRIA), 2002, p. 7; see also Lewis, Williams, Webb, & Stuart Daley, 1938). Examples of contemporary artists transgressing boundaries to work outside the gallery are Barbara Kruger (see Figure 2) and Jenny Holzer (see Figure 3), who contributed work for fundraising campaigns during the AIDS pandemic.

![Figure 2: Barbara Kruger (1992) Girl. Don’t die for love, Broadside](image)

Development of practices outside the gallery were underpinned by a movement away from the idea of ‘art as object’ to art oriented toward process, relationship, and community or public art (Gablik, 1991, p. 7). This new paradigm reflected an increasing interest in social participation and a diverse range of theoreticians, critics, curators, and artists have contributed to these new ways of thinking about and practising art. These approaches brought art to an intersection with people and communities. Such approaches seem indistinguishable from the everyday practice of social work. The next section provides a brief survey of emergent ideas from avant-garde and contemporary art theory, attempts to locate the features sharing common territory with social work, and identifies how this might influence ideas in social work and art.
Figure 3: Jenny Holzer, (1996), *You are my own*. Photograph, Colour inkjet print on gallery gloss paper, Edition of 100, h: 8.5 x w: 9 in / h: 21.6 x w: 22.9 cm

**Connective aesthetics**

Suzi Gablik (1991) focused on the social and environmental responsibilities of art, as an aesthetic and value-based activity leading to participatory, socially-oriented interactions requiring empathy and listening. In this vein, Gablik emphasised participation, relationship, narrative, and the formation of a vision for society through the creation of a beautiful world. Bergman inspired her:

> In a time when science is not providing the answers we had hoped it would, what can art do? What can artists do? … If we project images of beauty, hope, healing, courage, survival, cooperation, interrelatedness, serenity, imagination and harmony, this will have a positive effect (as cited in Gablik, 1991, p. 152-55).

Thus Gablik (1991) offered a somewhat different approach to the swing of the *art-science* pendulum, which might be compared to the shift toward evidence-based practice in social work (see Chapter 1).

The importance of listening and dialogue emerged through David Levin’s view of listening as ‘a question of character … its development is a practice of the self. In listening to others – the process of moving beyond mere expression – is the
distinctive feature of the empathic approach to art’ (in Gablik, 1991, p. 111-112). Active listening, one of the basic microskills of the helping professions (Egan, 2002; Gray & Powell, 2006b), is fundamental to social work engagement. Gablik (1991) applied listening to art through the creation of a collective elaboration of meaning which was shared between the artist and participants in an artwork. Developing collective meaning has significant implications for what it means to be an artist and what constitutes a work of art. In her work, the relationship between artist and participants becomes the work of art. The question from a social work perspective becomes: Is the relationship between social workers and the person, group, or community with whom they work a work of art? If the practices of listening, empathy, and collaboration constitute a work of art, the answer would seem to be yes.

Long an influence in social work, the impact of ecological systems theory is evident in Gablik’s (1991) work, in her consideration of ecological issues and in her systemic thinking about the social context in which these issues are located. It was not until 1995 that Gablik (1991) labelled her aesthetic as ‘connective’ (p. 17) foreshadowing the development of Bourriaud’s (2002) relational aesthetics discussed below.

**Happenings, the blurring of art and life**

Allan Kaprow (1993), an important figure and early proponent of socially-oriented art, drew on the ideas of North American philosopher John Dewey (1934). Central to his work was Dewey’s idea of ‘art as inseparable from experience’ where universally recognised ‘everyday events, doings and sufferings … constitute experience’ (as cited in Kaprow, 1993, p. xi-xii). This led Kaprow to see art as a site of aesthetic experience where *doing is knowing*. Through art, Kaprow hoped ‘to know the meaning of everyday life’ (Kelley, 1993, p. xxiv). The work of Dewey has influenced art and social work. Dewey was a contemporary, friend, and colleague of pioneer social worker Jane Addams, who was seen as the force that put Dewey’s ideas into practice (Hamilton, 2008). Paul Ardenne, Pascal Beausse, and Laurent Goumarre (1999) noted the influence of Dewey’s work on contemporary art practices. The common links to Dewey within both disciplines appear to centre on
his ideas regarding experience and learning by doing. Ardenne et al. (1999) argued that the value of experience lay in the way in which it invited attention to context.

By comparison, Kaprow’s (1993) work focused on the ‘process of interaction’ (p. xi) culminating in the idea of the non-artist or the unartist. ‘Non-art’ (Kaprow, 1993, p. xxi) involved observation, engagement, and interpretation of the process of living. In his attempt to define unart and the place of experimentation, Kaprow described five modes of working in which all artists could locate themselves and their work:

1. Within recognisable art modes and contexts.
2. In unrecognisable or non-art modes in recognisable art contexts.
3. In recognisable art modes presented in non-art contexts.
4. In non-art modes presented as art in non-art contexts (on the understanding the art world knows about it).
5. In non-art modes and non-art contexts ceasing to call the work art, retaining instead the private consciousness sometimes it may be art, too (Kaprow, 1993, p. 175-176).

It is in this fifth and final mode of working that social work is most clearly located. If the position were assumed that all social workers were artists, there would be a significant group of artists working in this way, as distinct from those Kaprow was able to identify within traditional art circles. Social workers might, in Kaprow’s terms, be described as artists who make ‘life works’ (Kelly, 1993, p. xii).

In the late 1950s, Kaprow’s non-art practice developed into ‘Happenings’ an ‘art form in which all manner of materials, colors, sounds, odors, and common objects and events were orchestrated in ways that approximated the spectacle of modern every day life’ (Kaprow, 1993, p. xii). Key components of a Happening included the context (outside the gallery), the absence of a plot or stated philosophy, improvisation, urgency, and commitment as a moral act. Meaning was made in the moment of participation (impermanence), and was spontaneous and subject to change (Kaprow, 1993). Social work shares in these commitments, except in regard to its stated philosophy.

Kaprow’s (1993) work reverberated with the elevation of the generalist over the specialist in an attempt to sustain an expansive worldview. In terms of art, he made the distinction between ‘art like art’ (produced by a specialist interested in the
object) and ‘life like art’ (produced by a generalist interested in the wider world and conversation) (p. 201). Thus, for Kaprow, the meaning of life became more important than the meaning of art – a position embodied in social work practice. His significant contribution was the movement of the site of artworks from the gallery to the places and occasions of everyday activity.

**New genre public art**

Suzanne Lacy (1995) drew together the work of artists, who engaged in ‘political and social activity … distinguished by its aesthetic sensibility’ (p. 19) and worked collaboratively with their audience in public or community contexts, under the term *new genre public art*. This work was not accepted within the art world where works with ‘a prospect of real social change’ (p. 20-21) were viewed as lacking validity as works of art. In effect, critics relegated these works to the margins of art or into the domain of social work, describing new genre public art as ‘the aesthetic expression of activated value systems’ (Lacy, 1995, p. 30). Similarities to social work values emerged here. The educative nature of the work, the social influences supporting its development (including feminism, ethnic influences, Marxism, and a shared interest in the politics of the left), social activism, relevance for communities (particularly marginalised ones), and collaborative methodology (Lacy, 1995, p. 25) contributed to an art ‘not built on a typology of materials, spaces or artistic media, but rather on concepts of audience, relationship, communication and political intention’ (Lacy, 1995, p. 28). Lacy (1995) emphasised the need to develop critical, organisational, and communicational skills, suggesting artists needed to know:

… how to collaborate, how to develop multilayered and specific audiences, how to cross over with other disciplines, how to choose sites that resonate with public meaning, and how to clarify visual and process symbolism for people who are not educated in art. In other words … question the primacy of separation as an artistic stance and undertake the consensual production of meaning with the public (Lacy, 1995, p. 177).

Evident in the development of shared meanings, working in cross or multidisciplinary ways, and connecting with the public or communities was Lacy’s (1995) connection with social work practices. Similarly, the influence of feminism,
location in the public sector, and resulting invitation to think about effectiveness and assessment of the work in its attempts at transformation or change were also mutual. The growing influence of social theory within art was similarly acknowledged. Like social workers, artists placed their emphasis on what was viewed as important to the individual and the situation. Thus some artists emphasised otherness, marginalisation, and oppression. Others analysed the impact of technology. Some drew from the ecological movement or from theories of popular culture. As might be expected, feminist and racial politics were evident. Art’s potential role in maintaining, enhancing, creating, and challenging privilege was an underlying theme. Power relationships were exposed in the process. Lacy’s (1995) power sensibility drew strong parallels to social work’s ‘understanding of power inequalities and … commitment to the empowerment of powerless people has been a cornerstone of more modernist critical social work approaches’ (Fook, 2002, p. 45).

For some artists ‘the relationship is the artwork’ (Lacy, 1995, p. 35). This indicated the required skills of listening, the inclusion of voices, empathy, and encouragement of a reciprocal relationship between venue, content, and the maintenance of a fluid and process-oriented approach (Lacy, 1995). An example is Lacy’s work Cancer notes (see Figure 4).

From a social work perspective it was not surprising the question ‘is it art or is it social work?’ (Lacy, 1995, p. 45) was asked of this work. The struggles of measurement experienced by the push towards science were also shared between disciplines. In the face of the immeasurable and unmoving and ‘where there is no quick fix for some of our most pressing social problems, there may be only our ability to feel and witness the reality taking place around us. This empathy is a service artists offer to the world’ (Lacy, 1995, p. 174-175).

Again, artists step into the empathic domain to which the helping professions (for social work is not the only profession concerned with empathy) traditionally laid claim. Finally, Lacy foreshadowed the ideas of Doreen Massey (1995), Lucy Lippard (1997b), and Miwon Kwon (2004) and changes in thinking regarding space (and place) when she proposed ‘the space between the artist and audience is, in fact, the artwork’ (Lacy, 1995, p. 178).
Figure 4: Suzanne Lacy (c. 1996). Cancer notes, Roswell Memorial Cancer Hospital, New York

**Space, time, place, and the politics of location**

Geographer Massey entered the world of contemporary art through her commentaries on artworks with a space-time connection (for example, Rachel Whitread’s work *House* shown in Figure 5) and thus plays an important role in art theory. Massey’s primary contribution to this area, as identified by Dean and Millar (2005), was an understanding of place as defined by or constructed from a ‘particular constellation of social relations, meeting and weaving together a particular locus’ (p. 104). She called for a ‘global sense of the local, a global sense of place’ (Hubbard, Kitchin & Valentine, 2004, p. 219, 224).

Her focus on mobility, openness, flow, differential power relations and a ‘global sense of place’ located her as a central figure in human geography (in Hubbard et al., 2004, p. 224). Her ideas are not new to social workers – and while they are not largely written about in geographical terms – they are often sensed or felt in the work, particularly that undertaken in and with communities. Social workers would intuitively understand her view:

> The social spaces through which we live do not only consist of physical things: of bricks and mortar, streets and bridges, mountains and sea-shore, and of what we make of these things. They consist also of those less tangible spaces we construct out of social interaction. The intimate social relations of
the kitchen and the interaction from there to the backyard and the living room. The relations with neighbours: talking across the back wall, the more formal hello in the street, the annoyance when they come home noisily and very late, yet again, on a Saturday night. These local spaces are set within, and actively link into, the wider networks of social relations which make up the neighbourhood, the borough, the city. Social space is not any empty arena within which we conduct our lives, rather it is something we construct and which others construct about us. It is this incredible complexity of social interactions and meanings which we constantly build, tear down, and negotiate. And it is always mobile, always changing, always open to revision, and potentially fragile. We are always creating, in other words, not just a space, a geography of our lives, but a time-space for our lives (Massey, 1995, p. 36).

Figure 5: Rachel Whiteread (1993). *House*, Cast, East London, demolished 1994

In her discussion of *House*, Massey argued Whiteread’s work (and by extension other art) served as a disruption to the time-space dimension in three significant ways to produce different meanings:

Firstly, in a temporal sense through setting ‘a familiar past in the space time of today … [and as a result making] … present something which was absent.
Secondly, it worked spatially: it turned space inside out, the private was opened to the public view … [which led to] the intimate … [becoming] monumental … [and] … Thirdly … House disrupted our accustomed sense of time-space by apparently solidifying the volume that had once been the interior of the house; the living space, the space of life. Its openness has been filled in. All that was air was turned into solid (Massey, 1995, p. 36).

When considered together, these three aspects of time-space disruption began to point the way for the consideration of multiple layers of meaning. Thus a connection can be made with the temporal and spatial nature of social work practice (as noted in Chapter 2 in the discussion on liminality). Massey (1995) indicated disruptions were influenced by memory, nostalgia (including nostalgia for a specific place and time), elements of sharedness or ‘the desire for communal identifications’ (p. 40), tradition, and the questioning of our relationship to others, including their cultures, states, histories, experiences, traditions, peoples, and destinies. She argued these disruptions, particularly turning spaces ‘inside out’, subsequently ‘challenges us to put our own meanings on them’ (Massey, 1995, p. 42). Thus, emphasis shifted to the meaning and metaphors carried by space. Consequently, Massey’s (1995) attention turned to what she called ‘the politics of location’ and advised that ‘in such a context (where there are multiple meanings at play) it becomes particularly important to ask how the evocation of memory is working and what effects – social and political – it is producing’ (p. 46). Social workers identify the politics of location within the organisations and communities in which they work. How one engages with the context determines the nature of disruption according to Massey’s schema. It is also possible to find applications of disruption in the art world in the work of writer Lucy Lippard.

Lippard (1997b) explored the layers of meaning in place-specific art (art that is of place rather than about place), including the social role and nature of public art. She located site art as the activist branch of public art. Place is where lived experience happens and the function of art is to ‘make special’ (Dissanayake, in Lippard, 1997b, p. 37; Dissanayake, 1995). Lippard enabled art to elevate that which made a place special, and embed it in everyday life. Thus, the experience of different places enabled increased understanding of difference. The ‘lure of the local’ was described as the ‘pull of place that effects each of us’ (Lippard, 1997b, p. 7),
located the concept of place within the local, and highlighted its spiritual and political aspects. Lippard (1997b) suggested our beliefs about spirit were the lens through which we ‘viewed’ (p. 14) land and called forth questions of belonging, identity, and representation. Frequently referred to, was the importance of finding a place – a *sense of place* – or our response to place emerging from our senses, integral to which is the notion of *space*. In brief, Lippard (1997b) believed space defined landscape in a context where space and memory combined to define place. This view of space affected understanding of time, which in turn, had a reciprocal influence on the relationship between past and present. Thus Lippard (1997b) said, if ‘landscape w[ere] a way of seeing’ (p. 61) then ‘every place [would] become[s] a story’ (p. 50). Thus, narrative became central and the role of artists was to look at the world and transform it through the process of seeing, naming, pointing out, and telling.

Lippard’s (1997b) description of ‘art as a framing device for experience’ (p. 286) assumed the position art needed to be meaningful and change oriented. Therefore, in working to achieve change, artists worked on the interdisciplinary periphery where ‘empathy and exchange [were] key’ (p. 290). The pursuit of change was a grassroots activity, which took advantage of ecosystems, and used collaboration to raise consciousness and make connections between histories and cultures as place was made visible. Lippard (1997b) saw a role for exposing social agendas and using maps to build community through naming, organising, and connecting the dots. For her, mapping became a symbol of time and place. These ideas served to bring art into increasing contact with people and community, and resulted in arts practice indistinguishable from everyday social work practice.

**Art as therapy**

Lygia Clark (1997) brought a very different perspective to this discussion. Her development from neo-concrete painter through an exploration of three-dimensional sculptural forms, to engaging with groups of students in ‘exchanges’ [where participants ‘vomit’ their ‘psychic contents’ back and forth between members of the group (L. Clark, 1997, p. 306), to the position where she used what she called ‘relational objects’ [everyday objects which are given meaning by the subject/participant (L. Clark, 1997, p. 319)] in a psychotherapeutic context. These objects included:
plastic or cloth bags, full of air, water, sand or polystyrene; rubber tubes, cardboard pipes, cloths, socks, shells, honey and other such unexpected objects are spread about the poetic space which she created in one of the bedrooms of her apartment, to which she gave the name of the ‘consultation room’ (Rolnik, 1997, p. 343).

Thus the object became not an end in itself but a means to an end, as shown in images of her work in Figures 6 and 7. Lygia Clark (1997) called this work ‘Therapy’ and incorporated experimental psychotherapeutic techniques. Thus, her work is found at the intersection between ‘art and the clinic’ (Borja-Villel, 1997, p. 14) and has implications not only for social work but also for psychology, psychiatry, and medicine. During this therapeutic phase of her work, she herself had therapy, using it in a similar way to the social worker engaged in professional supervision. She reflected:

For this reason, in order for me to become a solid support, I am deeply analysing myself with Pierre Fedida, whose interest for the rediscovery of the body brings him close to myself (L. Clark, 1997, p. 314).

[Image]

Figure 6: Lygia Clark (c. 1979-1988) Therapy

Her approach to her audience shifted across time from:

the detached spectator who views paintings in an art gallery … to the participant who changes the object in front of him … [to] … the participant [who] was invited to make or use an object following written instructions or was initiated into group experiences by the artist herself, at first in the precincts of museums, and later – the artist being aided by sympathetic friends – in the street and public places, [and finally to the ‘consultation room’] (Brett, 1997, p. 19).
Lygia Clark (1997) stopped calling herself an artist and moved to researcher or psychologist. Those with whom she worked became her ‘patients’ (L. Clark, 1997, p. 33). This accompanied a progressive change of emphasis from the visual to the other senses. She identified her work as social and political in nature and the values at the base of her work as including ‘the idea of liberating man (sic), lifting repression’, and creating ‘a revolutionary impact’ (p. 13-14). Features of her productions included ‘art as ritual’ (p. 15), ephemeral work ‘embodied in the act, and enacted in the body’ (p. 17). It existed only in the moment it occurred and in the trace left in the mind, which she described thus:

The instant of the act is not renewed. It exists by itself: To repeat it is to give it a new meaning. It contains no trace of past perception. It is another moment. At the same moment at which it takes place it is already something in itself (Brett, 1997, p. 17).

Further her work involved sensual experience through which participants rediscovered their creativity and self-expression. In her 1983 manifesto Livro-obra, she valued the work as a ‘passive contemplation; the act of carrying the proposition; the act as a field of experience; becom[ing] aware of … alienation; the participation of the spectator (and) … the notion of freedom’ (L. Clark, 1997, p. 211).

As a turning point in visual thought, Lygia Clark’s (1997) work invited a reconceptualisation of time-space through awareness. As Paulo Herkenhoff (1997) put it: ‘She invented the phenomenology of the plane and then overcame geometry … [and] … with the death of the plane … sought out the space, the place, the regions’ (p. 36). Lygia Clark’s (1997) later work contained a distinctly sexual, even
erotic element since she took the position: ‘The erotic experienced as “profane” and art experienced as “sacred” are fused in a unique experience … This is a mixing of art and life … Touching is exercised on the bodies themselves’ (p. 247).

It is at this point the social worker becomes uncomfortable, for here the question of ethics arises. Not enough is said in the literature about Lygia Clark and this aspect of her work to allow the disquiet to settle. Herkenhoff (1997) suggested, having broken through the limits of art, Clark submitted herself to whatever the ethics of the cure imposed upon her but she never addressed whether touch was ethical or not. By externalising art, Clark relinquishes responsibility for her actions: Art took over. Hence, the question of ethical practice remains and the tension between art and social work increases.

**Relational aesthetics**

French curator, Nicholas Bourriaud (2002) penned the term *relational aesthetics* not as a ‘theory of art … but a theory of form’ (p. 19, 27) and believed change, driven by chance, randomness, and political acts, occurred in the social arena. The development of relational aesthetics reflected a growing propensity toward the reconceptualisation of the ‘white cube’, that is gallery-oriented exhibition to the experimental ‘laboratory’ or non-gallery oriented approach to displaying contemporary art (Bishop, 2004, p. 51). Ardenne et al. (1999) framed relational aesthetics in an historical context – of futurism, dada, the Russian *avant-garde*, 1960s, and later, 1990s recalibrations of participatory art. Regardless of historical precedents, relational aesthetics were located within human interaction and social context. It highlighted art’s role in healing and social well-being. The similarity to social work is found in its community and social action orientations.

Postmodernism was evident in the idea that making something *new* (novel or original idea in modernism) was no longer the primary criterion for art making. As a result, art became a ‘way of living’, ‘no longer simply a space to be walked through … [but rather] … a time to be lived through’, ‘an unlimited discussion’, ‘an encounter’ (p. 15 & 18), producing ‘a specific sociability’ (p. 16) and, as in Kaprow’s (1993) approach, offering an aesthetic experience in the everyday, where democratic, participatory process dwelled.
The creation of a work of art, which might or might not result in an object, must contain meaning for artist and participant and the exhibition space served as the ‘arena for exchange and/or encounter’, creating new possibilities and narratives through ‘an immediate discussion’ (Bourriaud, 2002, p. 15-16). Like Lygia Clark (1997), the work was time oriented, and the artist inhabited the circumstances of the present. This might be considered similar to the work of the social worker responding to her client in the moment or with immediacy so the work in and of itself reveals the process (see also Kaprow, 1995).

Works by artists like Carsten Höller demand the interaction of the viewer and have been linked to Op Art and relational aesthetics, where the focus is not on social relations, but on the physical and bodily experience of the artwork on the viewer (Allen, 2004). These works would seem to be more aligned with Op Art than relational aesthetics given their lack of social engagement. This is particularly so when considered in light of the work of Dutch artist Joep van Lieshout. Her work through Atelier van Lieshout (AVL) aimed to test state control of communities by flouting regulations regarding weapons, architecture, sexuality, alcohol, and food. It used art to challenge the law and ‘take over the world’ (Allen, 2001, p. 105). It is not surprising then, that her work (see Figure 8, A-portable: Women on waves) ‘encountered difficulties with the [abortion] law’ (Allen, 2001, p. 105). Its intention was ‘to make first-trimester abortions available to women in countries where the procedure is illegal by performing them in international waters, twelve miles off shore and just beyond the jurisdiction of national laws’ (Allen, 2001, p. 109). Van Lieshout believed art should work in and across contexts. Like van Lieshout, Lucy Orta engaged in relational aesthetics (Pinto et al., 2003).
Figure 8: Atelier van Lieshout (2001). *A-portable: Abortion clinic in a container for Women on Waves. Amsterdam*

**Intervention**

Engaged in direct social action and intervention, Orta’s work has been described as *interventionist* (Thompson, Sholette, Mirsoff & Chavoya, 2004). Orta positioned her work in the social context across four levels of action: ‘they act as a warning, create the impression of being operational or functional, they are poetic but raise questions or create disruptions and they act as a release mechanism for the gradual process of transformation’ (in Pinto et al., 2003, p. 9). She countered the modernist approach of ‘art for art’s sake’ in her demonstrated preference for poetic actions ‘located in the world of human, social and economic developments … [To achieve this she crossed disciplines] integrating both the poetic and the functional’ (Pinto et al., 2003, p. 8). She valued human life and freedom, and encouraged artists to share in and strive to implement these humanistic ends, which reverberate with the core values of social work – human dignity and worth, social justice, service to humanity, integrity, and professional competence (AASW, 2002). Robert Pinto (in Pinto et al., 2003) observed how Orta operated ‘on a plane where ethics and aesthetics find themselves sharing the same territory’ (p. 32).

Articulating very different ethics from Lygia Clark (1997) noted earlier, Orta’s practice was collaborative and underlined the importance of social interaction in human lives. Appropriated from a participant in her work, Orta was committed
to the idea ‘each of us, even the most marginalized, has “a lot to say”’ (Pinto et al., 2003, p. 32). Orta shared her interest between ‘the spectator’s attention … to the object … [and] the network of internal and external relationships and references of which her installation-performances consist’ (Pinto et al., 2003, p. 34). She focused on the body as the creator of sensation and relationships. Her work reflected a growing interest in the collective … mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion, … the models of collaborative interaction that go from the microcosm of the small community to the macrocosm of a planet governed by politico-economic and environmental laws (Pinto et al., 2003, p. 45).

In this context, the artist’s project was the product of collective intelligence. She took a populist interactive approach where ‘direct experiential engagement and communication between the artwork and … audiences occur[red]’ (Pinto et al., 2003, p. 90). In this communication, shared experience and the sensual emerged.

Paul Virilio said: ‘In my opinion, all avant-garde [emphasis added] art, and I include your [Orta’s] work here, is outside commercialization’ (as cited in Pinto et al., 2003, p. 119). Thus he inadvertently highlighted another parallel with social work, namely, service rather than commercialisation. Virilio compared Orta’s work with social work saying ‘I happen to know quite a few social workers who work this way and it’s extraordinary the “customer loyalty” they manage to create’ (as cited in Pinto et al., 2003, p. 118). He similarly described Orta’s work as ‘primitive art’, meaning ‘art whose originators “made do” with whatever came to hand’ (in Pinto et al., 2003, p. 128), Here Virilio resonates with social work’s penchant for making do.

**Littoral art**

Bruce Barber (1998) preferred the term littoral art, ‘the intermediate and shifting zone between the sea and the land … [which] … refers metaphorically to cultural projects … undertaken predominantly outside the conventional contexts of the institutionalized artworld’ (n.p.). Most importantly, he viewed artists’ engagement in public, community-based arts as an essentially political act, noting artists should behave ethically within public spaces. In his schema, public, community-based artists focused on changing the world through social, cooperative, participatory, and democratic practices. Drawing on the work of Jürgen Habermas, he believed
sociocultural actions could be strategic, exemplary, instrumental, or communicative. Like Kester who followed, Barber shared a connection to social work through Habermas (see, for example, Garrett, 2009a, 2009b; Gray & Lovat, 2008a, 2008b; Hayes & Houston, 2007; Houston, 2009a, 2009b): ‘Communicative actions attempt to lessen provocation and encourage dialogue. They are the result of the conjoining of theory and practice into a political praxis’ (Barber, 1998, n.p.). For Barber (1998), these works aimed at consciousness raising and social change, where the artist might ‘use any form and employ any materials, techniques or procedures to reach his/her objectives’ (n.p.). The emphasis, however, was on giving and dialogue. Like Kaprow, Barber (1998) identified a historical legacy and connection with the ‘avant-garde and neo-avant-garde [emphasis added] of the more recent past’ (n.p.). He thought littoral artists tried to understand the impact of their work in a public context and thus ‘learn from their mistakes’ (Barber, 1998, n.p.). He saw the process of a littoral art project as one which should unfold organically, and from this organic unfolding came the potential for new work to develop. He viewed littoral art as a social process with which one should not interfere once it was set in motion. The aesthetic values of the end product were not the focus of the work and the process might have a physical form or be invisible. Barber (1997/2004) identified Lacy’s work as an example of littoral art.

Of particular interest here is her art project on family violence (see Figure 9) given the nature of the empirical study nested within this thesis. Lacy’s project ran for two years, across several North American sites. It involved sculptural installations of wrecked cars created in collaboration with families who had experienced domestic violence. Domestic violence prevention groups contributed advice and community outreach services.

Barber (1997/2004; 1998) believed littoral art need not be interventionist and, while dialogical processes generally might be straightforward, successful communication was not inevitable: ‘[p]olitical praxis is often arrived at dialogically’ (Barber, 1997/2004, n.p). Littoral art was a precursor to Grant Kester’s (2004) dialogical art.
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**Figure 9: Suzanne Lacy and collaborators (1993-94). Auto on the edge.**
(Multiple cities throughout the US, 1993-1994)

**Dialogical art**

Kester (2004) offered further understanding of art as process via his concept of dialogical art, underpinned by Mikhail Bakhtin’s idea ‘that a work of art can be viewed as a kind of conversation’ (p. 10). Attention to art as process within community served as a mirror for social work (Compton & Galloway, 1979; Kester, 2004). The work of the artist was to provide the context rather than the content and, through the use of personal qualities and skills, conversation became ‘an integral part of the work’ (Kester, 2004, p. 8). Kester (2004) insisted it was not sufficient to say ‘any [emphasis added] collaborative or conversational encounter constitute[d] a work of art’ (p. 69). What was at stake in these projects was not the dialogue per se but the extent to which the artist was able ‘to catalyse emancipatory insights [emphasis added] through [emphasis in original] the process of dialogue’ (Kester, 2004, p. 69).

Kester’s (2004) view of the aesthetics of dialogue stemmed from the Kantian notion of aesthetic experience where the ‘cognitive powers [were] free to play’ and resulted in ‘liberatory pleasure’ (p. 107). For Kant, and Habermas, all people perceived the world through the same basic cognitive processes. The aesthetic experience and judgements regarding the aesthetic value of objects reflected cognitive human interests. Communities of shared interest created the conditions for consensus. Local consensual knowledge, then, flowed from collective,
communicative action. Subjectivity was formed through the discourse and intersubjective exchange of communicative action. In other words, it was socially shaped. Nevertheless, as England (1986) noted, subjectivity has been a consistent challenge for social work’s attempts to locate itself within the scientific paradigm (see Chapters 1 and 3).

Kester (2004) made a link between the different ways of describing similar processes and spelled out the various terms used to describe this new way of discussing and engaging in art making. Thus he identified new genre public art (Lacy, 1995), littoral art (Barber, 1997/2004; 1998), relational aesthetics (Bourriard, 2002), conversational art (Jacobs & Brenson, 1998), dialogue-based public art (Finkelpearl, 2000; Senie & Webster, 1992) and his own dialogical art (Kester, 2004), engaged art (Bishop, 2006a), and community-based art (Kwon, 2004 see below) as all discussing the same issues. In addition to the terms identified by Kester, connective aesthetics, art therapy, and social work might also be added. The primary distinction for social work was the articulation and adoption of a particular, clearly articulated set of humanistic values, which, in turn, have led to the development of ethical guidelines for practice (AASW, 2002). Kester (2004) located the importance of emancipation, empowerment, and participatory democracy via the work of social worker Jane Addams and the Settlement House Movement where art and social work cohabited7. His focus moved to community and provided the platform for critique and development of practice models by Kwon (2004).

**Art as community development**

Kwon (2004) moved from traditional ways of looking at the site of art (described earlier by Lippard, 1997b) to considering site-specificity as a ‘problem–idea’ (Kwon, 2004, p. 2) rather than an artistic genre. She considered site in the context of art and spatial politics (see also Massey, 1995) directed at increasing the impact and meaning of the work. Thus, the site became more than the space. Kwon (2004) tracked the development of site-based art from the 1960s when site-specific art took the site to mean the actual location (art in public places). Thus site was a *real place*

---

7 Addams and her friend Ellen Gates Starr who was an artist worked to bring programmes in the arts to Hull House. Initially this work was based on a shared vision that art could be a means of radical social change. For further details regarding their relationship and work see Stankiewicz, 1989.
and site-based art had an aesthetic function. Site then shifted from physical location in a gallery to the system of socioeconomic relations surrounding art and its institutions (art in public spaces) where it took on a design function. The final phase was for the site to become issue specific (art in the public interest), wherein the institutional frame was secondary to the broadly determined site defined as a field of knowledge, intellectual exchange, or cultural debate in which art took on a social function. Hence Kwon (2004) considered the site to be a social entity and suggested art in the public interest was a bottom-up approach in which artists negotiated, promoted, coordinated, compromised, researched, interviewed, and organised, in the process becoming accessible, accountable, socially responsible, or socially good.

Kwon (2004) referred to Lacy’s values (described above) relating to art in the public interest where the artist as social change agent pursued social justice.

Kwon (2004) questioned the notion of community and the relationship of artist to community. She saw Kester’s (2004) work as an oversimplified, economically deterministic reading of community-based art, which minimised the diverse approaches to working with communities. She proposed four approaches, all of which are familiar to social work: consultation with representatives from the community; pairing with an existing organisation; constituting a new group or organisation through the coordination of the artwork itself; and community sustainability beyond the artist’s context and institutional support. She suggested collective artistic practice was a projective (rather than descriptive) enterprise. She raised the importance of space and belonging, leading to her promotion of sustainable relations between space and place. Thus art became a powerful source of social and political change in the form of community development – a domain of social work and art explored further in Chapter 5.

**Activism**

Increasing discussion regarding the place of activism and social action as a means of addressing injustice and inequality is evident within the art literature (see, for example, Chandler & Newmark, 2006; de Zegher, 1998; Ennis, 2005). For artist Martha Rosler this related to the ‘psychosocial or … the ideological’ (Eiblmayr, as cited in de Zegher, 1998, p. 158). The former is strongly associated with assessment in social work and the latter with radical practice as mentioned above.
Participation

Clare Bishop (2006b) examined the social dimensions of participation in art emergent since the 1990s. Participation is also an important concept in social work (Thompson, 2002). Bishop (2006b) acknowledged the heritage of participatory practices in art reaching back to the 1920s. She identified the ‘Paris “Dada-Season” of April 1921 … a series of manifestations that sought to involve the city’s public’ (p. 10) as an important starting point which led to 1960s avant-garde theatre and its direct physical involvement as ‘an essential precursor to social change’ (p. 11). Bishop (2006b) argued, as an artistic medium, participation was no more ‘intrinsically political or oppositional than any other [form of action]’ (p. 12). She saw a connection between participation, empowerment, and the aesthetics of collective agency. Shared authorship of a work of art made participatory art a democratic, egalitarian, nonhierarchical model of creative collaboration. Further, participatory art involved a collective sharing of meaning allowing for the re-establishment of social bonds (Bishop, 2006b).

The shared territory and its implications for practice

The shared territory identified through this exploration of the art literature reveals and highlights values, skills (including ways of communicating and related processes), history, context, and concerns held by social work and the socially-oriented art of the avant-garde. In combination, these six areas (detailed in Table 2) describe the modes of engagement used by social workers and artists in practice. The most surprising discovery was the historical influence of pioneer social worker Jane Addams on this form of art practice, compared with the influence of social movements and ideas like humanism, feminism, Marxism, and critical theory.

Emerging interest in the art literature regarding accessibility, accountability, ethics, and critical reflexivity, all of which are important in social work, were of major interest and pointed to significant implications for engagement, for this is also where social work and art divide. Social work holds a clearly articulated position regarding ethical and accountable practice in working with people (see, for example,
Table 2: The shared territory of social work and art emanating from the art literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Consideration of otherness, marginalisation, and oppression</td>
<td>Practice of the self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Sensibility about power</td>
<td>Interrelatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moral component</td>
<td>Liberating people and lifting repression</td>
<td>Makes a difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses issues (including world peace, human rights, rights of the physically challenged, democracy, memory, cultural diversity, pro-choice, ecology, and caring … and the common enemies of war, hatred, racism, classism, censorship, drug addiction, ageism, apartheid, homophobia, hunger, poverty, joblessness, pollution, homelessness, AIDS, greed, imperialism, and cross-cultural blindness)</td>
<td>Value of human life and freedom</td>
<td>Ecological systems theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountable</td>
<td>Humanism</td>
<td>Located in the everyday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seeks social justice</td>
<td>Process oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role of social agent</td>
<td>Subject to chance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solidarity</td>
<td>randomness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>Debate about ‘the generalist’ or ‘the specialist’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nondefensive</td>
<td>Political and social activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critically reflexive</td>
<td>Absence of a plot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic or participatory</td>
<td>Eduative function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Struggles of measurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility, openness, and flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused on relationship and dialogue</td>
<td>Development of shared meaning (collective elaboration)</td>
<td>The importance of the context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Including the voices of others</td>
<td>Public or community contexts and relevance for communities (particularly marginalised ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Catalyse understandings</td>
<td>Ambiguity of the term ‘community’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>Mediate exchange</td>
<td>Social influences which have supported its development (including feminism, ethnic influences, Marxism, and a shared interest in the politics of the left)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>The network of internal and external relationships</td>
<td>The social spaces, social interaction, and social relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory process and engagement</td>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>Located in the world of human, social, and economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work collaboratively or collaborative methodology</td>
<td>Exchange</td>
<td>Outside commercialisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The possibility of an immediate discussion</td>
<td>Interactive approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Addams, Hull House, and the Settlement Movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Art, by comparison, until recently, has paid little regard to this and ethical considerations are only just starting to emerge as an issue within art practice and the art literature.

In surveying a range of literature arising from the socially-oriented art of the avant-garde, the key theoretical ideas of art as process, connective aesthetics, new genre public art, place and space, therapy, relational aesthetics, intervention, littoral art, dialogical art, and art as community work were highlighted. Within these ideas, six territories shared with the everyday practice of social work were located: history, context, concerns, values, skills, and communication. It is this shared territory that shapes the way artists and social workers engage with individuals, groups, and communities. It is the mutual interest in working with people in their social context, using participatory, democratic processes, communication based on listening and empathy, and relationship as the medium of transformation and change which becomes the work of art for both disciplines (Gray & Webb, 2008). In viewing the shared territory from a reflexive, ethical perspective, the tensions between social workers and artists have also been highlighted.

Thus in moving from modes of engagement to the ethics of engagement new questions emerge: For art – ‘are artists working in this arena ready to engage with ethics?’ – and for social work – ‘are social workers ready to re-engage with their history as art and lead the way?’ These questions assume significance for artists and social workers for it is in these modes of practice that art becomes social work and the art of social work is located. From this position, ethical practice becomes paramount. However, locating commonalities only partially answers the question of where social work might sit in the art historical canon. It was Kaprow (1993) who inadvertently provided an expanded understanding of this question through his examination of five streams of influence he believed contributed to the development of avant-garde art (see Figure 10). While there were synergies with the ideas of Erving Goffman (1971) and Dewey (1934), it was the last stream – ‘art as a moral act’ (Kaprow, 1993, p. 53) – in which social work might be most strongly located. Social work’s beginnings in charity are consistent with the idea of social work as a moral act. Malcolm Payne (1999) noted the moral basis of social work has been discussed and examined increasingly within the social work literature since the
‘Doing is knowing’ from John Dewey incorporating the notion that every day events, doings, and sufferings are universally recognised as constituting experience

Daily routine as performance from the ideas of Erving Goffman in *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life*

Marshall McLuhan’s notion that ‘art is what you can get away with’

Medieval mystery plays and processions → Travelling Saltimbanques → Carnival → Circus → Mime → Dada → Surrealists

Art as a moral act

*Figure 10: Kaprow’s (1993) five streams of influence on the development of the avant-garde as art separated from daily life*
1950s, with the focus centered on values and codes of ethics. He also argued social workers made artistic (aesthetic) judgements and the actions of social workers were often in response to unattractive behaviour or appearance of, ‘an offender or mentally ill person, or dribbling because of a disability … [and noted he had] … often seen aesthetic judgements about clients in reports: ‘drab decorations’, ‘unkempt hair’, ‘unmatched, ill-fitting clothing’, or ‘a dismal housing estate’ (Payne, 1999, p. 20). He saw aesthetic judgements as integral to social relations and also viewed them as part of what have traditionally been described as moral judgements. Further, he believed, when social workers deny their aesthetic judgements, they ‘avoid using the well established rules for assessing aesthetic evidence, and [their] judgements are the poorer for it’ (Payne, 1999, p. 250). He believed social workers had avoided economic, political, and aesthetic judgements and maintained their focus on moral judgements to ensure a ‘neutral, scientific status for [their] knowledge base’ (p. 250).

The *art as a moral act* stream serves as the juncture or connection point between the two disciplines. Goldstein (1987) served as a beacon for appreciating the artistic nature of social work practice and also offered a link between the moral and the aesthetic. It is here that artists and social workers meet and divide. Morality and ethics become entwined and confirmed for social workers through their undergraduate education, but to date this has not been the case for artists.

Ethics, as an issue within art, until very recently, has been discussed only within the literature explored in this chapter and, as noted above, it has not, in all instances, been consistently evident. Within Australia, the National Association for the Visual Arts (NAVA) was the first to develop a *Code of practice for visual artists* (NAVA, 2001, 2004, 2009). This document has been updated to incorporate ethical guidelines in the wake of the Bill Henson scandal in 2008 involving an exhibition of which included nude photographs of an underage girl, which fuelled concerns about the ethical practices of all artists.

In acknowledging the interrelationship between moral and aesthetic judgements, social work can be further confirmed as situated within the frame of contemporary *avant-garde* art from the evidence stream identified by Kaprow (1993). What emerges from the placement of social work in this way is a new area of engagement for artists who have been practising in socially engaged ways. Thus
artists would be invited to more actively and comprehensively address ethical practices when engaging in community and public art practice. In so doing, the artist would start where the person is and the artist’s intentions would become secondary to the individual group or community with whom they would be working.

This chapter has examined the literature on socially engaged contemporary *avant-garde* art practice. It has located references to social work, its component features, and processes related to social change through identifying commonalities between the practices of the two disciplines. In reviewing the practices associated with connective aesthetics; ‘Happenings’, the blurring of art and life; new genre public art; space, time, place, and the politics of location; art as therapy; relational aesthetics; intervention; littoral art; dialogical art; art as community development; activism; and participation important areas of shared practice have been identified. Common ground has been identified in six domains: values; concerns; context; skill; communication; and history. It has been argued that the greatest variation between art and social work lay in the ethics underpinning practice and has highlighted an emerging trend within art toward a more ethical base to its practice. These areas of commonality and difference now serve as a lens through which to review the social work literature on art in the next chapter.
Chapter 4

Locating Art in Social Work

Art, Social Work, and Social Change
This chapter moves beyond the definitions of art explored in Chapter 2 to examine the application of art to social work practice. Refracted through the prism that social work is art and that it, therefore, has a number of commonalities with art practice, this chapter reviews the social work literature on art from a fresh perspective. It begins by tracing the chronology and history of ideas relating to art in the social work canon. It then examines these themes against some of the areas identified in Chapter 3 such as values, concerns, skills, communication, and contexts. It expresses the view that social work as art and the work of art in social work have been inspirational. These views provided impetus to theorising about art, which has extended understanding of the heart of social work. The commonalities noted with the contemporary art literature provide confirmation of the importance of the focus on practice within the social work literature. However, they also suggest some fundamental omissions, such as the honouring of the historical beginnings of art and the place of community in social work. The common shared history between the two disciplines is expanded in Chapter 5. In light of these conclusions, the relationship of art to the idea of artful practice (Gray & Powell, 2006b) is explored before finally turning to social change and highlighting the place of communication, advocacy, and activism within the change process in social work. Without naming it as such, Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) identified the zeitgeist – spirit of the times – as influential to ‘highlighting or downplaying’ (p. 198) the artistic scope of social work practice. Their conception is revisited and developed at the end of this chapter.

**Chronological and thematic history**

While England (1986) was an important catalyst for this thesis, he was certainly not the first to write about art in social work. This happened considerably earlier and was evident in literature as far back as the late 1800s, particularly in relation to the work of two US social work pioneers Mary Richmond (1862-1928) and Jane Addams (1860-1935). Richmond (1917) mentioned art in relation to social casework and Addams (1895) in relation to community work. Nevertheless, though
the art of practice has been widely canvassed in social work (Sheppard, 2006), it has not been explained ‘in substantive terms’ (Palmer, 2002, p. 193) due to ongoing confusion in language, terminology, meaning, and understanding. For example, Helen Perlman (1957) talked about the art of practice. England (1986) viewed social work as art. Siporin (1988) described it as an art form and aesthetic practice. Goldstein (1992) described it as an art and frequently referred to its artistic practice. Gray and Powell (2006a, 2006b) referred to its artistry, and Sheppard (2006) focused on the worker’s humanity and underpinning helping values, which he situated in an interpretivist approach to knowledge. Gray and Webb (2008) drew attention to art as the work of the social. Within these layers of meaning, emphasis has shifted between ‘the person of the worker, creativity and the importance of the relationship’ (Sheppard, 2006, p. 153).

Gray and Webb (2008) suggested those who wrote about the art of social work saw ‘art [emphasis in original] as inhering in the individual social worker’ (p. 182). Would this thinking make sense in fine art or the arts per se? Does art exist in the artist? Given the diverse descriptions in social work, would one talk about painting, for example, as art, as an art form, as an art, as a work of art, as artistic practice, or as artistry? Would one discuss the art of painting and the art as inhering in the individual painter? Taking a more general approach to the arts, would music, for example, be described as art, as an art form, as the work of art, as an art, as artistic practice, or as artistry? Would one talk about the art of music and the art as dwelling in the individual musician? Certainly the potential for all of these descriptions exist in art and social work. Like painting and music, social work could be considered a medium of art thus signifying the method or category in which an artist (social worker) works. In social work, these various terms are used interchangeably when referring to art in relation to social work practice. Figures 11 and 12 trace the chronology of the key ideas relating to art within the social work literature and provide some sense of the developmental (evolutionary) nature of ideas about art in social work.

As shown in Figures 11 and 12, Richmond (1917) was the first to refer to the artistic basis of practice. In 1949, she drew a distinction between the social caseworker’s scientific mindedness and the artist’s practice skills. Here begins the clinical thread in social work (already introduced in Chapter 3, while Chapter 5
further develops the community thread that begins with Addams). Thus, from the start, there was tension between the science and art of practice. Among practitioners social work was understood ‘as a creative art form [emphasis added] rather than a science’ (Siporin, 1988, p. 177). The art was seen as having something to do with the skill of the worker. Hence much of the exploration of art in social work might be seen as an attempt to name and understand the subjectivities experienced within professional practice. This insight invited two questions:

1. If social work were art what new sense might be made of its subjectivity?

2. Are artists more comfortable with the subjectivity of their practice than social workers?

To begin to consider these questions, a review of the social work literature led to the identification of four main areas of concern in relation to locating art in social work as follows:

1. Art as it related to philosophy and values.

2. Art as it related to social work practice.

3. Art as it related to social change.

4. A group of miscellaneous ideas that were less easily categorised but demonstrated some link to a number of Dutton’s (2009) criteria for art (see Chapter 2).

As already noted, the focus on practice was of central concern within the art literature. The commonalities identified in Table 2 (see Chapter 3) are now examined further. It is important to note a number of these categories could be defined other than they are here – such is the ephemeral nature of this literature.
1889  
Jane Addams  
Uses art in practice at Hull House

1917  
Mary Richmond  
Social Casework as an artform

1949  
Swithun Bowers  
Art as the practice skill

1968  
Lydia Rapoport  
Creativity in social work examines subjectivity and style

1971  
Noel Timms  
Work begins to parallel a philosophy of art

1974  
Elizabeth Irvine  
Art is in the relationship between the worker and client

1979  
Michael Whan  
The worker as artist, critic and creator of ‘story’

1982  
Sheila Seltzer & Jane Reifler  
First example of using art as a therapeutic tool

1986  
Hugh England  
Social work as art

1987  
Howard Goldstein  
Like art, social work is involved in clarifying the personal and moral meaning of social issues and events

1988  
Max Siporin  
Clinical social work as an art form and the aesthetics of practice

1992  
Howard Goldstein  
Social work as an art form: Creativity, imagination and intuition are useful in practice

1995  
Colin Piele  
Creativity as the fundamental nature of all processes, social work practice and knowledge development

1998  
Howard Goldstein  
Considers art as beyond technique

1999  
Howard Goldstein  
The art of understanding, artistry in narrative and metaphor

1999  
Linda Turner  
Examines creativity in social work in greater detail (extended in 2000 and 2001)

Figure 11: Chronology of ideas about art in social work (Part A)
Figure 12: Chronology of ideas about art in social work (Part B)
Values and art

The values of social work are what make it unique as a profession and discipline. Values are much written about in the social work literature beyond art and are often linked to ethics (see, for example, Banks, 2003; Gray & Webb, 2010; Payne, 1999; Reamer, 2005a, 2005b, 2006; McBeath & Webb, 2002). Ethics are part of social work’s special focus vis a vis Dutton’s (2009) criteria for art. The gap between art and social work in circumstances like those of Lygia Clark demonstrates a very different (absent) approach to ethics between the two disciplines, particularly in relation to working directly with people. It is, therefore, important to reconsider what the art-oriented literature in social work says about values and ethics.

In Chapter 3, the place of Reamer’s (1993) ‘corpus’ (p. 161) of social work values, principles, and skills was identified as essential to its art and the basis of professional unity. In contrast, Rapoport (1968) saw the values of social work and art as located in its social purpose, which was upheld through the sanction of wider society. Social work, however, became increasingly linked with social control, with attention focused on the use of professional responsibility and authority to bring clients into line with social norms. Also Rapoport (1968) perceived tensions between technical considerations brought about by increasing concerns with scientific practice, which she saw as an aspect of social control, and social work’s value base. For her, art too had a regulatory function in societies where there was minimal separation between the artist and society: In these circumstances, ‘art serves purposes of social control, through ritual, religion or politics’ (Rapoport, 1968, p. 143-144). With regard to contemporary art, she suggested the regulatory function of art was in ‘organizing sensory knowledge and experiences into some communicable form’ (p. 144). For Rapoport (1968), the values of social work made it more than a mere technical or regulatory operation in society.

Contemporary theorists have pursued the relationship between art and values. For example, Damianakis (2007) saw a relationship between social work’s humanistic values, art, and research. For her, the art focus suggested the need for research motivated by ‘an ongoing ethic of care’ (p. 25). Thus, she connected art to the ethical
basis of social work. Gray and Powell (2006b) examined artful practice and social work ethics through the lens of moral philosophy. They believed artful practice had a moral purpose and was also spiritual (see also Gray, 2010).

The values noted in Table 2 are consistent with those of social work. The primary difference (as previously noted) is the ethical emphasis in each discipline. Making a difference is one of the catch cries of social work. Despite the shared concerns between art and social work identified in Table 2, there was little focus on ethics within the art literature, while the social work literature oriented to art focused on the use of self, art as making new, political and social activity, and meaning and change. The art theory and history of art literature has more in common with the social work literature on ethics and associated philosophical ideas than the literature on contemporary art practice (discussed in Chapter 3), which neglects the ethical dimension. Nevertheless, the philosophical basis of social work’s art has been little explored, as discussed below.

**Philosophy and art**

There was no one, single strand evident within the social work literature on the philosophical basis of its art. Hence all that could be hoped for was a brief scoping of the terrain. Philosophical references began with Aristotle and ranged through to those of contemporary philosopher Raimond Gaita (in Gray & Powell, 2006b; see also Gray & Stofberg, 2000). One of the earliest and strongest advocates for the philosophical underpinnings of art in social work was Reamer (1993) who looked to the tradition of Western philosophy and the relationship between art and aesthetics. Thus, he considered the ideas of Plato, Aristotle, and St Thomas Aquinas on art and beauty, as well as the writing of ‘relatively minor figures such as Baltasar Gracian, Jean de La Bruyere, … Georges-Louis Leclerc, [C]omte de Buffon’ (Reamer, 1993, p. 160) and the originator of aesthetics, German philosopher Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (who influenced Kant’s later ideas), among others. Significant in Reamer’s (1993) discussion was the importance of examining the extent to which social work met established criteria for art that provided the basis for the discussion of Dutton’s new criteria set out in Chapter 2.
Prue Chamberlayne and Martin Smith (2009) turned to German hermeneutic philosophy, especially the work of Georg-Hans Gadamer (2003) and moral theologian and educator Michael Crotty (1998) – who focused on hermeneutics in research – to appreciate their ‘long standing advocacy of aligning human sciences with the arts, for an understanding of culture, aesthetic experience, “play”, the uniqueness of being, [and] for different criteria of methodological rigour and truth’ (p. 3).

Gray and Webb (2008) looked to the work of another German philosopher, Martin Heidegger and ontological phenomenology in combination with the work of French philosopher, Alain Badiou. This allowed them to position social work as art in terms of ‘artistic attunement’ (p. 182) and art in ‘the service of a politics of liberation’ (p. 182). The latter is dealt with below in the section on the political nature of art in social work. Combined with this philosophical background, Gray and Webb (2008) viewed art ‘through the lens of Hugh England in tandem with advances in phenomenological research’ (p. 182). They argued it was the art of social work rather than the social worker that made up practice. This position enabled their construction of a ‘radical agonistics’ (Gray & Webb, 2008, p. 184) by which they meant energy akin to the difficulties experienced in art.

Ferguson (2009) was highly critical of the philosophical position taken by Gray and Webb (2008) due to their ‘over-reliance on Heidegger’s ontology; an over-estimation of the potential of art to act as alternative paradigm, and a particularly content-less version of politics, derived from the work of Alain Badiou’, which he saw as ‘likely to prove to be of limited value in the project of developing alternative forms of social work’ (Ferguson, 2009, p. 213). He saw two problems with their argument: the first being the relationship of Heidegger to German National Socialism and the second, what he described as a category error in attempting to use an obscure, abstract ontology on which to base their analysis (Ferguson, 2009). By bringing their philosophical approach to social work as art, Ferguson (2009) identified Gray and Webb (2008) as an attempt to move beyond England’s (1986) position to ‘present art as an alternative paradigm for social work practice to the currently dominant paradigm’ (p. 215).

Such an approach varied vastly from Siporin’s (1988) work that turned not to mainstream philosophers but to the philosophical ruminations of a disparate group of
authors, including: Leo Tolstoy and his belief the ‘artist transmits emotion and moves to unify people in sharing experience’ (in Siporin, 1988, p. 177); Dewey and the notion that ‘art is experience [which] ... unites form and content’ (p. 177); and existential psychologist Rollo May’s idea that ‘art is arriving at form in human life [which led to meaning and transformation]’ (p. 177). Further contrast can be seen in comparing the more contemporary approach of Yasmin Gunaratnam (2009). She turned to the work of Pierre Bourdieu (1990) and his thoughts regarding ‘practice’ to provide a basis for bodily ways of knowing, for practice which, in Bourdieu’s terms, was seen as ‘involving a sensual, moment-by-moment unfolding of activity that [was] characterised by presence, context and improvisation’ (p. 17). Gunaratnam (2009) also considered the work of Theodor Adorno (1984) who suggested:

art offers neither a rational duplicate of the objective world, nor an inscription of the ‘psychic content’ and intents of the artist, rather it is a part of an interactive and somewhat mysterious relation between objectivity and subjectivity that is conveyed through ‘mimesis’ to convey the ‘slippery, paradoxical quality of art and its relationship to an unruly, autonomous other, defying categorisation, identification and incorporation that is so relevant not only to research but also to all human relationships (p. 21).

Palmer (2002) argued the art of social work practice might be seen as a heuristic perspective, which differed from approaches which sought to quantify and categorise things into typologies and hierarchies. A heuristic, an often-unconscious process, was seen as a cognitive or problem-solving device, which became inbuilt and developed with understanding and wisdom. Drawing on the work of art therapist Bruce Moon (1998), who suggested ‘the making of art is always involved with perception, feeling, imagination, relationship, manipulation of materials, and the soul of the artist’ (p. 6), Palmer (2002) identified a link to ‘an alternative epistemology or ways of viewing the universe … [which could] offer a [holistic] perspective other than a disconnection or compartmentalization of the body, mind and spirit’ (p. 200). Clearly, then, these philosophical connections converge in a form of practice valuing creativity and spontaneity, as described below.
Practice and art

Issues surrounding the nature of, and skills for, practice are a central concern in social work and much of the social work literature relating to art has a practice focus. An emergent trend within the literature identified art and social work as the same practice (see, for example, ‘Art for social work’s sake’ (2002), Community Care, which described an art project funded by the UK Arts Council as social work). This has recently expanded to the emergence of a more formal blending of the two disciplines known as SWART (Storey, 2008). Lou Storey (2008) described this phenomenon as the formalisation of a natural pairing which ‘has informally existed in different contexts in the history of art, but has not, until now, been directly named. Both social work and art are hard to define’ (n.p.). The combined pursuit of social justice through both social work and art sits at the basis of SWART.

Storey (2008) cited acclaimed US social worker Romare Bearden as an example of an artist engaged in SWART and suggested his art strongly reflected his social work ethics, while his social work practice served as a source of inspiration and was inherent in his art. In this approach to social work and art, there was a shared ‘potential to create change’ (Storey, 2008, n.p.) and commitment to emotion. Both activities in this construction were seen as giving up ‘a degree of control and predetermination to successfully “join” with his or her own creativity [emphasis added]’ (Storey, 2008, n.p.). Storey (2008) observed artists and social workers were mostly paired in the same Myers-Briggs type indicator career groupings. The common traits between the two included ‘helping people achieve their goals; having enthusiasm that motivates others; having a gift for encouraging others to actualize themselves, and being driven by a strong sense of personal values’ (Storey, 2008, n.p.). In her own SWART practice, Storey (2008) made art in response to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM-IV-TR) and issues relating to the social work code of ethics with a focus on social change. Like Gray and Webb (2008), she believed SWART directly addressed the social work of art and opened yet another dimension to the relationship between social work and art, by moving the orientation from a philosophical one back into practice. Similarly, as noted...
in Chapter 2, the development of the University of Creation (Souzou Gakuen University)\(^8\) in Japan, exclusively comprising social work, art, and music programmes, provided a further example of the increasing connection between the two disciplines. It is yet to be determined what the implications of this emergent trend on social work and art ultimately will be. Nevertheless, this literature points to an artistry in social work practice and it is to this that the discussion now turns.

**Artistry in social work practice**

It was Rapoport (1968) who identified the lack of discussion of artistry in social work. In naming this omission, she created room for this gap to be filled as social work’s artistry became increasingly linked to its skill dimension. Conceivably the greatest influence on this dimension came from psychologist Donald Schön (1987) whose notion of *reflective practice* (to which art was integral) was enthusiastically embraced by the social work profession where artistry came to comprise artistic ability, quality, and most prominently, skill. Thus, for example, Siporin (1993) and later Sheafor and Horejsi (2003) saw artistry in the ‘application of knowledge and skill … articulated through professional and personal styles’ (p. 44).

Epistemologically, artistry became increasingly linked to postmodernism. Goldstein’s (1999) work reflects this bias with artistry in social work framed in terms of meaning-making – as something which contributed to the gaining of understanding in practice. It shifted focus from the ‘what’ to the ‘how’ [emphasis] (p. 386) of understanding. Thus Goldstein associated theory with science and practice with art, with the latter dealing with the peculiar, diverse, and fugitive aspects of the human condition. Goldstein (1999) favoured a narrative approach to working with people and their concerns, which he viewed as requiring creativity and artistry. Likewise, Gray and Powell (2006b) located artistry in dialogue and relationships. From these various sources, the idea of artful practice emerges.

---

\(^8\) [http://english.souzou.ac.jp/index.htm](http://english.souzou.ac.jp/index.htm)
Social work as artful practice

Based on the teaching of Roselle Kurland (a US social work academic who died in 2005), Steinberg (2006) defined artful practice as that which sought ‘to understand the relationship between context and possibility—to dance the perpetual dance between what is and what might be’ (p. 36). For her, art and science were ‘kindred spirits’ (Steinberg, 2006, p. 36). She focused on artful practice in group work and the skills of tuning in, making a group work, dealing with difficult environments, reading between the lines, listening with a keen ear, developing group purpose, attending to complexity and duality, observing keenly, being sensitive to the possibility of and openness to change, and of creating an environment which anticipated and proactively supported change. For Steinberg (2006), artful group work was also about style, attending to the sense of things, reframing problems as opportunities, and being hopeful. In its essence, she concluded, artful practice ‘[was] the elegant part of social work with groups’ (Steinberg, 2006, p. 36 - 37).

For Gray and Powell (2006a, 2006b), artful practice was ‘good, [emphasis added] direct, practice’ (n.p.) which was consistent with social work’s moral position. They traced the shifting sands of social work’s moral beginnings through to the processes of professionalisation and its subsequent move to becoming more than an ‘idea and a social expression of caring for one another’ (Gray & Powell, 2006b, n.p). For them, artful practice meant reconnecting with the moral basis of social work through the pursuit of deep, ‘purposeful relationships … [motivated by] our innate capacity for altruism, and … our aspirations for making a better world’ (Gray & Powell, 2006a, n.p). They saw artful practice as implicit and explicit, comprising nine key aspects:

1. The importance of keen and focused listening and presence.
2. The importance of relationship and mutuality.
3. The importance of enriching experience.
4. Informed intuition and critical reflection.
5. Wisdom and understanding.
6. An open-ended and inclusive view of theory and knowledge.
7. Consideration of ethics and a sense of morality.
8. The importance of contextual knowledge and tailoring our work to fit.
9. The importance of creativity, aesthetics, and tailoring our work (Gray & Powell, 2006b, n.p.).

They suggested these components ‘contribute[d] to a deeper understanding and a sense of personal efficacy’ (n.p.) when addressing social inequality, leading to the better representation of ‘the interests of those with whom we work’ (n.p.). Thus Gray and Powell (2006a, 2006b) attempted to make sense of the primary conceptual concerns of art in social work.

The ethereal nature of the social work literature on art and its lack of order make it difficult to discern exactly what its art is. Thus, in trying to make sense of this, an attempt was made to bring some sort of order to these disordered and eclectic texts, through focusing on its bulk, which has to do with art as inhering in the practice of social work. Here a clearly technical bent is discernible in trying to delineate exactly what qualities and skills of the social worker constitute art.

Within this group is the insubstantial literature on social work methods and art. Then there is a more limited literature, which sees art as having an instrumental purpose, where art is a medium or tool for change, usually at a direct practice level. Following that is the literature on relationship and communication, which is highly interpretive (and postmodern). Finally, there is a small body of transformative literature, which tries to discern how art in social work contributes to social change. These categories are outlined in Table 3. As is argued below, this is where the neglected dimension of art in community practice is made visible. It is developed in Chapter 5.
Table 3: Discernible categories within the practice-related literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROACH</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Art as the use of self</td>
<td>Personal qualities and style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Art as skill</td>
<td>Attempts to name discrete skills constituting art:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Performance skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Creative skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Art as a medium or method</td>
<td>The art of direct practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The art of social group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The art of supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The art of research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive</td>
<td>Art as communication</td>
<td>Communication and meaningful relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication as meaning-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>Art as social change</td>
<td>Artful practice as social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art as harbinger of a changing world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Art as political</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal approach: Art as the use of self**

Notwithstanding the concerns with subjectivity already noted in Chapters 1 and 3, the use of self remains much discussed in relation to art in social work, especially by key advocates of art as the use of self, including Rapoport (1968), Ringel (2004), and O’Brien and Leneave (2008). Use of self implies social workers require:

1. *Particular attitudes*, such as openness, flexibility, and fluidity. These attitudes are linked to values within social work (as noted earlier in this chapter) and reflected in practice as tolerance, respect, compassion, kindness, taking an anti-oppressive stance, and so on.

2. *Personal characteristics*, such as open-mindedness and curiosity, and mindfulness of the ‘power and impact of [one’s] personality’ (Seligson, 2004, p. 534).

3. *Skills*, including the ability ‘to convey warmth, empathy, and genuineness, the ability to effectively utilize personal experiences to properly meet practice goals, … the appropriate use of intuition or practice wisdom’ (O’Brien & Leneave, 2008, p. 92-93), and to build and sustain relationships through communication and dialogue (Gray & Powell, 2006a, 2006b).

But the literature on the creative and imaginative use of self is a sundry assortment including:
1. Problem-solving ability, intimacy in knowing and contact, ‘expression, communication, [and] transformation or change’ (Rapoport, 1968, p. 151).

2. Life experience which uniquely informs the social worker’s technical skill and personal style regardless of the nature of the art form – social work or art (Seligson, 2004).

3. What was done and how it was executed as a consequence of the use of self in social work (Davies, as cited in Higham, 2005).

4. A ‘sense of judgement and creativity’ (Higham, 2005, p. 6).


Clearly, the use of self is confusingly intermingled with notions of skill and each social worker’s application of intra and interpersonal skills in social work practice. Ultimately, the notion of the use of self is poorly developed, articulated, or understood and remains subjective, despite attempts to move it onto more solid ground through notions of reflexivity – the cultivation of an acute awareness of self in all situations (Patni, 2008). Little discussed, however, is the need for a measure of objectivity to ensure the worker has got it right. While Rapoport (1968) acknowledged the need for ‘a special kind of distance and objectivity’ (p. 151), she did not examine how this was to be achieved beyond the claim the creative use of self involved unbiased assessment and compassion. As a check and balance to this intuitive approach was a strong Kantian focus on the use of reason or rationality embodied in the idea of critical (self-)reflection.

A more recent development has been the use of art to highlight or reflect upon social work. For example, Canadian social worker Adrienne Chambon (2005) used works of art to facilitate critical reflection on social work practice and teaching. To cite one instance, she used Stan Douglas’ collage and video installation work Nutka (1996). The text from the catalogue provided a map to orient the reader and the work demonstrated that practice frequently remained ‘implicit and unquestioned’ (p. 5). Further, her work indicated the need to look beyond the obvious. She recommended ‘[p]art of that knowledge is what is left unstated; Absence is often the focus of my work’ (Chambon, 2005, p. 9). This stands as a new addition to the social work literature which contrasts with traditional approaches to critical reflection which variously focus on investigation, technique, and facilitation (Gardner, 2003; Osmond & Darlington, 2005),
reflexivity (D’Cruz et al., 2006), caution (Yip, 2006), and critique (Iker, 1999). Chambon’s (2005) work fits most with the technique and facilitation approaches to reflection.

**Personal qualities and style**

Closely related to notions of the use of self are those relating to personal style. Rapoport (1968) saw a social worker’s style as developing within the context of ‘creative impulse, imaginative response, and intuitive wisdom’ (p. 155) and manifesting in communication. She understood style as the worker’s ‘characteristic manner of expression and execution’ (p. 155) and saw practice as informed by aesthetics, which she linked to the artful application of method. In other words, the aesthetic are contained in the social worker’s personal style in applying the methods of social work.

Siporin (1988) also considered the ‘creative use of style’ (p. 178) as a component of social work as an *art form* (also cited in Palmer 2002, p. 193). He saw the artistic or aesthetic aspects of practice as the creative and innovative use of technique. He suggested social workers and artists used style in similar ways, paying attention to design, form, structure, rhythm, melody, and themes in their work. They ensured their work had a ‘beginning, middle and end’ (p. 179). They used ‘various technical procedures, such as sensory images and metaphors and psychosocial rituals and ceremonies, to engage, arouse, and influence the client intellectually and emotionally’ (Siporin, 1988, p. 179). Siporin (1988) also valued the cognitive style of the worker, noting the work of Myron Weiner and Douglas Crowder who identified an inclination for practitioners to use abstract and metaphorical rather than concrete thinking and communication with clients. He also argued most of the personality characteristics required for an effective and creative style to generate art in social work practice could be taught and learned, thus creating the potential for changing the self to fit the purposes of practice.

Style, according to Sheafor and Horejsi (2003), was an expression of how social workers related to their clients using their ‘energy, creativity, wisdom, and judgment as well as their passion and commitment to particular social issues’ (p. 44). They also acknowledged each worker’s individuality in their physical (appearance) and behavioural
approach and the potential for altering their professional style. In so doing, the social worker needs to ensure their style is appropriate to the context, clients, and agency in which they find themselves.

Style is clearly linked here with the practice of social work on a number of levels, and its importance confirmed within Dutton’s (2009) criteria for art. The final section of this chapter moves away from the immediate commonalities with the art literature and Dutton’s criteria to review the place of artistry and social change within the social work literature on art. It is to this arena the next section turns.

**Rational-)technical approach: Art as skill**

In reviewing the philosophical connections of art in social work, little consistency in approach was evident. This inconsistency presented similar problems to those identified by Dutton (2009) in relation to philosophical approaches to other forms of art (see Chapter 2). Hence an attempt was made to reconsider the philosophical basis of art in social work through Dutton’s lens and to apply his criteria for art ‘as a field of activities, objects and experience that appears naturally in human life’ (p. 50). What implications might this have for social work practice? In the social work literature, this naturalistic perspective is implicit in discussions of art as skill, which is based on the idea social workers have innate abilities, and qualities which can be nurtured, developed, and styled to fit the circumstances. The image here is the shape-shifting social worker. This is what Gray and Powell (2006a) referred to as ‘tailoring our work to fit’ (p. 5).

Lydia Rapoport (1968) noted the tendency to use ‘skills’ rather than ‘artistry or craftsmanship (sic)’ (p. 142), to create ‘artistic, and craftsmanlike (sic) [practice]’ (p. 142). By craftsmanship she meant the ‘skilful execution of activities, consciously controlled and directed … to achieve a preconceived result’ (p. 143). However, she used these terms interchangeably and saw the qualities of creativity, art, and craftsmanship as integral to the various methods of social work, including casework, group work, community work, research, administration, and supervision. Beyond skill, Rapoport (1968) established the trend of describing art in terms of the qualities of the social worker. England (1986) too identified art as ‘practice skill’ (p. 88) linked to ‘seeing man (sic) whole’ (p. 89) such that it was as an artist the social worker could
synthesize ‘disparate material and employ it in specific, unique instances’ aided by the ‘science of human relations’ (p. 88-89).

Siporin (1988) expanded Rapoport’s understanding of ‘a conscious, intentional craftsmanship (sic) … applied with a controlled individualized style’ aimed at the creation of ‘beauty and truth’ (p. 179). In so doing, he related the skill of the social worker to ‘beautiful work [done with a] visible and articulated sense of purpose’ (Siporin, 1988, p. 179). In his seminal piece *Clinical social work as an art form*, Siporin (1988) lamented, following Perlman (1957), the art of practice consisted of ‘a high degree of skill’ (p. 178) but a lack of attention to the ‘aesthetic aspects of practice’ (p. 178). For Siporin (1988), clinical practice as a whole was an art form and the helping activity of social work a ‘creative art work’ (p. 178). For Siporin (1988), a focus on skill and method without attention to practice aesthetics led to narrow technicism.

**Attempts to name discrete skills that constitute art**

The range of skills attributed to social work’s art is vast with little clear agreement about the particular suite of skills which might constitute the art of social work. Many of the skills listed in Table 2 in Chapter 3 can be found within social work texts (see, for example, Maidment & Egan, 2004; Trevithick, 2000, 2005). The varied skills said to constitute the art of social work include but are not limited to:

3. Collaboration and shared responsibility – inspired by creative and interpretive knowledge – as the ‘art of understanding’ (Goldstein, 1999).
4. Intuition or unconscious processing of information in the ‘intuitive moment’ (Ringel, 2004, p. 20), which Seligson (2004) called the skill of ‘being in the moment’ (p. 534), seen as essential to effective connecting and accurate listening.
5. Use of the emotional structures, including letting go, connection, and listening (Ringel 2004; Seligson, 2004).

6. The development of intuitive abilities through intensive self-reflection, becoming settled, stillness of mind, close observation, creativity, and self-knowledge which leads in turn to increased spontaneity and creativity in clinical practice (Ringel, 2004).

7. *Not knowing* as a skill closely linked to creativity and intuitive knowledge, which involves the ‘ability to allow the mind to be empty, open, and receptive to new ways of knowing and experiencing’ (Ringel, 2004, p. 20).

Self-awareness has long been regarded as a core skill in social work. More recently, Daniel Goleman (1995) connected self-awareness to emotional intelligence creating the potential for another array of byproducts of self-awareness, including stress reduction, identifying and managing emotions, and developing interpersonal communication skills, including *inter alia* conflict resolution skills.

Seligson (2004) suggested social workers should look to performing artists for wisdom in the ‘integration of technique and artistry’ (p. 533 see below). She juxtaposed the – conscious – integration of skill in, and the unconscious nature of, practice, saying, over time, practitioners moved from being consciously unskilled to virtuosity (unconsciously skilled) (see Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986). Hence the conscious application of technical skill to the unconscious – automatic – use of creativity and intuition allowed for a ‘more personal and artistic means of giving and receiving communication [with immediacy]’ (Seligson, 2004, p. 534).

Mary Katherine O’Connor (n.d.) thought social workers with a background in art, literature and the humanities brought different (creative) problem-solving skills to their practice. In her own practice, she experienced the same feeling when practising social work and producing art. Thus skill was necessary for creating an artwork and for practising social work. O’Connor (n.d.) might serve as a forerunner to the notion of merging disciplines noted above but the lack of a clear date for her work makes this difficult to discern.

Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) took a slightly different approach, locating the ‘creative capabilities of the social worker’ in her role as
‘co-creator of harmony’ (p. 207). They identified a range of tasks (and, in fact, seem to include any social work task as a possibility for artistic or creative expression). Further, they thought success within the artistic arena required social workers also to engage the creativity of their clients. They believed it was from the material the client presented that the social worker and client could work together to co-create harmony at various levels of practice.

These authors tend to narrow the focus to the use of self and intuition. All link creativity, collaboration, and intuition or the intuitive use of self (through self-awareness and self-reflection) to skill. The skills of performance and creativity, which are often described separately, are now examined.

**Performance skills**

Several social work authors have considered performance, with a strong focus on improvisation, as central to social work’s art (see Seligson, 2004; Walter, 2003). Seligson (2004) considered facets of ‘the art of performance’ – in drama, dance, and music – and their place in informing and enhancing social work practice, highlighting similarities between ‘the importance of technique, self knowledge and use of self and being in the moment’ (p. 531). For her, the art of social work is ‘that which lies beyond technique’ but within ‘the practitioner’s personal traits and life experiences [which combined] with those of the client … form a transactional relationship unique to those individuals in any given moment’ (Seligson, 2004, p. 531). She drew attention to the similarities between social work practice and performance in three areas:

1. Basic skills and techniques and the intuitive knowledge of when to let go.
2. The need for self-knowledge and the ability to use the self in the service of the audience or client.
3. Practitioners’ ability to act spontaneously to work to their fullest potential (Seligson, 2004)

From her postmodern perspective, Walter (2003) repositioned social work between art and science, and railed against modern, dualistic thinking, proposing instead an alternative ‘third space’ or ‘borderlands’ in which ‘the critical yet unrecognized improvisational arenas of social life and social work become visible’ (Walter, 2003, p. 531).
She presented Hull House (discussed in Chapters 3 and 5, see also Addams, 1895) as an example of a third space:

… a space between public and private spheres, secular and religious duties, male and female roles, and between socioeconomic locations of the poor, middle and upper classes. As a third space Hull House encompassed an ever evolving arena of practice and thinking, always presenting a variety of identities that eluded stable definitions and categories. Hull House would alternatively house clubs and events that “activated and deactivated its identity with shifts in people, seating arrangements, and intentional frame” … In this, I contend that Hull House and the third space it represents were a historical microrepresentation of social work’s ongoing ideological and epistemological location in a space that resists a stable identity and instead improvises on the professional self (Walter, 2003, p. 319).

Thus, the third space is the context in which social work is practised – the stage on which it is enacted – which allows for fluidity, curiosity, and possibility. Besides performance, another skill set which arises within the art-focused social work literature with direct relevance to Dutton’s (2009) criteria is creativity.

Creative skills

Many social worker authors examine the centrality of creativity rather than art per se as part of their exploration of the artistic in social work. Among these key authors are Rapoport (1968), Siporin (1988), Sheafor and Horejsi (2003), and Turner (1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002). Rapoport (1968) explored creative and artistic as terms appropriate to social work. She distinguished the creative as innovative thought and action which resulted in the creation of something new from the artistic. She described creativity as ‘the ingenious, imaginative and proficient application of what is already known’ (p. 143; also cited in Turner, 2002, p. 26). She situated creativity within the scientific and artistic domains and identified a number of limitations to creative practice within social work, including the poor state of knowledge and theory, which was further constrained by the practice context and agency structure. It was unclear, however,
whether she was referring to theory and knowledge in relation to creativity, to social work, or to both.

Though Rapoport (1968) identified the potential relationship between creativity and the ego, she did not explore it extensively. This particular challenge was taken up by Kaplan (1968) who explored the *synthetic function* of the ego derived from the sexual drive aimed at ‘joining objects’ and ‘creating new units’ (p. 164) and suggested sexual reproduction was a prime example. He further suggested the strength of the synthetic function was its ability to integrate internal and external elements and reconcile ideas which were in conflict through integrating differences, stimulating creativity mentally, and building relationships. He viewed these abilities as fundamental to creative practice. While coming from a psychological (Freudian) perspective, the developmental aspects are relevant to the discussion of art as instinct in Chapter 2.

Kaplan (1968) also explored the link between the creative impulse and survival identified by Rapoport (1968). He suggested creative ability might be connected to the process of early infant development and the need for survival, thus satisfying an innate biological need. Kaplan’s (1968) view of the infant not having a perception of the mother until the mid-second year of life is now dated in light of contemporary views on infant mental health. It is now acknowledged, despite being born developmentally and physically immature, infants are acutely adjusted to humans and come readily equipped for face-to-face interaction from the earliest hours of life. With this knowledge comes the consequent increased attention on early engagement between infants and their significant caregiver(s) (acknowledging the increasing focus on the role of fathers) for survival and long-term social, emotional, and cognitive development and supporting services directed to the prevention and early intervention of problems in these vital relationships (see, for example, Puckering, 2007). Despite his dated view, Kaplan’s (1968) link between infant perception and the creative processes of later life relates to the biological view of art held by Dissanayake (1988, 1995, 2000) discussed in Chapter 2.

In this vein, Kaplan (1968) explored the link between memory and creativity, suggesting that each trace of memory had a degree of ‘psychic energy’ – or in the language of psychoanalysis – ‘cathexis’ (p. 167; see also the definition of cathexis at the
opening of Chapter 5 in relation to community). He basically argued that when memories connected and unified, they required less energy for maintenance than single memory traces. He believed the psychic energy saved as a result of connections could lead to some of the emotional facets of aesthetic experience in artist and viewer and saw elegance (a feature also noted by Rapoport (1968) in relation to her notion of style) as an important part of the aesthetic experience related to psychic energy.

Canadian social work academic, Linda Turner (1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c, 2002), in her in-depth exploration of creativity in social work practice and education, identified five themes:

1. Creative expression, that is, the incorporation of art, music, drama, and other creative techniques in helping others, to allow non-verbal forms of expression (L. Turner, 2001).
2. Creative self-presentation, including the personal characteristics of the worker vis a vis spontaneity, adaptability, and flexibility.
3. Creative conceptualisation focuses on identifying problems and solutions with individuals in direct practice (and presumably groups).
4. Creative conceptualisation within community practices.
5. Creative cosmology – a term borrowed from Peile (1993) – to describe the spiritual dimensions of direct work with clients.

Turner (2002) examined the social work values underpinning creativity in practice as joining with and believing in the client and applying empathy, compassion, and problem-solving skills. This creative blending of values and skills was needed for clients to feel valued, empowered, and ‘encouraged to flourish’ (p. 26). She recommended five strategies for creativity development:

1. Journal keeping, following methods developed by artist Julia Cameron, psychologist, Ira Progoff, and business administrator and author, Jordan Ayan.
2. Practising ‘experiential juxtaposition’ and ‘stretching’ (p. 8), that is, thinking beyond our normal thinking and actively searching out and engaging in activities one would normally avoid and, in so doing, developing openness to new possibilities and relationships.
3. Conquering what she called ‘expression inhibition’ (p. 9) through a process of increasing confidence in self-expression which is ‘playful and personal’ (p. 9) following leads offered by Sark and Black who promoted the right to self-expression and continuous improvement, and encouragement to explore the forms creativity could take.


5. Dealing with negativity by using de Bono’s approach to pessimism thus offering different ways of thinking about ‘blind spots’ (p. 10).

Ultimately, Turner (2000) viewed creativity as complex and multidimensional. She proposed a tridimensional understanding of creativity incorporating the aptitude to think of novel ideas; assert one’s uniqueness and personal preference; and get in touch with a higher self by attuning to a creative process through reflection. She connected creativity, metaphor, symbolism, the unconscious, and the spiritual as vessels of knowledge and meaning. Through her exploration of the work of Betty Edwards (1979), Turner (2000) identified a tenuous link between creativity and empowerment to suggest that to ‘be creative [was] to actively pursue empowerment; those who are empowered engage in creativity’ (p. 11). In this regard, she viewed creativity and enhanced commitment to its practice in social work as essential as it meant ‘simultaneously committing to the tradition of empowerment’ (p. 11).

Table 4 compares and contrasts the various qualities identified by Rapoport (1968), Siporin (1988), and Turner (1999). Though there are varying degrees of overlap, there is no single quality which all identify. The main areas of agreement are creative modes of thinking and capacity for incongruity.
Table 4: Comparative qualities of the creative social worker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for conflict</td>
<td>Able to tolerate and deal with ambiguity, anxiety, disorder, and conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual openness, general receptivity to new information and ideas, and ability to be open toward the seemingly contradictory or obscure with high tolerance for ambiguities</td>
<td>Open minded and able to think in convergent and divergent modes to encompass contradictions and polarities, that is, thinks in Janusian terms, and accept ambivalence and paradox</td>
<td>Divergent and convergent thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to understand and master</td>
<td>Posesses associative fluency and flexibility</td>
<td>Competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagination or thought content that is divorced from its perceptual origin [and] … consists of mental images or ideas which have not been experienced in or derived from reality¹ (p. 152)</td>
<td>Imaginative fertility with the ability to shift perspectives, and use different frames of reference to develop original ideas and solutions</td>
<td>Originality with change inherent in a creative approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insight</td>
<td>Insightful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking for complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non conformist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High motivation and persistence in a task and need for a deep commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Willing to risk and learn from mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous need for a certain detachment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for simplistic reduction and intolerance for uncertainty work against the creative process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘courage not to understand’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of a special relationship between the conscious and preconscious mind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition</td>
<td>Uses right and left brain, that is, a variety of approaches to reasoning, including logical, nonrational, parallel, lateral, analogical, and intuitive thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to a state of surprise</td>
<td>Adventurous, playful, humorous, and curious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leads to a state of surprise</td>
<td>Morals sensibility, which focuses on ‘behaving rightly’ (p. 180) or virtuously in particular areas of life</td>
<td>Doing something better and quite differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other authors have viewed creativity in light of issues of importance at specific historical junctures. For example, the historical debate between psychodynamic and functional theorists in the 1930s centred on the relationship between determinism and free will and translated into issues about the relative importance of the client’s history over their self-determination in the present. Kevin Grigsby (1995) saw this as a conflict between determinism and creativity and sided with the functionalists who suggested the ‘positive, creative action of the individual client, mediated by the relationship between the social worker and client, was fundamental to the process of change …’ (p. 706). Here it was the relationship rather than creativity that was central to the helping process.

Another historical juncture in social work’s development was the competency movement. Mark Lymbery (2003) examined the relationship between competence and creativity seeking reconciliation between them through Schön’s (1983) notion of reflective practice. He saw competence as a necessary step toward the development of creativity, which he viewed as part of the repertoire of the ‘very skilled [or competent] social worker’ (p. 99). He placed competence and creativity at either end of a spectrum. The orientation and response (competency or creativity) of the social worker along this spectrum was determined by ‘the degree of complexity and predictability faced in each set of circumstances’ (p. 100), the implication being that situations of high complexity required creativity while for predictable ones competence or skill sufficed. Interestingly he did not see creativity and competence as equally important whereby the competent social worker created opportunities for creativity and the creative social worker also had to be competent to practice and intervene with clients. Competence is an ethic in social work, whereas creativity is not.

Yet another historical thread relates to intuition and practice wisdom in social work (England, 1986; Rapoport, 1968; Sheppard, 1998). For Shoshana Ringel (2004) intuition, fantasy, and imagination enabled the social worker to find ‘novel solutions to problems’ (p. 20). Flexibility, fluency, and originality were essential to this creative process. Her more limited view of creativity as ‘innovation, divergence, and progress’ (p. 20) arises from the social worker’s appreciation of each client’s situation as unique and constantly in flux. For Ringel (2004), creative therapy incorporated ‘intuitive
insights ... stimulated by ideas from multiple sources’ (p. 20) as well as practitioners’ creative use of self, spontaneity, flexibility, risk taking, ‘use of humor [sic], curiosity, playfulness, and … ability to shift perspectives’ (Ringel, 2004, p. 19-20). The worker’s creative self-presentation determined her unique style. So-called textbook answers to human problems could not accommodate this uniquely creative approach.

Many of the views herein described were consistent with changes in the literature on creativity (see, for example, Bohm, 2004; Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). The post-structuralist decentering and dispersal of creativity away from romantic and modernist ideas of its locus in genius reframed the locus of creativity in the normal individual (Gunaratnam, 2009). Everyone has the capacity to be creative. Interestingly, one lone voice has been critical of this discourse on creativity in social work. Kara McDonagh suggested what was absent in social work was ‘an understanding of the role of creativity, imagination, and passion, the willingness to take risks and explore innovative ways of approaching problems, and the emphasis on a genuinely reflective process of finding an authentic voice with which to speak’ (as cited in Frye Burnham, 2006, n.p.). For this she looked to artists. Nevertheless, creativity is a significant factor within the social work art-related literature. Some authors focused their discussion of creativity on a specific domain of practice: Elizabeth Randall (2002), for example, noted Delgado’s (2000a) focus on creativity in practice with young people and Mary Bitel (1999) discussed creativity in groupwork. Other aspects of Bitel’s (1999) work are examined later in this chapter.

Instrumental approach: Art as a medium or method

In this section, the terms medium and method are used interchangeably. Most of the discussion on art in social work relates to clinical or direct practice, but there is also some writing on art in relation to group work, supervision, and research. More importantly, however, what distinguishes an instrumental approach is the focus on art as a tool, technique, medium, or method to achieve certain therapeutic ends or purposes, as the examples below show.
Art in direct practice

Art-based tools and techniques have taken many forms within the social work literature ranging from the esoteric to the graphic. For example, maps have proved helpful graphic tools in allowing the social worker to gain perspective and get the ‘whole picture’ (Okitikpi & Aymer, 2008, p. 59). Social worker and artist Patricia Martin (2009) used her website as a medium to demonstrate that art contributed to social development thus providing evidence of its effectiveness.

Art therapy might also be considered a tool for direct practice. The use of art therapy practices and techniques within social work is important to consider. The discussion that follows is limited to the literature written by social workers on the topic.

One of the most dramatic proponents of the area of art as a tool in social work, Palmer (2002), observed how a young woman who had been asked to draw a person drew a swan. This incident triggered a lifelong exploration of the place of art in social work:

The metaphor was not lost on me at the time, but my understanding of this extraordinary drawing and experience has expanded and deepened over the years. Likewise, my conception and awareness of the powerful interrelationship of art making and the art of professional practice have evolved over my professional lifetime (p. 192).

This experience created a ‘form of meta-communication that, in itself, seemed to reflect dimensions of the art of practice’ (Palmer, 2002, p. 193). Five key themes from the art therapy literature informed Palmer’s (2002) work using art as a therapeutic tool:

1. The relationship between the client and therapist.
2. The presence of metacommunication beyond the spoken word.
3. The inherent value of metaphor and image (that is, representations of internal and external experiences) in another form.
4. The spiritual dimension of art, which some have referred to as the soul (Hillman, 1989) or notions of self-transcendence like hope and faith (Moon, 1998).
5. The yearning to find a way to communicate that reflects the universal ‘human need to give expression to one’s feelings and experiences—to give form to the unspeakable’ (Peterson & Hardin, as cited in Palmer, 2002, p. 201).

Jerome Sachs (1994) highlighted the importance of curiosity in obtaining ‘an authentic first encounter’ (p. 471). Again the relationship was at the heart of the art and yet another voice was added to promote the idea of art within the therapeutic relationship. However, curiosity in social work is important beyond the therapeutic encounter.

In Ephrat Huss’s (2009) work with Bedouin women, the idea of ‘symbolic self-expression’ was seen to offer ‘the opportunity to express alternative perspectives and hybrid identities that challenge dominant social work paradigms’ (p. 598). They were regarded as nonthreatening and enabled ‘the social worker to get closer to the pain, dilemmas, conflicts, and solutions that the women constantly negotiate within their hybrid social realities’ (p. 598). In Huss’s (2009) project, the arts were used as a tool to ‘intensify the interpretive voice of the women’ and to redirect ‘social work policy and intervention’ (p. 598). In a similar approach, but using a variety of media, Sophie Yohani (2008) incorporated the use of photography and quilting as tools for engaging refugee children in Canada to meet therapeutic and research aims.

Sheila Seltzer and Jane Reifler (1982) used drawing as an effective technique in engaging adolescents in outpatient groupwork. Drawing, painting, and other visual techniques offered an alternative to purely verbal expression of problems and have been seen to render alternate rich and complex understanding (Newell-Walker, 2002).

Matto (1998) used art therapy with adolescent female survivors of child sexual assault:

Art therapy techniques can help identify core constructs that underlie personal meaning, establishing coping responses to overwhelming feelings, and instill a sense of control through indirect methods of expression [thus a] sense of empowerment can be achieved (p. 636).

She saw the art making process as involving a:
continuous decision-making process — a culmination of outcomes that result from unique decisions made along the way, enhancing problem solving skills. The art experience, then, can become a conduit for accessing tacit, cognitive processes, allowing a client to change such underlying constructs (p. 637).

Matto (1998) saw the importance of process over product in using art therapy and suggested art as product was only important in so far as it served ‘as a catalyst for verbal dialogue, communication and/or personal expression of unique experiences’ (p. 639).

From her role as an art therapist, Ursula Newell-Walker (2002) attempted to understand the relationship between painting and drawing and subsequent changes in understanding. She suggested art therapy required the social worker to use a subjective approach to building understanding. In her UK study of midlife transitions, she found art making could be helpful in:

accentuat[ing] sensory exploration, curiosity and experimentation, contributed ... [to] a changed relationship with self and with the external world. Key indicators of success were noted by changes in the use of language, the choice of art materials and colour (p. 43).

Her technique proved useful in the context of loss. She recognised the importance of timing in allowing new, unfamiliar, or seemingly irrelevant details to emerge gradually and the need for restraint in making quick interpretations or judgments. For her, when working with understanding the self, metaphor had a reparative quality. She provided a checklist to guide the social work practitioner in the use of art therapy. She highlighted noticing the unexpected, anecdotes from everyday life, the detail in doodles or drawings, connections and contradictions, and moments of surprise; and listening for metaphors. She saw observation as more important than probing, which could interrupt the client’s train of thought or creative work checking different sources of evidence against one another. For her, to ‘verbalise is to acknowledge. Doing this too quickly can cause a shock, and may undo good work by occasioning defensive denial’ (Newell-Walker, 2002, p. 49). It was important to prepare the client for what was to come. In her work, there was significant overlap with other areas of writing, which focused social work’s relationship to art on skill. Yet, like
England’s (1986) earlier emphasis on the use of self, questions relating to the subjectivity of her approach remain unanswered. Subjectivity can result in the intensification of bias and, at worst, lead to mistaken judgements. Newell-Walker’s (2002) methodological position depended on the nature of the problem from a subjective, interpretivist position (see below) as follows:

1. *Constructivist:* Here the worker studies the client’s problem in relation to the particular context in which it has arisen and must be solved.

2. *Heuristic:* Here the worker builds an understanding of – and hence interprets – the client’s experience of the problem.

3. *Phenomenological:* Here the worker assumes the ‘reality’ of the client’s experience is best explored at ‘a point of convergence’ (p. 50), that is the point where observable, or physical phenomena like an experience or the colours in a drawing, were filtered through the worldview of the person trying to make sense of them. This implies being in the moment and showing empathy.

The social worker, then, in clinical work, and research, seeks to ‘understand a changing reality through the building and testing of theory’ (Newell-Walker, 2002, p. 53). However, the onus is on the worker to critically appraise theory prior to developing an intervention strategy. She saw the most effective tool in the practitioners’ toolkits as themselves, but warned ‘this powerful tool needs to be used in a self-conscious and well-documented way’ (p. 44). Newell-Walker’s (2002) approach – and that of others writing on the art of practice – would be deeply problematic for advocates of evidence-based practice and merely entrenches the subjectivity inherent in interpretivist approaches and the social worker’s use of self.

**The art of social group work**

Bitel (1999) suggested many parallels could be drawn between an artistic endeavour and the practice of group work. Following Goldstein (1998), she located art in ‘empathy, accessibility to one’s range of emotions, and being fully oneself within the work’ (p. 77-78):
[t]he art of group work ... goes far beyond technique (Goldstein, 1998) and becomes a dance: a beautiful mosaic of bits of life; a theatrical moment so finely crafted in a story so beautifully human that no playwright could ever capture the pathos and joy of the human condition so eloquently, simply, or clearly; a song that the human spirit creates out of struggle and longing for connection. That is good group work and that is an art (Bitel, 1999, p. 79).

Bitel (1999) saw the social worker as a performing artist who had ‘the talent and will to move beyond the constraints of method and technique and respond imaginatively and creatively to the impromptu, unrehearsed nature of the special human relationship’ (Goldstein, 1998, p. 247, also cited in Bitel, 1999, p. 80). Thus, links to meaningful relationships and art as performance discussed later in this chapter are made.

**The art of supervision**

Okitikpi and Aymer (2008) saw art as located in the formation of meaningful relationships. In this context, they identified supervision as the development of ‘a mature relationship in which the social worker can tell a professional story about the practice and thus become accountable for their work’ (Okitikpi & Aymer, 2008, p. 26). This is most closely aligned with ideas of art as meaningful relationship discussed in the next section.

**The art of research**

Art as research has only quite recently been discussed within social work. Damianakis (2007) argued, despite the growing interest in the inclusion of arts within research, this had not yet led to a sustained programme of research. She described the use of *creative writing* as a research practice to gather arts-related data from social workers (Damianakis, 2007).

In a more panoramic approach to art as research, William Lighthall (2006) reviewed the emergent practice of linking art and social work research by Professor Izumi Sakamoto, who used ‘photos, paintings and handmade masks created by a group of homeless women to communicate their experiences and present the findings of the
Coming Together project’ (n.p). She used art in research to convey her findings to a wider, non-academic audience. This new trend can be found in enterprises like the Arts and Social Work Research Initiative, created by the University of Toronto’s Centre for Applied Social Research with the support of founding professors Izumi Sakamoto, Ernie Lightman, and Adrienne Chambon.

In a similar vein is the photographic research of Peter Szto (n.d.) who used photography to document and provide visual evidence of the floating population of mass migrants from country to city in Guangzhou in China. Szto’s ideas were largely based in visual anthropology but linked to the ideas of artist and art critic John Berger and art historian W.J.T Mitchell (Szto, n.d.). In Szto’s work a merging of ideas from art and social work research practice can be observed.

There is also a surfacing interest in the arts as part of qualitative research methodology. As evidence of this trend, Chamberlayne and Smith (2009) referred to the 2006 conference Circles within Circles - Qualitative Methodology in the Arts: The Researcher as Artist (see Wainwright & Rapport, 2007). They suggested a significant resource for arts-based approaches to research existed in ‘German hermeneutics’ (Chamberlayne & Smith, 2009, p. 3; and discussed above). Emphases on the promotion of collaborative, participatory, and emancipatory models of social inquiry were also evident in their writing. A tangentially relevant research matter was identified by Victoria Foster (2009), who highlighted the importance of alternatives to text-based approaches, arguing it was ‘important to include visual and oral, as well as written elements to research methods’ (p. 109), especially when working with cultures where story telling rather than the written word was more important. Further, Foster (2009) argued ‘[p]articipatory, arts-based research ... widen[ed] the potential for a greater range of people to be party to the conclusions drawn from a project’. Moreover, ‘in capturing glimpses of the human spirit, it [could] foster empathy in its audience’ (p. 111). Importantly, Foster found arts-based research had successfully validated findings from conventional data collection methods in the same areas of practice. Consequently, she advocated a mixed methods approach to research (V. Foster, 2009). From an alternate and underdeveloped position, Powell (2007) located artistry in research, describing it as a
place where ‘new knowledge, skills, insight and understanding’ (p. 505) come together through artistry.

Timothy Rapley (2001) developed the idea of the interview as artefact referring to the research interview as a relationship of sorts since it was ‘a joint accomplishment of interviewer and respondent. As such, its relationship to any “real” experience is not merely unknown but in some senses unknowable’ (p. 304). The art in the research interview was a co-creation of interviewer and respondent. Rapley (2001) recognised the performative nature of language and its lack of neutrality. The conversation within the research interview was a ‘form of social action’ (p. 307), which ‘relies on and attends to the skills and methods people employ in doing [emphasis added] everyday life’ (p. 309). There is evidence here of the research relationship as a medium of transformation that resonates with narrative influences on social work discussed below.

**Interpretive approach: Art as communication**

Within social work, and *avant-garde* art, communication is often referred to as a core skill along with listening and empathy (see Table 2 in Chapter 3). However, more recent literature in this area reveals a postmodern – interpretivist – influence with discussions of the use of metaphor and constructing and making sense of meaning within the context of a *co-constructed* helping relationship (Goldstein, 1999, also in Gray & Powell, 2006b). Here understanding rests solidly on the worker’s ability to communicate meaning and make sense of client communication – referred to as the client’s story – and behaviour. The influence of narrative ideas and practices is clearly discernible. Narrative approaches give central place to the client’s story and emphasises the importance of communication in relationship development and meaning-making. The social work encounter is one in which the client’s story is *told, interpreted and transformed* into a new, preferred story through a creative process of interaction and engagement between social worker and client. In the narrative approach, social workers help clients to *re-write* their stories by identifying the problem as the problem, acknowledging people’s expertise in their own lives, and appreciating that problems are constructed in socio-cultural contexts influenced by power relations of race, class, sexual preferences, gender and disadvantage. The client’s problem is externalised and normalised
accounting for unjust social structures and unequal power relations. The social worker and client respectfully co-create meaning by drawing on unique outcomes regarding the problem in tandem with the client’s abilities, skills, competencies, and strengths to form an alternate, preferred narrative. To describe this approach, White and Epston (1990) talk about re-storying the client’s experience to make helping a transformative, empowering experience.

**Communication and meaningful relationships**

A number of authors view meaningful relationships as an artistic creation (Baxter, 2009; England, 1986; Higham, 2005; Okitikpi & Aymer, 2008; Palmer, 2002; Sheafor & Horejsi, 2003; Siporin, 1988). Siporin (1988) described the helping relationship as an ‘art form’ (Siporin, 1988, p. 178) in which the client and worker develop ‘patterns of human behaviour and relationships that are original and beautiful’ (Siporin, 1988, p. 177-178). Creatively using style and metaphorical communication (as discussed in this chapter), the social worker and client produce an ‘aesthetic experience of change’ (p. 177) (see also Palmer, 2002).

England (1986) said Elizabeth Irvine (1974) was the first to hint at art inhering in the ‘encounter [emphasis added] between persons’ (England, 1986, p. 89-90). Sheafor and Horejsi (2003) believed that successful work leading to concrete change with individuals, families, groups, communities, and organisations depended on effective relationships built on trust. They too described the creation of such relationships as an art.

Okitikpi and Aymer (2008) similarly emphasised meaningful relationships in anti-discriminatory practice, which promoted an appreciation of difference, respect, and self-determination, and the unique needs of service users. They located the art in the ‘practitioner’s reflexive and reflective abilities and [in] their forte for forming meaningful and trusting relationships’ (p. 3). The worker’s ability to create such relationships depends on their use of self and ‘skills, tasks and competencies’ (p. 26).

Patricia Higham (2005) believed the art of forming helpful relationships should be extended beyond clients to colleagues, particularly in multidisciplinary teams. Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998) focused on the intimacy of the
relationship as the medium through which the artistic was expressed in practice and Graybeal (2007) viewed meaningful relationships as ‘the heart of change’ (p. 514). Clearly, then, creating meaningful relationships requires more than competency and skill. It requires the creative ability to connect with others, to build trust, to make clients feel safe and comfortable so that they will take the risk and reveal their stories of success and failure, hope and disenchantment, courage and fear, and so on to the receptive, nonthreatening social worker.

**Communication as meaning-making**

Among the earlier theorists advocating a narrative approach were Siporin (1988) and Goldstein (1999). For Goldstein (1999), the helping process involved moving beyond reason to imagination, curiosity, and meaning-making. The artistry lay in shifting from theory (what or science) to practice (how or art). For Goldstein (1999), through use of a narrative approach the social worker makes sense of the ‘metaphoric human experience, the fragments that clients (or other humans) will (and will not) reveal about themselves, the stories they tell’ (p. 386). But (intuitive) meaning-making is more than (rational) sense-making or understanding.

In meaning-making social workers often make use of metaphors (Goldstein, 1999; Siporin, 1988). Metaphorical communication distances the client from the concrete problem and enables abstract discussion in which clients can draw inferences relating to their own experience. Palmer (2002) identified a trend within the social work literature of practitioners using metaphors with fine arts referents when attempting to describe methods. She provided the following examples:

1. When writing of murals in Latino communities as *indicators of community strengths*, Delgado and Barton (1998) referred to world renowned artist Diego Rivera’s remark that ‘mural painting must help in [a person’s] struggle to become a human being’ (p. 346). They saw graffiti – referred to as tagging – as an authentic depiction of the ‘struggles associated with urban living and issues of oppression’ (p. 349).

2. Weick (2000) noted ‘concerns about human well-being prepared the canvas on which human issues have since been painted’ (p. 399).
Palmer (2002) equated her own work on the resilience of trauma survivors to a ‘rich tapestry of history, a tapestry whose stories are woven in the souls of its makers’ (p. 200). Drawing on art therapy knowledge, Palmer (2002) promoted the idea of social worker and art therapist as metaphorician, that is, as one who has ‘the capacity to understand the many metaphorical messages that the adolescent [client] will send … transmitted through dramatic and subtle actions, images, words, movements, sounds and silences’ (Moon, 1998, p. 16, also cited in Palmer, 2002, p. 201).

For Michael Whan (1979) the client’s story contains and sustains composite interconnected meanings in which the social worker as artist is simultaneously listener, critic, creator, and interpreter (of the client’s story). So the worker has to have a quick grasp of the story being told, and a fluent ability to construct their own account of the client’s situation (England, 1986). This depends on the social worker’s ability to understand, make sense of, and discern the meaning being conveyed in the client’s story. This meaning or understanding is communicated back to the client so shared meaning ensues. Communication then is more than conveying information. It also conveys meaning as a ‘necessary aspect of human well-being’ (England, 1986, p. 110). The ability to convey and grasp meaning is a fine accomplishment and ‘the aspiration of all art’ (England, 1986, p. 110). For Martinez-Brawley and Mendez-Bonito Zorita (1998), the artist and social worker share the ability to accommodate ambiguity and seek meaning in human action and to transform experience into an empowering creation.

Transformative approach: Art as social change

Rapoport (1968) seems to be the first to identify art – and social work – as an instrument of or for social change. For her, social work emerged from the need to deal with human problems in society. As such, it became the caretaker of ‘our failures in social living’ (p. 144) focusing on the residual functions of welfare, which assumed most people would help themselves through the market and productive work, family, or charity leaving the state to provide assistance only to those unable to help themselves. But for Rapoport (1968), this was not enough. Social work also had a role in changing social institutions and structures, in being a powerful agent for social change. The social control function was ever present in the residual role, even if it remained in the
background and largely invisible. It was in the reform model that social work’s social change agenda became most visible, placed firmly at the forefront of practice. Here art was the worker’s ally due to its ability to define human and aesthetic values and, in so doing, bring about a change in thinking, which could lead to institutional change. Rapoport’s (1968) focus on advocacy was based on the work of artist Alex Comfort, who believed ‘all creative work speaks on behalf of somebody who would otherwise be voiceless’ (p. 144-145).

Kaplan’s (1968) more conventional approach emphasised social work’s role in identifying problems and taking measures to change them through a process of intervention. While art depicted social situations in a way that might promote a climate of change, it ‘rarely play[ed] the active role, as social work does, in instituting change’ (p. 163). He argued there was a ‘tendency to overrate the social influence and social predictability of the arts, particularly graphic and musical types of expression ... [and suspected that] ... the roots of art in magical thinking, so evident in the primitive cultures, account[ed] for the over evaluation in these terms’ (p. 163-164). His focus was not on the aesthetic but on the changing role of art through time where ‘[t]he artist hasn’t always played the role of social critic’ (p. 164). Thus, Kaplan (1968) dismissed art’s ability to influence social change.

Siporin (1988) shifted the locus of change-oriented social action from art to artisan when he said ‘[t]he social worker, as an artisan, seeks to influence and change; to shape his material; to apprehend and realize its potential; and to do so in a dynamic experiential relationship with other people and things’ (p. 180). Can the artist not also be an artisan in this sense?

It is Powell (2006b) who provides a window of possibility by linking artistry, artful skills, and social change believing that by skillfully transmitting accumulated knowledge, social workers ‘produce small advances in individual lives and the collective reweaving of our social fabric that leads to social change’ (Janeway, 2006, as cited in Powell, 2006b, p. 465), which is pursued further in the next section.

David Tacey (2004, as cited by Weir, 2009) returned to a primeval tradition, where art’s role was to bring new life, to ‘make a new’ (p. 122) tradition. Through ‘awareness and experience’ (Weir, 2009, p. 122), art had the potential to bring the
issue of violence to the surface so it could be addressed. Also highlighted is the potential for participation to bring tangible and nontangible social benefits (Matarasso, 1997).

A more recent development relates to early intervention and prevention, which Okitikpi and Aymer (2008) suggest were first principles of the art of social work and, therefore, important to reclaim for practice. They suggested this in the face of social work’s diminishing focus on early intervention and prevention in the UK.

Steve Trevillion (2008) believed prevention, early forms of community development, and community-based ideas stemming from the Settlement Movement were influential in shaping New Labour policy-making in the UK based on ‘partnership with service-users’ and ‘capacity building in disadvantaged communities’ (p. 43) (see Chapter 5).

At the more ambitious end of the social change spectrum are borrowings from the arts arena where engagement in the arts is viewed as a panacea for all manner of social ills. This approach is reflected in documents like the UK’s Social Inclusion Strategy for the Arts (Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), 2001 as cited in Chamberlayne & Smith, 2009, p. 134), a government publication designed to influence social policy and hence society more generally.

**Artful practice as social change**

Powell (2006b) saw individual and social change as stemming from: (i) viewing people in context; (ii) paying attention to what was needed; (iii) building an understanding of the issue, its history, and persistence; and (iv) applying knowledge and skills in a way (artfully) to create change. He looked to artful practice as a stimulus for social change. He recognised the role of accumulated pieces of knowledge being conveyed through artful skills leading to change. He saw this as occurring in individual lives as noted earlier in ‘the collective reweaving of our social fabric’ (Janeway, 2006, in Powell, 2006b, p. 465). Further, he believed change stemmed from context, noticing, attending to, generating relevant knowledge, and artfully applying them to bring about change. The underlying view of change here was one which required people to move beyond their usual ‘predetermined and formulaic’ (Powell, 2006b, p. 466) ways of thinking to incorporate ‘knowledge, art, inspiration, improvisation, and guts’ (p. 466) based on the
idea that change required know-how (Varela, 1999) in preference to know-what knowledge. Powell (2007) identified a number of key attributes of artistry, including the creative nonformulaic, immeasurable expressive impulse, which was culturally embedded and tacitly understood. Linking to the ideas of Dissanayake (1995) discussed in Chapter 2, he suggested that ‘artistry was about “making special” ... and art [was] about the impulse to craft something special in a place and time in an irregular world’ (Powell, 2007, p. 507).

**Art as harbinger of a changing world**

Noticeable in the literature are recurrent discussions of art in social work as a response either to major social change or significant internal change. This seems to occur on two fronts: either as a reflection of a perceived decline of social work or, alternatively, as a call for the revitalisation of social work. Frequently, the plea for art in social work seems to emerge in times of perceived crisis within the profession – when questions about the nature of social work are at the forefront and under scrutiny. Varied evidence in support of this idea is found in Richmond’s (1917) comments about social work being a science and an art that emerged following Flexner’s (1915/2001) critique of social work. England (1986) foreshadowed the rise of positivism and evidence-based practice, as well as the emergence of the neoliberal world when he wrote his seminal book *Social work as art*. Lymbery (2003) saw the shift from competence to creativity stemming from a decline of social work in the UK. This seems to reflect the increased role of social work as a function of social control within the UK social care system.

Higham (2005) identified the neglect of the art of social work in the UK and USA over the last 30 years in the face of positivist approaches and the pursuit of professionalisation. She saw contemporary multiprofessional practice as an opportunity for the profession to return to England’s (1986) notion of the art of social work, thus bringing the multiprofessional team the benefits of effective work in complex circumstances. Higham’s (2005) desire for the return to social work as art appears to be driven by the transformation of the ‘welfare state into the welfare mix (Alcock, 2003) [emphasis in original]’ (p. 5). She saw the need for a new kind of social work, to accommodate multiprofessional practice, which drew on the workers’ creativity to
‘construct new ways of working’ (Higham, 2005, p. 5). It could also be argued anyone working from a generic understanding of social work would not see this as a new kind of practice.

**Art as political**

A return to the notion of zeitgeist noted at the beginning of this chapter highlights, not just the artistic scope of social work, but also the need for a re-engagement with its artistic heart in the face of change. Thus Gray and Powell (2006a) called for a return to the struggle and, more recently, Gray and Webb (2008, 2009) appealed for a return to the political in social work via art.

In examining the work of educator, social worker, community organiser, non-profit leader, activist, and artist Kara McDonagh, Linda Frye Burnham (2006) perceived an intensely political practice. In her early practice, McDonagh engaged in a variety of activist activities, describing these actions as ‘metaphoric, symbolic, collaborative actions, which were part theatre and performance art as well as, powerful acts of resistance, advocacy and activism’ (as cited in Frye Burnham, 2006, n.p.). She believed ‘making art, attending to people’s basic needs, addressing political issues and learning to be an effective collaborator [were] not separate ideas’ (as cited in Frye Burnham, 2006, n.p.). She actively pursued the intersection of these different notions.

A basis for political action was also evident in the previously discussed work of Gray and Webb (2008, 2009). If Gray and Webb (2008, 2009) are correct and art is located in the endeavours of the ‘social’ then this also has implications for artists who work in the arena of political change with the intention of creating a genuinely transformative form of practice. While critical of the lack of content behind Gray and Webb’s (2008) promotion of a ‘return to the political’ (p. 111; Ferguson, 2009, p. 213), Ferguson (2009) saw this as a positive development given the historical denial of the political nature of social work activities and beliefs. By comparison Healy (2008), questioned whether art could or should be used to foster ‘a collective moment of political truth’ (p. 194), as Gray and Webb (2008) had claimed. She saw the potential to minimise differences in purpose and context and argued for the recognition of art as a part of knowledge and practice. But she contended that an ongoing and productive
engagement with other forms of knowing was equally if not more critical to the
development of social work knowledge and identities. What is important here is what
can be observed between the social work and art literature under review – most
notably, a more overt ownership of the political nature of the context of practice by
artists and social workers who address social issues.

**Conclusion**

Reviewed through the lens of commonalities identified within the art literature, this
chapter has argued that, if social work *is* art, practice is central in its artistic endeavours.
It has argued historically – or chronologically – and thematically that the social work
literature relating to art has been dominated by a practice focus and this is in accord with
social practices within the art context. In reviewing this literature against the areas of
values, concerns, skills, communication, contexts, and history, important omissions
have been identified and discussed. While the philosophical approaches to art in social
work have served to expand the territory, ultimately they have suffered the same fate as
philosophies of art, and not resulted in developing clear understandings of what art is. In
refocusing on and confirming the importance of practice it is possible to also reclaim and
honour the historical beginnings of art in social work and the place of community. The
schema which outlines the discernible practice-related categories within the literature
highlights the relationship between art and social work as being located in practice. This
assists in distinguishing between the premises that social work *is* art, or *an* art and the *art
of* social work. As social work is based on education and training, competency and skills
acquisition, theory development and knowledge acquired through practice, and creative
intelligence arising from experience, the excellence of this practice is what defines the
*art of* social work. The *art of* social work sits within the global notion that social work *is
art as proposed in Chapter 2 in terms of Dutton’s (2009) art instinct and criteria for art.
The latter is conceivably applicable to all professions or disciplines that involve people
and elements of practice, each of which could potentially be described as *an* art.

In light of these conclusions, the relationship of art to the idea of ‘artful
practice’ was explored and its connection to practice, skill, and social change was
highlighted creating a link to the importance of communication, advocacy, and activism
within the change process in social work. The next chapter turns to the place of art and social work in the community context.
Community: A Place of Cathexis

Art, Social Work, and Social Change

*The Macquarie Dictionary provides two meanings of cathexis both of which are relevant in this context (a) the investment of emotional significance in an activity, object, or idea (in this instance community) and (b) the charge of mental energy so invested.*
This chapter addresses the fundamental omission identified in Chapter 4 regarding community practice, and begins to honour the historical connection between art and social work within the community context. Beginning with a more detailed exposition of the shared history between social work and art as identified in Chapter 3, and a particular focus on the relationship of both the disciplines through the work of Jane Addams, the chapter provides a basis for the empirical study located within a real world community context and argues for the use of arts-based community development and collection of data via an art practice as research approach for the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. The historical and conceptual development of social work and art practice within the community are explored with attention paid to the Australian context. The chapter emphasises the influence of personal experience, interdisciplinarity, and complexity on community practice, exploring the relationship to Kwon’s (2004) notion of art as community development and proposes a creative conceptual model encompassing the disciplinary approaches of social work and art in the interests of social change.

There was little discussion of the historical connection to Jane Addams, Hull House, and the Settlement Movement within the literature on social work as art, though this is a major reference point for the history of social work, where Jane Addams is referred to as the mother of modern social work. Importantly, this historical connection is located within the literature on community social work. The lack of discussion of Jane Addams’ connection with art in the social work literature is an oversight that might be reclaimed and redressed. Addams’ importance is further heightened through historical connections with artists found in community art and community cultural development literature. Kester (2004) described her influence on artists working in the Settlement House Movement in Chicago in the late 1880s. Social workers are largely unaware of this connection. Through her commitment to emancipation, empowerment, and participatory democracy, Addams triggered the development of similar values and practices across social work and art.
Also significant within the social work literature is Addams’ relationship with progressive intellectuals and reformers – the most notable being John Dewey (discussed in Chapter 3) – and their ‘advocacy of an idealized notion – or ideology – of community’ (Mowbray, as cited in Thorpe, Petruchenia & Hughes, 1992, p. 54). Further, some authors note that the Settlement House and local reform associations Movement showed extraordinary similarity with community action today (Gans, as cited in Thorpe et al., 1992; Weil, 1996). Thus a key shared value between social work and art stems from Addams’ and her colleagues’ advocacy of grassroots democratic action within local communities. Their work has been described as an archetype of practice with and in communities which moved from a focus on ‘planning for these communities to planning with residents [emphasis added] … to build stronger communities’ (Weil, 1996, p. 9). It accorded with much of the Third Way discourse emanating from the UK during the Blair era (1997-2010).

In the art literature, Kester (2004) inadvertently identifies Addams’ influence significantly beyond that traditionally acknowledged within social work. Her impact on the development of social planning and sociology, in addition to social work (Deegan, 2002) was also important. Her pioneering work developed methodologies and set standards for research within communities for social work to emulate but this quickly evaporated as psychodynamically oriented casework and the search for a scientific approach gained ground. Over the years, the pendulum has swung between individual casework and community work approaches, with some hiatus in the 1960s and 1970s, but community work’s strong radical overtones alienated those in the social work mainstream and community social work gradually became a separate profession (C.L. Clark with Asquith, 1985; Kenny, 1994 see below). Addams’ research focus and methodological approach does not seem to have transferred to arts practice either.

The ‘Safe at Home’ project was conducted on a social work research model involving direct participation of residents or community members similar to that developed at Hull House by Addams and her colleagues. Findings were used to extend community education and the planning of community-based action projects (Deegan, as cited in Weil, 1996). Not only have models of community work, growing out of the Settlement House Movement and Addams’ work, such as organising, planning, and
development, had a vast influence on community practice within social work (Weil, 1996), they have also had a significant, but to date unacknowledged, influence on the community, dialogical, and relational arts arena. The participatory methods and methodologies developed within early social work research are, on the basis of this history and the identified shared discourse pool, also applicable to research in the arena of arts practice. They have developed into a separate discourse on action and participatory action research (PAR) warmly embraced by social work. Growing mainly in the community development literature, they are highly relevant, too, for arts research with its strong social element, particularly community-oriented arts research. Examples of socially-oriented art research likely to benefit from participatory research approaches and methodologies are now being documented, for example, Barrett (2007), Barrett and Bolt (2007), and Crouch (2007).

Community from a historical perspective

Within social work, the beginnings of community work have been traced to the Settlement House Movement and the work of Addams, who tied ‘economic and social development … [with] physical and social planning’ (Weil, 1996, p. 8-9). According to Weil (1996), Addams and her colleagues developed methodologies and set standards for community research and ‘planning and development practice’ (p. 9).

In more recent times, one of the first books to influence social work in the USA linked community organisation to processes of adjusting needs and resources through service coordination (Ross, 1958). Dunham (1970) was one of the first US authors to distinguish between different forms of community engagement, namely, community organising, locality – community – development, and community planning. Later Rothman (1979), following Alinsky’s (1972) Marxist influenced Rules for radicals, added community action to distinguish this more radical model from the apolitical, consensus-oriented, participatory, democratic model of community development (Batten, 1965; Biddle & Biddle, 1965; Dunham, 1970) which had developed in the colonial Third World – Africa and Asia, especially – where it was tied to the development of local government. Lappin (1983) recorded its arrival in the USA during the 1950s as follows:
[Community development emanated] from the Third World as a fresh and promising answer to the problem of widespread poverty. Social workers greeted the new approach with an inquiring interest that expressed itself in the form of anecdotal, descriptive, and analytical comparisons with their own form of community work (p. 59).

The early literature on community development portrayed it as a paternalistic enabling strategy claiming it was in people’s best interests to help them help themselves. Community development was seen as a rational, systematic approach to problem-solving in which the community (social) worker's role was to enable the whole community to become involved in the identification of place-based problems and to mobilise local members to deal with them (Ross, 1958). Hence, Dunham (1970) defined community development as the ‘organised efforts of [local] people to improve the conditions of community life and the capacity of … people for participation, self-direction, and integrated effort in community affairs’ (p. 140). Rothman (1979), too, distinguished between community or locality development, community organisation, social planning, and social action. He defined locality development as ‘a process to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance on the community’s initiative’ (p. 26). Warren (1983) also emphasised the importance of purposive planned change at the community level and the rational model of community development describing it as:

[A] process of helping community people to analyze their problems, to exercise as large a measure of autonomy as possible and feasible, and to promote a greater identification of the individual citizen and the individual organization with the community as a whole (Warren, 1983, p. 35).

This ‘traditional’ view of community practice would appear to be consistent with Midgley’s (1993) ‘individualist strategies’ (p. 5) within a liberal capitalist economic model. In terms of this view, community development was seen as a people-centred, holistic, consensus-oriented perspective approach to poverty alleviation in which community resources were harnessed and channelled into social improvement programmes to improve the quality of life and the social functioning and well-being of 144
people at a local community level. Community development implied participatory social change strategies and acknowledged people’s right to self-determination in socio-political processes affecting their lives. Supported by democratic principles, it aimed to achieve improved social welfare and created processes whereby individuals and groups might participate in social change and development (Gray, 1996, 1997).

In the UK, the term community work was favoured over the community development approaches arising in the colonies. With the influence of radical theory, which began to infuse UK social work in the 1970s and construe social work as an intrinsically political endeavour, the ‘traditional’, apolitical, consensus-oriented, system-maintenance community development approach came to be widely criticised (Bailey & Brake, 1975; Biklen, 1983; Corrigan & Leonard, 1978; Daniel & Wheeler, 1990; Friedmann, 1992; Galper, 1980; Mullaly, 1993). Radical theorists favoured a critical, conflict-oriented perspective where social problems were attributed to the failures of liberal capitalism and the ultimate goal of social work was to work with poor and oppressed people, using empowerment strategies to transform society through: (i) consciousness-raising, that is, making oppressed people aware of the extent to which their problems were caused, not by their own wrongdoing, but by the context in which they lived. In redefining social reality in this way, they aimed to translate personal troubles into political concerns; (ii) normalisation, that is, convincing oppressed people they were not to blame for their poverty. In social work the aim was to overcome ‘blaming-the-victim’ approaches; and (iii) collectivisation or focusing on collective interests so as to overcome individualism (Gray, 1997). This radical perspective with its useful insights into the way in which injustice and oppression arose and were maintained in society found a captive audience in community theorists (C.L. Clark with Asquith, 1985). Community work was a means to work towards the elimination or, at least, the reduction of injustice and oppression in society. Hence, in the UK, community work in the 1980s was heavily influenced by this Marxist thinking and evolved as a separate area of study from social work (C.L. Clark with Asquith, 1985). Later, Twelvetrees’ (1991) work focused on the neighbourhood level and concentrated on working with ‘communities of interest’ (p. 7-8), that is, groups of people with shared concerns, interests, or identities. More recently, Stepney and Popple (2008) described and
analysed the reinvigoration of community work in Third Way policy in the UK (see also Popple & Redmond, 2000).

**Issues surrounding Australian community development**

In Australia, the work of progressive intellectuals and reformers, like Addams, came under criticism for advancing:

[A] romantic ideology of community, idealising the small town as a place featuring easy neighbourliness and intimate face-to-face personal contact. Moral and ethical breakdown was diagnosed and attributed to weakened social constraints that came naturally with cities, industrialisation and bureaucratisation (Mowbray, as cited in Thorpe et al., 1992, p. 54).

Writing in 1974, Berry described these liberal reform efforts as ‘characterised by various commitments to social engineering, scientific management, the use of specially qualified experts in government, direct democracy and an antibureaucratic bias. Remote, impersonal government was deplored and grass roots democracy praised’ (as cited in Mowbray, 1985, p. 46). Though Addams and the Settlement House Movement influenced the dominant models and practices of early community work in ‘organizing, planning, and development’ (Weil, 1996, p. 9), today their work is seen in light of liberal notions of citizen participation and the role of education, planning, research, and social and political action in building social, political, and economic justice. For example, from a contemporary critical perspective, Cannan and Warren (1997) saw early approaches – in social work and education – as devoid of economic and political analysis.

Within Australia, community development – with its social and economic focus and bottomup, people-centred approach – emerged as a strategy for social change in the 1970s (Ife, 2002; Kenny, 1994). It spawned a new approach – following the collapse of many local economies – called ‘community regeneration’, which had a strong economic focus (Cannan & Warren, 1997). Today community development is most often referred to as a process of community engagement through which it is possible to negotiate the ‘tension between the world as we want it and the world as it is … [through working]
both with and against existing social forms’ (Kenny, 1994, p. 23). But an area of contention is whose responsibility it is to do this work in light of the relationship of community development to employment, salaried staff, and professionalisation. Some authors see community development as a form of service delivery with a professional face conducted by employed, trained, and qualified people bound by contractual arrangements to an employer or the community (S. Clarke, 2000). Others see it as voluntary, unpaid, and noninterventionist, arising through local initiative (Kenny, 1994). Community development in this view is thus at odds with the professional welfarist tradition where a community development worker does not necessarily come from or live in a local community and whose job it is to use his or her professional expertise to intervene in the community. Community development workers provide education, training or capacity building, and information to enlighten and strengthen communities to deal with their own poverty and disadvantage. Its bottom up approach harnesses and supports naturally occurring networks, and internal resources and capabilities in severely disadvantaged communities.

In Australia, the traditional interventionist welfarist approach is strongly identified with social work and has been challenged from within the social and community services industry, where notions of social justice, community participation, and accountability to service users are important aspects of practice (Kenny, 1994). Kenny (1994) outlined the differing positions taken on the relationship between community development and professional social work as follows:

1. **Social work is the generic term** for all professional human service work, while community development is one of many methods within the social work *oeuvre* used by social workers. In this approach, ‘differences between social work and community development work are not seen to be significant or clear-cut, as community development is subsumed under social work principles’ (Kenny, 1994, p. 31).

2. **Social work is radically different from community development**, where the focus extends beyond the social and community services to include advocacy, political activism, small business cooperatives, microenterprises, and so on. In this view, community development is neither a job nor a profession but
an activity focused on changing social structures and relationships in profound ways.

3. **Once part of the same industry, social work and community development parted company.** Stemming from 1970s British community work, and the influence of the Marxist critique of social work, which identified social work as reinforcing existing social inequalities, there followed a shift by disillusioned social workers to community work, where they took up a ‘radically anti-establishment, anti-professional and anti-credentialist’ (Kenny, 1994, p. 31) position differentiating the philosophy and practice of community development from social work.

Distinguishing social work from community development has been a prevalent occupation in Australia and the UK and is an area of hotly contested debate. While Kenny (1994) saw empowerment as the central difference between the two, social workers counter with a value-driven practice aiming to:

1. Reject the abuse of power for exploitation or suppression and support anti-oppressive policies and practices.
2. Empower individuals, families, groups, communities, and societies in the pursuit and achievement of equitable access to social, economic, and political resources and in attaining self-determination, self-management, and social well-being.
3. Engage in participative, open, and empowering processes, including advocacy, to enable clients to further their desires and interests as far as is possible, taking into account the relevant interests of others (Australian Association of Social Worker’s Code of Ethics, 2002).

A crucial distinguishing feature, however, is the context in which the work, whether social work or community development, is done. In the UK, for example, S. Clarke (2000) argued, if community development were part of social work and community development workers were employed by the traditional agencies employing social workers, they would likely experience the same restrictions as the general social work constituency. For Kenny, (1994) community development jobs in Australia generally fall under the Social and Community Services Award (at a lower pay rate) and
thus, though part of the social and community services industry, have a distinct function from that of professional social work.

While there are a variety of community development activities, and many debates and controversies about their practice, it should now be evident there are some key values forming the basis of community development theory, objectives, tasks, processes, and practices, regardless of who performs the work. In Australia, community development rests on the view that disadvantaged people can have full control over their own lives only when social structures and institutions are changed. Because community development probes inequalities to reveal underlying structures and ideologies, it has natural links with critical social theories, such as Marxist and feminist theory (Kenny, 1994). Hence, community development has a mixed reputation within the social and community services industry. To some, it has taken on the spectre of a revolutionary front, the harbinger of radical action groups and social movements challenging the very foundations of society. To others, community development represents a nostalgic and naive longing for a romanticised notion of community (Mowbray, 2004). Between these two extremes, mainstream community development represents a modest attempt to further people’s efforts to gain control over their lives (Kenny, 1994). In summary, community development variously refers to:

1. A job or profession.
2. A set of tasks in human service work.
3. A method or approach to social and economic development.
4. A philosophical or intellectual approach to the world.
5. A political activity.
6. A way of working with people based on a set of values.
7. A way of life based on principles offering a direction for the future.
8. A ‘living, dynamic, and challenging endeavour sometimes simple and coherent, sometimes contradictory and full of dilemmas’ (Kenny, 1994, p. 3).

Ife’s (2002) reworking of community development in relation to the green movement and new paradigm thinking might be seen as an example of the changing view of community development as the ‘embodiment of a form of politics which will usher in
the twenty-first century’ (Kenny, 1994, p. 3). Regarding the principles of community development as a new politics, key ideas include:

1. Planning purposeful strategies to alter the way things are done generally and change the structures of society. In other words, it intervenes in – quantifiable and qualifiable – processes of social change to develop new forms of social organisation.

2. The community using or creating its own resources to meet its needs through cooperative and collaborative problem-solving.

3. Building structures to encourage democratic participation in decision making within informal community groups or nonprofit organisations in the community or non-government sector.

4. Setting priorities and target groups for funding in the community.

5. Locating the roots of disadvantage and inequality within the social system.

6. Taking collective action to bring about real change in society for the benefit of all.

7. Focusing on the citizen rather than the citizen-as-service-user as the target for intervention.


9. Acting locally and thinking globally.

10. Planning, researching, and evaluating the effectiveness of interventions to ensure accountability to relevant constituencies.

11. Improving people’s well-being and quality of life.

12. Developing and sharing resources.

13. Engaging in social interaction and participation, self-help, and mutual support activities.

14. Building autonomy through working with the socially excluded as a long-term process involving teaching others to do things for themselves.

15. Redressing the powerlessness of the disadvantaged through ensuring access to knowledge, skills, and opportunities and resources.

16. Working with people where they live, respecting culture, and accepting diversity (Bourget-Daitch & Warren, in Cannan & Warren, 1997; Cannan

**Personal experience shapes ‘community’**

One’s sense of community is shaped by personal experience, though writers rarely engage in such autobiographical detail:

[Those who] write within and about community development are almost inevitably engaged emotionally, intellectually or economically with the subject as academics, researchers, policy makers and analysts, practitioners, managers and even occasionally beneficiaries. Thus, community development can be a practice that to some extent reflects who we are and what we value. At its best critical writing challenges personal assumptions and behaviours and provides insights that extend our conceptual understanding of the field in which we are engaged (C. Miller, 2008, p. 1).

Community evolved for Miller (2008) as an academic, researcher, practitioner, and beneficiary. For artists – and in light of the purpose of this study – there is the added dimension of art to the extremely variable definition of community shaped by each person who lives, works, and dreams in one. Just as the personal influences one’s sense of community, discipline also plays a role. This disciplinary influence is examined in the next section.

**Interdisciplinarity shapes ‘community’**

Community is an interdisciplinary domain in which participation, collaboration, and cooperation involves a diversity of – nonprofessional and professional – people. Rarely is community work a solitary occupation. Not surprisingly, therefore, as already shown, a variety of terms are used to describe forms of community intervention, including community work, community organisation, community action, and community development. These terms are often used interchangeably, different terms are used to mean the same thing, and in different contexts the same term can have very different meanings. Given that the empirical aspect of this study investigates the effectiveness of art as an
intervention within a community context, of particular interest is the contribution of the arts to the community sphere and it is to this the chapter now turns.

Art and community

The literature on art and community takes many forms and similar struggles with terminology are evident. It is Kwon (2004) who best appreciated the ambiguity of the term community in relation to art. She saw that the ‘discursive slippage around “audience”, “site” and “public” [was] itself a distinctive trait of community based public art discourse’ (p. 94), thus adding an additional layer of complexity to the traditional community-oriented literature. Thus, community arts, community animation, community-based arts, cultural work, cultural action, participatory arts projects, community cultural development (Goldbard, 2006), cultural activism, arts-based community building, asset-based community organising, creative community building (Borrup, 2006), and arts-based community development (Cleveland, 2002) are all used to describe creative practices within communities. Meade and Shaw (2007) preferred the term democratic imagination coined by educator Maxine Greene in 1995 (see also Goldstein, 1992, 1997), which suggested:

a potential capacity for entering attentively into the experience of others, thinking critically about structures and relations of power and acting creatively and collectively to transform the world for the better … [viewed as] particularly urgent in the current globalized context of practice (p. 414).

Each approach has a slightly varying emphasis, such as breadth or narrowness of the locus of concern, theoretical connections, historical influences, and the like. Thus all of these terms, in addition to social work approaches to community incorporating creative elements, might be categorised under the umbrella term creative community practices as outlined in Figure 13.

The two dominant modes – community cultural development and arts-based community development – the latter of which is an alternative term which incorporates Kwon’s (2004) four models of working with communities described in Chapter 3 are developed in the next two sections.
For Goldbard (2006), the primary difference between arts-based community development and community cultural development was the cultural in community cultural development, which indicated a more:

generous concept of culture (rather than, more narrowly, art) and the broad range of tools and forms in use in the field, from aspects of traditional visual-and performing-arts practice to oral-history approaches usually associated with historical research and social studies, to use of high-tech communications media, to elements of activism and community organizing typically seen as part of non-arts social change campaigns (p. 21).

This indicates a rather narrow view of art and what art might constitute. The major deficit of community cultural development is its lack of a:
formally agreed theory or code of practice, [rather it] is based on a framework of understanding … loosely agreed on by those working in and with the sector. While these ideas are not overtly stated or even acknowledged, it can be argued that they still operate to shape the work of CCD’ (Community Arts Network SA Incorporated, 2004, n.p).

Goldbard (2006) held an antitheoretical position in arguing community cultural development was an art rather than a science, believing those who ‘focused too closely on “models,” “replicability” and “best practices” tend[ed] to produce dull work, lacking depth and heart’ (p. 101). She does however acknowledge a ‘mosaic’ (p. 101) of theoretical and social influences including:

1. William Morris’ idea of the social integration of the artist.
2. Social activism and connections to resistance movements.
3. The Settlement House Movement and Jane Addams plus subsequent critiques of the movement’s approaches to and understandings of theory underpinning its practice.
4. The influence of the Popular Front of the 1930s in the USA and the related development of class consciousness across time.
5. The implementation of the post-Depression New Deal and subsequent US Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and Manpower Services Commission in Britain leading to the art initiatives being framed as work and the employment of artists in public service positions.
6. The art extension programmes of US universities, which operated parallel to the Settlement House Movement to bring art to communities.
8. The influence of the work of Paulo Freire and Augusto Boal and the concept of liberating education and theatre.
9. Debates about culture and development as opposed to cultural development (the former strongly linked to the World Bank and international aid, the latter focusing more heavily on the development of cultures and cultural capacity).
10. The influence of oral histories and anthropology.
11. The development of international cultural policy discourse.
12. A recent foregrounding of spiritual questions.

The areas of overlap between social work and community cultural development include the use of community development principles, such as community self-determination, the idea of the worker as a change agent in pursuit of social justice, collaborative art, and cultural production. Both are characterised by community involvement in a collaborative process with community and practitioner as equal contributors. These approaches potentially include the following steps:

1. The naming and identification of issues, values, visions, criteria for success, links, and opportunities.
2. Planning and researching solutions, directions, and approaches.
4. Monitoring and evaluating progress, group processes, and outcomes.
5. Resource development of funding, partnerships, networks, information, and expertise.
6. Target and target audience development for advocacy, promotion, and awareness raising.

With the exception of the ordering of the steps and the focus on audience in relation to advocacy, promotion, and awareness raising, these steps are consistent with the intervention research model outlined in Chapter 7.

Community social work and community cultural development differ since social work’s primary goal is not active participation in cultural life, which is identified as an essential goal of community cultural development\(^\text{10}\), but rather broader participatory engagement. The greatest area of contrast between social work and community cultural development includes social work’s stronger, more clearly articulated code of practice and a largely agreed range of theory underpinning its practice. Despite the obvious

relevance of community cultural development to the context of this study, and given active participation in cultural life – an essential goal of community cultural development – was a secondary goal for this study, the closely related alternative arts-based community development was considered to have a higher degree of relevance. It was also more closely aligned to the community development practices with which the partner agencies in the ‘Safe at Home’ project were familiar. The next section focuses on the field of arts-based community development.

**Arts-based community development**

According to Newman, Curtis, and Stephens (2003), stimulated by social democratic government policy and participatory, developmental practices and supported by the evolution of the community arts movement in the late 1960s, which developed parallel to the community health and women’s health movements, art projects in the UK had become an important community development strategy (see also Putland, 2008). Likewise, Matarasso (2007) noted the growing individualisation in UK social policy from the 1980s onwards saw a shift from the collective to the individual in cultural policy and the use of cultural action to encourage community development. Contemporaneous variations and evolutions of theories, values, and approaches to arts-based community development followed. Rhonda Phillips (2004) identified far earlier influences in the USA in the City Beautiful Movement of the late 1890s.

In a special edition of the *Community Development Journal* on community development and the arts, Meade and Shaw’s (2007) editorial noted how contributors, including Braden and Mayo (1999), Kay (2000), and Newman et al. (2003), had ‘consistently identified the role community arts can play in supporting new forms of community leadership and refining skills that may be utilized in more mainstream community development programmes’ (p. 419-420).

Newman et al. (2003) believed the influx of newcomers to community arts practice resulted in the importation of significant experience from the community development, community activism, social service, and business sectors. The result was the birth of arts-based community development and the expansion of the theoretical underpinnings of community arts practice to incorporate those from the social, political,
and pedagogical arena adding to previously held cultural and imaginative ideas (Clover, 2007).

More recently, a tension between political support for the arts and politicisation of the arts has emerged in the face of the arts becoming an agent of state policy. As a direct consequence, demands on the arts to build communities, regenerate economies, and include marginalised groups have increased (Meade & Shaw, 2007). Meade and Shaw (2007) believed this posed a risk to the arts becoming ‘a convenient means of political displacement, distracting attention from the real causes of social problems’ (p. 415-416).

Cleveland (2002) believed there was little critical thinking evident in the field of arts-based community development and its underpinning ideas continued to be ‘a work in progress’ (n.p.). Hence the specific meanings to commonly used words like culture, community arts, and community artists were diverse and elusive. In the interests of clarity, the Centre for the Study of Art and Community defined arts-based community development as:

- arts-centered activity that contributes to the sustained advancement of human dignity, health and/or productivity within a community. These include:
  - Activities that EDUCATE and INFORM us about ourselves and the world
  - Activities that INSPIRE and MOBILIZE individuals or groups
  - Activities that NURTURE and HEAL people and/or communities
  - Activities that BUILD and IMPROVE community capacity and/or infrastructure

[emphasis in original] (Cleveland, 2002, n.p.). These four areas constitute what Cleveland (2002) called neighborhoods which together comprised the ‘ecology’ (n.p.) of arts-based community development against which all community art projects could be located (see Figure 14). It is interesting to observe, given Goldbard’s (2006) view of the difference between community cultural development and arts-based community development noted above, that in Figure 14 art projects are not the only examples to be located in the model as cultural activities are
also strongly represented. Social work projects which may or may not incorporate art could also be located within this framework making it relevant for all creative community practices.
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Figure 14: Cleveland’s (2002) ecology of arts-based community development

Most frequently, arts-based community development studies incorporate self-reports of positive change across personal, social, economic, or educational arenas (Newman et al., 2003). More recently, arts-based community development outcomes have included conflict resolution, public safety, economic development, community revitalisation, and improved economic or social health. These are viewed as indicators of the altered nature and raised profile of community art and the consequent emergence of
the new field of arts-based community development (Clover, 2007). In this light, Cleveland (2002) viewed art-based community development as:

a realm of cultural practice that regards public participation and artistic creation as mutually interdependent ... [where] ... there are significant and tangible community benefits, beyond the aesthetic realm, that naturally accrue from certain kinds of community art endeavors (n.p.).

Like the generic practice of community development, arts-based community development is confounded by different terminology. Borrup (2006) suggested this kind of work goes by many names, including cultural activism, arts-based community building, community cultural development, asset-based community organising, and creative community building. As already noted, Meade and Shaw (2007) preferred the term *democratic imagination* which focused on collective transformation.

Matarasso (2007) argued there were emergent examples of effective community arts practice from disadvantaged, rural communities of southeastern Europe suggesting community arts practice was transferable across different circumstances. However, he also indicated that by themselves, art and community activism were unable to address the social, economic, and related – structural – factors facing marginalised communities.

Rhonda Phillips (2004) proposed an economically driven typology of arts-based community development incorporating arts-based business incubators, artists’ cooperatives, and tourism ventures. Here the arts have become businesses focused on the revitalisation of local economies. Entrepreneurial creativity and flexibility are essential and outcomes depend on the community’s ability to respond to its needs, generate economic opportunities, and gain community support. Gone is a social justice focus on access and resources.

Like many community development (and social work) practitioners, Purcell (2007) noted the lasting influence of the Freirian focus on empowerment, community action, and social transformation which run counter to the role of the arts in transforming the social: ‘the arts are intrinsically progressive ... the impact of artistic ventures can always be measured and ... artistic production is about objects’
(Schwarzman, as cited in Purcell, 2007, p. 114). For art to be transformative, it had to distinguish ‘between art that [was] about politics, and art that [was] political … [and] … provide a context within which others [could] take action’ (p. 114).

**Challenges of arts-based community development**

**Power interests**

Arts-based community development has been described as ‘sociology by other means’ (McGonagle, 2007, p. 426) and, as a consequence, though it can be ‘dismissed as not quite art’ (p. 420), it is still about ‘democracy … hearing … people’s voices, social justice and equity and diversity’ (Purcell, 2007, p. 112-113). Further development of community arts practice requires ‘engagement with the mechanisms of power’ (McGonagle, 2007, p. 427) lodged in mainstream art institutions, such as museums and galleries, and influencing these powerful interests, which enhance democratic social interaction and engage or revitalise local economies. Engagement in this manner is a legitimate role for the arts. McGonagle (2007) believed paying greater attention to this role could expand the community development potential of an art space.

Grodach (2009) noted that the physical environment influenced community development outcomes. Public space was defined in numerous ways to: (i) facilitate relationships and engagement between groups; and (ii) provide opportunities for interaction and participation between strangers, and a place to conduct functional and ritual activities to tie communities together. The experience of a public space was determined by one’s social identity and background, one’s reason and way of occupying the space, and the context of the space itself hence the potential for public space to ‘reinforce existing social inequalities’ (Grodach, 2009, p. 3).

**Resource intensiveness**

The commodification of the arts in Rhonda Phillips’ (2004) economically driven model raises complex issues since ‘[c]ommunity artmaking is necessarily cumbersome, messy and slow’ (Cleveland, 2002, n.p.). It is an extremely resource intensive process and does not fit the paradigm of short-termism and pressures to produce outcomes
characterising contemporary human service environments where community development is likely to take place.

**Romanticism**

There is a tendency to romanticise the arts-based community development process as shown in the following examples:

‘We are increasingly recognizing that creative expression and participation are powerful means of building healthy and resilient communities, from neighbourhoods to nations,’ says the Canadian Conference of the Arts’ discussion paper *Arts and Communities*. This factor makes artists and organizations resources for their communities, whether or not they are engaged in community-based art (as cited in Milner, 2002, p. 12).

Culture is the basis of community and a building block for community problem solving (Robert McNulty, President, Partners for Livable Communities, as cited in Milner, 2002, p. 12).

Simplistic and over-optimistic statements such as these, compound the difficulties experienced in evaluating and quantifying the outcomes of arts-based projects in local communities (Newman et al., 2003; Purcell, 2007).

**Methodological, quantification, and evaluation issues**

Quantification and evaluation raise questions about the ‘extent to which creative processes can – or should – be managed and controlled’ (Newman et al., 2003, p. 310) and the quality of art produced in community contexts. Empirical approaches from education seem to have more in common with the arts than those from health and social care (Newman et al., 2003). Particular challenges for measuring the effectiveness of arts-based community development include ‘the large number of stakeholders, multiplicity of potential outcomes and the impracticalities of experimental forms of research because of the dissonance between requirements for numerical accuracy and artistic temperaments’ (Newman et al., 2003, p. 312).
External evaluation best ensures unbiased and accurate results. Jones (in Newman et al., 2003, p. 318) questioned the extent to which all sections of the community were reached by such programmes. Newman et al. (2003) believed ‘neither the simple measurement of inputs and outputs, nor the reduction of outcomes to quantitative measurements of personal satisfaction or growth [were] … sufficient to capture the collective, as well as the individual impact, of an artistic experience’ (p. 319). Further, they believed a more encompassing range of evaluative techniques was required to capture the depth and breadth of the intersection between art and community development. However, they did not specify what these techniques might be. Nevertheless, numerous arts-based programmes claim success.

Cleveland’s (2002) study attributed failure to ‘poor communication, differing commitment levels, and a lack of a sustained impact’ (n.p.). Despite the enthusiastic participation of quality artists and project partners, most difficulties arose from poor partnership development and community engagement skills. Notwithstanding this emerging research on the efficacy of arts-based community development, findings remain inconclusive and methodological problems abound, including inadequate information about sampling and respondent attrition, the measurement of respondents’ views, and the lack of corroborating evidence for substantial claims of success in some areas, such as claims of improved health outcomes (Newman et al., 2003). Cleveland (2002) expressed concern regarding the application of a ‘therapeutic or remedial [presumably rather than a research] methodology’ (n.p.) but did not expand on this. Importantly for this study, there is no evidence within the arts-based community development literature of projects measuring attitudinal change.

**Risk**

The increasing influence of neoliberalism and the consequent focus on risk management has also had an impact on those working within the community context:

To make political art that is ‘public’, that will be on full view, seen by many, and oftentimes permanent (another reason why it has to be of the best quality it can be) there is risk. This artistic risk – both in terms of going public but also creating the artworks themselves … is important to the cultural and aesthetic
growth of the individual and the collective. And it is also important to reclaiming public space where sharing, diversity, and contestation all exist (Felton, in Clover, 2007, p. 519).

Artists are required to anticipate the risk to the public flowing from their projects.

**Partnership and collaboration**

Collaborative partnerships face a number of critical, predictable problems, including a lack of clarity regarding needs or problems, unmet expectations and responsibilities, differences in values, funding and resourcing difficulties, poor documentation, responsibility without authority, conflicts of loyalty, and inflexibility. For collaborative partnerships to work, clarity and agreement on the need or problem, expectations, goals, responsibilities, and values is needed along with:

1. Vision and leadership.
2. Site-specific programme design and effective planning.
4. Broad-based community representation and involvement in identifying needs, developing potential solutions, and contributing to the artwork.
5. Public awareness and communication.
6. Owning the result in the belief participation and ownership lead to enhanced opportunities for achieving lasting, worthwhile outcomes (Cleveland, 2002).
7. Knowledge of the community to enhance understanding of the complex working environment (Cleveland, 2002).

It remains for these factors to be subjected to empirical testing.

**Conclusion**

In reviewing the historical connection between art and social work in community practice, this chapter has celebrated their shared history through reclaiming the place and role of Jane Addams and her contribution to art, social work, and community development. Addams’ work provides a reference point for the empirical study on the basis of its *real world* community context and use of art in practice. In reviewing the arts-based literature, an umbrella model of creative community practice incorporating a
range of differing approaches to the use of art in community development was presented. The community cultural development and arts-based community development models – and their respective strengths and weaknesses – were explored in some detail. From this exposition, a justification of the use of an arts-based community development approach for the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project has been provided. The next chapter examines the methodology of this study providing the framework for the empirical project.
Chapter 6

Methodology

Art, Social Work, and Social Change
Research is defined as the creation of new knowledge and/or the use of existing knowledge in a new and creative way so as to generate new concepts, methodologies, and understandings. This could include synthesis and analysis of previous research to the extent that it is new and creative (Australian Research Council, ERA Guidelines, 2009, p. 9).

The methodological approach and research methods used in this study are outlined in this and Chapter 7. This chapter begins with an outline of what research is understood to be and how social work and fine art position themselves in relation to it. The chapter turns to an examination of the heuristic methodological framework and the mixed method approach for the conceptual aspects of the study. It explores how these approaches relate to, are consistent with, and support the research process and the empirical social intervention research project nested within it. The chapter then investigates the impact of the crossdisciplinary approach to research. It focuses on the way in which methods were chosen, implemented, and the data gathered prior to and simultaneously with the empirical study. The elements of the two methodological aspects of the study (a heuristic and social intervention research framework) and their relationship to each other to form a creative synthesis from different research paradigms (Peile, 1988) are outlined.

**Research and its relationship to social work and art**

The Australian Research Council’s (ARC) (2009) *Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA)* definition (quoted above) served as a guiding beacon for this study, which located creativity at the forefront of the production of new knowledge. Research, in the simplest of terms, concerns finding out about things. The essential purpose of research is to review existing knowledge and to generate new knowledge. Through knowledge review and knowledge creation, research acts as a bridge (or mediator) between theory and practice. It is often focused on making the unknown known, the uncertain more certain, providing arguments regarding proof and truth.
There are, generally speaking, two clear approaches to research – one directed towards thinking (pure or basic research), the other towards doing (applied research). Both forms are important and contribute to the generation of knowledge in different ways. Research can provide the basis on which theories are tested or created. It can also function as an instrument by which the adequacy of a theory is measured as, it tests whether the theory works in practice. This was not a primary focus of this study. Anecdotally, many social workers in practice describe applied research as more relevant and helpful to their practice which they view as grounded in the real world. The notion of usefulness is also significant in creative arts research (Barratt & Bolt, 2007). On this basis, combined with my extensive history as a social work practitioner and commitment to produce useful research for practice – and to practitioners of social work and art – an applied approach was chosen for this study.

Applied research attempts to address a specific practice-relevant question. In this study that question was: Is art an effective intervention in changing community attitudes about domestic violence? Though uncertain whether research could provide a definitive answer to this question, I believed it would, at the very least, contribute to further understanding or sense-making about the subject under examination and generate a range of ideas to explain the who, what, when, where, why, or how of arts-based community development as a medium for attitudinal change, at the same time giving rise to further areas for exploration and investigation. This iterative process was born of the postmodern idea of knowledge as constantly under review and ever changing.

Nevertheless, all research involves a systematic approach of:

1. Identifying the research issue or problem.
2. Specifying the research aims.
3. Establishing the research design (or plan).
4. Determining or choosing research methods.
5. Delineating criteria and standards of judgement for validity and reliability or, in the case of qualitative research, trustworthiness.
6. Gathering data.
7. Generating evidence from the data.
8. Providing explanations of the significance of the work.
9. Creating links between new and existing knowledge.
10. Laying claim to knowledge.
11. Submitting knowledge claims to critique.
12. Disseminating the findings (adapted from McNiff & Whitehead, 2006, p. 22).

Research is frequently described as a process of systematically gathering evidence through which learning occurs. It is ‘a systematic way of exploring something we desire to know more about’ (I. O’Connor, Wilson, Setterlund, & Hughes, 2008 p. 54) which is linked, within the profession of social work, to an ethical responsibility to expand social work knowledge to ensure the best outcomes for clients (AASW, 1999; I. O’Connor et al., 2008). Research is integral to the process of continuous improvement and development within an area of learning or discipline (I. O’Connor et al., 2008). Besides the ethical responsibilities relating to disciplinary improvement and development, research is concerned primarily with extending existing knowledge or creating new knowledge.

**Research in social work**

There has been a long history of hotly contested debate within social work regarding the nature of research and the relative merits of what Peile (1988) referred to as the empirical (by which he meant positivistic scientific) and normative (interpretive) paradigms. This debate tended to be divided along lines of rigorous experimental research (also called objectivist, empirical, or scientific) (Fischer, 1993; Peile, 1988) consistent with Mode 1 knowledge production versus qualitative research (also referred to as subjectivist, normative, or interpretive) consistent with Mode 2 knowledge production (Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny, Schwartzmann, Scott, & Trow, 1994; Peile, 1988; Reid, 2001; Witkin, 1991). The former is usually strongly associated with measurement while the latter emphasises understanding. Table 5 outlines the key characteristics of the two positions (modified from Peile, 1988).

Many have argued the separation of the subject from the phenomenon being studied, that is, strict adherence to the objectivist, empirical, or scientific method in social work research was not possible (McNiff & Whitehead, 2006) while some
hardened positivists, like Bruce Thyer (2008) might suggest subjectivist, naturalistic, interpretive research is not research at all. Karger (1983) argued these paradigmatic debates were essentially political and overlaid the struggle for control of the direction, leadership, and future of the profession between researcher-academics and practitioners. He believed few practitioners made use of research findings or found them helpful (Karger, 1983). Methodological choices, too, involve political decisions (Trinder, 1996).

**Table 5: The empirical and normative paradigms in social work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empirical</th>
<th>Normative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prediction</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias limitation (value free)</td>
<td>Bias incorporation (value laden)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of knowledge and values</td>
<td>Integration of knowledge and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement and testing</td>
<td>Insight and meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Subjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detachment</td>
<td>Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain knowable world – absolutism</td>
<td>Multiple perspectives – relativism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on content</td>
<td>Focus on process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aim for certainty</td>
<td>Reliance on faith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research in art**

The literature review suggests the relationship between art and research is a new area of scholarly examination with the earliest writing emerging in the last decade, especially in the last three to five years. It is a new phenomenon, positioned at the very edge of knowing in this field (Elkins, 2009; Emlyn Jones, 2009; Leavy, 2009). Given the newness of the area, Emlyn Jones (2009) suggested any input into the debate must be considered ‘provisional and conditional’ (p.31). Therefore, the contribution of this thesis must also be considered in these terms. Clearly, the topic is an area for significant further research and contemplation. Art shares the dilemma with social work regarding the place of research. In art as in social work there is little agreement, with some leaning toward the interpretive (Macleod & Holdridge, 2006; G. Sullivan, 2005), others to the positivist (Elkins, 2009). A further challenge facing artists is one of how they join the
already established research community while retaining the unique and distinctive nature of art and its processes (Mottram, 2009).

As in social work, the paradigmatic discussion in art was influenced by the long history of debate over the differences between art and science. While the range of views is similar to the discussion in social work, the art historical underpinnings extend further with the debate framed within history and trace back to the Middle Ages. The Renaissance is identified as a key turning point (Burgin, 2009; G. Sullivan, 2005). The histories document varying preferences for:

1. Art to become a science.
2. Art’s tendency to become science.
3. Art’s inclination to be ‘the equivalent of pure scientific research’ (Burgin, 2009, p. 72-73).
4. Art’s emergence at the edge of science as the predictor of things to come – thus pushing the boundaries of science (Burgin, 2009).
5. Art heralding scientific discovery (Shlain, 1991).

In addition, from the late 19th century onwards, German scholars began to develop art history or kunstgeschichte as a science. This movement was followed by the emergence of Morelli’s notion of connoisseurship as a form of forensics (Hyde Minor, 2001). Hyde Minor (2001) believed empiricism had ‘displaced meaning in art’ (p. 90) and moved it ‘from the art object to the process of experience’. Thus, the notion of art based upon an independent idea gave way to psychological explanations of art as ‘a product of the human mind and emotions’ (p. 90). In essence, this is a re-emergence of the idea of art as experience (Dewey, 1934).

This potted collection of connections between art and science has been described as a group of unrelated events rather than a cumulative history (Burgin, 2009) where the binary is ever present. At one end of the spectrum is the view of creative artist Paul Dikker who perceived an unbridgeable gap between art and science with science focused on the ‘object of perception or observation’ (science studies reality as it is) and art as an ‘expressive tool’ through which the artist created a new reality (Van Gelder & Baetens, 2009, p. 97). In contrast was the view a little further along ‘Harrison’s spectrum’ (Elkins, 2009, p. 140) where the difference between art and
science lay in the ease of distinguishing research within each discipline. He suggested research in science was identified with ease but not so in art. At the centre of the spectrum, Van Gelder and Baetens (2009) mused at the possibility ‘(a)rt and science do not only have the same mother, they are even double-ovum twins’ (p. 98). They favoured the unity of art and science basing this possibility in ancient history where the Greek ideal of arete did not distinguish between art and science and the nine muses inspired arts and sciences. An initial split occurred in the Middle Ages, when a distinction was introduced between the language-based trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and logic) and the mathematics-based quadrivium (arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy). A further step was made from the Renaissance onwards, with the creation of the academies for art and music, aimed at creating an advanced training in the practice of arts, independently from the corporatist environment of the studio. Van Gelder and Baetens (2009) noted the increasing artificiality of this historical split and posed an important question for consideration: ‘For what is art today, and what is science?’ (p. 101). It is here in the arts, like Peile (1988) and others in social work, a new approach was sought.

The territory mapped out for further exploration is the space between art and science – the space of the relationship between – emerging from sources within the social sciences and art. Graeme Sullivan (2005) suggested artists engage in ‘mindful inquiry in art and science’ (p. 6) by drawing on the relationship between the science of sight and creativity of the eye, thus aligning the ‘process of artistic inquiry with the reductive methods of science’ (p. 18). Van Gelder and Baetens (2009) highlighted the need to explore the similarities rather than the differences between art and science. Within the social sciences, this trend is evident in the attention paid to examinations of the ‘relationship between’ their ‘intrinsic similarities ... their grounding in exploration, revelation, and representation’ (Leavy, 2009, p. 2). Underpinning these ideas is an acknowledgement of a shared interest in understanding human experience. Thus emerges an interest in an alternate paradigm in the arts similar to that proposed by Peile (1988) in social work (see, for example Emlyn Jones, 2009). If the paradigmatic direction for art were further clarified and developed in this way, it would considerably
influence the approach to the relationship between art and research emergent within the
literature – the area to which this chapter now briefly turns.

In surveying the field for this study, three dominant ways of considering the
relationship between art and research were identified:

1. A position taken predominantly by artists and art academics, which is most
   commonly described, with some considerable contestation, as either art as
   research, practice as research or practice-led research (Barrett & Bolt, 2007; Elkins,
   2009; G. Sullivan, 2005). Developments in this area are attributed to a global
trend within academia toward research output with artists working within the
academy increasingly under pressure to conduct research (Elkins, 2009).
Consequently, practising artist-academics are forced to come to an
understanding of how research might relate to their current artistic practice or
be used as research to meet institutional requirements. In a counter argument,
Sullivan (2005) linked the growth of research within art as part of the ongoing,
ever changing development of the role of the artist occurring across time.
Whether intentionally or otherwise, Sullivan (2005) hinted at the need for a
renaissance in which new methods were developed to answer the questions of
our times.

2. Art-based research practice emerged from the qualitative frame of social research
(Leavy, 2009). Very simply this position distinguishes art as a research method.
It locates the methodological issues within the qualitative (normative,
interpretivist) framework discussed above offering the potential to incorporate
the variety of methodological possibilities accommodated by this heuristic
paradigm. Compared to the art as research concept, the social science approaches
seem, on the whole, to more clearly define the separation of method and
methodology. Sullivan (2005) identified one of the key problems between these
different approaches as the variation in ways of dealing with the ‘interpretation
and critique of meaning’ (p. xv) and the resultant knowledge produced. He
suggested the social sciences can emphasise the researcher as ‘editor’ rather than
artistic ‘practitioner’ (p. xv). This he believed to be the case even when a
reflexive approach was taken.
3. An approach, which counters those already described, is evident in the position of artists like Paul Dikker (see Van Gelder & Baetens, 2009) who states quite simply that artists should not engage in debates about art, science, or research. This view is held largely by artists outside the academy, given the discussion earlier in this section regarding the academy driving art’s relationship to research.

This study aligns with Leavy’s (2009) social science-based approach, which promoted art practice as a method of data collection within the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. I gathered drawings, paintings, and collages from community members in the initial phases of the study, and subsequently in the early stages of a number of the interventions. This data was then analysed – initially via a visual scan of all collected material. The data collected for the Alkira Avenue Park and The Cottage installations were also analysed using NVivo qualitative software and the results compared to the visual scan. Themes and images consistent with the study leitmotif of being 'Safe at Home’ were then matched to the attitudes identified via the community-wide survey that were to be addressed by the study. From this data the artworks were developed.

**Methodological framework for the study**

A creative heuristic approach formed the methodological framework for this study, which focused on diverse forms of knowledge, knowledge production and a range of procedures for gathering and analysing data. This creative approach combined insights from participatory action research and developmental or social intervention research. Due to its interdisciplinary nature, this study took disciplinary understandings from social work and art as described in the literature review. Based on my view of and experience with both disciplines, it strived to encompass these two partial (disciplinary) views, and drawing on their practice, enfold them into a unified single view which I called the *creative paradigm* as suggested by Peile (1988). This provided the basis for the

---

11 Two of the art interventions that were part of the nested empirical study, the ‘Safe at Home’ project discussed in Chapter 7. See also The 'Safe at Home' project: A process record in pictures *Volume 1* for Hopscotch installed at The Cottage and *Volume 2* for the Snakes and Ladders mosaic installed in the park on Alkira Avenue.
combination of methods used in gathering and analysing the data. This approach was aimed at developing knowledge about social work and art and their propensity to elicit social change, and at understanding whether art, as an intervention, might change community attitudes towards domestic and family violence. The research was concerned with problem-solving and theory building. The problem-solving pertained to methodological and design issues for this study and to the bringing together of two diverse disciplines, developing an integrated methodological approach, and applying it to the social problem of domestic violence.

This methodological approach was primarily qualitative even though a survey method was used to collect baseline data on community attitudes to domestic violence. This was because the main bodies of research literature with resonance to the framing of my thinking and approach came from grounded theory (Day, 2004; Walker & Myrick, 2006), mixed methods research (Plano Clark & Creswell, 2008; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003), phenomenological (Glendenning, 2007; Heckman, 1980; Laverty, 2003), hermeneutical (Laverty, 2003; Vis, 2008) and heuristic approaches (Heineman-Piper, Tyson & Heineman-Piper, 2002; Moustakas, 1990; Poulter, 2006; Poulter, 2005; Selas-Smith, 2002), participatory action research (Selener, 1997), and social intervention research (Fraser et al., 2009; Rothman & Thomas, 1994). These were drawn upon to develop a methodological framework that best fit my worldview and the subject matter.

Within the methodological creative heuristic paradigm, a mix of methods was used, including surveys, documents, observations, drawings and artworks as the means of collecting data. With the use of mixed methods in research, acknowledgement of the importance of my values in the interpretation of results, and focus on ‘what works’ as the ‘truth regarding the research question under investigation’ (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, p. 713), the choice of a pragmatic mixed methodology (Howe, 1988; Maxcy, 2003; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003, 1998) may appear a logical fit for this study. However, I rejected mixed methodology pragmatics on the basis of several important critiques related to the epistemological and ontological assumptions of mixed methodology pragmatics explored in the next paragraph.

In this study, my subjective understanding and experience was important and led to methodologies more usually associated with qualitative research based on social
constructionist theories. Consequently, I combined ideas from various research approaches including participatory action research and developmental or social intervention research and fashioned them into a creative – heuristic – paradigm (Peile, 1988). This was with the understanding that, strictly speaking, methodologies cannot be mixed (Creswell, 1994; Guba & Lincoln, 1988) and mixed methodologies are frequently poorly developed and explicated (Mason, 2006). Following Mason (2006), I sought a more creative approach in this mixed method study. However, interviews, surveys, questionnaires, statistical analysis, and so on, are research methods, they are not methodology. Whether a particular study is primarily quantitative or qualitative, then, depends on the study’s purpose, which in turn, depends on the problem under study and the questions asked. In this study, because I sought to understand the relationship between social work and art and its propensity for social change, and within this whether art was an effective medium for attitudinal change, I chose a problem-solving heuristic approach as I believed my interdisciplinary study best fit with the understandings of qualitative research. Figure 15 draws the disciplines together by combining:

1. **A normative, heuristic qualitative approach**, which took a particular value stance and sought clarification, the integration of knowledge and values, and understanding (see Table 6) through the creation of artworks. This heuristic relational and dialogical element infused the research process. To challenge my inevitable subjectivity in working from this perspective and ensure sound professional social work and art practice (research) in working with others, greater balance and objectivity was sought via the addition of:
   a. **A social intervention research framework** (Rothman & Thomas, 1994) for the ‘Safe at Home’ project (described in Chapter 7). It incorporated:
      i. **A quantitative community-wide survey** to establish a baseline on community attitudes towards domestic violence.
      ii. **An artist-practitioner-researcher model** for the implementation of the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project comprising:
         (a) **Arts-based community development** as the practice approach during the intervention phase (discussed in Chapter 5).
(b) *Art practice as research* as a method of data collection from community members (research participants) during the art making intervention phase (Leavy, 2009).

iii. A small *quantitative and qualitative neighbourhood survey* of the geographical area in which the most intensive interventions were conducted to establish comparative data to the baseline attitude survey and responses to, and impact of the artworks.

![A normative, heuristic qualitative methodological stance](image)

**Figure 15: The heuristic methodological approach**

This *creative – heuristic – paradigm* (Peile, 1988) aimed to develop a holistic understanding of reality ‘in which parts are not separable but are enfolded in each other’
(p. 13). It thus had several defining features drawing on a range of insights already outlined:

1. **An understanding of all – cosmological, ontological, ethical, spiritual, political and so on – aspects of the entity under study and the wider environment or social context**: This holistic understanding required the choice of research methods based on epistemological considerations compatible with my worldview and paradigmatic assumptions. Thus my position was made transparent and is open to challenge. Further, it required me to remain open-minded and encouraged growing awareness of the limitations of my understanding and experience.

2. **The researcher’s experience of the entity under study**: Accordingly, it was able to accommodate my practice experience in art and social work.

3. **The researcher’s knowledge of and willingness and ability to hear and understand differing paradigms (for example, positivist and interpretivist)**: This was important so I could justify the particular choices made for this study. I recognised that the chosen – creative – paradigm presented a partial rather than a complete view believing valuable insights could be gained through this and other partial views. I also appreciated the richness to be gained in related or differing paradigmatic positions despite the tensions inhering in ‘antagonistic contradiction’ (Peile, 1988, p. 5).

4. **An understanding of the researcher was an inherent part of the study**: I was not separate from the phenomena being studied, but my insights, understanding, and experience were a very important part of the study as it developed. Having said this, the paradigm was neither objective nor subjective but allowed for a ‘synthesis’ (Peile, 1988, p. 13) of my subjective position and from there ‘looking in through oneself to the whole’ (p. 13), to the external community and the subject under study. Key to this was my insight and ability to synthesise different positions of understanding in order to uncover this implicit undivided whole.

5. **A range of theories external to social work providing a different way of understanding**: The theories influencing the choice of paradigm included the work of Thomas Kuhn (paradigm shifts), David Bohm (quantum physics), Karl Pribram
(neuroscience), Ilya Prigogine (complex systems), and Rupert Sheldrake (morphic resonance). In his view of the creative paradigm vis a vis social work, Peile (1988) drew on the political structuralist uses of research of Karger (1983), the institutional context of knowledge of Rein and White (1981), the political perspectives developed by Imre (1984), the reviews of research trends in other fields conducted by Haworth (1984), and the methodological dilemmas of the positivist and normative positions explored by Mullen (1985).

The value of the chosen framework lay in its closeness to practice and crossdisciplinary nature. A range of scholars labelled this approach Mode 2 knowledge production (Gibbons et al., 1994; Nowotny, Scott, & Gibbons, 2003; Gray, 2008; Gray & Schubert, 2009, 2010, 2011a). Mode 2 is an engaged, collaborative approach to research, which generates knowledge useful for solving real world problems. Positioning this research within the crossdisciplinary framework of Mode 2 enabled the flexibility to incorporate social work and fine art research approaches and methods, that is, the strategies or traditions of inquiry from both disciplines. Thus a heuristic methodology was chosen for the formulation and developmental phases of this study involving moving back and forth between single (A) and recurrent, ongoing (B) processes present in the conduct of the research (see Table 6 – the numbering of the processes in this table will be used as a reference point throughout the remainder of Chapters 6 and 7):

1. Bring initial idea about examining the relationship between art (A1) and social work.
2. Develop ideas through conversation (B1).
3. Identify the need to test research questions in practice (A2).
4. Refine research questions (A3).
5. Confirm and commit to a heuristic process (B2).
6. Search for relevant literature and research (B3).
7. Map ideas across disciplinary boundaries (B4).
8. Disseminate emergent ideas and artworks (B5).
9. Test research questions in a community context (B6).
10. Establish validity in heuristic research (B7).
11. Test art making methods, media, and skills (A4).
12. Determine the methodological framework for the nested empirical study (A5).
13. Submit work for peer review through conferences and journals (B8).
14. Successfully complete conference presentations, exhibitions, and journal publications (B8).

Table 6: Heuristic approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Steps in the research process</th>
<th>A heuristic approach</th>
<th>The empirical study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The research framework</td>
<td>C: Single processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Single processes</td>
<td>B: Recurrent and ongoing processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Identify research issue or problem</td>
<td>1. Consider initial idea of examining the relationship between art and social work</td>
<td>1. Develop of ideas through conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Specify research aims</td>
<td>3. Refine research questions</td>
<td>2. Develop aims and objectives for the empirical project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Establish research design (or plan)</td>
<td>2. Confirm and commit to a heuristic process</td>
<td>3. Develop a research plan with the Network bridging practice and research for ‘Safe at Home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fund research</td>
<td>5. Test art making methods, media and skills</td>
<td>6. Test research questions in a community context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ensure ethical and safe conduct of research</td>
<td>5. Determine the methodological framework for the empirical project</td>
<td>7. Develop community-wide survey and pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Determine methods</td>
<td>6. Test research questions in a community context</td>
<td>8. Test pilot – cut out intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Steps in the research process (continued)</td>
<td>A heuristic approach</td>
<td>The empirical study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A: Single processes</td>
<td>B: Recurrent and ongoing processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 2: Implementation</td>
<td>9. Gather data</td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Call for participants and community consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Gather baseline data through community-wide survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Engage the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Design and conduct arts-based interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. Data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Second survey, data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16. Neighbourhood survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 3: Analysis and Interpretation</td>
<td>10. Generate evidence from data</td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Develop of key themes from data for the arts-based interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Data Analysis with SPSS and NVivo – interpretive analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Provide explanation of significance of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Create links between new and existing knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Lay claim to knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 4: Dissemination</td>
<td>14. Submit knowledge claims to critique</td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Submit work for peer review at conferences and via journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Disseminate findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>9. Successfully complete conference presentations, exhibitions and journal publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Submit thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Successfully complete conference presentations, exhibitions and journal publications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1: Problem formulation and research design

Heuristic approach and social work

The heuristic approach was crucial to the first phase of this study involving problem formulation and choice of research design. It has been described as the ‘active and reflective use of various theories as “heuristic tools” to shape practice interventions and thereby build practice wisdom’ (Poulter, 2005, p. 199). From its Greek origins (heuriskein), heuristic means ‘to discover or to find’ (Moustakas, 1990, p. 9). It is a research strategy involving a problem-solving process in which the researcher’s perceptions, intuition, commonsense, knowledge, and experience informs the research question and design. It is a subjective process involving self-dialogue, self-search, and self-discovery leading to inner awareness, inspiration, and meaning-making from which the research question(s) and methodology derives. The researcher is personally involved in the search for ‘qualities, conditions, and relationships’ (Moustakas, 1990, p. 11) and in drawing links between the problem under study and his or her internal reflections (awareness, feelings, and thoughts). As Moustakas (1990) so elegantly put it:

It is I the person living in a world with others, alone yet inseparable from the community of others; I who see and understand something, freshly, as if for the first time; I who come to know essential meanings inherent in my experience. I stand out within my experiences and in the entire domain of my interest and concern (p. 12).

The heuristic approach centres on two critical ideas: The importance of attention to process and the place of experience:

The process of self-dialogue makes possible the derivation of a body of scientific knowledge that is useful. Such a process is guided by a conception that knowledge grows out of direct human experience and can be discovered and explicated initially through self-inquiry (Moustakas, 1990, p. 17).

Moustakas (1990) identified seven important concepts and processes underpinning heuristic research: Identifying with the focus of inquiry, self-dialogue, tacit knowing,
intuition, in-dwelling, focusing, and an internal frame of reference. He also outlined six phases of heuristic research: initial engagement, immersion, incubation, illumination, explication, and creative synthesis. These phases and their relationship to the progress of this study are summarised in Table 7. They were central to the formulation phase of the study identified in Table 7.

**Heuristic approach and art**

Despite the potential for the incorporation of artwork into a heuristic methodology, there are surprisingly few references to it within the art-related research literature. Sullivan (2005) resisted the prescription of a specific theory, model, or method for visual arts research while simultaneously claiming to offer ‘a set of heuristic devices in visual and verbal form that present ideas about research’ (p. 94). It remains unclear in his book how, if one is offering a heuristic set of devices, this is not part of a heuristic methodological approach.

Bourriaud (2002) hinted at the ongoing role of heuristics in art across time when he suggested ‘[v]ideo plays the same heuristic, exploratory role as the sketch played in the nineteenth century’ (p. 75). Kester (2004) acknowledged the role of heuristics in his work as a critic and historian in his comparison of the demands on audiences between work in the East and West when he said ‘[m]y goal in this comparison is less judgemental than heuristic’ (p. 24). Neither discussed the heuristic in methodological terms. Similarly, Deutsche (1992) describes the use of a heuristic approach in practice without a methodological link:

My desire to approach contemporary public art as an urban practice is, then, an abstraction for heuristic purposes, but one that is motivated by the imperative, first, to respond to concrete events changing the function of public art and, second, to contribute to the formation of an alternative. An oppositional practice, however, must possess an adequate knowledge of the dominant constructions within which it works. In the case of public art it depends therefore on a critical perception of the city’s metamorphosis and of the role public art is playing within it (p. 162).
Table 7: Phases of the heuristic process (Moustakas, 1990) and how they relate to this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Conceptual aspects of the study</th>
<th>Empirical aspects of the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial engagement</td>
<td>Interested and concerned of the researcher, its personal and social meanings are discovered through self-dialogue and search. Development of the research question. Clarification of tacit understanding of the question.</td>
<td>Initial questions that the researcher commenced the study with. The process of engaged conversations with supervisors to clarify and refine and limit the research questions to a more manageable size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Researcher lives the question, then life becomes crystallized around the question. The researcher becomes intimately acquainted with the question in all contexts, maintaining sustained concentration and focus. Includes spontaneous self-searching, self-dialogue, pursuing intuitive clues and hunches and drawing from the tacit dimension.</td>
<td>Conversations, searching the literature for emergent ideas, mapping, note-taking, noting observations, synchronistic browsing, personal art making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incubation</td>
<td>Researcher retreats from intense, concentrated focus on the question allowing the tacit dimension and intuition time to clarify and extend understandings outside immediate awareness thus producing creative awareness and integration of the phenomenon or its parts.</td>
<td>In this research incubation has most frequently occurred in one aspect of the study when the researcher’s focus has turned to another major aspect of the study or sought to resume some semblance of work, life, and interests outside the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>Naturally occurs when researcher is open to intuition and tacit knowledge. Illumination is a breakthrough into conscious awareness of one or more qualities or themes embedded within the question. Maybe an initiation of new experience leading to new knowledge dimensions or insights, correction of distortions, modifications, synthesis of fragmented ideas, or new discoveries. Reflection is essential with meaning and essence stemming from tacit workings.</td>
<td>In the conceptual aspects of the study illumination was always precipitated by the process of beginning to write. Most of the major discoveries of this study were made following a highly emotional period of intense frustration, often accompanied by an intense sense that something wasn’t quite right or proceeding well. A subsequent period of distraction and rest would result in a breakthrough of some form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explication</td>
<td>Researcher attempts to comprehend and elucidate meanings of the illuminating discoveries in much greater detail, that is, what has stirred in consciousness is more fully examined. Involves recognition of new parts and themes. Researcher focuses, refines, self-searches, self-disclosures, and recognizes meanings are idiosyncratic to the experience and contingent upon internal frames of reference. Researcher attends to own awareness, feelings, thoughts, beliefs, and judgments before turning to understandings derived from others. Further viewpoints, textures, and features are articulated, refinements and corrections made. Discoveries and meanings combined and organized into a comprehensive description.</td>
<td>Further reflection and searching regarding discoveries made. This process is often embodied in the process of revising written and creative work. A higher degree of engagement with supervisors is present during the explication phase as new ideas are checked and discoveries consolidated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative synthesis</td>
<td>Achieved through intuitive and tacit capacity. Requires mastery of the material that illuminates and explicates the questions. Researcher is challenged to draw the components and central themes into a creative synthesis. Usually takes the form of a narrative description based on examples of verbatim material but may be expressed as a poem, story, drawing painting, or alternate creative form. Essential preparation includes knowledge of the data and a interlude to contemplate the topic and question to generate inspiration for synthesis. Tacit dimensions, intuition, and self-searching are required. Researcher moves beyond attention to the data itself and permits the interior life of the question to grow in a way that achieves a full expression of the real meaning of the investigated phenomenon are apprehended.</td>
<td>Completed written and personal creative work. Completion of thesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leavy (2009), whose focus was on the use of art in social science research, wrote specifically about maps and models as heuristic devices allowing for the visualisation of information and data during ‘interpretive moments’ (p. 232). She referred to the role of the artist-researcher-teacher reminiscent of the researcher-practitioner model in social work. She described this within *A/r/tographical work*, which she portrayed as a specific category of arts-based research practice within education research in which A/r/t was a metaphor for artist-researcher-teacher (Leavy, 2009). Similarly, Macleod and Holdridge (2006), who conducted a study which included a number of artist-researchers, noted practitioner-researchers tended to use ‘phenomenology and ontological speculation’ (p. 5). In concluding this section, it remains a mystery as to why there is so little discussion of the heuristic methodology within the fine arts research literature. This is particularly so given the methodological capacity so accommodating of the creative process, its focus on creative synthesis, and the production of creative work.

In her exploration of the heuristic process, Sela-Smith (2002) identified an important contradiction in the way in which Moustakas (1990) used the concept of *experience* – first as a verb in connection to the internal self-search and, secondly, as a noun in relation to observation and thoughts as they pertain to the examination of an experience or event. She believed the position the researcher took in relation to experience ultimately influenced the explication of the heuristic approach. Thus, it is important for researchers to be mindful and transparent in their use of the notion of experience.

**Researcher’s initial idea: Relationship between art and social work (A1)**

I came to this thesis with a variety of questions about the relationship between art and art making, and to social work practice born of observations from my own practice experience. At the same time, these questions had wider significance for social workers, artists, and the communities in which they work. They led to a study that could ’not be hurried or timed by the clock or calendar… [and required my willingness] … to commit endless hours of sustained immersion and focused concentration on [this] central
question’ (Moustakas, 1990, p. 14). Simultaneously seeking to understand the whole and discern unique patterns of experience in a disciplined and scientifically organised manner was central to the research process. The heuristic approach was particularly suited to this study because it provided a methodology that:

1. Allowed my experience and insights as researcher-social worker and researcher-artist to be incorporated into the research design.
2. Accommodated the complexity of the research context and the subject matter of the research – domestic and family violence, social work, and arts practice – and enabled movement back and forth between each component and the whole.
3. Allowed a place for social work values and their influence on the research process as well as the values of artists as a comparative feature of the research.
4. Supported the idea of transparent practice through the active articulation of biases, values, and assumptions within the research.
5. Allowed for the incorporation of quantitative and qualitative forms of research within the research design. This was an essential consideration as it allowed a largely quantitative community-wide survey to coexist with qualitative collection of data via arts-based interventions.

**Development of ideas through conversation (B1)**

The evolution of this thesis began in conversation. Eight of the initial supervision conversations held with Mel Gray and Anne Graham (23 February, 2005; 5 March, 2005; 31 March, 2005; 12 May, 2005; 30 June, 2005; 8 September, 2005; 27 October, 2005; 12 January, 2006) were recorded and transcribed. The key issues and themes identified within the transcriptions then formed the basis for further searching and interrogating relevant literature across art, social work, and potential philosophical and methodological approaches to accommodate both disciplines. These conversations served as a departure point from which to pursue further investigations linking new and developing ideas. As issues emerged, directed reading was undertaken. These conversations formed a critical foundation for the study and in a sense the approach to
reading was similar to the way an artist might approach a painting – adding colours and textures to the palette as the image developed.

**Search for relevant literature and research (B3)**

This research was groundbreaking since there was very little written either in social work or in art of a crossdisciplinary nature relevant to the terrain under study. It was essentially virgin territory. The approach taken to the literature was to examine issues and trends emerging from the conversations, described above, searching relevant terms as they arose and following potential ideas for the empirical aspect of the study as they emerged. This resulted in the conduct of an extensive library catalogue, database, and web-based search using the terms, *social work*, *fine art*, *community*, *community art*, *community work*, *arts-based practice*, *arts health*, *arts for health*, and *social change* separately and in combination. The terms *domestic and family violence* and *attitudinal change* were subsequently added to the search strategy when the ‘Safe at Home’ project was chosen for the empirical aspect of the study. Some twenty-four databases were searched, including Art Index, Australian Public Affairs (full text plus APAIS), AVAD5: Australian Visual Arts Data Base, Blackwell Synergy, Design and Applied Arts Index, Ebsco Mega File Premier, Expanded Academic ASAP, Ingenta Connect, JSTOR – The Scholarly Journal Archive, Project Muse, Proquest 5000, Sociological Abstracts, Taylor and Francis Online Journals, Science direct via Elsevier, Scopus, Austrom, Oxford Journals, Social Science Journals Proquest, PsychInfo, Factiva, and Cambridge Journals online and Social Work Abstracts. Smaller directed searches were also undertaken in relevant areas as they arose, including *creativity*, *ethics*, and *community arts related domestic violence programmes and projects*, as well as a range of philosophical and methodological possibilities.

A further search strategy that I called *synchronistic browsing* was also employed. This involved a process where I browsed the shelves of libraries, bookstores, and websites for material adjacent to material identified in the earlier searches and examined titles or material that captured my interest. This mode of searching also incorporated material encountered by supervisors, friends, and colleagues forwarded as items of *possible interest* to me. This was a highly free flowing, non-traditional, creative approach.
to searching the literature but one which yielded some remarkable additions not located through the structured, traditional search strategy. The need for a way of capturing and digesting what was emerging from the literature-gathering process arose. This led to a unique method of mapping the crossdisciplinary terrain (outlined in the next section).

A thorough investigation of the research literature failed to reveal a clear, previously tested, methodological approach for this crossdisciplinary study incorporating social work, art, social change, and attitudinal change regarding domestic and family violence. No prior studies of a similar nature were located despite the comprehensive search. In hindsight, this may be the result of limiting the search terms used to fine arts and community arts as distinct from creative arts.

Little was known empirically about the social impact of art. There were no guides for researching this area. The need to find a methodology to bridge the disciplinary requirements of fine arts and social work became the driver of the methodological search. Using the research principles outlined above as a framework, these circumstances confirmed the heuristic approach as the way to proceed. This then allowed me to commence with what was known and move consciously to merge familiar social work methods and practices with emergent ideas regarding practice as research within the arts in order to research and address a social problem within a single multidimensional, interdisciplinary project.

**InSight: Mapping ideas across disciplinary boundaries (B4)**

In response to the need to capture emerging ideas from the collected literature this study produced a unique mapping technique that allowed the collection and integration of ideas, which I called the gaining of InSight. A variety of ideas and practices, which are now outlined, contributed to the development of the InSight approach to mapping.

There is a long history of mapping within social work stemming back to Jane Addams and her early work *Hull House maps and papers* (1885). For Addams the process of mapping was a physical one that aided her understanding of the Chicago in which she worked. It was one of a number of methods she used, which ultimately shaped the intellectual and methodological development of social work (Deegan, 2002). However, the approach to mapping taken in this study drew on a spacious consideration of maps...
and mapping – from geography, cartography, visual arts, and direct experience. The cartographic notion of taking bearings from many angles in the real world and applying them to ensure the production of an accurate map\(^\text{12}\) captured the need for a multifaceted approach to mapping based on the understanding mapping does not result in the production of new knowledge but rather exposes what was previously known (Munster, 2005) I believe, in potentially in new ways.

The trend within psychology of moving away from behavioural and cognitive forms of mapping to mind mapping based on developments within brain imaging and the need to bring greater understanding of the physiology of the brain and the expression of emotion and behavioural change (thus providing a connection with emotional intelligence) has become important for mapping responses, concepts and ideas (Dreyfus and Dreyfus, 1986; Goleman, 1995). This was also relevant in Boden’s (1990) metaphoric approach to and articulation of mapping. She suggested:

> (e)xplorers usually make a map – maps do not merely offer isolated items of information … but guide the traveller in various ways … to generate an indefinite number of ‘coulds’ and ‘cannots’ … where creativity is concerned … maps of the mind … generate systems that guide thought and action into some paths but not others (p. 47).

She contrasted this with theoretical mapping approaches used by scientists working in the unknown (Boden, 1990). Thus, mapping may be conscious or unconscious (Boden, 1990, p. 49), and map-making and maps are likened to computer programmes and computational concepts which produce generative systems and heuristics (Boden, 1990, p. 75).

Consistent with the methodology of this study a heuristic approach to mapping is evident in the maps created within this research (see examples in Appendix F). My experience, through which an understanding of the unfamiliar has become more familiar, has been incorporated as part of mapping the terrain of this study. This involved systematic consideration of the different kinds of maps – conceptual maps, visual images,

\(^{12}\) http://wwwarunet.co.uk/Hcboyd/mml.htm, Accessed 8/11/05 12.51 pm
diagrams, flow charts, integrating devices to create flow, webs, and networks. It incorporated a variety of approaches including note-taking, doodling, drawings, visually linking key themes, the development of systems of understanding (most notably those visually represented through diagrams, charts, and graphics), outlining ideas and processes within research. These forms of mapping were used as a guide for direction, an aid for getting from one place to the next in tandem with mapping as a conversation (Kester, 2004), and opened space for dialogue, thinking and sense-making.

There is no software programme available that would do the kind of research mapping that this set of documents represent, for they are in part spontaneous visual maps. No conceptual modelling could adequately deal with the images which require interpretation. In this study the term mapping becomes a metaphor for a method of data collection – a form of re-searching what was known against what was unknown. Thus the known was used as a way of navigating through the less familiar territory. From a creative or visual arts perspective the maps are an artwork, which convey the artist’s (researcher’s) place in (on) the map. They convey meanings, which cannot be described by words alone. Adding a visual layer beginning with the known allowed sensing and integration of the unknown – a process consistent with the Habermasian idea that adding a visual layer over thinking and reason was a sensory phenomenon (Habermas, 1989).

The concept of ‘mapping the terrain’ (Lacy, 1995, p. 13) offered a connection between dialogue and place, which could be expressed in linguistic terms, for example: ‘We create maps of language that represent cultural pilgrimages and metaphoric journeys of transformation and empowerment’ (Houston Conwill, & Estella Conwill Májozo, as cited in Lacy, 1995, p. 13). Place is important to each of us, however, it often remains absent within social work (see Gray & Schubert, 2006). All research sites will have a range of unique place-based idiosyncrasies that necessitate considerations of culture and context. Cessnock Local Government Area, the site of the ‘Safe at Home’ project, is no exception. The physicality of mapping, which is akin to the mapping undertaken by Jane Addams noted at the outset of this section promotes consideration of ‘the local’ in relation to place – that which is known and familiar and the relationship to ‘memory, known and unknown histories, marks made in the land that provoke and evoke’ (Lippard, 1997b, p. 8). Lippard (1997b) suggested place as the:
latitudinal and longitudinal within the map of a person's life. It is temporal and spatial, personal and political. A layered location replete with human histories and memories, place has width as well as depth. It is about connections, what surrounds it, what formed it, what happened there, what will happen there (p. 8).

Place has also been linked to the mapping of meaning, desire, pleasure and the relationships between identity and difference (Parkins & Craig, 2006). All of these things imply place is also about lifestyle, and thus has resonance with and relevance to community and the lives of those living within it.

Mapping of soul, spirituality, and dream space within the fine arts (see Lacy, 1995), invited deeper consideration of the choices made about which aspects to map in the process. This coheres with a Bachelardian approach to mapping which suggested ‘[e]ach one of us, then, should speak of his roads, his crossroads, his roadside benches: each one of us should make a surveyor’s map of his lost fields and meadows. Thoreau said that he had the map of his fields engraved in his soul’ (Bachelard, 1994, p. 11). Thus, to map my inspiration for this thesis would be to map my personal crossroad – the place where fine art and social work meet. This would also be indicative of the journey I have undertaken in embracing a new identity as an artist through the conduct of this research.

The InSight method of mapping is consistent with that developed by Sullivan (2005) as a strategy to capture features in socially produced phenomena in arts-based research. His view of mapping was that of a:

process of locating theories and ideas within existing conceptual frameworks so as to reveal underlying structures and systems of connections. This involves locating key concepts and ideas … within some kind of terrain or typology and examples of mapping procedures include file card systems, concept maps, citation logs, idea genealogies, and the like (p. 196).

This array of diverse ideas about mapping is not without its dangers, as Wittgenstein suggested:
The difficulties that we run into are like those we would have with the geography of a country for which we have no map, or only a map of isolated places … We may freely wander about within the country, but when we are compelled to make up a map, we get lost. The map will show different roads which lead through the same country and of which we could take any one at all but not two (as cited in Dean and Millar, 2005, p. 26).

Thus the choice of which road the mapmaker might take then becomes the central question. A question, which might be considered through Deleuze and Guttari’s (1987) equally important philosophical approach to mapping – they believed maps ‘pursue connections or lines of flight [that are] not readily perceptible’ (p. 146). Following a line of flight and unseen connections may lead us to discover new places on the map. Wittgenstein’s critique however, also invites us to keep a firm eye on the research destination, that is, to discover answers to the research question(s).

This web of mapping ideas represents a much thicker and richer description (Geertz, 1973 and developed in relation to narrative practice by White, 1992, 1995), than any single notion of map or mapping. This position allowed for an expansive view of a new situation, a way of surveying the unknown against the known in order to explore the old, the new and the diverse. These paragraphs represent a linguistic mapping of the ideas of mapping that contribute to InSight as a method of data collection. The approach might equally be visually represented as in Figure 16.

**Capturing emergent ideas and artworks (B5)**

The principle *write and show as you go* was embedded in the research formation phase of this study. It served as a method of documenting emergent ideas across the conceptual, empirical, and art making aspects of the study. This approach was consistent with the view of writing and reporting as an important part of an analytic research process. This process naturally led to the submission of work for peer review through conferences and journals (B8).
Figure 16: Mapping the ideas of mapping for the InSight method
Testing research questions in a community context (B6)

During the initial exploratory conversational phase of the study described above the Cessnock Anti Violence Network\(^{13}\) (from herein referred to as the Network) extended an invitation to me, based upon my previous work in the Cessnock area as a social work practitioner, to undertake the arts-based project raising awareness about domestic and family violence. A counter-invitation to expand the project and incorporate a practice-based research element was put to the Network for consideration. A series of subsequent discussions resulted in the birth of the ‘Safe at Home’ project, which sought to maximise the scope and impact of achieving and measuring positive attitudinal change about domestic violence for the benefit of the community. The ‘Safe at Home’ project is described in detail in Chapter 7. The emergence of the ‘Safe at Home’ project confirmed the need for this research to be conducted by a researcher-practitioner.

The writing of a thesis forces structural linearity into the research process. However, conducting this research was not a linear process and there were frequently several parallel research processes operating simultaneously. As the literature based searching and discovery continued, the ‘Safe at Home’ project was confirmed and commenced. A further process was also in operation – that of exploring the art media to be used in the intervention phase of the study.

Establishing validity in heuristic research (B7)

Within heuristic research, questions of validity pertain not to statistics but to meaning. Validity is focused on the rigour and exhaustiveness of the researcher’s processes pertaining to self-conduct and interactions with research participants (also called co-researchers in heuristic terms). Ultimately validity rests in the judgement of the primary researcher who is the only person who has proceeded through the six phases of the research process – from ‘the beginning formation of the question through … incubation, illumination, explication, and creative synthesis’ (Moustakas, 1990, p. 32). Thus, validity in the heuristic approach is highly subjective and it is the researcher who

\(^{13}\) During the later stages of this study the Cessnock Anti Violence Network (CAVN) changed its name to Cessnock Domestic and Family Violence Network. For the purposes of consistency the Cessnock Anti Violence Network is used throughout this thesis.
constantly returns to the data, checking against it the interpretations and descriptions drawn to ensure necessary and sufficient meanings. This requires constant review of the significance of the discoveries made and a process of further examination and evaluation to obtain a valid portrayal of the experience being studied. Thus heuristic work can, in the end, only be recognised on the basis of personal knowledge and judgement (Moustakas, 1990). Thus I engaged in a process of constant reflection, interrogation, and evaluation of observations, processes, data and ideas independently, with members of the Network, supervisors, research participants plus social work and artist colleagues independent from the process.

**Testing art making methods, media, and skills (A4)**

One of the critiques of arts-informed research is the ‘paucity of highly skilled, artistically grounded practitioners, people who know how to use image, language, movement, in artistically refined ways’ (Eisner, 2008, p. 9). I was concerned about the potential for the research, from an artistic perspective, to appear ‘amateurish to those who [knew] what the potentialities of the [chosen] medium[(s) were]’ (Eisner, 2008, p. 9). Eisner (2008) warned of the need for adequate skill and technique in each medium if one was to be ‘multilingual’ (p. 9) across different media in order to effectively represent what had been learnt. To address this concern, I engaged in a series of skill development and media exploration activities which aimed at attempting to convey domestic violence-related images through collage, painting, and mosaic, that is, the primary art media subsequently used in the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. This process served to build my skill and confidence to make quality images with research participants. The works produced were personal. However, they drew on the collected wisdom and experience of working therapeutically in social work practice contexts with women and children who had experienced domestic and family violence. The images were an attempt to convey some of the emotional impact of the domestic and family violence they described (see Figure 1 and examples in Appendix F).
Determining the methodological framework for the nested empirical study (A5)

The determination of the methodological framework was critical to this study and is described in detail in Chapter 7 along with the steps relating to Phase 2: Implementation.

Phase 3: Analysis and interpretation of the data

Qualitative and quantitative data were gathered at different stages of the research process (A18). The following outlines the approach taken to the analysis and interpretation of these different forms of data at various points in the research process.

Qualitative data analysis

The qualitative data included field and observational notes, meeting minutes, emails, documents relating to other domestic violence related activities distributed during the life of the study, a small amount of video data collected at events and workshops and the images and ideas gathered from community members in the process of making the different artworks. Consistent with qualitative data analysis examining this data set proceeded inductively and was guided by the data topics, questions, and evaluative criteria to aid focus (Lofland & Lofland, 1995). Consistent with the methodological approach, the qualitative analysis process was a ‘creative act’ (Lofland & Lofland, 1995, p. 181).

Given the specific nature of the research question and time limitations for the analysis of data a framework analysis (also called thematic analysis) (Lacy & Luff, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Ritchie & Spencer, 1994) because of its usefulness in applied social contexts was chosen. The strength of this approach was that it allowed my inductive process in coding the data and the inclusion of a priori concepts important from the Network perspective. Thus, it also allowed stakeholder concerns to be examined and addressed. Secondly, it offered adequate flexibility in the way in which the data was managed in that it allowed for the concurrent collection and analysis of some data and a more linear approach of collection and subsequent analysis of other aspects of the data as
needed by this project. The analysis incorporated four stages (adapted from Lacy & Luff, 2007).

**Stage 1: Familiarisation**

Most qualitative studies include transcription and reading of the data. No interviews were conducted in this study however the familiarisation stage occurred in three steps:

1) All qualitative data was entered into NVivo, a qualitative software package designed to assist in the management of qualitative data and able to accommodate all forms of data, including images and video that were collected in this research.

2) The data was then organised into categories relating to different aspects of the study including material relating to the Network, the different artworks, documents relating to domestic violence that were distributed via the Network during the period of the study, and field and observation notes. In this process all of the written data was de-identified.

3) I then familiarised myself with the data by reading, re-reading, looking listening, and watching the material. Observations were recorded throughout this process.

**Stage 2: Identifying a thematic framework**

The thematic framework comprised initial emergent codes and subsequently added *a priori* codes as follows:

4) The thematic framework was drawn initially from the themes that emerged from the data and subsequently *a priori* concepts relating to the Network agenda. These emerged from the attitudinal survey on community attitudes to domestic and family violence that had been highlighted in the quantitative survey and a return to the research questions were added to the framework.

**Stage 3: Indexing**

5) Also called coding, data was coded according to the thematic framework in two stages: Initial emergent themes and then reviewed against the *a priori* themes drawn from the Network in relation to the quantitative survey findings.
Stage 4: Charting and interpretation

6) The data were arranged thematically with the aid of lists and charts to compare emergent and a priori themes. The data was then interrogated for associations, concepts, and patterns and converted into visual displays with reference to the research questions. The diagrams and tables throughout this thesis are the product of the specific mapping approach taken in this research, described earlier in this chapter and the subsequent interpretation.

Quantitative data analysis

The quantitative data was drawn from the community-wide and neighbourhood surveys. The data gathered was entered into and analysed with the assistance of the computer programme SPSS specifically designed for the analysis of large amounts of quantitative data. The focus of the quantitative data analysis has been on generating descriptive demographic statistics primarily through the reporting of frequencies and the range of responses to the attitudinal aspects of the survey.

Surveying attitudes

There is no single, agreed definition of attitude (Olson & Zannam, 1993 as cited in Haddock, 2004). For the purposes of this study a simple broad dictionary definition was chosen: ‘position, disposition, or manner with regard to a person or thing’ (Macquarie Dictionary, 2005, p.84). It was understood attitudes could not be observed but inferred through participants’ responses (Haddock, 2004). The most common psychological approach to the measurement of attitudes is through direct indicators captured via self-report questionnaires. This study follows Likert’s (1932) technique of summarised ratings where brief statements are written in a way that responses indicate an attitude that is either favourable or unfavourable in varying degrees, or neutral. It is also possible to average the score of each participant using this method (Haddock, 2004). While attitudinal direct measures dominate the psychology literature they are not without critique and concern. These may include the potential for a participant to be unaware of an underlying attitude toward an issue; the subtle differences that a researcher uses in framing the question can influence responses; or the inclination of some participants to
misrepresent their response in order to appear more favourable (Haddock, 2004). Despite these limitations, direct measures of attitudes are reported to display high reliability (Haddock, 2004).

**Phase 4: Dissemination**

_Successfully completed conference presentations, exhibitions, and journal publications (B9)_

The heuristic process resulted in a continuous, recurrent engagement in art making, writing and reflection which produced a sound body of work. A sequential record of the journal publications, conference presentations, permanent public artworks and exhibitions is located at the beginning of this thesis on pages 10 – 13.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has outlined the heuristic methodological approach and the mixed research methods applied to the conceptual aspects of this study. It has examined the relationship of the two bodies of disciplinary literature with a focus on the heuristic methodology and the link to the researcher-practitioner (social work) and artist-researcher (art) models. The heuristic process is traced and summarised in relation to the conceptual and empirical aspects of the study and supported by a clear rationale for this as the methodological base and its capacity to incorporate both disciplines despite the absence of any depth of presence within the art literature. The rationale for how the decisions for the methods were derived is also made transparent. An explanation of the framework and its link to the empirical project is outlined and justified. It is to the empirical aspect of the study – the ‘Safe at Home’ project the next chapter turns.
Chapter 7

Phase 2: ‘Safe at Home’

Art, Social Work, and Social Change

---

Parts of this and Chapter 8 were published as Gray, M., & Schubert, L. (2009). Turning base metal into gold: Transmuting art, practice, research, and experience into knowledge. *British Journal of Social Work*. Accepted 22-02-10.
This chapter outlines the nested empirical study known as the ‘Safe at Home’ project, which aimed to test a research question within practice. Hence, it asked: *Is arts-based community development an effective means of raising community awareness and changing attitudes about domestic and family violence?* It also contributed to an additional research question, namely: *Is art an effective intervention in community development as a method of change?* This is achieved through a specific focus on observations within the practice context, which sought to answer the sub question: *What are the differences and similarities between artists and social workers in the process of community engagement?* The chapter begins with a brief outline of the geographical and social context in which the project was located before it introduces the Cessnock Anti Violence Network, the issue of domestic and family violence around which the study was focused, the development and implementation of the ‘Safe at Home’ project, and its methodological approach. Throughout this chapter, reference continues to be made to Table 6 in relation to the heuristic processes outlined in Chapter 6.

**Cessnock Local Government Area**

Cessnock Local Government Area (LGA) is located within the Hunter Valley of New South Wales and covers approximately 1,950 square kilometres (see Figure 17). It is geographically located approximately 120 kilometres north of Sydney and 40 kilometres west of Newcastle. The town of Cessnock is the primary regional commercial centre of the area (Cessnock City Council, 2011). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (2011) estimated the population of the Cessnock Local Government Area to be 51,706 (based on 2009-2010 figures) and growing at an annual rate of 1.8%. Approximately 47% of the population live in the larger towns of Cessnock and Kurri Kurri (Cessnock City Council, 2011).

The diminution of the area’s principal industrial base, coal mining and the parallel growth of the wine and tourism industry, have dominated the character of the area since mid-last century. Today Cessnock LGA incorporates one of Australia’s most
Figure 17: Cessnock Local Government Area map

Source: NSW Electoral Commission
famous wine regions known as Hunter Valley Wine Country, and approximately fifty-seven towns, villages, and localities each with a distinctive character contributing to a unique socio-cultural landscape.

Stage 1: Problem formulation and research design

Cessnock Anti Violence Network and the ‘Safe at Home’ project (C1)

The Cessnock Anti Violence Network (the Network) is a community collective of government and non-government human service agencies operating within the Cessnock LGA. Member agencies included Cessnock Family Support Service, Koe-Nara (Schools as Community Centre), Housing NSW, Cessnock City Council, Cessnock Community Health Service, Centrelink, McAuley Outreach (Mercy Community Services), Department of Community Services, Attorney General’s Department (Cessnock Local Court), NSW Police Service (Domestic Violence Liaison Officers), Family Insight and Hunter Valley Women’s Domestic Violence Court Advocacy Services. During the final stages of the project, additional services joined the Network including The Salvation Army, Samaritans, Carrie’s Place, and the newly formed Hunter Domestic Violence Support and Advisory Services.

The role and focus of the Network was raising awareness and prevention of domestic violence within the local community. The Network served as a forum where all agencies providing services to women and children experiencing domestic violence could discuss issues of concern, and enhance interagency responses to people who experienced domestic violence. Through its membership of government and non-government agencies, the Network took a leading role in raising local community awareness of domestic and family violence, particularly in relation to its unacceptability and criminality.

The aim of the Network was to create projects and activities, which would assist in reducing domestic violence in the community. The structure of the Network and relationships between member agencies worked to enhance interagency responses to community members who were victims of domestic and family violence. As a not-for-
profit collective, the Network received minimal funding each year ($A600 - $A1000) via the allocation of funds to local domestic violence committees under the NSW Strategy To Reduce Violence Against Women through the Regional Strategies Officers – Violence Prevention. These funds were directed towards the established White Ribbon day activities during the 16 Days of Activism to Stop Violence Against Women campaign running annually across New South Wales. The Network recognised the limitations of this approach in achieving change.

In an attempt to extend its impact on domestic and family violence, the Network periodically sought additional funding for specific projects. The ‘Safe at Home’ project is one example of this approach. At the outset of this study, the Network held approximately $A11000 awarded to complete an arts-based project directed at raising awareness of domestic violence. These funds were granted under the Cessnock Community Renewal Project (originally funded by the New South Wales Premier’s Department allocated to Cessnock City Council and the Cessnock Local Area Planning Team who led the Community Renewal process). The Network relied on the limited time and energy its members were able to secure – away from their core agency business – to develop proposals and conduct its projects. I contributed additional time to Network activities and sought additional resources to make the project possible.

A small formal steering committee involving key Network members and university staff was established with the scope to invite additional members as required. As part of a truly collaborative way of working, the majority of project business was dealt with through the regular monthly Network meetings where all members could contribute freely. I attended these regular monthly meetings and, through this process, managed to maintain a strong partnership with the Network (see Table 6: D1). A minimal number of additional Steering Committee meetings were held to attend to urgent matters occurring outside regular meeting times.

The Network actively collaborated at all stages of the ‘Safe at Home’ project with significant focus and contribution to the:

1. Provision of key linkages with the research site community.
2. Development of the community-wide attitudinal survey instrument.
3. Development and implementation of the evaluation measures and tools.
4. Collection of relevant community domestic violence data.
5. Cofacilitation of all community engagement processes.
6. Assistance in the recruitment of participants for the project.
7. Key member agencies offered counselling and other appropriate welfare support to any participant requiring this as a result of their exposure to or participation in the project thus ensuring a safe and ethical research process.
8. Cofacilitation of all aspects of the intervention phase of the project.
9. Active participation in the promotional aspects of the project.

The Partnerships Against Domestic Violence strategy launched in 1997 by the Australian Commonwealth Government was designed to encourage Commonwealth and State levels of government to work together to address domestic violence (Phillips & Carrington, 2003/2006). Using a community development approach, ‘Safe at Home’ extended the principles of working together across sectors and strengthening partnerships to address domestic and family violence. It took the principles further by locating the partnership at the local, state, and national levels and incorporated relationships with the non-government sector. Further, this project took one of the areas of prevention – ‘working with communities to educate against violence’ – identified in the literature review Current perspectives on domestic violence undertaken as part of the Partnerships against Domestic Violence programme (Phillips & Carrington, 2003/2006, n.p.).

Aims, objectives, and rationale for the ‘Safe at Home’ (C2)

The scope developed for the ‘Safe at Home’ project focused on gaining a clearer picture of domestic violence within the local community in terms of attitudes and incidence as well as exploring the effectiveness of using art as a medium for promoting attitudinal change. The intentions of the project were then further articulated into six clear aims as follow:

1. Establish the nature and extent of public awareness of and attitudes to domestic violence in the research site.
2. Gain more accurate knowledge of domestic violence in the research site than was revealed by available data.
3. Develop, test, and implement a creative social intervention, with applicability in communities with a high incidence of domestic violence, which used creative intervention as the medium to highlight the problem and raise awareness of domestic violence in the research site with the ultimate goal of increasing safety at home for families.

4. Determine the validity of the intervention in terms of increased community awareness of domestic violence in the community.

5. Establish the value of a community-wide partnership between a network of services working in the area and those directly affected by domestic violence.

6. Evaluate whether this intervention raised awareness of domestic violence, that is, whether changes in community attitudes about domestic violence occurred as a result of a creative collaborative community awareness and education programme.

Thus this research project aimed to determine whether positive changes in community attitudes to domestic violence occurred as a result of a creative, collaborative community intervention. ‘Safe at Home’ represented a systematic attempt to assess community attitudes to domestic violence, implement an intervention to raise awareness of domestic violence based on these concrete findings, and then reassess community attitudes post-intervention.

Using art as a form of creative social intervention to build awareness about issues of concern is a common strategy used in a range of community practice, particularly in relation to domestic and family violence. However, thus far, there has been no Australian research examining the effectiveness of this kind of intervention as a strategy for change. A research plan bridging practice and research (A3) was subsequently developed using a social intervention research framework and examined in the next section.
Social intervention research: Research–intervention–research

Methodological framework for ‘Safe at Home’ (A5)

Also known as intervention research, the forerunner of social intervention research was developmental research (Thomas, 1987, 1989, 1993). Within social work, intervention research sought to serve as a research methodology linking theory (knowledge) and practice. It focused on the development of knowledge about interventions. The methodology and practice of intervention design and development provided the uniqueness of intervention research. This integrated model usually comprised a series of phases (these differ across authors) addressing the key elements of analysis of a problem and subsequent project planning; the gathering and synthesis of pertinent information; design of the intervention; the development and initial testing of the intervention; implementation, documentation (manual or guidelines); evaluation and advanced development; and dissemination (Rothman & Thomas, 1994; Fraser, Richman, Galinsky, & Day, 2009). The model proposed by Rothman and Thomas (1994) coined the term social intervention research and applied the notion of intervention research to the social world. It appealingly suggested it could be used by an individual or team of researchers and, importantly for this study, was appropriate for inter or intradisciplinary interventions. Rothman and Thomas (1994) identified three different categories of intervention:

1. Intervention knowledge development: Developing knowledge concerning the intervention.
2. Intervention knowledge utilisation: Discovering ways the findings from knowledge development can be applied in practice.
3. Intervention design and development: Research seeking to utilize innovation in interventions.

The social intervention research process developed by Rothman and Thomas (1994) and the subsequent modifications made by Fraser et al. (2009) are summarised
### Table 8: Comparing models of social intervention research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Rothman and Thomas (1994)</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Fraser et al. (2009)</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Problem analysis and project planning</td>
<td>Identify and analyse key problems. Initiate state of the art review. Determine feasibility. Prepare project plan. Set a developmental goal. Identify and involve clients. Gain entry and cooperation from settings. Identify concerns of the population. Analyse identified concerns.</td>
<td>Specify the problem and develop a programme theory</td>
<td>Develop core features of an intervention. Create detailed description of a problem. Measure its incidence and prevalence. Use existing data. Identify a target population. Use research literature to develop an understanding of the risk and protective factors related to the problem. Identify a change process (programme theory, or a theory of change) based on literature review and information from practitioners, advocates, experts, and others who know about the problem. Incorporate a strengths approach. Delineate proximal and distal outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information gathering and synthesis</td>
<td>Identify and select relevant existing types of information. Identify relevant information sources. Establish retrieval procedures. Gather process and store data. Collect and analyse original data, as required. Synthesise data and formulate conclusions. Use existing information sources. Study natural examples. Identify functional elements of successful models.</td>
<td>Create and revise programme materials</td>
<td>Develop and revise programme materials using critical reviews and pilot studies findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stage 1 of Manual Development</strong>: Develop a first draft and test for feasibility. Create preliminary outline of treatment plan. Pilot test for feasibility (including assessment of practitioner capacity to implement proposed treatment plan). Write core components of the intervention. Seek expert review (including practitioners, consumers, and others with expertise in the problem area). Apply in practice. Assess with a variety of evaluative methods. Create rationale describing underlying theoretical generalizations of intervention. Determined duration of intervention. Specify session goals and activities. Develop benchmarks or measures to gauge programme implementation fidelity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Identify design problems and intervention requirements. Specify boundaries of the domain design and development. Determine design participants (for example a design team,</td>
<td>Refine and confirm programme</td>
<td>Test and refine component areas in studies that maintain high control of programme implementation. Use a variety of designs with activities building toward efficacy level analyses which estimate effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stage 2 of Manual Development</strong>: Expand manual to provide guidance for implementation and training. Expand treatment manual to include strategies for dealing with common challenges and barriers to implementation. Develop protocols for selection and training of intervention agents, and supervisors. Integrate interventions with clinical standards, professional guidelines, adjunctive programme, treatments, or services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Stage 3 of Manual Development</strong>: Refine a tested manual for use in a variety of settings. Undertake several efficacy trials to test intervention materials in (a) in diverse populations; (b) in alternative practice settings; and (c) with a variety of intervention agents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early development and pilot testing</td>
<td>Develop plan for trial use in a pilot test. Create limited operation model of the intervention for use in the pilot test site. Determine the developmental research medium and procedure. Determine developmental and monitoring instruments (for example developmental logs). Identify and address design problems. Revise intervention, as required. Continue proceduralisation and implementation of the model. Plan field test and select a site. Expand the trial field test as informed by the pilot. Implement field test and revise intervention, as necessary. Develop a prototype or preliminary intervention. Conduct a pilot test. Apply design criteria to the preliminary intervention concept.</td>
<td>Assess effectiveness in a variety of settings and circumstances</td>
<td>Undertake effectiveness trials designed to confirm intervention components in routine practice. Implement under routine conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Evaluation and advanced development</td>
<td>Plan evaluation in light of the degree of interventional development. Select evaluation methods. Conduct pilot evaluation. Carry out systematic evaluation. Revise intervention as necessary. Select an experimental design. Collect and analyse data. Replicate the intervention under field conditions. Refine the intervention.</td>
<td>Disseminate findings and programme materials</td>
<td>Disseminate findings and materials. Measure practice penetration - also described as a programme’s reach into a target population or uptake by practitioners and agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>Assess needs and points of access of potential consumers. Formulate dissemination plan. Design and develop appropriate implementation procedure. Prepare user-ready innovation for potential consumers. Develop means and media to reach potential consumers. Test use of innovation in a ‘test market’. Monitor and evaluate use. Revise (or reinvent) innovation as necessary. Develop and conduct large scale dissemination as appropriate. Repeat above steps, as required. Prepare the product for dissemination. Identify potential markets for the intervention. Create a demand for the intervention. Encourage appropriate adaptation. Provide technical support for adopters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Fawcett et al. (1994); Rothman & Thomas (1994); Stuart (2003); Fraser et al. (2009)
and compared in Table 8. This study takes the Rothman and Thomas (1994) route on the basis that Fraser et al.’s (2009) heavy focus on the manualisation of the intervention was inappropriate for the spontaneous nature of an art intervention. However, Fraser et al. (2009) offered some important thinking and developments which served as important considerations though their subsequent development of social intervention research brought it closer to evidence-based practice (Padgett, 2009).

Social intervention research needs to be undertaken within a practice setting and thus is firmly embedded in practice. It aimed to be relevant and socially useful (Fraser et al., 2009). From an arts perspective, social intervention research presented an interesting alternative given the increasing trend for the work of community-oriented artists to be socially relevant, as seen in Chapter 3.

The framework held the potential to incorporate social work and art. This was further promoted by Fraser et al.’s (2009) observation: ‘(l)ike an artist or an engineer, you have to lay out the task and enjoy creating solutions. Social intervention research takes place at the confluence of imagination, innovation, and science’ (p. 4).

The design and development of an intervention distinguishes intervention research from evaluation research. Intervention research includes evaluative methods, but it must also involve the formulation and subsequent revision of a service or programme (Rothman & Thomas, 1994). Intervention research involves creative as well as evaluative processes, and it often results in two products: a detailed description of a new programme or service and an evaluation of the effectiveness of that programme or service as part of a process of continuous development and improvement. Fraser et al. (2009) described these interventions as intentional strategies for change.

The intervention research process is dynamic and involves practitioners, researchers, and their agencies. It is through collaboration that new interventions are created. Two key features identified by Fraser et al. (2009) are pertinent to this research: First, the need to fund the research was highly relevant and is briefly discussed later in this chapter. Secondly, the preventative nature of the intervention is invariably, although quite subtly in this instance, through the arts-based focus, designed to ‘interrupt risk processes leading to social and health problems’ (Hawkins, 2006, as cited in Fraser et al., 2009, p. 8). Interventions intentionally aim to change behaviours, lessen
risk, or improve results either overtly or covertly. In this instance, the intervention aimed to strengthen the protective factors safeguarding against the risk of domestic and family violence and through doing so, embody a strengths orientation to practice (Saleebey, 2005; also cited in Fraser et al., 2009).

Social intervention research offered the possibility of outcomes across the domains of individual, family, group, organisation, community, or other relevant systems levels. It also offered the flexibility to intervene in one of these domains and observe change or outcomes at any of the other domains (Fraser et al., 2009, p. 9). Thus an intervention could be implemented with a small group of people at the community level and then open potential for future observations on what was happening at a systemic level within the court system and individual cases of domestic and family violence as well as gathering attitudinal data at the community-wide level to examine for outcomes or change. Consequently, it would be possible to take steps toward determining whether the intervention and its intended outcomes existed as a nested hierarchy (Fraser et al., 2009, p. 10).

Fraser et al.’s (2009) description of interventions as ‘structural’ (p. 54-64) was also relevant to this study with its gendered consciousness regarding women in relation to domestic and family violence and the desire for change at this front of gender relations. Similarly, the notion of this being a place-based intervention using a collective process was also important (Fraser et al., 2009) since it focused on a group of people sharing a common geography and also a specific group of people with a set of common goals and values in the shape of the Network. Hence the project focused on ‘who and where [emphasis in original]’ (Fraser, et al., 2009, p. 11). The how was also consistent with a focus on the collective processes and the ways in which the behaviour of one community member might influence the behaviour of other community members and, therefore, through attachments and commitments promoting ‘collective efficacy in addressing social problems’ (Fraser et al., 2009, p. 11) within the community.

In light of the intention of this study to examine the effectiveness of art as an intervention, the position of Fraser et al. (2009) on the effectiveness of interventions is central. They suggested there was variation in the effectiveness of interventions. For an intervention to be evidence-based, evaluation of the cumulative findings of interventions
‘using scientific methods’ was required to demonstrate the intervention had the desired outcome. That is:

the program produce[d] positive outcomes when compared to routine or other ethically acceptable approaches. The term evidence based, proven, and effective all refer to scientific findings showing that an intervention is responsible for producing desirable results. When the evidence is strong, interventions are called effective (Fraser, et al., 2009, p. 11).

To test the interventions of this study to a level providing this degree of evidence, given the accompanying requirement of a series of implementations in a variety of settings and contexts over a significant period of time, was beyond the scope of the study. The focus of Fraser et al.’s (2009) approach on effectiveness and efficacy suggested it would not be possible to proceed beyond the initial stages of the process, the results of which would determine recommendations for further research. The focus on effectiveness reinforced the idea that social intervention research was rooted in scientific methods. However, it follows a process in which all kinds of evidence can be used in the design and development of programmes. Fraser et al. (2009) identified this contradiction and proposed a heuristic way of approaching it through the inversion of the scientific hierarchy of knowledge in the process of social intervention research incorporating:

the opinions of practitioners, consumers, and experts ... to identify and sequence relevant program content. And after a program has been formulated, a cohort of case trial with both qualitative and quantitative measures may provide information to refine content or to identify missing content. Only after an intervention has been fully developed would an RCT be considered appropriate. In this sense, the evidentiary hierarchy informs evidence-based practice, but a broad set of methods, – quantitative and qualitative – are used in developing interventions (Fraser et al., 2009, p. 13).

It remains a moot point regarding how one might actually go about conducting a random control trial on a whole community and simultaneously account for the unique
nature of individual communities and variables influencing a social issue. This is a limitation of this project and its methodology. However it is unlikely to pose a more significant limitation than any other framework applied in a complex community setting.

This study implemented a pilot intervention under real world practice conditions (A8) in the form of the initial sessions of the Domestic and family violence: STOP, I don’t like it! intervention – locally referred to as the cut out project. Pilot testing is a key feature of efficacy studies as it helps to address the question of whether positive outcomes can be replicated in other sites without the involvement of the programme developer in implementation (Fraser et al., 2009). In this study, replication without the programme developer was not possible.

While the research process is presented here as a linear process, the reality of the experience in practice was far from linear. Rothman and Thomas (1994) and Fraser et al. (2009) acknowledged this. Both described stages and components of the research process as overlapping and cyclical with the researcher returning to earlier aspects.

Social intervention research is essentially a positivist approach to research and, in this study it has been adapted to a heuristic paradigm on the basis that it offered enough consistency in its philosophical underpinnings to be an adequate ‘fit’ for the project based on the following methodological rationale:

1. *Its relevance to the practice context.* Social intervention research was designed to operate in the real world between researchers and practitioners and the people in the community who ultimately experience the intervention. Testing an intervention in the natural setting is part of the process (Rothman & Thomas, 1994; Fraser et al., 2009).

2. *The focus on finding solutions to problems* (Fraser et al., 2009; Rothman & Thomas, 1994) was consistent with the heuristic and philosophical approaches to the study.

3. *The imagination, creativity, and artistry of the process are acknowledged and promoted* (Fraser et al., 2009) and hence the methodology holds an increased potential for relevance for a crossdisciplinary study incorporating social work and art.
4. *Its socially inclusive nature* allowed for the inclusion of the views, expertise, and practice wisdom of practitioners and community members in relation to the issues under study at all stages.

**Methodology in practice**

This intervention research study involved *research – intervention – research*, that is, a pre-test survey of community attitudes to domestic and family violence, literature review, and study of demographics of the community under study. This was followed by an intervention involving a lengthy community development process centred on the creation of eight different artworks, with the majority of artworks created in one of the most heavily affected neighbourhoods of the LGA. Hence the intervention centred on arts-based community development practice since it involved engaging the community: (i) for action and (ii) identifying potential arenas for action, for example, clean up the park, social action for a playground *cum* skate park, addressing vandalism and motorcycle problems, and so on, as identified by the community, all of which appear to have nothing to do with domestic and family violence. However, ‘art allows you to see what is really going on’ (Ruskin, as cited in Crombie, 2007). Hence for the purposes of this study, there was also consideration of *art practice as research* since the arts-based community development process involved interpretation and analysis of the outcomes of the process rather than a structured measurement more familiar to conventional social (work) research. The mediating factor is the context and adequate funding to explore the research question to its full extent, that is, Is arts-based community development an effective intervention to raise awareness of, and thus reduce the incidence of, domestic and family violence in the community? The intervention was followed by a further research process including a small sample post-intervention survey and evaluation of the intervention in the neighbourhood where the most concentrated art making had been undertaken.

The process, which developed as a result of the heuristic approach in the conduct of this research, was multilayered with multiple concurrent processes operating simultaneously though, for purposes of clarity, they are described in the text in a sequential manner. The reality, however, was very different with various elements of the different processes in operation at any given time influencing, shaping, and
ultimately changing the other. The remainder of this chapter explores these overlapping layers and processes.

**Context of domestic and family violence (C4)**

The process for searching the literature described in Chapter 6 was extended in an attempt to locate research relating to the use of art in changing attitudes to domestic and family violence and relevant literature to contextualise the issue for the purpose of the study. No studies in the territory were identified. However, newspaper and magazine articles on the use of art in relation to domestic violence were located. The remainder of this section provides a brief contextual overview of domestic and family violence.

Within Australia, as elsewhere, domestic violence is a significant problem, with an estimated economic cost of $A8.1 billion in 2002 (Laing & Bobic, 2002). This is minor compared with the associated social and health costs. In 2006 Cessnock LGA was ranked 22nd out of 143 LGAs with a population of over 3000 across New South Wales with regard to the level of domestic and family violence. The incidence of domestic violence within Cessnock LGA was reported at 625.7 per 100,000 head of population (Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, NSW, 2008). This compares to the state average of 389.1 per 100,000. Police estimates for domestic violence calls for the Cessnock and Kurri Kurri areas were 812 in 2006 and 867 in 2007 (J. Brown, 20 May 2008, personal communication) indicating a clear increase.

An enduring issue in addressing domestic violence against women is not only how one prevents domestic violence, but also how one knows when violence has been prevented. A primary strategy has been community public education. Long a project of feminist social work, community education programmes have sought to raise public consciousness as to the incidence and prevalence of domestic and family violence in the community in order to promote a culture of non-violence. Often, community education posters have been a major means of getting this message across, although various approaches to reducing and preventing domestic and family violence have been tried over the years. The majority of these have focused specifically on women, including personal safety and self-protection training, and specialist sexual assault services. However, these programmes failed to deliver anticipated changes to widespread
violence against women, though they highlight the complexity and diversity of affected groups. More recently, strategies have sought to target men, but it is commonly accepted now that community education is, at best, only a partial solution to this problem. Awareness does not necessarily lead to behavioural change (Carmody & Carrington, 2000). Carmody’s (2003) analysis of these past approaches sheds light on the shaping of future intervention strategies, not least the totalising concept of femininity and the construction of all men as potentially violent. The demonising of men and the concomitant construction of women as victim are counterproductive to a programme of action seeking to change community attitudes. This needed to be balanced with evidence showing while women are mostly at the receiving end of domestic violence, the solution lies in a whole-of-community response acknowledging most men also abhor violence against women (and men) (Carmody & Carrington, 2000; Pease, 1997, 2002, 2008). Developing views on domestic and family violence were important to the project development, for example, the emergent link between domestic and family violence and the abuse of animals or pets within violent households (Johnson, n.d.; Volant, Johnson, Gullone & Coleman, 2008).

Sullivan, Bhuyan, Senturia, Shiu-Thornton, and Ciske (2005) reported on the results of one of the few participatory action research studies on interpersonal violence involving the domestic violence community comprising representatives from community service organisations and government agencies, including advocates, activists, and survivors. Though the present study involved a partnership with a similar anti-violence network, building relationships with community members and engaging them in decisions relating to the production of the artworks, it was not a participatory action research study, but rather an intervention research project, which used some aspects of action research. Centrally, the project sought community engagement. However, as Sullivan et al. (2005) found, local community residents are the most difficult to engage in such studies, especially women at high risk and perpetrators. They report ‘the group that had the most limited participation in the research process [were] research informants’ (Sullivan et al., 2005, p. 990). In their study, participants constituted women from ethnic minority groups. The focus in this study was not on women telling their stories, but on women, men, and children working together to create artworks to
raise awareness and change community attitudes about domestic and family violence. It is important to see this in light of the partner agency support, which not only ensured the project’s legitimacy, but also increased the likelihood of the findings having wider implications for the study community. As Sullivan et al. (2005) report, ‘it is only through the diligence of community partners and researchers that actions will result’ (Sullivan et al., 2005, p. 993). More importantly, however, for the purposes of this thesis, research of this nature transforms art, practice, research, and experience into knowledge with far wider implications. Hence, in this formative intervention research study, the arts-based interventions served as a means of building trust with people who were already service users within the Network, which, it was believed, would lead to ‘better dissemination of research findings, and programs … grounded in research and strengthened by evaluation’ (Sullivan et al., 2005, p. 993).

Despite the Zero Tolerance campaign targeting abusive and controlling behaviours mainly affecting women and children in the UK, it is estimated one in four women experience domestic violence in their lifetime and one in eight annually, with police receiving calls for assistance every minute of the day. Yet, despite increasing reports, Home Office estimated only 35% of incidents were reported. Most concerning was that one woman in the UK was killed every three days due to partner violence (Harwin, 2006). Between four and six million women in the USA experienced domestic violence annually, and 95% of all cases involved women (Abel, 2000). Yet, despite this, ‘[i]nformation about the effectiveness of practice … is scant … [and] little research has been initiated on the effectiveness of intervention with battered women’ (Abel, 2000, p. 55-56). Abel’s (2000) overview of the empirical literature found several studies between 1986 and 1996 in which groupwork was the main intervention and most of the results were inconclusive. Humphreys (2007) noted the absence of social work’s contribution in the area of domestic and family violence despite the opportunities presented by their frontline roles in key positions in local areas. This study sought to begin to address this imbalance.
Funding the ‘Safe at Home’ project (C5)

A collaborative approach to funding the study was taken in partnership with the Network. Using the Network’s initial $A11000 as seeding funds across the life of the study, 13 grant applications to various funding bodies were made. These included applications to: The University of Newcastle Strategic Pilot Grant (Humanities and Social Sciences), 2007; The Bodyshop – Stop the Violence Grants, 2007; Australian Research Council Linkage Grant, 2008; Harold Mitchell Foundation Grant, 2008; Coal and Allied Trust Proposal in tandem with the University Foundation, 2008; Australia Council for the Arts Community Partnership Grant, 2008; NSW Regional Council for the Arts Grants, 2008; The University of Newcastle Strategic Pilot Grants (Drama, Fine Art and Music), 2008; Wesnet Inc. (Women’s Services Network) Capacity Building Grants, 2008; 2008-2009 Domestic and Family Violence Grants Programme, Violence Prevention Coordination Unit, Office for Women’s Policy, Department of Premier and Cabinet; 2009 CDSE (Clubs NSW) Grants; Australian Research Council Linkage Grant, 2009; and Ian Potter Foundation Grants, May 2009. Four of these applications were successful. In addition to the grant applications and Network funds, Housing NSW contributed funds specifically so the project could directly engage residents on the two housing estates at East Cessnock and Weston. Total cash funding of the Safe at Home project was $68,400. Thus ultimately the project was funded in an extremely piecemeal fashion via different funding bodies with no one single sponsor prepared to fund the whole project.

Ensuring safe, ethical conduct of the research (C6)

Ethical clearance for this study was secured via the University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics Committee (H-613-1007) prior to its commencement. Several aspects of the ethical clearance were revised and confirmed to accommodate the contributions of community members to the design and development of the project. The ethics clearance was multifaceted with separate participant information sheets and consent forms developed for the distinct phases of the study:

1. The community-wide survey.
2. The arts-based project.
3. Consent to use data and artworks gathered in the research process.

4. The neighbourhood survey.

Within the second phase, age appropriate participant information and consent forms were used when community members joined the art making activities of the study.

The questionnaire used for the community-wide survey and advertisements calling for participants were also subject to ethical clearance from The University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics Committee. Copies of all participant information sheets, consent and referral forms are in Appendix A, the community-wide survey instrument in Appendix B, and the neighbourhood survey instrument in Appendix C.

Given that the research issue of domestic and family violence is sensitive, a support and referral system was established with appropriate member agencies of the Network to ensure access to counselling and support for any community member distressed or adversely affected in the conduct of the research. In addition, the Network monitored all aspects of the project to ensure ethical conduct. These supports and ethical monitoring remained in place for the duration of the project (see Table 6:D2).

Given the community-based nature of the research, risk assessments and safety clearances were secured from The University of Newcastle Health and Safety Team (162/2008). Risk assessments were also completed, to meet the requirements of partner agencies within the community for exhibition (Hunter New England Health) and construction (Cessnock City Council) aspects of the project.

Subsequent variation to the ethical approvals (see Table 6:B3) was sought following the decision to sample only the neighbourhood in which the major work of the study had been conducted. Approval was also sought and obtained for the second survey instrument for the post-intervention survey.

**Ethical issues arising during the project**

A number of ethical issues were addressed during the planning and conduct of the research relating to confidentiality and participant consent, working with children, managing community dynamics, and dual roles.

**Confidentiality**

Both the community-wide and neighbourhood surveys were completed anonymously
and returned via standard, pre-addressed, reply-paid mail. This strategy ensured confidentiality for all survey respondents. Some survey participants chose to identify themselves on their survey, however, the details of these participants were excluded from all analysis and reporting. This level of confidentiality contrasted significantly with the arts-based intervention phase of the study. The intervention phase of the study was clearly framed as a public activity where confidentiality could not be provided. The one exception where confidentiality could be afforded was the provision of a drawing for the Snakes and Ladders mosaic by East Cessnock community members who could provide a drawing by leaving it at The Cottage anonymously. The creation of the community artworks, was by nature a communal activity where people would be seen and identified by others within the community. In consenting to participate in this aspect of the study, participants were fully aware of the public nature of the project and that they would be working with other community members in the creation of artworks. This overtly public approach to the intervention phase of the project meant that some community members, for whom confidentiality was an issue, chose not to participate in the more public aspects of the study.

**Participant consent**

As participants could choose the extent of their participation, the consent-taking process was constant and consistent throughout all aspects of the study. For the most part, double levels of consent were taken on the same day where participants consented to participate, and then subsequently reviewed their contributions, quotes, and photographs at the end of each workshop or activity. In this way, withdrawal from the project was not a significant issue, and the need to further follow up participants who chose to participate in the study on a one-off basis was minimised.

**Working with children**

The University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics committee did not have any requirements for researchers relating specifically to working with children. The Cessnock Anti Violence Network, however, required that their members pass a Working with Children Check and this extended to their participation in the project. A further safeguard was the Housing NSW two-worker safety policy, which ensured
neither I, as the researcher, nor Network members as co-researchers ever worked alone with children or adult members of the wider community who participated in the project.

Managing the dynamics of community

There were effectively three ‘communities’ to which the ‘Safe at Home’ project related:

a) The Cessnock Anti Violence Network as a community of concerned practitioners focused on providing a joined-up approach to domestic and family violence;

b) The geographical community located in East Cessnock on the Housing NSW estate; and

c) The wider geographical community of residents of the Cessnock LGA.

The needs of these three communities were very different and an ethical approach to balancing these differing needs was required throughout the project. This was addressed by maintaining clarity regarding which ‘community’ was the focus of the research at any given time. This tri-layered conceptualisation of community influenced the project’s process and outcomes. Consistent with a community development approach and domestic and family violence policy, the project’s intention was to take an overall ‘whole-of-community approach’, however this was limited by resources. In practice the Network community drove the agenda – raising awareness of domestic and family violence – throughout the project. This topic was not a natural choice for either of the more broadly defined communities. At times, this agenda was at odds with broader community priorities, particularly in the geographical community of East Cessnock where the bulk of the art making was conducted. While the Network’s agenda of raising awareness of domestic and family violence was given priority, it was important to ensure an ethical approach toward the preferences and priorities identified by the wider community throughout the process. This included the lack of locally accessible activities for children after school and on weekends, the danger of and noise made by unregistered motorbikes on the local streets, or the need for action regarding a child seen to be involved in causing difficulties for the community. In order to acknowledge and highlight these needs, all issues raised by community members beyond domestic and
family violence were referred to the Community Development Worker, Housing NSW, or other relevant local agency for follow up.

Simply because people are located in close geographically proximity does not mean they automatically share a sense of community. This issue was encountered more frequently in the East Cessnock community due to the higher levels of project activity in that neighbourhood. The ‘Safe at Home’ project had an ethical obligation to respect the views of individual community members who did not share a sense of community with their neighbours in this area. This respect for the choice of community members upheld their preference for privacy – their desire to ‘keep out of trouble’ and ‘keep ourselves to ourselves’ – to maintain a sense of safety and security within the community. In some instances this included the need to respect the choice not to participate.

**Dual roles**

Conducting a research project in a relatively small rural town where I as the researcher and many members of the Network lived and worked invariably increased the likelihood of dual roles with research participants from the broader community. The potential for this was further accentuated with two Network member agencies taking the role of providing therapeutic support to any community member who became distressed as a result of the project. All of the Network members and myself were experienced in managing such dual relationships within our respective work contexts and community lives, and each worker took responsibility for disclosing potential conflicts of interest across roles and negotiating an appropriate, respectful response. This was not, however, present as a significant issue during the project and on the few occasions where a potential conflict arose the Network member retreated to the ‘required agency’ (as per the ethics proposal) role and other Network members or myself assumed the primary research focus.

**Establishing criteria and standards of judgement for ‘Safe at Home’ with the Network (C9)**

The project was based on the shared belief it had the potential to achieve a number of art and social outcomes including:
1. Monitoring and evaluating the progress and outcomes of a creative social intervention as a model of community participation and partnership with relevance across divergent contexts but especially in rural and regional areas where domestic violence and related social problems present major difficulties for policy makers and service providers.

2. Community agencies would benefit from the project’s findings about the effectiveness and impact of this form of awareness-raising and practitioners would develop skills in using the innovative processes of collaborative art production in conjunction with group and community work methods.

3. It would lead to the development of a new model of intervention for community practice, which offered an innovative, creative medium for informal support, resource and partnership development, networking, information dissemination, advocacy, education, attitude change, and awareness-raising.

4. It would benefit a very depressed area, which has been much neglected and has longstanding negative community attitudes towards and limited awareness of domestic and family violence.

5. The results would be of long-term significance because it would provide a model of community engagement with wider application particularly in rural and regional areas where the highest rates of domestic violence are reported.

6. It provided the community an opportunity to work with a highly experienced artist who works in nontraditional modes of art making and therefore expose the community to a unique experience of art that is community oriented and differs from the traditional understanding of artist studio practice.

7. It would create a permanent public artwork in the form of a park installation.

8. It would enliven the cultural life of the community across the duration of the project with a range of art activities and exhibitions planned.

9. It would produce high quality artworks as part of the process.
The level of attitudinal change assessed via a second post-intervention survey would determine the degree of success of the project.

Stage 2: Implementation

Call for participants and community consultations (C10)

Call for participants

A paid advertisement in the Cessnock Advertiser on Wednesday 21 May, 2008 invited community members aged between 5 and 90 years to attend a community consultation regarding the development of ideas about the project and to participate in the subsequent art making phase of the project (see Figure 18).
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Figure 18: Advertisement for call for participants and community consultations

Community consultations

Six public meetings to enable consultation with the community about the project and possible art projects to be undertaken were held at different sites across the LGA area.
Table 9 outlines the consultation schedule. The venues chosen provided more equitable geographical access to the project across the LGA. Each consultation was co-led by one of the six members of The Network who had offered to support this aspect of the project and me. A consultation plan ensured consistency across all meetings (see Appendix D). The consultations led to the identification of a range of potential artworks to be created as shown in Table 10 for the project. All suggestions for artworks were included on the list and the choice of artworks to be completed was determined by the degree of funding and resources secured and participant preferences as the project proceeded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>VENUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10.30 am – 12 noon</td>
<td>Kurri Kurri Community Health Group Room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th May, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lang Street, Kurri Kurri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1.00 pm – 2.30 pm</td>
<td>Weston Civic Centre, Station Street, Weston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th May, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3.30 pm – 5.00 pm</td>
<td>Cessnock Viney Room, TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th May, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>North Avenue, Cessnock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6.00 pm – 7.30 pm</td>
<td>Branxton RSL Hall New England Highway, Branxton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th May, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>11.00 am – 12.30 pm</td>
<td>Cessnock North End Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th May, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>Church Street, Cessnock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>6.00 pm – 7.30 pm</td>
<td>Cessnock Cessnock Pensioner’s Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th May, 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 North Avenue, Cessnock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10: Implemented art interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Art making site</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Process and participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide interventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cut out project (Domestic and Family Violence – STOP! I don’t like it) (see The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in pictures: Volume 1, pp. 12-27 and 41-47)</td>
<td>To create a work which would symbolically represent the children identified through the community-wide survey as victims of domestic and family violence across the Local Government Area.</td>
<td>Family Insight Housing NSW and Cessnock City Council</td>
<td>North End Hall at the Playtime Supported Playgroup conducted by Family Insight. This served as the pilot site for the intervention phase of the study. The cut out project was subsequently expanded across a range of community sites and activities including White Ribbon day at Peace Park Weston, School Holiday Activities, The Cottage, East Cessnock, Weston Safe Families day in the Park on the corner of McBlane and O'Toole Streets, Weston.</td>
<td>Creation of cut outs involved tracing the body shapes of children onto MDF board which was then painted by children and their parents. Cut outs were then taken off site where they were cut out with a jigsaw by the artists and each one finished with a black outline, and clear sealed to present a single unified work across sites.</td>
<td>Two workshops were held with the Playtime Supported Playgroup where Family Insight staff and volunteers actively assisted parents and children in the supported playgroup session (n=12). The Peace Park cut outs were created at a White Ribbon day Event (n=1). The East Cessnock cut outs were created across three school holiday workshops (n=22). The Weston cut outs were created at a one off event at the Weston Safe Families day (n=15). In total 82 people participated in this intervention and produced 50 cut outs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters and coasters campaign (see The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in pictures: Volume 1, pp. 48-54)</td>
<td>Two sets of posters and matching coasters targeting different attitudes were created from a series of collage works created by women in the craft group conducted by Cessnock Family Support Services. All hotels and clubs on the southern side of the Local Government Area (the most densely populated sectors) were targeted for distribution of the artwork.</td>
<td>Cessnock Family Support Service</td>
<td>Cessnock Family Support Service</td>
<td>Collage and drawing, Adobe Creative Suite 4. Commercial printing completed by EyeDesign, Cessnock.</td>
<td>A series of 12 weekly workshops was conducted at Cessnock Family Support Service craft group (n=7) to create the initial collages, select the final images to be used for the posters, develop the text for the posters and coasters. Toward the end of this process the images and text were then worked on further by the artist-researcher in Adobe Creative Suite and returned to the group for review and subsequent changes made over several sessions until all group members were satisfied with the final artwork. The proofs were then developed for commercial printing with EyeDesign graphics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community exhibitions (see The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in pictures: Volume 1, pp. 13 and 28-40)</td>
<td>Works produced during the course of the project were made available for exhibition, installed with temporal works documented. To date the cut out project has been exhibited in 5 locations. The posters and coasters were displayed in 16 licensed premises.</td>
<td>Koe-Nara Cessnock City Council (Library) Centrelink Cessnock Family Support Service Local clubs and hotels</td>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td>Exhibition</td>
<td>A variety of the cut outs were displayed in local community agencies on stands. The posters and coasters were displayed in hotels and clubs across the southern half of the Local Government Area (n=36).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weston intervention</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston Safe Families day and activity book (see The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in)</td>
<td>This intervention was not part of the originally planned list, rather the 'Safe at Home’ project with its increasing connection with Housing NSW was invited to be an active participant with the cut out project as an integral part of the day which was coordinated by Housing NSW.</td>
<td>Housing NSW Hunter New England Health Cessnock Family Support Service.</td>
<td>The Park, Corner O'Toole and McBlane Streets, Weston</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>This was a collaborative event with a number of agencies contributing to activities including some non-Network agencies, for example, Youth Off the Streets. The 'Safe at Home’ project conducted the cut out project as reported above, provided a sausage sizzle, and contributed to a Family Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pictures: Volume 1, pp. 42-45 and 115-119</th>
<th></th>
<th>Book that was distributed on the day Some 60 people attended the event.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Cessnock interventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Art for the Park**  
(see *The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in pictures: Volume 2, pp. 5-39)* | This was an activity integral to connecting with members of the East Cessnock community. It aimed to engage them with the project and gather ideas about the work to be created for the park. | East Cessnock | Event incorporated conversation, painting, drawing, video, photography and a sausage sizzle. Presentation by CrocStars including a discussion of safety for pets. | 30 Community members registered as active participants, with other onlookers attending the event. 142 workshops flowing from this initial gathering were subsequently held in East Cessnock to complete three mosaic works and add to the cut out project across the duration of the study. |
| **Respect**  
(see *The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in pictures: Volume 1, pp. 55-71)* | Engage community members in one of the most domestically dangerous neighbourhoods within the community. The initial intention was to create a collaborative community wall and garden at the Alkira Avenue Cottage with culinary events to take place, involving the use of community garden produce raising, issues of safety in the home laterally (following the work of artists like Jeremy Deller and Rikrit Tiravanija). The residents participated in the process of making an initial wall mosaic but were not responsive to the notion of a community garden and this idea did not proceed. What emerged was the idea of creating open space around The Cottage where the younger children could play and the result was the ground Hopscotch mosaic which directly addressed the idea of being 'Safe at Home'. | Housing NSW | Mosaic for The Cottage (exterior wall). The community garden aspect of this intervention did not proceed due to lack of community interest. | Idea of promoting greater respect within the community was generated in the community consultation process. |
| **Hopscotch**  
(see *The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in pictures: Volume 1, pp. 99-114)* | This artwork aimed to raise children’s awareness of domestic violence and strengthen community networks by the creation of a ground level sculpture within this park. It used the drawings of children and other local residents which conveyed messages that promoted the idea of being 'Safe at Home’ into the design of the sculpture. | Housing NSW, Cessnock City Council, Family Insight, Hunter New England Health Family Action Centre Aftercare Personal Helpers and Mentors programme Northnet | Mosaic for The Cottage (ground installation utilising waste space beside the building). | Test piece using the children’s drawings before embarking on the larger snakes and ladders mosaic in the park. |
| **Snakes and Ladders**  
(Park Installation 1)  
(see *The 'Safe at Home' Project. A process record in pictures: Volume 2, pp.41-132)* | This project actively involved the Housing NSW Community Development Worker, the Cessnock City Council and a variety of community participants and volunteers through Aftercare and Northnet who assisted in the creation and construction of the work. Community consultation at Art for the Park regarding this project revealed an interest in extending the project to include work that also addresses the pathways in the park used by families to walk from home to school and back. Similarly incorporation of ideas gathered from the community in the immediate vicinity of the park several years ago were explored for inclusion. | Alkira Avenue Park, East Cessnock | | |
Community-wide survey: Gathering baseline data (C11)

Consistent with a whole-of-community approach, it was decided to undertake a community-wide survey to provide a baseline for the project (see Table 6: C7). The process of developing the survey instrument was collaborative. It focused on gathering data which would be helpful to Network members for understanding of local concerns regarding domestic and family violence and incorporated research questions about attitudes. In developing the survey, the aim was to obtain as expansive a spread of views about domestic and family violence within the community as possible. Consequently, a four-page survey comprising some 56 questions was developed (see Appendix B). The process of creating the survey in a collaborative manner presented a number of challenges:

1. There were many more questions Network members wanted to ask than would fit in four pages which the University’s Maths and Statistics Department recommended was the absolute maximum length for a mailed survey.

2. There was a need to balance what the Network members and I wanted to ask and still ensure the survey was not so overwhelming it would not be completed and returned.

3. The need to balance the competing interests between Network members in the development of questions required skillful negotiation and diplomacy.

There was a strong commitment from Network members to ensure the survey served the purposes of direct practice and practice relevant research. Three issues ultimately drove the question development: First, concern regarding the low literacy levels within the LGA and the desire to keep the language as straightforward as possible to enhance accessibility. Secondly, the belief of Network members that many of the people they saw in response to domestic and family violence did not recognise this as what they were experiencing. There was a strong desire to try to identify and quantify the degree of this perceived lack of understanding within the community. Thirdly, the limited funding available to conduct the survey would be the key determinant of the sampling approach.
Wherever possible, a quantitative approach was taken to the development of questions in an attempt to create more credible scientific data, while understanding this would not provide the rich descriptions of a qualitative approach. It could, however, increase the simplicity of managing the data. The survey was ultimately framed around four categories of questions:

1. A range of contextual questions to enable comparisons across the different communities within the research site, including basic demographic information, participant’s definitions, understandings, and experiences of domestic violence, and knowledge of behaviours and attitudes. Some of the attitudinal questions were modeled on previous studies conducted by VicHealth in conjunction with the Australian Institute of Criminology (Taylor & Mouzos, 2006) and a domestic and family violence pilot screening survey conducted by the Northern Territory Department of Health and Community Services (Young, Hayhurst, & Page, 2003). The aim was to enable some level of future comparison. Many questions needed to be modified to account for low literacy levels.

2. Responses to the idea of intervening in domestic violence situations.

3. A question about the need to further address domestic violence within the community was also included. This was seen as an opportunity to test the level of community support for further work in the area.

Principles supporting the implementation of the survey were important. All parties agreed that anonymity would be guaranteed to provide greater freedom for individuals to respond safely. Ethical requirements meant the survey must be limited to community members over the age of 18 years while it was not practical to include multiple Participant Information Sheets and surveys in each envelope as more pages meant fewer potential returns.

The preparation and packaging of the survey for mail out involved over 30 community volunteers attached to member agencies of the Network. Each survey was packaged in a plain white, sealed envelope and contained a Participant Information Sheet and a leaflet identifying local services providing additional support to those experiencing domestic violence within the community.
Sampling for the community-wide survey

Purposive sampling was used for the community-wide survey as it targeted heterogeneity\textsuperscript{16} with the intention of including all views, opinions and attitudes rather than focusing on proportional representation. Hence the sampling method aimed for a diversity of views to gain the broad spectrum of ideas within the community rather than focus on the average or modal instance of ideas across the Cessnock LGA. Thus the approach aimed to sample ideas rather than people. In order to get all ideas and especially those at the extreme ends of the spectrum it was important to include as diverse a range of participants as possible. To obtain breadth, ways to access as many households as possible were explored. Initial investigations found options were limited. Without access to an address list for every household within the LGA, the only inexpensive way to access all households was via the Australia Post listing for all mail points and post boxes listed for unaddressed mail. This would not provide access to every household, as it excluded those with \textit{no junk mail} signs on their letterboxes, but offered the best coverage. It also meant that the distribution range of the survey would extend beyond the LGA, as postal areas do not align with LGA boundaries. It was impossible to determine the degree of spill but Australia Post thought this was minor.

A total of 18,473 households across the Cessnock LGA were surveyed in April, 2008 via the unaddressed mail service of Australia Post. This was equivalent to surveying 37.7\% of the total population. The University statisticians provided a forecast of a 3\% return rate.

To maximise the number of surveys returned, Network members and I promoted the survey across the local community during the week following the distribution of the survey. This involved media coverage in the two largest local newspapers covering the area using a prepared story (see Figures 19 and 20) posing a challenge to the community to assist in achieving a better return rate than the generally estimated 3\% return rate for a mailed survey. The story was subsequently picked up by a

\textsuperscript{16} http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/sampnon.php
Figure 19: Article in the Cessnock Advertiser, 2 April 2008

Major survey on domestic violence here

By Krystal Adams

Residents of the Cessnock local government area should keep an eye out for a plain white envelope in their mail boxes next week.

Greta woman Leanne Schubert is conducting possibly the largest domestic violence survey ever held in Cessnock, or any Australian community, as part of her PhD studies at The University of Newcastle.

Titled "Safe at Home: Using art to build community awareness of domestic violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area," the idea for survey came about while Leanne was working as a social worker at Cessnock Community Health about 18 months ago.

Leanne was already studying for her PhD in Social Work at the time, and the survey has become part of her research project.

The survey is designed to help understand the community's views on domestic violence, with an aim to build ways of improving the safety of women, men and children in their homes, in particular hoping to tackle the high rate of Apprehended Violence Orders (AVOs) in the local area through awareness building.

It is being conducted in partnership with the Cessnock Anti-Violence Network, whose members meet monthly at Cessnock Family Support Services.

Leanne has also had a lot of help from her family, as well as the Cessnock Hospital Park Ladies and Ko-Nara Centre volunteers.

"It's been a big community effort," she said.

Cessnock Family Support Service coordinator Kate Woods-Crowe said the survey was important because it will indicate how the wider community views domestic violence.

"We see people here all the time who are living with domestic violence; it will be good to hear what everyone else thinks," Kate said. "Quite often people don't even realise they are being affected," she added.

The survey is also part of a larger project that seeks to strengthen community awareness of domestic violence through using art. Leanne said art is a common way to address domestic violence, however there has never been any significant research to determine whether this idea leads to real change.

"Art is a non-threatening way of raising awareness. As a community strategy, the use of the images can prompt people to think in new ways," she said.

The art project will address the issues of domestic violence with the question "Are you safe at home?" and Leanne said that could be portrayed through various methods, such as a sculpture at the park, a poster and coaster campaign, or printed on 7-shirts or tea towels.

Members of the Cessnock community will be invited to take part in the arts-based projects and community meetings that will start toward the end of May.

Possibly the biggest ever survey conducted in the city or any other Australian community

Leanne is hoping to have identified some early trends from the survey's findings that she will be able to present at these meetings.

A summary of the results will be written in plain English and made available through the local libraries.

As well as the art project, Leanne is looking at doing a follow up survey in the next two years.

Leanne said she wanted to conduct her research project in the Cessnock local government area in order to give something back to her own local community.

If new families change their lifestyle, then the project will be worthwhile," Leanne said.

The surveys will be delivered to more than 18,000 households in the Cessnock local government area from April 7 to 11.

People aged 18 and over are asked to fill in the survey, which is anonymous and should take about 20 minutes to complete, and return it in the included reply paid envelope.

"Statistics tell us that surveys like this only have a three per cent return, so we would love to see the people of Cessnock prove them wrong," Leanne said.
local radio station (1233 ABC Local), which resulted in all-day news coverage and a followup feature interview on a national radio station (ABC News Radio). Further, Network members, volunteers and I placed over 100 posters in prominent positions around the LGA during this period, encouraging community members to return their survey (see Figure 21). Simultaneously, community members were engaged in conversation about the survey and the project.
Have **YOU** returned your

‘**Safe at Home**’

**Community Survey**?

The Cessnock Anti Violence Network and The University of Newcastle encourage you to share your views and return your survey today!

Figure 21: Community distributed poster encouraging survey return
All data gathered via the survey was analysed and interpreted according to the descriptions provided in Chapter 6. The quantitative data was analysed first and provided the basis for the development of the key themes for the arts-based interventions drawn from the data regarding community attitudes.

**Development of key themes for the arts-based interventions (C17)**

Members of the Network, research participants, and I reviewed the responses to the survey’s attitudinal questions and key attitudes to address via the arts-based intervention were established. The attitudes identified from the community-wide survey by the Network and research participants that were of concern due to their implied lack of awareness about the impact of domestic and family violence are described in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey questions</th>
<th>% Responses for questions which indicate a lack of awareness or concerning attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women going through custody battles often fabricate or exaggerate claims of domestic violence to strengthen their case</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A victim must be getting something out of the abusive relationship</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The victim has often done something to cause the violence</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a crime</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a private matter to be handled in the family</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship to keep the family intact</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Members of the Network and I designed and developed five clear simple anti-violence messages accessible for community members with low levels of literacy and children, to begin to address commonalities underpinning some of the attitudes about which concern was identified. The main initial focus was on the illegality of domestic
and family violence and increasing awareness of the impact that domestic and family violence has beyond the immediate family. These initial messages served as a beginning point for the intervention phase of project and were used in the process of initial community engagement on the East Cessnock housing estate:

1. Domestic violence IS a crime.
2. Domestic and family violence. STOP I don’t like it!
3. Everyone has the right to feel safe, especially at home.
4. A happy home = A safe home.
5. Domestic violence affects neighbours too.

These messages were used as a starting point for engaging community members (C12), with a particular focus on the residents of the East Cessnock housing estate in conversations and during art making activities in the development of the installation for the park on Alkira Avenue.

**Design and conduct of the arts-based interventions (C13)**

Community members, Network members, and I identified a range of potential projects through the consultative process. It was anticipated a diverse range of community members would be involved in the project including people with disabilities, young people, and Indigenous people – a number of whom lived on the two Housing NSW estates – as the project commenced and generated further connections within the community. The participants of this phase of the research were in agreement the level of funding would determine the final mix of artworks undertaken for the project.

The project was designed to use art to create and communicate social messages and to address a public issue based on the premise: (i) the community had the will and the resources to help itself; (ii) it knew what was best for itself; (iii) ownership of the strategy should rest within the community; (iv) partnership involving organisations and the community was the most effective awareness-building strategy; and (v) the use of strengths in this area would translate to strengths in other areas of community life. In short, community capacity building would have a ripple effect (Delgado, 2000b).

The use of art went beyond enhancing residents’ skills and knowledge to engagement in significant changes in the physical environment to enhance awareness of
this complex social problem. The permanent artworks were intended to become structures within the community to serve as a constant reminder of the need to be ‘Safe at Home’.

The project was designed to allow for the intensive intervention (art making) process over 30 months. It was intended to capture the energy and commitment of the community oriented towards ameliorating the problem of domestic violence. Table 12 shows the initial range of ideas for artworks derived from the community consultation process, which continued to be refined, and developed with different groups of participant community members in relation to how the artworks would be produced. Thus, community members were directly engaged in the intervention design and implementation of the artworks. This process occurred through ongoing conversations with participant community members in workshops and at art events.

These artworks and awareness-raising objects were created through a series of workshops with different community members (participants). In terms of the collaborative art production, the partners, community participants, and I negotiated: (i) setting goals and objectives and (ii) deciding on the nature of the creative works and management of the process. All workshops were facilitated by two practitioners, generally a practitioner from the Network and me. Children were actively involved through the playground installations modeled on prior work by Anne Graham who had created a number of community-based playground sculptures around the world. The park installation stands as a lasting reminder to the community of the importance of being ‘Safe at Home’ and free from violence. The intervention process and findings from the completed interventions are reported in Chapter 8.

**Post-intervention neighbourhood survey (C15)**

A post-intervention survey was designed on the basis of the arts-based interventions produced through the research process with community members. It aimed to provide a small comparative sample within the sector of the community in which the most concentrated art making had occurred. The survey aimed to collect data on:
### Table 12: Planned artworks following community consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artwork</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground Installation 1</td>
<td>This artwork aims to raise children’s awareness of domestic violence and strengthen community networks by the creation of a safe soft sculpture within this park using the drawings of children and other local residents into the design of the sculpture. It is anticipated that this project will actively involve the Housing NSW Community Worker, the Cessnock City Council and will attempt to engage a variety of volunteers through programmes like the Community Shed and Work for the Dole projects in its design, development and construction. Community consultations regarding this project have revealed an interest in extending this project to include work that also addresses the pathways in the park that families walk from home to school and back. Similarly incorporation of ideas gathered from the community in the immediate vicinity of the park several years ago are also being explored for inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-Shirt Campaign</td>
<td>Support young people to develop T-Shirt designs using anti-domestic violence messages that are attractive to young people. Workshops incorporating collage which allow participants to engage with contemporary ideas and visualizations in the production of T-Shirt designs will be utilized. Further engagement of young people is envisaged through the process of screen printing their designs onto T-Shirts. It aims to influence the 15-24 age groups of which there were 1470 identified in the LGA in the last census (ABS, 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Painting - Mural or Mosaic, Community Garden.</td>
<td>Engage community members in one of the most domestically dangerous streets within the community and create a collaborative community wall and garden at the Alkira Avenue Cottage. Culinary events will take place, which will involve the use of community garden produce. As this is intended to be a long-term project issues in relation to the environment, ecology, nutrition and laterally, issues of safety in the home, will be raised (following the work of artists like Jeremy Deller and Rikrit Tiravanija). The Residents will participate in the process of making the walls and garden and eating the produce; creating a garden, growing food, and sharing produce are all activities, which assist in the development of a caring, hence safe, community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poster and Coaster Campaign</td>
<td>Target all licensed premises for distribution of the artwork. Artwork to be developed through a series of community workshops or group work programmes around attitudes of concern identified by the community survey with a variety of community members including women who have experienced domestic violence, young parents, young people, Indigenous community members, seniors etc. These groups will be engaged via the support and assistance of the members of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tea Towel Campaign</td>
<td>Produce 2500 tea towels to target the Housing NSW estates within the LGA. Artwork to be developed through a series of community workshops or group work programmes around attitudes of concern identified by the community survey with a variety of community members including women who have experienced domestic violence, young parents, young people, Indigenous community members, seniors etc. These groups will be engaged via the support and assistance of the members of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Bix Boxes Campaign</td>
<td>Hold a community art competition with the main prize being that the artwork is part of a nationwide campaign relating to ‘Safe at Home’ in partnership with Sanitarium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Exhibitions</td>
<td>Works produced during the course of this project will be made available for exhibition, installed and temporal works will be documented and the documentation will form part of the final exhibition and catalogue. The exhibition and catalogue will provide an opportunity for the community to access the work, ideas and strategies generated through the project. We also intend to seek opportunities to tour the exhibition to appropriate locations as it may provide a model for art interventions in response to a range of issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billboards</td>
<td>That link to the poster and coaster campaign supporting extensive community exposure beyond the licensed premises targeted in the poster and coaster campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatic performance</td>
<td>TAFE have indicated an interest in engaging in the project to produce a dramatic work about domestic violence through gathering stories from community members who are interested in sharing their story. Community members have welcomed this idea. This idea is in its early stages of development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground Installation 2</td>
<td>Vardy Park Weston. Community consultations regarding this project have revealed an interest in extending this project to include work that also addresses the pathways in the park that families walk from home to school and back. Similarly incorporation of ideas gathered from the community in the immediate vicinity of the park several years ago are also being explored for inclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookmarks - 10 Tips for a Violence Free Home</td>
<td>A suggestion was made in relation to conducting a similar exercise to a neighbouring LGA, which had constructed bookmarks with anti-violence messages. A community member suggested that the artwork and message development for a similar project be included in our activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cut out project</td>
<td>A work, which could represent each child under the age of 18 that the survey data represented, had experienced domestic and family violence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Basic demographic data.

2. Community members’ attitudes to domestic violence via a repetition of the attitudinal questions asked in the community-wide survey.

3. Community members’ awareness and experiences of the different artworks created as part of the ‘Safe at Home’ project.

The post-intervention survey sample was limited to a single neighbourhood (the area including and surrounding the East Cessnock Housing NSW estate (n=200) rather than the whole community), to enable comparison of the differences between the estate and the LGA. The packaging, distribution, collection of data, and analysis and interpretive processes were identical to those described above for the community-wide survey with the important exception of a strict timeframe for the return of surveys in the neighbourhood survey.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has outlined the ‘Safe at Home’ project, traced the geographical and social context of the study, introduced the Cessnock Anti Violence Network, and the issue of domestic and family violence. The chapter has described the phases of the development and implementation of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. The results of the ‘Safe at Home’ project are reported in the next three chapters.
Chapter 8

Findings: Pre-intervention Survey

Art, Social Work, and Social Change
This chapter begins to report and discuss the findings of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. It presents the first of the three main categories of findings emerging from the project – the pre-intervention community-wide survey. The findings of the other two main categories – the intervention phase and post-intervention neighbourhood survey (in tandem with a comparison of the key data) – are reported in Chapters 9 and 10 respectively. This chapter includes a summary of the quantitative demographic findings and reports on community attitudes to domestic and family violence.

**Pre-intervention community-wide survey**

The collection of baseline data on the community and community attitudes towards domestic and family violence was undertaken as described in Chapter 7. The survey was designed to meet the needs of the ‘Safe at Home’ research project and the Network’s practice agenda. Consequently, only the results of the ‘Safe at Home’ research project are reported herein.

**Survey distribution and return rates**

The survey was packaged by 34 community volunteers from member agencies of the Network, with three key groups – Cessnock District Hospital Pink Ladies associated with Cessnock Community Health Centre, volunteers of Koe-Nara Schools as Communities Centre and my extended family – completing the bulk of this task. This approach had an important unintended consequence of increased awareness of and commitment to the project via ripples of discussion by the volunteers with family and friends in the community across the LGA. Thus some *community ownership* was established during the survey distribution process. Koe-Nara and Community Health staff reported enthusiasm and excitement in their volunteers regarding their involvement. Thus, this strategy sparked an animated beginning to the project and generated community interest in the issue of domestic and family violence. The survey
distribution was accompanied by further community promotion and a local media campaign. Articles appeared in two local newspapers concurrent with the survey mailout in *The Cessnock Advertiser* on 2 April 2008 (Figure 19), and the *Branxton, Greta and Vineyards’ News* on 3 April 2008 (Figure 20). Accompanying the media coverage was a local poster campaign designed to encourage the return of the survey (see Figure 21). One hundred A4-sized posters were distributed and displayed across Cessnock, Kurri Kurri, Weston, Greta, and Branxton in a variety of locations, including chemists, community notice boards, banks, real estate agents, hairdressers, newsagents, cafes, libraries, employment services, retail outlets, such as health food, jewelry, and gift shops, health and community facilities, and the local cinema. The poster was also included in a newsletter to all residents of Housing NSW properties. The media strategy combined with the distribution of the survey resulted an 8.1% return rate which was significantly higher than the anticipated 3%.

Subsequent media coverage of the project on 1233 ABC Local and their all day news service on 8 April 2008 and a News Radio interview conducted by well-known ABC interviewer Kel Richards broadcast on the afternoon of 10 April 2008 resulted in national and international coverage of the project. This drew email correspondence from a Canadian man who shared his experience of domestic and family violence highlighting the impact of domestic and family violence on children and the lack of action taken to protect children by the responsible agencies. Further, the media coverage prompted a request for a copy of the survey from COSC – Ireland’s National Office for the Prevention of Domestic, Sexual and Gender-based Violence, Department of Justice, Equity and Law Reform in Dublin where a similar study was about to be undertaken.

Within six months, 1,505 surveys were returned and their data analysis commenced. Three surveys arrived after six months. Six envelopes were marked return to sender, seven surveys were returned with no questions completed, and five reply-paid envelopes were empty. These were all excluded from the data. The effective survey return rate was 8.1%. This represented 4% of the adult population of the Cessnock LGA. The higher return rate might have been attributed to the local community oriented approach to conducting the survey and significant community concern about domestic violence.
Comments written in the margins took two forms: Clarification of a respondent’s individual interpretation or meaning regarding their answer to a question or category in a completed survey and surveys where the respondent had added an unsolicited comment. The latter comments tended to convey negative attitudes regarding domestic and family violence, including some from community members who identified themselves as perpetrators. These comments were treated as data. There are critiques of this approach suggesting uninvited comments do not constitute data and should be excluded as they are indicative of problems with the design of the original questionnaire. These critiques direct the researcher to begin again with a more appropriate qualitative study (Morse, 2005). Recognising the complexity of the issue and the diversity of community attitudes embedded within the comments, plus the mixed qualitative and quantitative nature of the survey, such comments were incorporated in the qualitative data analysis process. Thus, the extreme comments made by perpetrators of domestic and family violence were included in the data and this allowed the development of strategies to address negative attitudes. The disadvantage of including some of this material was that it led to higher levels of missing data in the quantitative aspect of the study as some participants made comments without completing the survey questions. Missing data was also evident across the survey more generally as not all respondents answered all questions. The missing data was accounted for by using SPSS software to analyse the data and rounded validated percentages from this process are reported.

**Initial community response to the survey**

The distribution of the survey and subsequent call for participants (reported further in Chapter 9) generated a number of responses via telephone or email. The issues raised in this correspondence were highly diverse and ranged from offers to share personal stories to critiques of the research process as follows:

1. A phone call from a female community member who had completed the survey, and described herself as a ‘thriver of DV who had worked with the police department’ offered to be interviewed individually regarding her experience, as she believed she had a unique story to tell and felt her story had not been
adequately revealed via the survey. She felt it might be possible to use art as a trigger to telling her story in a new way.

2. A phone call from a female community member advising receipt of her letter and survey and indicating she was the only one in residence ‘so I don’t think it matters to me’ thus suggesting she was not subject to violence at home.

3. A phone message from a female resident acknowledging receipt of the survey and indicating she felt the survey was ‘not going to expose the ever increasing violence that I’ve been aware of for years’

4. Two female callers reflected concern regarding perceived increases in young people assaulting older people at home and the general violence of young people toward each other in public places.

5. Two correspondents, one female and one male, expressed concerns regarding gender – first a concern regarding the majority of domestic and family violence being carried out by men and the importance of maintaining an understanding of this in the project and another regarding men and husbands as victim of domestic and family violence, and the lack of attendance to this growing issue.

6. Further calls expressed concern about process issues in the conduct of the survey:

   a. Questioning why only one copy per household was delivered – with one caller advising she had photocopied the survey so she and her husband could complete it.

   b. An email from a community member expressing concern about the small print size used in the survey and the colour of the information brochure on domestic violence services which were difficult for this community member to read. She expressed concern for other community members with similar difficulties. Concerns were also expressed by this correspondent regarding the blank envelope and associated risks of it being discarded as junk mail. Also, the word AVO could be seen through the envelope by one of her friends who then thought it was from an organisation requesting a donation. She had not opened it contributing to a lower than hoped for response from the
community. Nevertheless, the community member said ‘I believe this survey will serve a very worthwhile purpose’.

c. There were several requests to share the survey with interested parties beyond the Cessnock LGA.

d. A number of suggestions for further behaviours related to domestic and family violence were made for inclusion in future surveys including:

i. Being kissed in a way you do not like, or in public in a way that is embarrassing.

ii. Laughing or smirking at your spouse in a condescending way.

iii. Pushing, shoving, biting, or spitting at your spouse.

iv. Using profane or other language that leaves your spouse feeling uncomfortable (sign of disregard or disrespect).

v. Constant broken promises (lip service).

vi. Lack of emotional availability.

vii. Tuning out the spouse when she is talking.

viii. Lack of carrying a fair share of responsibility in the marriage, either physically or financially.

ix. Taking control of the wife’s pay cheque without agreement.

x. Not working and expecting the wife to provide financially for the entire family while he does absolutely nothing productive or meaningful with his time.

7. This correspondence also identified the challenges the project faced in promoting change as follows:

I must admit I have doubts as to how art etc. can help. If those committing violence consider it acceptable behaviour, how can art etc. change their value system? Although I have to admit the Anti-Smoking campaign has worked.

8. An email from a non-Network social work colleague who lived in the Cessnock area offering congratulations on the positive media coverage of the project as follows:
Well done on a sensational article in today’s advertiser – you would have to be happy with the coverage! I thought it was a well written piece describing the project and your involvement extremely well.

**Demographics**

The majority of respondents to the community-wide survey were female (82.4%) and only 17.6% were male. Reflecting the predominantly white AngloCeltic nature of the community, only 1.7% of respondents identified as Aboriginal, 0.4% as Torres Strait Islander, and 0.3% as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. Some 4.3% of respondents declined to answer this question indicating it was not relevant. The age range of respondents was widespread, with the majority in their middle years, as can be seen in Table 13.

**Table 13: Age range of community-wide survey respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range in years</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents indicated they were married or in a *de facto* relationship (69.3%) with the remaining respondents being divorced 11.2%, widowed 6.2%, never married 5.2%, single 4%, separated 3.5%, and in a same-sex relationship 0.6%. The considerable diversity in the household constitution is shown in Table 14. The largest number of respondents (33.1%) identified as a couple with a child or children at home.
Table 14: Household constitution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s chosen household descriptor</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A couple with a child or children at home</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple whose children have left home</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person living alone</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple with no children</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single parent with a child or children at home</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blended family</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single parent whose children have left home</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other sort of household</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent with shared care of children</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelated adults sharing a house, flat or apartment</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those respondents with children in their family, 27.8% had no children living at home. The remainder had two (30.4%), one (25.5%), three (9.7%), four (5.1%), five (0.9%), six (0.5%), or seven (0.1%) child(ren) living at home. The outstanding majority of these children (87.4%) were biological children with the remaining 12.6% scattered across all other available relationship categories as reported in Table 15.

Table 15: Familial relationships to children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of relationship</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and step</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and kin</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and adopted</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and foster</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and unrelated</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step and foster</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step and kin</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster and kin</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anecdotally, Cessnock was assumed to be insular, stable, and unchanging in nature and some members of the Network believed this influenced community attitudes. Hence there was a strong desire to test the level of movement within the community by
determining the number of recent arrivals and comparing those to longer-term residents – hence the question: *How long have you lived in the Cessnock Local Government Area?* A surprising 8.6% of respondents indicated they had resided in the area for under two years, 12% between three and five years, and 10.7% between six and ten years. Thus just under one third of respondents (30.1%) were new arrivals to the Cessnock LGA between 2000 and 2010. This finding challenges perceptions of the strength of community attitudes about domestic and family violence being derived solely from Cessnock’s long mining history. It also reflects the reality of the cumulative ABS (2011) forecasts of population growth across the LGA.

**Table 16: Respondents by locality across the Local Government Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town, village or locality</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Town, village or locality</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>Pokolbin</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurri Kurri</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Black Hill</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellbird</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>Millfield</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdare</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>Abernethy</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branxton</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Wollombi</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Stanford Merthyr</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Congewai</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abermain</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Heddon Greta</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Rothbury</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Neath</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelaw Main</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Bishops Bridge</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulbring</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Lovedale</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laguna</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Brunkerville</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Mt Vincent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quorrobolong</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Belford</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellalong</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Keinbah</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nulkaba</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Spion Kop</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer’s Gully</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were distributed across the LGA with the main concentration in the two larger centres Cessnock (29.8%) and Kurri Kurri (11.3%). The spread across the remaining towns, villages, and localities can be seen in Table 16. This finding led to the decision to concentrate the intervention phase within the town of Cessnock.
Perceptions and experience of domestic and family violence

Respondents’ experience of domestic violence is shown in Figure 22. Beyond this 14.6% of 1,505 respondents had witnessed violence towards pets by a family member, 32.9% had witnessed children (including adult children) being violent toward their parents and 12.4% admitted their children had been violent toward them. Respondents were asked about their experiences of being pressured for money and 17.5% stated they had been pressured for money due to a family need, 16.0% due to a drug and alcohol problem, and 10.1% due to a gambling problem. A further 8.2% said they had been pressured due to a mental health problem and 5.7% due to some other circumstance.

In relation to direct experience of domestic and family violence 37.6% had experienced domestic violence in their immediate family or relationship, 16.9% had experienced domestic violence after a relationship had ended, and 32.3% had experienced domestic violence within their family of origin. This finding confirms widespread exposure to domestic and family violence within the community. Further to the experience of domestic violence, respondents were asked when their last experience
of domestic violence occurred. The range of responses was dramatic – from ‘today’ to ‘70 years ago’.

In moving from actual experience to a knowledge of someone who had experienced domestic violence within the community, 62% of 1,505 respondents indicated they knew someone who had experienced or was experiencing domestic violence.

The survey investigated which behaviours community members believed constituted domestic violence. Behaviours examined included slapping, punching, kicking, choking, using a weapon to inflict injury, intimidating, burning or scalding, driving dangerously, destroying property, smashing objects near the person to frighten or threaten, physically assaulting children, locking out of the house, depriving of sleep, forcing to use drugs or alcohol, abusing sexually, exploiting sexually, raping, indecently assaulting, forcing to view pornography, forcing to have sex, making the person have sex in unwanted ways, yelling, laying the blame and guilt for family problems, emotionally withdrawing, verbally attacking (the person’s intelligence, sexuality, body image, and capacity as a parent), repeated criticising that makes the other feel bad or useless, giving ‘the silent treatment’, forcing the person to justify everything done or said, threatening to throw or break things, threatening wellbeing and safety, partner threatening to hurt him or herself, abusing pets in front of family members, isolating someone, limiting access to family, limiting access to friends, limiting access to community agencies, limiting access to places of worship, controlling or withdrawing access to ownership of goods or property, controlling all access to food, harassing by phone calls, harassing by letter, harassment by repeated emails, text messages and the like, following or stalking, continually photographing, watching or waiting for the person at home, work or place of leisure. Respondents could choose to respond to individual behaviours or two summary alternatives – all of the below or none of the below.

Some 75.8% of respondents understood all of these behaviours were indicators of domestic violence, whereas 0.7% believed none of the listed behaviours constituted domestic violence. The following behaviours were considered more acceptable (often with a degree of qualification noted in the margin of the survey) by community members (based on lower percentage rates selecting each behaviour): giving the silent treatment
emotionally withdrawing (13.1%); continually photographing (16.9%); yelling (18.7%); laying the blame and guilt for family problems (18.9%); partner threatening to hurt him or herself (18.9%); limiting access to places of worship (18.9%); watching or waiting for the person at home, work or place of leisure (19.2%); controlling or withholding access to ownership of goods or property (19.4%); limiting access to friends (19.8%); limiting access to community agencies (19.8%); controlling or withholding access to money (19.9%). Qualifications generally related to parenting and the management of children, addressing drug and alcohol issues or religious groups and practices about which the respondent was concerned.

On the basis of concern within the Network and emerging in the recent literature regarding the abuse of pets as an indicator of high levels of domestic and family violence, this issue was examined through the survey. The survey identified 14% of respondents had witnessed violence towards pets by a family member. This contrasted with 31.9% who had witnessed children (including adult children) being violent towards their parents, and 11.6% who reported that their children had been violent towards them. The surveys returned indicated a 96% level of support for the issue of domestic and family violence to be further addressed within the community.

**Attitudes across the Cessnock LGA**

Questions 21 to 48 of the survey (see Appendix B) explored a variety of attitudes pertinent to domestic and family violence in an attempt to understand the prevailing views within the Cessnock LGA. Respondents were invited to rate their view on a Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree, and don’t know. The survey results for the attitudinal questions are reported in Table 17.

Aggregated, these responses indicate 80% of respondents were in agreement that it was hard to understand why women stayed in violent relationships, 70% believed women going through custody battles often fabricated or exaggerated claims of domestic violence to strengthen their case, 58% said most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to, 35% felt the woman must be getting something out
# Table 17: Attitudes to domestic and family violence in the community-wide survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Likert Scale Rating (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence tends to become more frequent and severe over time</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A victim must be getting something out of the abusive relationship</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to domestic violence both people are usually responsible</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The victim often does something to bring about violence in the relationship</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a serious issue in our community</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is common in our community</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence can be excused if the victim is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence can be excused if the offender is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In domestic situations where one partner is physically violent towards the other it is entirely reasonable for the violent person to be made to leave the family home</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence can be excused if, afterwards, the violent person genuinely regrets what they have done</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women going through custody battles often make up or exaggerate claims of domestic violence in order to improve their case</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship in order to keep the family together</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a crime</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people who experience domestic violence are reluctant to go to the police</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people turn a blind eye to, or ignore domestic violence</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is more likely to occur in migrant families</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a private matter to be handled in the family</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighbourhoods</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police now respond more quickly to domestic violence calls than they did in the past</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence can be excused if it results from people getting so angry that they temporarily lose control</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person would be justified in using physical force against their partner if they:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Argue with or refuse to obey them</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wastes money</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t keep up with the domestic chores</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeps nagging them</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refuses to have sex with them</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admits to having sex with another person</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t keep the children well behaved</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goes out too much with their friends</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Puts their own career ahead of family</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person would be justified in using physical force against their ex-partner in the following situations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refuses to go back to the relationship</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To have contact with their children</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to turn the children against them</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is unreasonable about property settlement and financial issues</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Starts a new relationship</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the abusive relationship, and 26% alleged the woman had often done something to cause the violence, indicating ongoing victim blaming in relation to domestic violence. Alarmingly in Australia, where public education campaigns, including television and radio advertising, have targeted the criminal nature of domestic violence, 18% of respondents did not clearly articulate domestic violence was a crime, 17% believed domestic violence was a private matter to be handled in the family, and 15% maintained it was a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship to keep the family intact. Almost two-thirds of respondents (64.9%) said domestic violence was common in their community, and 68.4% believed most people turned a blind eye to and ignored domestic violence. In terms of reasons for violence, 8.1% believed a person would be justified in using physical force against their partner if they admitted to having sex with another person, 5.3% believed a person would be justified in using physical force against their partner in order to have contact with their children, and 7.7% believed that domestic violence could be excused if the offender were heavily affected by drugs or alcohol.

Almost a quarter of respondents (24.9%) disagreed with the idea of it being entirely reasonable where one partner had been physically violent towards another for the violent person to be made to leave the family home. This level of disagreement would suggest the implementation of new programmes where the focus was on the perpetrator being removed from the family home might be likely to receive a degree of resistance across the Cessnock LGA. It was widely felt that people who had experienced domestic violence would be reluctant to go to the police (77.8%). By contrast, in terms of help seeking in the face of domestic violence, by far the majority said they would turn to family (61%), friends (60.6%), and or police (64.5%). (Respondents were able to select multiple choices as appropriate to them). This compares with 25.1% who said they would turn to local services, 27% who would seek assistance via a telephone helpline or 6.6% from the Internet. Of concern were the 6.4% who indicated they would not seek assistance and the 6.8% who did not know who they would turn to. Some 13.6% indicated they did not believe domestic violence was a serious issue in their community. Nevertheless, for 96% it was important for domestic violence within the community to be addressed.
Conclusion

This chapter has reported findings of the pre-intervention community-wide survey of the 'Safe at Home' project. The demographic data confirmed high rates of domestic and family violence within the community and identified a range of negative attitudes to address within the intervention phase of the project. It is the intervention phase of the project to which the next chapter proceeds.
Chapter 9

Findings: Intervention

Art, Social Work, and Social Change
This chapter continues to report the findings of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. Following from the presentation of findings from the pre-intervention survey in Chapter 8, this chapter presents the second of the three main categories of findings emerging from the project – the intervention phase of the study. The findings on this phase are presented in a twofold manner with (i) a discussion of the process and outcomes within the chapter, accompanied by (ii) a visual record of the process and outcomes located within the two accompanying volumes to this thesis: *The ‘Safe at Home’ Project: A process record in pictures, Volumes 1 and 2* which is referred to within the text. Findings are reported on the:

1. Call for participants.
2. Community consultation process.
3. Community development.
4. Art outcomes.
5. Practitioner involvement with a focus on the similarities and differences between the disciplines involved.

All of the findings reported in this chapter are based on observational data, process records and research notes gathered during the intervention phase of the study. To begin at the beginning of the intervention phase, the chapter commences with the call for participants for the project.

**Intervention: Arts-based community development**

**Call for participants**

Figure 18 presents the paid advertisement which invited community members aged between 5 and 90 years to attend one of a series of community consultations regarding the development of ideas about the project and to participate in the subsequent art making phase of the project. This advertisement, which appeared in *The Cessnock Advertiser* on Wednesday 21 May 2008, drew a very small response from the community across Cessnock LGA with only two community members indicating interest in participation. One of these community members was interested in
participating via an individual interview in preference to art making and, consequently, did not eventually participate in the project. Thus the formal call for participants required for research by the Human Ethics Research Committee yielded one participant for the project. Given this was not a viable community with which to work, all further participants were recruited via word of mouth within the community by members of the Network and referred to the project via a more informal route (see the referral form developed for this process in Appendix A).

Community consultations

In addition to the survey, a series of six community consultations was conducted to seek community input into the arts-based intervention. Following a lengthy preparation process with the Network (see community consultation plan in Appendix D), six public fora were held at various sites across a range of dates and times (see Table 9).

The consultations were locally advertised (see Figures 19 and 20) and there were also word-of-mouth attempts at engagement via personal invitations to the consultations by the Network members. Despite this intensive process, only four community members participated in these public fora with two indicating they had survived domestic violence. Despite the small number, a range of potential artworks for the project were identified as shown in Table 12 and several important themes emerged from these discussions:

Complex nature of domestic and family violence

The difficult nature of the topic at hand (domestic and family violence) and the existing taboo regarding the issue across the LGA was likely to elicit limited community participation. Further, fear of the idea of ‘art’ within Cessnock could present a barrier to community engagement hence the need for the messages conveyed to be clear, simple, and appropriate.

Community values

The frequent absence of discussions on respect in circumstances of domestic and family violence and its vital importance for healthy nonviolent relationships was discussed in relation to community pride and family values, including integrity and
loyalty. This small group of community members viewed respect as an antidote to domestic and family violence, as well as to more general issues of violence within the community.

**Gender issues**

The prevailing tendency in the domestic and family violence arena to be dismissive of men’s experience of domestic and family violence and the importance of not disregarding men’s experience was stressed. The perception that females were becoming more aggressive and violent was evident within these conversations. One community member expressed significant concern the project should not lose sight of the fact the majority of domestic and family violence was perpetrated against women. Thus I was encouraged to take a balanced view regarding the impact of domestic and family violence on women and men, as well as families. So as not to alienate community members struggling with violent behaviour further and to remain free of gender bias, blaming or shaming messages were avoided (see Figure 23).

**Recommendations for the project**

Suggestions were made for the project to address: the relationship between drugs and alcohol and violence in the home; the need for increased awareness regarding the range of behaviours that constituted domestic and family violence and to challenge traditional socialisations beginning with children; the need for a statistical understanding of the nature of the housing estate communities that would be part of the program. Suggestions were also made regarding the potential direction of the project, for example inclusion of existing programs on healthy sexual relationships; inclusion of a men’s health perspective and men’s groups to draw on their ideas about the issue; provision of information about domestic and family violence to General Practitioners; ways of addressing young people who perpetrate violence against older people and the promotion of help-seeking for those struggling with violence.
Concerns regarding project processes were also expressed within the consultations. These concerns related specifically to the advertisement for the consultations and associated call for participants. The community members at the consultation suggested the advertisement had been difficult to locate in the paper because of the dark advertisement located directly above it and suggested it could have been better positioned within the paper. The location of the times for the consultations needed to be at the top of the advertisement not at the bottom, and finally the community members felt that the use of the University logo was too threatening and served as a disadvantage.

Community members attending the fora saw all of the proposed artworks as appropriate for raising awareness and addressing negative attitudes toward domestic and family violence. A number of additional potential arts-based strategies were identified, including having the promotional material on billboards, involving surf companies in the creation of T-Shirts with young people, and an artwork to promote respect. Encouragement to seek funding for all strategies was offered by participants.
on the understanding only the successfully funded artworks would form the intervention phase of the study.

**Community development**

The project identified a range of community development issues from the conversations linked to the intervention phase of the study. These were predominantly focused within the East Cessnock community where the most intensive intervention took place. Domestic and family violence was not a topic chosen by community members within the LGA. This was clearly a Network agenda and consequently provided a range of particular challenges to the process of engaging with the East Cessnock and LGA communities. Had the project been working without this agenda, it would have sought intervention strategies to address some of the following concerns raised:

1. The need for a better path between the housing estate and the local school that many parents walked each day. This was a particular problem for the parents with prams and one parent with a child in a wheelchair that had extreme problems with the path in its current state.

2. The young people (aged 14-18) were interested in pursuing having a set of goal posts installed in the park. They felt there was nowhere for them to play football — and inevitably they ended up playing in the street rather than in the park itself. They believed goal posts would encourage greater use of the park.

3. Many of the local residents complained about the noisy unregistered dirt bikes that regularly disrupted the neighbourhood and asked if in some way we could do something to address this problem. Suggestions to address this included speed humps, barriers, and police intervention.

4. The lack of services and activities for primary aged school children was identified, particularly after school and on weekends. These discussions identified the difficulties many families experienced in involving their children in organised sport due to the associated costs (and in some instances the degree of commitment required to transport children to weekend games and training). Community members identified the need to address ongoing concerns about the level of vandalism within the
community. The focus of many of these discussions surrounded one particular child and his family.

5. The need for regular community cleanup and park maintenance, including better management of the passes for the local Council waste depot distributed by Housing NSW.

6. Lack of transport to enable young people to access the local Police Citizens Youth Club in Cessnock.

7. Concern regarding the level of drug and alcohol use and activity at particular households on the estate.

The ‘Safe at Home’ project fed these issues to the community development worker located within Housing NSW and supported the development of community-based strategies to address the following issues:

1. Community members identified the need for a range of activities for their primary school aged children. The outcome of identifying this issue was an activities program provided by Youth Off the Streets that offered a variety of activities for the children of this age group.

2. The issues related to the dirt bikes, previously raised by Housing NSW with the NSW Police Service, were raised again. This eventually led to a Police crackdown on unlicensed bike riders in the area.

3. Following discussion of the behavioural issues of one child that emerged through the ‘Safe at Home’ project, the Housing NSW Community Development Worker initiated the implementation of a series of joint structured interventions between the Housing NSW and Community Services to address the behaviour of the child about whom many community members had expressed concern. This intervention resulted in a small degree of improvement in settling this young person’s antisocial behaviours.

4. The ‘Safe at Home’ project negotiated directly with Cessnock City Council to support a community process to enable regular park maintenance, through the provision of rubbish collection from the park, managed by a local resident. An initial trial of this project is to be reviewed shortly.
5. Upon identification of the transport issues the Housing NSW Community Development worker initiated discussions with the local Police Citizens Youth Club in Cessnock regarding the regular provision of transport to the estate to enable young people to access their services.

6. Initial conversations with a group of young people on the estate established their interest in being part of a project that might attempt to have goal posts installed in the park. To date this strategy has not proceeded further.

These community development outcomes were only possible because of the strong relationship developed with the community development worker located within Housing NSW during the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. On its own, the project did not have the capacity to follow through with all the strategies identified, each of which flowed from conversations held with community members either in their own homes or while making the artworks rather than from the physical process of art making itself. Since the NSW Housing community development worker position, vacated in early December 2010, was not filled, no further community development outcomes were achieved.

**Art outcomes**

**Artworks**

The intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project comprised eight components, several of which were interrelated. The project resulted in five major artworks, two events, and an exhibition of work at various sites. Table 10 displays the completed artworks and processes undertaken in their accomplishment. All focused on promoting awareness of domestic and family violence and used art to create product and nonproduct art. The latter was aimed purely at engaging community members in the process with no evident physical outcomes beyond visual documentation. The process of art making and final art outcomes of the project are documented visually in two accompanying volumes entitled *The ‘Safe at Home’ project: A process record in pictures, Volumes 1 and 2* and should be considered in tandem with this section.
Community consultations resulted in further consideration being given to the pathways within the park on Alkira Avenue, which served as conduit between home and school for local families. The community expressed a desire to extend the ‘Safe at Home’ theme to the park pathways. Resources were not obtained for this important community development initiative. Further, I became aware of a series of community consultations undertaken as part of the Community Renewal process with the East Cessnock community several years prior to the commencement of ‘Safe at Home’ that had not been acted upon. This information generated by the East Cessnock community regarding the park was also considered in the final design in an attempt to incorporate a stronger community vision for the park into this project.

**Art practice as research**

In the process of making the artworks in the ‘Safe at Home’ project no new specific knowledge emerged relating to domestic and family violence. The positioning of community members’ drawings in the process of developing the design for the *Snakes and ladders* mosaic installation was interesting. One participant’s drawing represented a tearful eye behind a keyhole (see *The ‘Safe at Home’ Project: A process record in pictures, Volume 1*, p. 73). This section of the drawing was enlarged for one of the mosaic sections (see *The ‘Safe at Home’ Project: A process record in pictures, Volume 2*, p. 128, second row, second image). In the making of the work (which was completed by an artist, several community members, and me) the level of detail around the eye was difficult to retain in mosaic. In the process of reworking the image, the tear and some eye detail was lost and the image shifted. A community member observed the image resembled the mythical Greek evil eye. Another community member observed it had been positioned on piece number sixty-six (the number six is believed by the superstitious to be related to evil). Several community members have commented on the protective nature of this image. I was responsible for the translation of the design into the mosaic and the positioning of the pieces within it. However, the positioning of this drawing at piece number sixty-six was an unconscious one, and the design changes, which occurred in the process of the making, were not mine alone. I cannot explain this result empirically. It would seem the positioning of the piece may be the result of my unconscious workings as researcher-artist, but the outcome of the collaborative making of the work remains
unexplained. These two examples may provide a window to further understanding art practice as research as a form of unconscious knowledge moving to a position of becoming more conscious or aware. Further research would be required to qualify this possibility.

Beyond the superstitious, the making of the work confirmed the innate ability of children to identify and articulate the features of nonviolent relationships and environments. In contrast, children were simultaneously and consistently observed to have difficulty in demonstrating non-violence within their familial relationships with siblings during their participation in the project. Frequently children were observed to engage in acts of violence over small disagreements despite strong encouragement from Network members and me to resolve their differences in nonviolent ways.

I also acquired new knowledge and skills regarding the media and techniques associated with mosaic making, poster design and the related use of Adobe software.

**Practitioner involvement in the ‘Safe at Home’ project**

A total of 43 art, social work, or community practitioners and their students participated in the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. The number of practitioners from each discipline (including students) were as follows: social work n=10; art n=7; psychology n=1; social science n=4; early childhood n=4; welfare n=4; not disclosed welfare (employed in the human service sector) n=7; non-human service qualified (employed in the human service sector) n=4; and social work-art n=2. While social workers were the largest group, their level of participation was less than other groups such as the social scientists who were most actively involved with the project. This limited opportunities for the observation of social workers compared to artists more significantly than had been anticipated in the conceptualisation of the project.

The participating practitioners came from a variety of agencies as follows: one social worker, one social scientist and two human services (welfare) practitioners from Housing NSW; six social workers and one psychologist from Community Health; one social worker for Centrelink; one human services (early childhood education) practitioner from Communities NSW; two human services (welfare) practitioners from Cessnock Family Support Service; one social worker
and one human services (social sciences) professional from Cessnock City Council; one human services (youth work) practitioner from Youth off the Streets; five human services (two social science and three welfare) practitioners from Aftercare; two human services (early childhood education) practitioners from Family Insight; four non-welfare human services practitioners (two horticulture, one landscape and construction and one carpentry) from Northnet Green Jobs Corps Australia; one human services (early childhood education) practitioners from Koe-Nara Schools as Communities Centre; two welfare students from TAFE (on placement at Cessnock Family Support Service and Housing NSW); one social work student (on placement at Cessnock Community Health); and three fine art students, four artists and two social worker-artists from the University of Newcastle, including me (see Table 18).

**Table 18: Agency involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Total staff and students n=43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Health</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aftercare</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northnet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing NSW</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock City Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cessnock Family Support Service</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Insight</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrelink</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities NSW</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koe-Nara Schools as Community Centre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth off the Streets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows the levels of participation and observations made of the individual practitioners participating in the project.

**Nature of practice**

Research notes and process records were maintained throughout the project and observations drawn from these sources. Network members were grouped into four categories for the purposes of analysing engagement practices – social workers, artists, welfare practitioners, and non-welfare practitioners. Social worker-artists were grouped within the social work category and any differences from the approach of social workers noted. The findings are reported using these categories. The data
was analysed with the assistance of NVivo software to identify nine central themes: community engagement; engagement with the ‘Safe at Home’ theme, that is, talking about domestic and family violence; attitudes; personal networks and prior relationships; fears and concerns; tasks engaged in; variation from usual work; the influence of external factors; and leadership.

**Community engagement**

**Artists**

Strong themes of artists engaging well with children and actively encouraging them to participate in the art activities (mosaic, painting, and drawing) were evident in the data. One artist was very comfortable and highly skilled in engaging with the children participating at one event, energetically encouraging them to paint and draw. There were also observations of art students being led by the children in the activities undertaken (invariably shaped by a qualified artist or me) in a more passive manner. Art students were observed to engage in play beyond the activities of the project (mosaic making) to join with the children in ball games, word games, and the like.

Art students offered each other high levels of support when working together on the technical (technique) aspects of the art making and the social aspects of the project (for example, an honours art student supported visiting Japanese students with their English language usage in order to communicate effectively with the children in attendance). The Japanese art students involved were quick to engage with the regular practitioners in the art making process and were perceptive in their identification of supporting tasks, like food preparation and cleaning tasks, which they eagerly initiated and participated in.

More experienced artists actively invited adult and child community members to ‘have a go’ at whatever art making activity was being undertaken (this was most evident in the mosaic making, however this was also the medium that the majority of the artists were involved with during the life of the project). At Art for the Park, two of the more experienced artists were observed to engage more frequently with adult community members. This may have been related to their coordination of the more complex task of drawing up and commencing the *Respect* mosaic.
Table 19: Practitioner orientation, participation, and level of observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional orientation</th>
<th>Netwo rk Member</th>
<th>Level of participation</th>
<th>Level of observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>On two occasions with the East Cessnock Playgroup, at East Cessnock residents committee meetings, at the community consultations and in Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Once at The Cottage (attended on other days when I was not there to observe), two events – White Ribbon day, Weston Safe Families day, and Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>At two events: White ribbon day and Weston Safe Families day. Observed at a minimal level at both events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Observed on 3-4 occasions at The Cottage primarily on agency business but which also coincided with the ‘Safe at Home’ project and at Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>At two events: White Ribbon day and Weston Safe Families day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>At two events: White Ribbon day and Weston Safe Families day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>On one visit to The Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 8</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>On one visit to The Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>At two events: White Ribbon day and Weston Safe Families day and at Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Cottage across a variety of art related activities, such as poster and coaster Distribution, Weston Safe Families day and at Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>At one observation visit to The Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare 1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>At two events Weston Safe Families day, during the Posters and Coasters Project workshops, and at Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>At two events: White Ribbon day and Weston Safe Families day, during the distribution of the Posters and Coasters campaign, at community consultations and Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Cottage for art related activities, at one event: White Ribbon day and at Network meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work 9</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Closely observed during the invitation distribution across East Cessnock, at one event: White Ribbon day, at Community consultations and Network meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed Welfare 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Participated in the project on a number of occasions when there were no client demands while on service outreach at The Cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed Welfare 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Indirect participation observed at one event: Weston Safe Families day. Her direct practice with families was not observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed Welfare 3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Cottage Activities: initial incidental participation when she was relieving in a position which provided service outreach. Also observed on the uptake of the Housing NSW CDW position: but has not directly participated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Clean up the park day and cottage activities on two occasions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Cottage activities on one occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undisclosed Welfare 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Once only during the installation of Snakes and ladders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Undisclosed Welfare 5</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Undisclosed Welfare 6</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Early Childhood 2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Early Childhood 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Early Childhood 4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Landscaping 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Horticulture 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Horticulture 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Carpentry 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Undisclosed Welfare 7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Artist 1</td>
<td>Link to SAH</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Artist 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Artist 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Artist 4</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Social Worker-Artist 1</td>
<td>Link to SAH</td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Social Worker-Artist 2</td>
<td>Link to SAH</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Welfare Student 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Social Work Student 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Welfare Student 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Fine Art student 1</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Fine Art student 2</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Fine Art student 3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social workers

One social worker had inadequately prepared a group for participation in the project in relation to the issue to be addressed. This resulted in a particularly difficult process of engagement with the group regarding the project theme of domestic and family violence for me as the researcher. There was a clear misunderstanding between the social worker and me regarding the level of preparation undertaken with the group regarding their participation in the project. A negative response from the group made engagement with the theme of domestic and family violence impossible requiring the social worker and me to build a connection with the East Cessnock resident’s committee in an attempt to pave an alternate route into their community for the project. This involved direct negotiation with the resident’s committee members individually and discussing the nature of the project and its aims. This process also included the challenging the power dynamics surrounding one particular community member who was a member of the resident’s committee and the playgroup opposed to local involvement with the project. This required the social worker and me to employ a sophisticated understanding of the dynamics of the community. Had this process been unsuccessful in gaining entry to the community via alternate routes, intervention in this neighbourhood would have been significantly reduced if not impossible.

Like the artists, social workers also engaged actively with playful activities associated with the project, for example, participation in a game of snakes and ladders on an oversized floor mat of this game with children at the Weston Safe Families day. The primary social worker in this instance, coordinated, supervised and simultaneously participated in the game while sharing these roles with a human services (welfare) practitioner. Social workers used the activity they were engaged in to repeatedly begin conversations about the ‘Safe at Home’ theme and domestic and family violence, for example when painting a child’s face or filling a helium balloon. Several social workers were more comfortable in engaging with adult community members and did this with greater frequency than they engaged with children within the context of domestic and family violence oriented events. This was noted particularly during the Weston Safe Families day.
Several social workers took a very low-key approach to engagement, waiting for a community member to approach them in preference to initiating direct engagement. This was particularly noticeable with one social worker who held a dual role at the Cottage – one of agency service provision and a peripheral role in the ‘Safe at Home’ project when not attending to client issues. This social worker managed this dual role by keeping conversations with community members very general and not specifically directed to the ‘Safe at Home’ themes or specific concerns about domestic and family violence. Another social worker took an observational approach to engagement with community members at White Ribbon day providing a physical presence in conversations, but did not contribute to the conversation. This contrasted with another social worker who engaged with the tasks at hand, for example, filling balloons with helium rather than engaging community members.

A number of children were particularly keen to engage with a social work student on placement who attended the project as part of her placement tasks. This seemed to be supported by the student’s youthful, nonthreatening presentation. There were large numbers of children attending ‘Safe at Home’ school holiday activities which provided ample opportunity for student engagement.

Food was frequently and consistently used by social workers as a strategy for engagement with children and adults. This strategy was shared by all practitioners with the exception of the non-welfare human service practitioners who were not concerned about engaging with community members.

**Human service (welfare) practitioners**

Two practitioners from this group were the most intensively involved with the project in cofacilitation of the group work aspects of the project. These practitioners engaged with all comers to the project. Several other experienced practitioners in this group came from agencies that provided services to people experiencing domestic and family violence. These practitioners prioritised the engagement of women and promoted the benefits of the project. This included effective engagement in and support of the women in the posters and coasters workshop groups in making collages and models for the posters that conveyed anti-violence messages.
Of the human service (welfare) practitioners who brought their clients to participate in the project, 60% worked exclusively with their client group to support their participation in the project. This group of practitioners did not engage at the local community level. Only two of the more actively involved workers from this group who attended more frequently and became more familiar with participants from the East Cessnock community began to engage beyond their client group. For one of these practitioners, this extended to engaging in conversations with some of the child participants. These practitioners tended to allow clients and community members to direct the conversation but did not focus specifically on domestic and family violence unless the person engaged in conversation raised the issue.

Two of the service providers (other relevant human service training) group took on a teaching role in relation to mosaic making and engaged in the creation of the mosaic. One was experienced in the technique of mosaic and the other developed this skill as part of her experience with the project. These workers encouraged participants to ‘have a go’, building skills and confidence in those they worked with during the process.

Two practitioners in this category were students and one a trainee. Of these student service providers one was observed during two workshops and was noted to have little direct engagement with the group members beyond her presence and observation of what was happening in the group. Another initially had little engagement with community members participating in the project and observed what was occurring within the group process. This student practitioner took a role in budgeting for one of the events (Weston Safe Families day) as part of her learning requirements for placement. On becoming more familiar and comfortable with the project and her potential roles in it, this student engaged in organising tasks, took responsibility for cooking the barbecue at the Weston Safe Families day, and interacted with community members through preparing and sharing food and worked with children at East Cessnock on creating the Hopscotch mosaics.

The psychologist involved with the project had minor participation in the community activities, including attendance at two community events, but was highly involved in supporting the administrative functioning of the Network and its meeting processes (distributing minutes and chairing meetings).
The level and mode of engagement of the human service (welfare) practitioners seemed to be influenced by disciplinary orientation and training, level of experience, and perceived role within the project. The more experienced practitioners demonstrated stronger levels of engagement with adult and community members (n=4), engaged in general conversation (n=2), initiated specific questioning and discussion of the ‘Safe at Home’ themes of domestic and family violence (n=2), and encouraged community members to participate through extending invitations and support (n=1). Like the social workers, experienced practitioners from this group used the activities associated with the project as a means for engaging in discussion about the ‘Safe at Home’ theme, for example, when painting children’s faces at the Weston Safe Families day or making cut outs with the parents of preschoolers.

Like the social work group, a small number of these practitioners remained reticent participants. One less experienced worker in the welfare category was reserved in their contact with community members and demonstrated limited attempts at engagement. Another practitioner made no direct engagement with families notwithstanding ample available opportunities to do so. A third practitioner participated in an incidental way as a consequence of providing service relief to a colleague who ran another programme at The Cottage. This worker engaged in discussion with community members and me about the project but did not participate directly beyond providing verbal support – despite later relieving in a pivotal position in one of the key agencies involved with the project. Three human service (welfare) practitioners engaged licensees and hoteliers in the uptake of posters and coasters.

**Human service (non-welfare) practitioners**

Human service (non-welfare) practitioners engaged directly, and in the majority of instances, exclusively with the participants from their service who were assisting with the installation tasks. Frequently their approach was specifically aimed at achieving the completion of a particular task. Regular praise and humour motivated the young people participating. One non-welfare trained service provider expressed frustration and struggled with his group of young people who were involved in the site preparation for the *Snakes and ladders* installation as it required physical labour to
dig the foundations and remove the grass in preparation for the concrete slab. Another human services (non-welfare) practitioner reported that this was a particularly difficult group to engage and work with.

On two occasions one of the human service (non-welfare) practitioners engaged at a greeting and conversational level with neighbourhood children who were participating in the project. This occurred during the installation phase of the *Hopscotch* and *Snakes and ladders* mosaics. This was rare in this group as community engagement was not part of their primary agenda.

**Talking about domestic and family violence**

**Artists**

One younger artist expressed concern and discomfort that she did not know how to engage with community members regarding the ‘Safe at Home’ theme. However the most experienced artist involved with the project comfortably asked specific questions of participants about domestic and family violence using the ‘Safe at Home’ theme.

**Social workers**

All moderately and more experienced social workers were observed to engage in very direct questioning of participants about their understandings of domestic and family violence. They joined in general and ‘Safe at Home’ specific conversations with participants. The social work student engaged in a high level of preparation prior to participating in the project by raising issues in a variety of ways. This student's learning was driven by her curiosity and questioning and engaged in a process of debriefing following involvement in project activities to extend and consolidate the learning acquired.

**Human service (welfare) practitioners**

In the conduct of the project one human service (welfare) practitioner actively discussed attitudes and made suggestions for participants to consider regarding domestic and family violence. She sought out images and messages which challenged negative attitudes. This practitioner sensitively challenged group members to contribute to the discussions and image creation, celebrating each of their
contributions. This practitioner promoted the view that the women who became involved would feel an enormous sense of achievement at having a voice through the process of contributing. This view was later substantiated by the women's joy when the posters were produced and distributed.

The more experienced and more highly involved members of the human service (welfare) practitioner group also actively engaged community members participating in conversation about domestic and family violence.

Two of the human service (welfare) practitioners worked directly with the children to name the cut out project ‘Domestic and Family Violence – STOP! I don’t like it!' and to discuss domestic and family violence in age appropriate ways with the preschool group. They encouraged the children's parents to consider ways to engage in such conversations. Consistent with their backgrounds in early childhood their approach was strongly educational.

**Human service (non-welfare) practitioners**

There was no attempt by the non-welfare trained staff group to engage with the themes of the project beyond their discussions with me.

**Attitudes**

**Artists**

No attitudinal issues of concern arose in conversations with artists across the life of the project and no outstanding negative or positive attitudes were noted regarding the attitudes of artists.

**Social workers**

One social worker had her attitudes challenged regarding the nature of the people living on the Housing NSW estate at East Cessnock during a letterbox drop across East Cessnock. This practitioner identified a much stronger sense of community than she had previously thought possible. She noted a stark difference in the level of interaction between the residents on the estate compared to areas of East Cessnock beyond the estate, where few interactions were either observed or opinions expressed which the practitioner felt contributed to a lack of community feeling.
**Human service (welfare) practitioners**

One human service (welfare) practitioner gently challenged negative attitudes regarding domestic and family violence directly with participants in the collage group developing the posters and coasters, thus effectively promoting positive anti-violence messages. This practitioner held a strong anti-violence attitude.

**Human service (non-welfare) practitioners**

One human service (non-welfare) practitioner joked about local residents and the lack of any potential for change within the local area. This individual also expressed negative views regarding the potential of addressing domestic and family violence through the use of art and viewed the artworks as ‘*a waste of time and effort*’ given the likelihood they would soon be damaged.

**Personal networks and prior relationships**

**Artists**

No artist was identified as having a prior relationship with project participants and therefore management of this was not an issue. However artists were observed to more readily involve friends and family in the art making process.

**Social workers**

One of the social workers had previous knowledge of and relationships with some of the project participants involved in the art making process. In the one instance where this situation was directly observed the participant greeted the social worker warmly and engaged in conversations which included reference to the worker’s prior relationship with and knowledge of the participant.

An important difference was noted in the case of prior relationships between the social worker-artists and the broader group of social workers. Only the social workers-artists involved friends and family in the art making process. Social workers who did not identify themselves as artists did not involve friends or family in the project activities, thus maintaining a highly structured boundary around the project as part of their professional practice. In a similar vein, social workers did not participate in any of the weekend activities of the project, whereas social worker-artists did.
**Human service (welfare) practitioners**

Two social scientists, a welfare practitioner and two early childhood practitioners also had prior relationships with project participants. In each of these instances the workers more actively engaged with and gently encourage the participants who were part of their respective programmes to participate in the ‘Safe at Home’ project. This group did not involve family or friends in the art making process, but encouraged community volunteers linked with the service with whom they had prior relationships to participate in the project.

**Human service (non-welfare) practitioners**

Two practitioners in this category also had prior relationships with participants. In this group both practitioners actively encouraged the participants they knew to promote protection of the artworks within the community.

**Fears and concerns**

**Artists**

One artist expressed fear and concern they did not feel able to initiate conversations with community members regarding the topic of domestic and family violence.

**Social workers**

One social worker indicated initial feelings of lack of confidence to engage in the project, but following a brief period of observation of my practice and ways of engaging participants in this context, proceeded to take up the challenge and begin conversations with participants. This worker regularly invited me into conversations when she felt they extended beyond her current capacity or when she felt challenged by some aspect of the art making or engagement process.

**Human service (welfare) practitioners**

A human service (welfare) practitioner expressed a very different concern regarding the potential destruction of the work by local community members to the artworks that were being undertaken. These concerns brought some awareness of the practitioner’s potential personal response (anger) should this occur at some future point.
An inexperienced social scientist expressed fear about not knowing what to do, or how to go about engaging with participants. This occurred within the context of school holiday activities at The Cottage. This practitioner actively sought guidance, which then resulted in her dynamically engaging with the children present and inviting them to participate in activities and supporting them to discuss the ‘Safe at Home’ themes. The children were observed to respond very positively to this practitioner’s participation and they readily acted on her requests. The children seemed to react positively to this practitioner’s positive, youthful approach and a shared interest in contemporary music. Another human service (welfare) practitioner similarly overcame their own initial reluctance to engage in the art making (mosaic) process in order to then engage participants. A further human service (welfare) practitioner developed greater confidence through engaging in conversation with participants beyond the actual making of the mosaic however continued to describe experiencing difficulty in engaging direct discussions regarding domestic and family violence. A fourth human service (welfare) practitioner struggled to move beyond low levels of participation – initial greetings with adults – despite active encouragement by other practitioners. One of the early childhood practitioners was strongly focused on encouraging children’s creativity through the project and equally insistent the artists not change or rework any of the children’s work in the process of finishing the artworks.

**Human service (non-welfare) practitioners**

A human service (non-welfare) practitioner expressed concern regarding the destruction that was likely by local community members to the artworks that were being undertaken.

**Tasks**

The tasks undertaken by the different professional groupings are reported in Table 20. In this instance the social worker-artists, including me, are considered in a separate category as they participated in a greater range of tasks than the general social work group. Surprisingly it was the human service (welfare) practitioners who actively supported and encouraged art making (cut outs, drawing, mosaic) particularly with children who were the largest group of participants in all activities except for the posters and coasters strategy. Most of the practitioners in the group
enthusiastically engaged in the process of making art. They also valued the place of play with children and of food, with only one practitioner in this group not being actively involved in the preparation and distribution of food. This group also undertook the greatest share in the setting up, packing up and cleaning activities associated with the project apart from me. This contrasted most dramatically with the human service (non-welfare) practitioners who only assisted with the construction and installation aspects of the two large mosaic artworks.
Table 20: Practitioner participation in project tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in key tasks observed</th>
<th>Social workers- Artists n=2</th>
<th>Social workers n=10</th>
<th>Artists n=7</th>
<th>Service provider (Welfare other) n=20</th>
<th>Service provider (non welfare) n=4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended Network meetings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in community consultations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducted media liaison and promotion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided links to community groups and services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing/seeking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged community members in project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted general conversation with participants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoted ‘Safe at Home’ specific conversations (DV focused or project focused)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted participants to deal with personal issues arising during the project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in activity set up and pack up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with community members on project</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used food as a means of engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitated groups</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make cut outs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to information display at White Ribbon day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared site for Hopscotch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended White Ribbon day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibited of cut outs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed invitations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Art for the park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in design development for the respect mosaic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged young children to actively paint and draw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in The Cottage activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collected drawings, paintings or collages from community members</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made mosaic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door knocked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Weston Safe Families day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged children in games or activities related to being Safe at Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged children in games or activities related to being Safe at Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to newsletter production</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in poster and coaster development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged licensees and hoteliers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed posters and coasters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installed Hopscotch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site preparation for Snakes and ladders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in park cleanup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installed Snakes and ladders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributed to photo-documentation of project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought supervision around participation in project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended to observe only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Variation from usual work

Artists
One artist commented she normally made artworks which were very quick and easy to complete compared with the mosaic being worked on at The Cottage (Snakes and ladders) at the time of her involvement. This artist indicated she did not feel she would attempt such a large, slow-to-complete work within her own artistic practice. One very experienced community artist observed significant differences in the ways I as a social worker-artist drew images from the community to create the work compared to her own community practice where she would create a work from her artistic viewpoint of the community.

Social workers
One social worker indicated they had not sufficiently prepared a group regarding the domestic and family violence focus of the project prior to their involvement. This group rejected my invitation to participate once they understood the project focus. The social worker indicated this differed from their usual groupwork practice. Two social workers were reluctant to engage in art making activities as it was a departure from their usual practice. In both instances, the social workers were male. This was quite different from the two social workers that engaged in art making despite the absence of community participants.

Human service (welfare) practitioners
No specific observations were made of human service (welfare) practitioners beyond high levels of enjoyment in the different range of art making tasks. The project appeared to provide pleasure and relief, particularly on Fridays at the end of a busy working week.

Human service (non-welfare) practitioners
One of the human service (non-welfare) practitioners remarked that the project was a dramatic variation from their usual task of weed eradication. Several human service (non-welfare) practitioners expressed appreciation that the project provided opportunities for young people to develop skills.
Influence of external personal factors

Artists
One artist was diverted by the participation of her own children at an event. This resulted in attention being divided between community members and her family during participation in project tasks. The artist’s children contributed significantly to the activities and encouraged the participation and engagement of local children in the event.

Social workers
No social worker indicated personal external influences during their participation in the project and no external influences could be observed which had an impact upon the practice of social workers.

Human service (welfare) practitioners
One of the human service (welfare) practitioners was significantly restricted from holding a key role in the project as a result of short staffing within her agency. This meant the practitioner was filling several positions and roles. This severely limited the time and resources this worker was able to commit to the project during the final stages of the Snakes and ladders mosaic. In this instance, core agency business dominated agency commitment to the project.

Human service (non-welfare) practitioners
No specific observations regarding the external influences the human service (non-welfare) practitioners were made beyond the challenges that resulted in rescheduling their involvement in the project because of inclement weather.

Leadership

Artists
No artist took a significant leadership role within the implementation of the project.
Social workers

As a social worker-artist I took the primary leadership role in the project’s intervention phase. However social workers generally took up important leadership roles within the Network, particularly the role of chairperson until the end stage of the project when the only psychologist involved with the project took this role up. Social workers also led the practice activities at events where they participated in higher numbers. For example the more experienced social workers were observed to consistently take leadership roles in conducting the domestic violence specific events. For example one experienced social worker involved her colleagues in initiating community engagement with families in the playground in the park where the White Ribbon day activities were being held. Several less experienced social workers were observed to look to their more experienced colleagues or me for direction regarding project tasks.

Social workers were observed to more consistently initiate seeking consent regarding participation as part of their engagement with community members. This was likely to have been a result of a strong professional orientation toward ethics in addition to my influence and awareness-raising of the requirement of consent in the ethical conduct of the research.

Human service (welfare) practitioners

Four practitioners within this group took leadership and organising roles within the Network and for conducting the project. One orchestrated and facilitated the participation of clients from their agency to participate in the mosaic, gardening and site cleanup activities. In conjunction with other practitioners, another led the facilitation of workshops when I was unavailable. This practitioner also followed up community development issues which arose as part of the project, and initiated new projects as a consequence – sometimes in partnership with me and independently at other times when they were less directly related to the ‘Safe at Home’ project. Two other practitioners from this group held office-bearing positions in the Network and actively shaped the project.
Human service (non-welfare) practitioners

No human service (non-welfare) practitioner engaged in leadership roles or activities beyond the leadership of the construction aspects of the project for which they were engaged to undertake.

Influence of place

The public space of The Cottage on the housing estate of East Cessnock was problematic (See photographs in *The ‘Safe at Home’ Project. A Process record in pictures: Volume 1* pages 58-70 and 102-114 for varying use of this space). This space did not easily facilitate the key place oriented factors identified by Grodach (2009) as needed to positively influence community development. That is, it did not easily facilitate relationships and engagement between groups within this community, provide opportunities for interaction and participation between strangers or provide a space in which to conduct either functional or ritual activities to tie the community together. Located at one edge of a highly fragmented community which might be better described as a collection of people living in a geographical area, who have little in common beyond this geography, the physical location of The Cottage meant there was little passing traffic and it tended to attract families only from the immediate vicinity of the facility. It was less successful in attracting families living more distant who did not already have an established connection with a service operating from the premises. The exception to this was the project’s ability to attract the friends of children already participating in the project from other parts of the estate. The majority of children who participated in the project had minimal parental supervision or restrictions.

The degree of visibility of the ‘Safe at Home’ activities within the community had an enormous impact upon the level of attendance. The activities that were in the more highly visible public spaces (parks) tended to be better attended, for example, Art for the Park (n=30) and Weston Safe Families day (n=60). However, this was not the case for the White Ribbon day celebrations held at Peace Park in Weston (n=6). The difference between these events may be attributed to two factors. Art for the Park and the Weston Safe Families day were one-time events which had a high novelty factor and
incorporated a variety of attractions within their respective communities. These events were well advertised via mailbox drops.

Activities at The Cottage were similarly influenced by their degree of visibility. The days on which a tent was erected on the front lawn were consistently better attended than days where this was not done. On these occasions the project literally took to the street and became more highly visible than on the days when flying flags indicated the project’s presence within The Cottage.

External factors also influenced attendance. For example, the weather played a significant role with extremes of hot, cold and wet all present during the conduct of the project. The time of day and year activities were conducted also influenced attendance levels, for example more children attended during school holidays, or when the project was being conducted after school hours.

The fact The Cottage was owned by Housing NSW and served as an outlet for their services may have been a deterrent for some local community members, particularly those not wishing to associate with others from their immediate neighbourhood. This factor was identified as prevalent across the estate during the door knock phase of the project and many community members indicated they avoided The Cottage for this reason. Interestingly when the project was operating alongside Open Arms (a local Christian group), when they were operating their food parcel project, participation of adult community members was slightly higher as they would stay for conversation, morning tea and mosaic making when they came to purchase their low cost food package and engage in the social aspects of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. Open Arms food parcel project was defunded and a noticeable drop in the level of adult participation occurred part way through the ‘Safe at Home’ project as a consequence. Thus, the physical environment and the potential benefits perceived by community members associated with it appear to have influenced a range of outcomes.

Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has reported findings of the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. Focusing on the project’s process and product, the observational, process records and research note data have been thematically presented to report
community development outcomes, art outcomes and the similarities and differences between social workers and artists within the arts-based community development practice context. The next chapter reports the findings from the post-intervention neighbourhood survey and compares the pre- and post-intervention data.
Findings: Post-intervention Survey and Discussion

Art, Social Work, and Social Change
This chapter reports the third and final category of findings from the ‘Safe at Home’ project. Following the findings of the pre-intervention survey in Chapter 8, and intervention phase of the study in Chapter 9, this chapter presents the findings from the neighbourhood (post-intervention) survey. The chapter presents the distribution and return rates of the neighbourhood survey, the demographic and attitudinal data drawn from survey respondents, and compares and contrasts the data sets from the pre- and post-intervention surveys and discusses their implications.

Post-intervention neighbourhood survey

The collection of post-intervention data on the community and community attitudes towards domestic and family violence was undertaken via a neighbourhood-wide survey (Appendix C) mailed to 200 households in May 2011, across the East Cessnock NSW housing estates and the East Cessnock neighbourhood immediately adjacent to the Alkira Avenue Park where the major intervention was conducted. The survey was designed to collect comparable demographic data, community attitudes to domestic and family violence, and responses to the artworks created through the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project.

Survey distribution and return rates

The 200 surveys were packaged by me and distributed using the methodological approach previously described in Chapters 6 and 8 used for the pre-intervention community-wide survey. Eight surveys were returned yielding seven completed surveys and a copy of the Gospel of Jesus Christ according to John and the Romans. This represents an effective return rate of 3.5%, which remains slightly better than the expected 3% return rate for mailed surveys noted in Chapter 8. While small, this number of returns is significantly better than that for East Cessnock in the community-wide survey where there were no returns. This return rate is evidence of the success of
community involvement in one which has a long-held local reputation for being difficult to involve in such activities (N. Drage, personal communication, February 14, 2008). This return rate was viewed as impressive by a number of the Network partners who had anticipated a nil return. The distribution process of the neighbourhood survey resulted in significantly less community engagement compared with the community-wide survey. The survey distribution, however, was accompanied by an ethics committee approved targeted promotional strategy offering participation in a prize draw for community members who returned completed surveys. An additional local drop box was provided at The Cottage offering a local point to which surveys could be easily returned (see Figure 24). Interestingly, all surveys were returned by mail and none returned via the drop box. The neighbourhood survey had a strict two-week timeframe for completion and return.

It is left to the reader to make his or her own interpretation regarding the intended meaning of the community member offering the gospel as an alternative to a completed survey. The remaining seven surveys were processed using the same data analysis strategies described in Chapter 8 for the community-wide survey. Like the community-wide survey not all respondents answered all questions and, consequently, all frequencies for the quantitative questions reported are rounded valid percentages obtained via analysis using the SPSS programme which accounted for the missing data.

**Demographics**

Five (71.4%) of the seven respondents to the neighbourhood survey were female and two (28.6%) male. Indigenous Australians were over represented in this sample compared with the community-wide survey as three (42.9%) of respondents identified as Aboriginal and four (57.1%) identified as neither Aboriginal nor Torres Strait Islander. No respondents identified as Torres Strait Islanders.

This finding most likely reflects the high concentration of Aboriginal families who live in Housing NSW accommodation within the LGA and the connections made with Aboriginal community members through the intervention phase of the project.
Complete and return the **Safe at Home Neighbourhood Survey** and enter the **Safe at Home Prize Draw** for your chance to win two great prizes!

**First prize: A Big W gift card valued at $150**

**Consolation prize: A Big W gift card valued at $50**

For further details see the enclosed Participant Information Sheet.

**Return your survey and entry card to either:**

- The University of Newcastle by post in the reply paid envelope
- The Cottage, 58 Alkira Avenue, East Osmington where you can drop it in the Safe at Home Survey box

**All entries must be received by 5 pm on Friday 27 May, 2011.**

---

**Figure 24: Promotional material accompanying the neighbourhood survey mailout**
Table 21 shows the age range of neighbourhood survey respondents.

Table 21: Age range of neighbourhood survey respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range in years</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to marital status, two respondents (28.6 %) were never married, one (14.3%) was single, one (14.3%) was divorced, one (14.3%) separated, one (14.3%) widowed and one (14.2%) married or in de-facto relationships. Household composition is reported in Table 22.

Table 22: Household composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent’s chosen household descriptor</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A couple with a child or children at home</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple whose children have left home</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person living alone</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple with no children</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single parent with a child or children at home</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blended family</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A single parent whose children have left home</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other sort of household</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parent with shared care of children</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrelated adults sharing a house, flat or apartment</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For those respondents with children, three (42.8%) did not have children living at home, two (28.6%) had one child living at home, one (14.3%) had two, and another (14.3%) had three children living at home. The mix of familial relationships in the neighbourhood survey is outlined in Table 23. This is a considerably more homogenous group than respondents to the community-wide survey.
Table 23: Familial relationships to children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of relationship</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and step</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kin</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and kin</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and adopted</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and foster</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological and unrelated</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step and foster</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrelated</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step and kin</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster and kin</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the respondents (100%) to the neighbourhood survey were residents of East Cessnock. This contrasts dramatically with the community-wide survey where no respondents identified themselves as being from East Cessnock. This finding means no specific direct comparison can be drawn between the pre- and post-surveys, and thus must be considered as a broad comparison and contrast only. This is a significant limitation of this study.

Perceptions and experience of domestic and family violence

In terms of direct experience of domestic and family violence, Figure 25 outlines the three key areas examined.

The most recent experience of domestic and family violence within this survey group ranged from 2004 to recently. Beyond this one (14.3%) of the seven respondents had witnessed violence towards pets by a family member, another (14.3%) had been pressured for money due to a family need, two (28.6%) due to a drug and alcohol problem, and one (14.3%) due to a gambling problem. No one said they had been pressured due to a mental health problem or other circumstances.
With regard to perceptions of domestic and family violence, three (42.9%) respondents indicated they knew someone who had experienced or was experiencing domestic violence and two (28.6%) had witnessed children (including adult children) being violent toward their parents. Six respondents (85.7%) had not experienced their children being violent toward them with only one (14.3%) indicating this had happened to them.

**Attitudes across the Cessnock LGA**

Questions 15 to 42 of the neighbourhood survey (see Appendix C) were a direct replication of the attitudinal questions 21 to 48 of the community-wide survey (see Appendix B) and contrast the variety of attitudes pertinent to domestic and family violence in an attempt to compare the prevailing views of East Cessnock with the wider Cessnock LGA. Respondents were invited to rate their view on a Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, strongly agree, to don’t know. The survey results for the attitudinal questions from the neighbourhood survey are reported in Table 24.
Aggregated, the neighbourhood responses to the twenty-seven items relating to attitudes towards domestic and family violence indicate less negative attitudes than those expressed in the earlier community-wide survey. A smaller group of three (42.9%) respondents considered it hard to understand why women stayed in violent relationships, three (42.9%) affirmed women going through custody battles often fabricated or exaggerated claims of domestic violence to strengthen their case, one (14.3%) considered most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to, two (28.6%) felt the woman must be getting something out of the abusive relationship, and one (14.3%) believed the woman has often done something to cause the violence. Importantly, in this group, only one (14.3%) respondent did not clearly articulate domestic violence was a crime. The neighbourhood group unanimously agreed (100%) domestic violence was not a private matter to be handled in the family and only one (14.3%) maintained it was a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship to keep the family intact. Six respondents (85.7%) affirmed domestic violence was common in their community, and six (85.7%) believed most people turned a blind eye to, or ignored domestic violence. Interestingly, no one in this group believed a person would be justified in using physical force against their partner if they admitted to sex with another person, or in order to have contact with their children, nor did any respondent think domestic violence could be excused if the offender were heavily affected by drugs or alcohol. One of the respondents (14.3%) disagreed with the idea of it being entirely reasonable where one partner had been physically violent towards another for the violent person to be made to leave the family home. In this group, it was unanimously (100%) understood that people who experienced domestic violence were reluctant to go to the police. Further 100% of respondents believed domestic violence was an issue in their community.
Table 24: Attitudes to domestic and family violence the neighbourhood survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence tends to become more frequent and severe over time</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A victim must be getting something out of the abusive relationship</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to domestic violence both people are usually responsible</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The victim often does something to bring about violence in the relationship</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a serious issue in our community</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is common in our community</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence can be excused if the victim is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence if the offender is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In domestic situations where one partner is physically violent towards the other it is entirely reasonable for the violent person to be made to leave the family home</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence can be excused if, afterwards, the violent person genuinely regrets what they have done</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women going through custody battles often make up or exaggerate claims of domestic violence in order to improve their case</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship in order to keep the family together</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a crime</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people who experience domestic violence are reluctant to go to the police</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people turn a blind eye to, or ignore domestic violence</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is more likely to occur in migrant families</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence is a private matter to be handled in the family</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighbourhoods</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police now respond more quickly to domestic violence calls than they did in the past</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence can be excused if it results from people getting so angry that they temporarily lose control</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>Likert Scale Rating (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person would be justified in using physical force against their partner if they:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Argue with or refuse to obey them</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wastes money</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t keep up with the domestic chores</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeps nagging them</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refuses to have sex with them</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admits to having sex with another person</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t keep the children well behaved</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goes out too much with their friends</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Puts their own career ahead of family</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A person would be justified in using physical force against their ex-partner in the following situations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refuses to go back to the relationship</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To have contact with their children</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to turn the children against them</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is unreasonable about property settlement and financial issues</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Starts a new relationship</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Survey findings and observations on the art making process and objects**

The neighbourhood survey asked a range of evaluative questions regarding the artworks created via the ‘Safe at Home’ project. These findings are reported with the evaluative findings from observations made of each work during the intervention phase of the study to provide a more complete view of the works in one location.

Only two (28.6%) of the seven respondents indicated they had heard of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. Similarly, only two (28.6%) of respondents indicated they had seen the ‘Safe at Home’ logo. One neighbourhood respondent (04) indicated they had seen the logo when a human services (welfare) colleague and I visited her home. This was a surprisingly small response given the frequent use of the logo, including the distribution of fridge magnets in drawing packs to households (n=57), letterbox drops of project invitations, door knocks promoting the projects, and its use in updates about the project in Housing NSW newsletters to local residents.

One neighbourhood survey respondent shared thoughts about the project which implied some level of awareness raising on the issue of domestic and family violence as follows: ‘Nice to see domestic violence been brought out from behind closed doors the understanding it can happen to anyone no matter where you live’ (Neighbourhood Respondent 01). However, only two (28.6%) of the respondents had participated in the ‘Safe at Home’ project.

**Intervention 1: Cut out project**

None of the survey respondents had seen the cut outs on exhibition in any of the locations where they were exhibited – Koe-Nara Schools as Community Centre, Centrelink, Cessnock Family Support Service, Cessnock City Library, Peace Park in Weston, or at Art for the Park in the park at Alkira Avenue, East Cessnock. Thus there was no feedback via the survey on responses to this artwork. However, several agencies provided feedback regarding the responses of community members to this work. The cut outs were on exhibition within the community across these locations for 66 days and the feedback was diverse:
1. Centrelink staff reported that young children were particularly attracted to the cut outs which had served as a point of interest for discussion while community members were waiting to be served. Cut outs were displayed in the Centrelink office for the exhibition’s duration.

2. Cessnock Family Support Service indicated the cut outs had sparked opportunities to discuss Domestic and Family Violence with the families attending their centre. Cessnock Family Support staff became so attached to their cut outs they asked to have them on permanent loan and they remain on display in their Centre.

3. Koe-Nara staff reported some minor challenges with their cut out exhibition, as their exhibition space was outdoors and required daily installation and removal by service staff and good weather to ensure the safety of the work. Community responses in this location were also viewed as positive with considerable curiosity noticed in community members coming to the fence where the work was installed to examine it more closely. Interestingly, images of the work installed at Koe-Nara were shown at the Experiential Knowledge Conference in London and an audience member expressed her concern that the cut outs in the image looked as though they had been crucified and further amplified the impact of abuse within the project.

4. Cessnock City Library staff reported several community members had indicated they felt the cut outs were ‘spooky’ or ‘scary’.

Thus, responses to this work were highly varied across the community and beyond.

**Intervention 2: Art for the park**

Only one (14.3%) survey respondent had attended Art for the Park. One respondent indicated concern for the artwork located in the park ‘Hope that no one destroys it’ (Neighbourhood respondent 02). This response was reflective of a common concern expressed in conversations with community members during the making of the artwork. Observations within the community during the conduct of this event would suggest having CrocStars present was the major draw card of the day and an additional 15-20 community members arrived just for their performance and to share in the sausage sizzle that was part of the event. Thus food and animals supported engagement with the local community more strongly than the art or
domestic violence related activities, particularly young people. Many children said they enjoyed the day, particularly the reptile display.

**Intervention 3: Respect**

No respondents to the neighbourhood survey indicated they had seen the *Respect* mosaic at The Cottage. This is unsurprising as this artwork was installed just prior to the survey being distributed. Clearly then, none of the respondents had participated in the art making activities at The Cottage where the mosaic was made.

The process of designing and developing the mosaic saw active community participation at Art for the Park, and then at workshops at The Cottage where the work was subsequently finished. A major achievement related to this project was a shift in attitude by the resident’s committee. This committee was active at the outset of the project but later became defunct following high levels of conflict between a key committee member and community members living in close proximity to The Cottage. Initially, the resident’s committee insisted the work be installed within the interior of The Cottage due to their concern for the safety of the work. Their view shifted over time to the point where it was agreed the work should be installed on an exterior wall. One of the challenges of making this work was finding a way to safely install it on the exterior wall of The Cottage. Hence it was installed at the end of the intervention phase when a suitable solution was found.

**Intervention 4: Posters and coasters campaign**

Only two (28.6%) respondents had seen the posters and coasters promoting anti-violence messages in local hotels and clubs and at The Cottage; five (71.4%) respondents had not seen the posters and coasters; one (14.3%) respondent saw the posters and coasters in a local club (Cessnock Supporters); and another (14.3%) saw the posters in a local hotel (Pedens Hotel). No respondents saw the posters at The Cottage.

The distribution process found 97.2% of the licensed premises approached within the LGA (23 hotels and 13 clubs) took up the offer of displaying both sets of posters and 100% displayed and used both sets of coasters. Neighbourhood survey respondents confirmed the posters and coasters had been seen in two of the licensed premises – Peden’s Hotel and Cessnock Supporters Club.
One respondent to the neighbourhood survey viewed the posters and coasters campaign positively through the statement: ‘I thought it was great. People need to know it’s not OK’ (Neighbourhood Respondent 03) and another with a greater degree of reservation: ‘Helps get message across but does not stop people that drink or drugs as brain has gone’ (Neighbourhood Respondent 01).

Several of the community members who participated in the creation of the posters and coasters campaign expressed their delight and pride at seeing the posters in the local club they attended. Two of the participants indicated they had enjoyed the sense that the project had given them a voice and were pleased they had taken the opportunity to ‘have a say’.

Two sources of feedback from the community across the LGA emerged in response to this work. The first was from the staff of the local refuge and women’s centre in a neighbouring town, who had seen the poster focusing on women’s experience of domestic and family violence and the challenges of leaving violence and obtained a copy for their centre. She reported that women attending their centre had felt affirmed by the poster and indicated it had accurately represented their experience of attempting to leave a violent relationship. The refuge requested additional copies of the large and small posters for distribution beyond the LGA and for women attempting to leave a violent relationship to have as a supportive reminder of their attempts to leave.

The second source of feedback was the local Liquor Accord, which was actively involved in promoting the uptake of the posters and coasters in the local licenced venues. Their feedback was of a very practical nature and they advised the coasters had been ‘too good’ to use, by which they meant the printing process which had been used in the production of the coasters was so intense it stopped the absorbent function of the coasters – they didn’t adequately mop up the beer slops! For future print runs of the coasters, they recommended using a lower quality print process using less dense ink saturation.

**Intervention 5: ‘Safe at Home’ hopscotch installation**

The *Hopscotch* installation at The Cottage had been seen by only one (14.3%) of the respondents. Only one community member expressed a response to the *Hopscotch* installation. This respondent indicated this artwork was ‘Very nice’ (Neighbourhood
respondent 02). Observations of the process suggest this was the most direct community-oriented work undertaken. The children living near The Cottage requested a work be created at their end of the estate because they were not allowed to play in the park at the opposite end where the *Snakes and ladders* mosaic was to be installed. The children designed and, to a large extent, made the mosaics, which made up the *Hopscotch* installation. This work also had the highest level of participation of the young people who were participating in Northnet’s training program. Following completion of the mosaic, moderate damage to the artwork was observed. While the source of this damage could not be definitively determined, allegations were made by some of the local children that two children instrumental in the making of the work had caused the damage, which was subsequently repaired.

**Intervention 6: Weston Safe Families day and activity book**

No respondents indicated they had attended the Weston Safe Families day nor seen the accompanying activity book – a number of which had been distributed to children in the East Cessnock neighbourhood during the period of intervention. Feedback from Weston community members who participated in the day’s activities was generally positive with many service providers initiating conversations about domestic and family violence using the activity books to do so. There was one negative incident where one young person had made a cut out, which had been put out with a number of others to dry, and when time came to pack them up it was noticed that her cut out had disappeared. It was presumed stolen by an unknown person. This was a source of significant disappointment for this young person, who declined to make another as a replacement.

**Intervention 7: ‘Safe at Home’ snakes and ladders installation**

The *Snakes and ladders* mosaic in the Park at Alkira Avenue had been seen by three (42.9%) respondents but none of the respondents indicated their children had participated in the ‘Safe at Home’ project: five (71.4%) said no, one (14.3%) said they did not know whether their child(ren) had participated, and one (14.3%) did not answer this question. Community responses to the *Snakes and ladders* mosaic installation were positive and the majority acknowledged the attempt to convey a message via the work for example ‘Hope some people understand the message’
(Neighbourhood respondent 01), ‘Very nice’ (Neighbourhood respondent 02) and ‘Fantastic. Positively subtle. Fun with a message’ (Neighbourhood respondent 04).

The making of this work was a major enterprise. This intervention was strongly supported by the staff and clients of Aftercare’s Personal Helpers and Mentors programme where they became regular and active participants in site preparation, mosaic making, and preparation for the installation of the work. The children participating in this intervention expressed surprise and delight when they were able to identify their drawings within the mosaic, and disappointment on the few occasions it was not possible to incorporate a particular drawing. All children who participated had a drawing incorporated in the work; however some children created many drawings necessitating all children who participated be represented, while ensuring those who contributed a large number of drawings not dominate the final work.

**Effectiveness of the interventions**

The degree of exposure by the community to each of the art interventions by the East Cessnock respondents is reported in Table 25.

**Table 25: Degree of exposure of interventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Artwork</th>
<th>% Exposed to artwork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Domestic and family violence. STOP! I don’t like it</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Art for the Park</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Posters and Coasters</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hopscotch</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Weston Safe Families day and Activity Book</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Snakes and Ladders</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This finding indicates the large more highly visible, widely advertised participative community-based approach was the most effective of the artworks completed within the East Cessnock community, followed by the posters and coasters, which were extensively distributed, and visible throughout the community across the LGA.

Responses to the question *If you saw any of the artworks, did they change your understanding of domestic and family violence?* are displayed in Table 26. This result clearly indicates the artworks were not the precipitator to changes in understanding.
of domestic and family violence. What remains in question is the one (14.3%) respondent who did not know if this was the case as shown in Table 26.

Table 26: Degree of change in understanding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to the question ‘If you saw any of the artworks, did they change your attitudes to domestic and family violence?’ are displayed in Table 27. Like changes in understanding, changes in attitude according to this group of respondents were not brought about by exposure to the artworks. As with the question above regarding understanding, one respondent (14.3%) did not know if the works had changed their attitudes. Further investigation is required if additional meaning is to be made of this response.

Table 27: Degree of change in attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in relation to the question of change in understanding and attitude might be the consequence of the very short-time frame in which the survey was conducted after the completion of the artworks. Alternatively, it might also be an indicator of a beginning change in understandings in this area, and as in other areas of health promotion, art might need to be considered as a long-term or continuous venture and further evaluated on this basis.

This section has reported the findings relating specifically to the artworks and their impact. The next section contrasts the key data between the pre- and post-intervention survey.

**Contrasting pre- and post-intervention surveys**

While no direct comparisons can be drawn between the two data sets due to the uneven pattern of responses, and absence of East Cessnock respondents in the
community-wide survey, they provide an understanding of some of the differences between the two groups. Table 28 indicates the neighbourhood respondents: were more balanced in terms of gender representation; over-represented Indigenous Australians; and were younger. Figure 26 indicates the neighbourhood respondents had experienced more recent and higher levels of violence in their immediate family or relationship than the respondents of the community-wide survey.

Table 28: Comparing respondents to the two surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-Survey (n=1505)</th>
<th>Post-Survey (n=7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last experience of violence (timeframe)</td>
<td>70 years ago - Today</td>
<td>2004 - recently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of attitudes within the two groups is reported in Table 29. The key differences between the East Cessnock neighbourhood respondents and the community-wide respondents drawn from across the Cessnock LGA suggest attitudinal variation rather than attitudinal change. As there were no respondents from East Cessnock in the initial survey, no direct comparisons regarding change were possible. However, some differences are indicated between the two groups. Overall, the East Cessnock group held views which were considerably more understanding of the position of victims of domestic and family violence demonstrating their strong disagreement with the statement *A victim must be getting something out of the abusive relationship* at the much higher rate of 57.1% contrasted
Figure 26: Comparative experiences of domestic and family violence

with 39.3% in the community-wide survey. Similarly, the East Cessnock respondents better understood the challenges faced by women leaving a violent relationship demonstrating their strong disagreement with the statement *Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to* (42.9%). This contrasted with 14.3% in the community-wide sample. These two attitudes were specifically targeted through one of the poster and coaster sets developed for local licensed premises. However, the evaluation of the artworks did not indicate this difference could be attributed to the artworks even though 28.5% of respondents reported they had seen the posters and coasters in either a local hotel or club.

The fact that the neighbourhood group had experienced more domestic and family violence in their immediate family or relationship than the community-wide group might provide a basis for understanding the stronger anti-violence attitudes in this group. There was a greater degree of internal consistency of attitudes within the East Cessnock group with the stronger levels of disagreement to the attitudinal statement *It’s hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships* (26.8%) contrasted with 5.9% in the community-wide survey.

The East Cessnock respondents were also considerably more positive in their views on supporting victims of violence in their own home. There was strong agreement with the attitudinal statement *In domestic situations where one partner is physically violent towards the other it is entirely reasonable for the violent person to be made to
leave the family home (57.1%) contrasted to the 36.3% in the community-wide survey. Further research regarding this question may discover what this difference might be attributed to. This was not an attitude specifically targeted by the ‘Safe at Home’ project. It is more likely to be related to policy changes during the life of the project and the introduction of the Staying Home, Leaving Violence programme introduced in the area from 1 July 2010. This programme promoted opportunities for victims of violence remaining within the family home following incidents of violence and subsequent legal proceedings or the direct experience of domestic and family violence of respondents.

The criminal nature of domestic and family violence was less well understood in the East Cessnock community with strong agreement to the attitudinal statement Domestic violence is a crime evident in only 57.1% of respondents contrasting with 70.6% in the community-wide survey. This was one of the attitudes of most concern to the Network given prior national media campaigns and the continuing lack of understanding in the community that domestic violence is a crime. This attitude was targeted by the ‘Safe at Home’ project via conversational non-product oriented art aspects of the project rather than through the creation of an art product. This would suggest a verbal, conversational approach to art making has not been successful in promoting an improvement in community understanding that domestic violence is a crime.

The East Cessnock respondents were less forgiving of the perpetration of violence demonstrating their strong disagreement (71.4%) with the attitudinal statement Domestic violence can be excused if, afterwards, the violent person genuinely regrets what they have done contrasted with only 52% in the community-wide survey. This attitude was not specifically addressed by the ‘Safe at Home’ project and no other factor could be identified which might attribute for this difference beyond their higher levels of direct experience of domestic and family violence.

The East Cessnock respondents also appeared to have a much stronger awareness of the cultural dynamics of domestic and family violence registering their disagreement with the attitudinal statement Domestic violence is more likely to occur in migrant families at 57.1%, which contrasted with 20.2% in the community-wide
Table 29: Contrasting attitudes between surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic violence tends to become more frequent and severe over time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A victim must be getting something out of the abusive relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When it comes to domestic violence both people are usually responsible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The victim often does something to bring about violence in the relationship</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic violence is a serious issue in our community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic violence is common in our community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic violence can be excused if the victim is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic violence if the offender is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Type</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In domestic situations where one partner is physically violent towards the other it is entirely reasonable for the violent person to be made to leave the family home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domestic violence can be excused if, afterwards, the violent person genuinely regrets what they have done**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Women going through custody battles often make up or exaggerate claims of domestic violence in order to improve their case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**It’s a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship in order to keep the family together**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domestic violence is a crime**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most people who experience domestic violence are reluctant to go to the police**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Most people turn a blind eye to, or ignore domestic violence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**It’s hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Domestic violence is more likely to occur in migrant families**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community-wide Survey</strong></td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Survey</strong></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domestic violence is a private matter to be handled in the family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Police now respond more quickly to domestic violence calls than they did in the past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domestic violence can be excused if it results from people getting so angry that they temporarily lose control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A person would be justified in using physical force against their partner if they:

- Argue with or refuse to obey them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Wastes money

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Doesn’t keep up with the domestic chores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Keeps nagging them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Refuses to have sex with them

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Admits to having sex with another person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Survey</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Community-wide Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t keep the children well behaved</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Goes out too much with their friends</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Puts their own career ahead of family</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to turn the children against them</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refuses to go back to the relationship</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To have contact with their children</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Is unreasonable about property settlement and financial issues</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Starts a new relationship</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A person would be justified in using physical force against their ex-partner in the following situations:*
survey. As an attitude, this was not specifically targeted. This increased awareness is not related to the ‘Safe at Home’ project or the artworks created.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has reported the third and final category of findings from the ‘Safe at Home’ project from the neighbourhood (post-intervention) survey. The distribution and return rates of the neighbourhood survey were examined along with demographic and attitudinal data drawn from survey respondents. The evaluative data on the artworks and the observational data relating to each of the works were then examined before the chapter concluded with comparisons and contrasts between the data sets from the pre- and post-intervention surveys and discussed their implications. Together these data sets indicate art was not a short-term precipitator for attitudinal change regarding domestic and family violence. There is a need for further investigation of the *I don’t know* factor indicated in the results on attitudinal and understanding data and the *hope* factor evident in the respondent narratives. The final chapter of this thesis now turns to further discussion of the findings and identifies the implications for practice for social workers and artists.
Chapter 11

Discussion and Conclusion

Art, Social Work, and Social Change
To finish this study this chapter attempts to draw together the main conclusions by linking key theoretical concerns and emergent findings from the empirical study. It does this by considering two questions: What then does this mean and how does it relate to the existing body of knowledge? These questions are answered with reference to the original research questions posed in Chapter 1. The chapter closes by outlining the study’s implications for education, practice, and research.

**Influence of interdisciplinarity**

An interdisciplinary approach to examining art and social work presented a departure from the usual methods of considering both disciplines. An innovative mode of reflection upon the relationship between art and social work emerged by departing from usual disciplinary approaches. From this fresh interdisciplinary perspective, advantages for both disciplines were identified. Social work’s long-standing relationship with art could be perceived more clearly and, for artists the place of the social could be appreciated with heightened significance.

Art has been identified in this thesis as a constant thread within the social work literature from its early beginnings. It is not a fad. Parallel to the thread of historical continuity is the recognition of the relationship between art and social work present in the art literature. Together the two bodies of literature have facilitated a consequent reclamation of Jane Addams as a key figure in the history of both disciplines, particularly within the context of community practice. In this history, lies a clear beginning for shared territory between disciplines was located.

Taking up England’s (1986) invitation to address the long-standing gap in social work’s theoretical considerations, this thesis commenced the long-awaited deliberation of social work from a (beginning) art theoretical position. Most significantly for social work, this approach has led to the contemplation of social work from a bio-ethological perspective and the subsequent evaluation of the discipline against Dutton’s (2009)
cluster of criteria for identifying art. Importantly, against Dutton’s (2009) criteria, and building on the shared historical disciplinary connection, social work is art. This is an extension of the social work literature and offers a new way of defining social work’s relationship to art. From an art perspective, the testing of Dutton’s criteria has commenced.

**Social work IS art**

This conclusion corresponds to research question 1a. *What is meant by ‘art’ in social work?* The idea that social work is art is not only important to social work but also to art, for it invites artists to reconsider what it is, and how they define what they do. Accordingly, further questions emerged: Are Dutton’s (2009) criteria an accurate reflection of art? As was evident from the evaluation of social work against the criteria undertaken within this thesis that social work is not the equivalent of an art icon, does this mean only those artworks or art practices, which measure up to the iconic, can be considered art? If this is not the case, how should other forms of art (of lower than iconic measure like social work and other ‘fringe’ cases that might be tested against the criteria) be considered? While it was not possible to answer these questions within this thesis, it provided a platform from which they might be asked.

For social workers to take up the notion that social work is art requires further discussion regarding the special focus of social work. To support this proposal it was necessary to distinguish it from the art of social work. The schema outlining the discernible practice-related categories within the social work literature highlighted the relationship between art and social work as located in practice. Drawing on the training, skills, knowledge acquired through practice, and intelligence, arising from experience upon which social work is based suggests the excellence of this practice, is what defines the art of social work. Thus, the art of social work is located within the more encompassing notion that social work is art according the notion of an art instinct and measured against Dutton’s (2009) criteria for art. It remains conceivable the concept of is art may be applicable to all professions or disciplines that involve people and elements of practice, each of which could potentially then be described as an art. For artists to take up the notion that social work is art requires a counter-conversation regarding the
pecial focus of art in the social domain. Further consideration is now given to each of these positions. The current international definition of social work cited within this thesis (see Chapter 2) with its focus on problem-solving, social change, and empowerment essentially supports an anti-oppressive approach to practice. Many of the terms used within the definition, however, can also be located in the shared territory with art for a number are named in Table 2. The primary exception, however, is the theoretical orientation toward human behaviour named in the international definition of social work. Nonetheless, the constancy of human behaviour as social work’s central theoretical concern must be questioned in light of recent research findings regarding the diversity of theory in contemporary Australian social work literature alone (Gray, Heinsch, Schubert, & Webb, 2010; Gray & Schubert, 2011a, 2011b; Schubert, 2011b). Defining social work in terms of art – in tandem with its values and theoretical base – would allow the profession to acknowledge the shared nature of its concern with artists and promote social work practice in a more positive, proactive, dynamic manner. Reorienting the definition of social work in this fashion allows for engaging diversity in new and creative ways beyond anti-oppressive, victim-oriented practice (Gray, Coates, & Yellow Bird, 2008).

The active role artists are taking in the Occupy Wall Street movement in late 2011 serves as a poignant and current reminder of the social role art plays in society. While some artists and art theorists continue to deny work of this kind is art, engaged artists are on the streets, and readily participating in and addressing social issues. As this mode of art strengthens, examples of this approach to art become increasingly visible. Interestingly, by comparison to artists, there are few references to social workers in relation to the Occupy movement within the media. This further confirms what has emerged from the literature in this thesis – artists seem to be more strongly connected to activism and political action than social workers, and in some respects better at promoting the causes with which they are concerned – artists are more highly visible than social workers in promoting social change. This conclusion relates directly to research questions 1e. What does the literature in social work and in art say about the relationship between art and social change? and 1f. Can social workers learn from artists in relation to communication, advocacy, activism, and change? It would seem social workers
could learn a great deal from artists in this activist arena of social change. As the social engagement of artists increases, the questions for artists become: Does the positioning of social work within art become more viable as artists increasingly take up socially engaged practices? Could artists sanction the inclusion of social workers in their ranks and, for social workers, is engagement in more political, highly visible practice possible? This conclusion also invites consideration of how the professionalisation of social work has influenced and relates to activism and political action.

**Sanctioning the social**

The deliberation about sanctioning extends beyond artists. This thesis has established the struggle for recognition experienced by artists in the social domain and social workers in the public realm — possibly the consequence of a joint existence at the margins of society. Further, discussion and investigation regarding the potential means for promoting greater sanction of both disciplines and the work undertaken in the social domain from the wider society is needed. In order to move in this direction, social work would need to sanction the idea *social work is art*, and artists to sanction *working in the social*. Increasingly there would seem to be more elements that unite than divide the two disciplines. The potential in this shift is a strengthening of both disciplines through a joining of disciplinary forces and seeking more empowered ways of describing the creative work in the social domain undertaken by both disciplines.

**Artful practice**

The place of practice in social work and art has been central to this thesis. It is the practice aspects of this study, which speak directly to research question 1b. *How does this relate to the idea of ‘artful practice’ within social work?* The discussion within Chapter 4 refocused on and confirmed the importance of practice and, in so doing, reclaimed and honoured the historical beginnings of art in social work and the place of community. The importance of this for art was also noted via the need to further strengthen social practices within art. Within both disciplines, *artful practice* remains firmly connected to skill and social change with the important link between communication, advocacy, and activism within the change process evident in each.
Creative community practice

The model of creative community practice developed in response to the diversity of terminology and presented in Chapter 5 emerged through an examination of research question 1c. *What is meant by 'community art(s) practice'?* The model of creative community practice proposed in this thesis was inadvertently tested through the implementation of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. The model was designed and proved able to accommodate the diversity of approaches among the assorted group of practitioners involved in the project regardless of disciplinary orientation. The work undertaken within this project could easily be framed in terms of the majority of terms presented under the creative community practice umbrella, that is, art as community development, arts-based community development, arts-based community building, community animation, community arts, community-based arts, community social work practice that uses any creative (arts or cultural) component, creative community building, community cultural development, cultural work, cultural action, cultural activism, democratic imagination, participatory arts, public art, and site art. The only exception within the model was asset-based community organising. This was because the ‘Safe at Home’ project did not take a strong asset-based approach and none of the practitioners involved expressed a preference for working in this manner. Had any of the practitioners chosen to do so, however, there is no reason to believe this approach would not have been easily accommodated within the model. This degree of resonance and fit across all practitioners would seem to confirm the creative community practice model as a relevant and pertinent way of describing the range of collective creative community practices across art and social work, and fields of community social and arts practice able to accommodate the nuanced emphasis of each approach.

The effectiveness of art in practice

The effectiveness of art was examined using clear measures specifically in relation to community attitudes. However, theoretical considerations and observational findings are also discussed in this section, which relates to the opening research question 1. *Is art an effective intervention in community development as a method of change?* and the more specific
research question 2. relating to the empirical study: *Is arts-based community development an effective means of raising community awareness and changing attitudes about domestic and family violence?*

**Art-based community development as a means of change**

The most significant challenge within the empirical study was that of attempting to harness and support naturally occurring networks and promote internal resources and capacities within a community where the available resources and networks upon which to build were limited. Networks within this community were fractured, and frequently based on familial relationships. A major feature of the East Cessnock community identified through the conversational aspects of this project was the intense opposition of community members to associate with many of their neighbours. The motto ‘we keep ourselves to ourselves’ dominated many conversations. While community members were supportive of the project and what it was attempting to achieve, art was not successfully able to draw a majority of adult community members from the East Cessnock neighbourhood beyond their position of safety to engage with their community. Building trust with community members, over time, assisted in drawing them to the project, however the gains were small and progress was slow. The implication for practice here is that short-term funding arrangements see projects end just as relationships of trust are beginning to develop. Without a long-term approach to resourcing and agency commitment to remain present in such neighbourhoods, little further real progress is likely. However, the likelihood of agencies remaining committed in the face of very small numbers of participants is slim. This dilemma serves to compound the challenges of achieving sustainable change. What art was successful in achieving within the ‘Safe at Home’ project was the generation of a sense of hope and possibility within the community as evidenced by the narrative comments in the neighbourhood survey, which were also reflected in the degree of support for the project heard in conversations across the community.
Changing attitudes regarding domestic and family violence

The findings from the ‘Safe at Home’ project clearly indicated art was not an effective short-term intervention in raising awareness of and changing attitudes to domestic and family violence. What remains in question, in light of this finding, is the need for further longer-term research to examine the I don’t know and hope factors which were also identified. The outcomes from the study suggest that further discussion of the use of art as an intervention within an awareness-raising context in terms of health promotion is needed. This position is supported by the discussion of art as early intervention and prevention in Chapter 4 (see Okitikpi & Aymer, 2008). The use of art within the ‘Safe at Home’ project could be considered an early intervention and prevention health promotion strategy. To consider the use of art and its effectiveness in this way would mean taking the longer-term view required for health promotion (Healey & Zimmerman, 2010).

From a theoretical standpoint, the findings from this study cannot yet be considered evidence-based. This conclusion is drawn on the basis of Fraser et al.’s (2009) view that, for an intervention to be evidence-based, evaluation using scientific methods was required for the cumulative findings from evaluations to demonstrate that the intervention was effective in producing a desired outcome. Consistent with Fraser et al’s (2009) view regarding the substantiaion of research, the neighbourhood survey was not adequately representative of community experience in relation to the intervention to be able to stand as appropriately scientific. Thus there is a need for further research across the LGA before adequate cumulative findings could be claimed. Also confirmed by this study is the choice of the use of Rothman and Thomas’ (1994) social intervention research model as more relevant for researching arts-based interventions. The project only completed phases one to four of the model: problem analysis and project planning; information gathering and synthesis; design; and early development and pilot testing. Thus further evaluation, advanced development and dissemination is needed to complete the social intervention research process. This compares favourably to Fraser et al.’s (2009) approach to effectiveness and efficacy where the study did not proceed beyond the beginning of phase two, that is, specifying the problem and developing a programme.
theory on which to begin to create and revise programme materials. However, regardless of the social intervention research approach chosen, the research process remains incomplete and the study findings must be considered provisional. The study does not yet equate to a successful or fully-fledged example of an intervention as an intentional strategy for change comprising a detailed description of a new program – or intervention protocol – and an evaluation of its effectiveness (Fraser et al., 2009). Rather, art as an intervention, as it has been used in the ‘Safe at Home’ project, remains in need of further continuous development and improvement before it can be described as an established programme.

**Challenges of measuring arts-based community development**

Like other examples of arts-based community development, the ‘Safe at Home’ project struggled with Newman et al.’s (2003) proposition that ‘neither simple measurement of inputs and outputs, nor reduction of outcomes to qualitative measurements of personal satisfaction or growth … sufficient to capture the collective, as well as the individual impact, of an artistic experience’ (p. 319). To examine the project in terms of inputs and outputs means this example of arts-based community development was highly resource intensive and dependent on funding and in-kind contributions. While the project created three permanent artworks, countering this was the extraordinarily limited level of benefit to the community in creating real attitudinal or behavioural change. Even though this study attempted to go beyond inputs and outputs to incorporate effectiveness measures, the impact of this project beyond these small benefits remains unaccounted for. Thus this study reconfirms the difficulties in identifying successful reporting and evaluation measures for community development initiatives.

**Art practice as research**

The conclusions regarding *art practice as research* emerging from this study offer a glimpse into the workings of this idea. This is important as it indicates the potential that art is a means of accessing unconscious knowledge. While artists are beginning to explore this idea as research becomes more important for art academics, it is new to social work.
The practice examples observed and described as the workings of *art practice as research* in Chapter 9 may represent the visible transfer of knowledge from the unconscious. As noted in Chapter 9, the group determined the changes to the artwork during the process of making the mosaic. How this collective working is to be understood requires further investigation if these processes are to be fully understood beyond collective meaning-making. The differences between the examples of conscious versus unconscious knowledge further highlight the need to understand ‘art practice as research’ and the processes involved in moving from unconscious to conscious or aware knowledge. This conclusion strongly suggests art is a form of knowledge.

**Art as knowledge**

Knowing, in its many forms, is an art (Knowles & Cole, 2008). Within social work this is not new (see for example England, 1986; Goldstein, 1992: Graybeal, 2007; Seligson, 2004; Sheppard, 1998; Siporin, 1988; Turner, 2000). Concluding that art is a form of knowledge coheres with and extends the idea of art as research knowledge. This emerged during the intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project and led to the proposal that the situated knowledge of Mode 2 knowledge production was more useful for social workers – and artists – engaged in participatory community practice than science-driven Mode 1 (see Gray & Schubert, 2009, 2010).

The positivist traditions of Western philosophy have seen a disconnection of the arts from knowledge (Eisner, 2008) in preference to science. This disconnection is sharply reflected in the art-science binaries discussed at the outset of this thesis. The more Aristotelian approach of differentiating knowledge – seen in the discussion on practice in Chapter 4 and reflected in Table 3 as the discernible categories within practice – allows for a more integrated, holistic, dialogical approach to knowledge. In light of understanding art as knowledge, the categories of practice described in Table 3 might now also be considered as different forms of knowledge – personal, technical, instrumental, interpretive, and transformative. In this way knowing in social work and art becomes ‘a multiple state of affairs, not a singular one [for] [i]n pragmatic terms knowing is always about relationships’ (Eisner, 2008, p. 5). Art as knowledge contributes in several important ways including:
1. The appreciation of the nuances of situations via the reading of images.

2. It generates a mode of empathy, which enables action, that is, not art imitating life but life imitating art.

3. It provides a fresh perspective and prevents stock responses.

4. Through connecting with the personal and subjective via attention to process, art assists in discovering our humanity, thus enlarging human understanding (Eisner, 2008).

This conclusion highlights the need for extending research, which explores the relationship between art practice as research and its intuitive workings for social work and art.

**Implications for practice and education**

The conclusions in this section respond directly to the third and final research question and its sub-questions: 3. What are the implications for practice? 3a. What are the implications for social work and social work education? and 3b. What are the implications for art and art education? This section examines a range of issues highlighting the implications for practice and education of future artists and social workers.

**Community engagement**

The ‘Safe at Home’ project was most successful in engaging with children who were the largest group of participants across the majority of interventions within the project. In addition, the project also engaged well with Aboriginal community members within the East Cessnock neighbourhood (children and adults, with the latter evident in the neighbourhood survey results). This was supported by the incorporation of images important to Aboriginal members of the community. One example of this was the inclusion of the Aboriginal flag in the Snakes and ladders mosaic. This finding is important on two fronts. First, early intervention is believed to be best begun with children (Heckman, 2000; Heckman & Masterov, 2004). Secondly, the Indigenous people of Australia are subjects of some of the highest rates of domestic violence in the country. Based on figures derived from the Gordon Inquiry in 2001, an Aboriginal woman residing in rural and remote areas was 45 times more likely to experience domestic and
family violence than her white peer (as cited in Korff, n.d.). Finding effective ways to engage with and address this issue in partnership with the Indigenous community remains critical. The findings from this study imply art may provide an accessible and acceptable means to assist in addressing this issue long-term.

Practitioner similarities and differences in engagement

This section addresses the observations of practitioners made during the ‘Safe at Home’ project in response to, and beyond research question 1d. What are the differences and similarities between artists and social workers in the process of community engagement? Surprisingly human service (welfare) practitioners were the main practitioner group participating in the project, rather than artists or social workers. Therefore, some of the comments also relate to this group. Overall the major similarities and differences are summarised as follow:

**Similarities**

1. The personal style, preferences, level of training, experience, and degree of confidence of each practitioner may have influenced their level of engagement with community members and project tasks regardless of disciplinary orientation.

2. As confidence developed in students and less experienced workers, their level of engagement and participation increased.

3. Social workers and artists engaged with children in play beyond the topic of domestic and family violence.

4. All practitioners, with the exception of non-welfare participants, used food frequently to engage community members.

5. Social work students sought advice and direction more often than art or welfare students and were also observed to prepare themselves more thoroughly.

6. For all practitioners, this project served as a variation from their usual work.
Differences

1. Artists were generally more comfortable and flexible in their initial engagement with children than social workers.

2. Experienced artists strongly encouraged community members to have a go at art making and this invitation was extended to social and human service workers to develop their art making skills which they then shared with community members.

3. Several experienced social workers had a stronger understanding of the dynamics operating within the community than other participants, demonstrated by their articulation of detailed knowledge of relationships between community members, and different sectors of the community. This knowledge appeared to influence the ways in which they engaged with particular community members.

4. Overall experienced social workers and human service (welfare) practitioners asked community members more directly about domestic and family violence and used the activities of the project to raise and hold conversations about this issue.

5. The dual role played by some social workers and human service (welfare) practitioners influenced how they engaged with the community and, generally, these practitioners were reserved in their ‘Safe at Home’ project participation.

6. Human service (welfare) practitioners provided the highest levels of cofacilitation of the group work aspects of the project, with particular attention paid to the engagement of women.

7. Human service (welfare and non-welfare) practitioners, who worked exclusively with their client group as part of the project, had limited engagement with community members from East Cessnock. Their approach was influenced by agency orientation and role.
8. While community attitudes toward domestic and family violence were not changed as a result of this study, one social worker reported attitudinal change regarding the nature of the East Cessnock community, such is the power of community development to create change in unintended and unexpected ways.

9. Artists and social worker-artists involved family and friends in the intervention process indicating a wider, flexible, informal view of community and community development, which compares markedly with those social workers and human service (welfare) practitioners who brought clients with whom they had some prior relationships to the project and employed a more formal, structured approach to community framed by their role as a professional.

10. Artists and social workers were generally less concerned about the potential for physical damage to the work than human service (welfare and non-welfare) practitioners.

11. Surprisingly, it was the human service (welfare) practitioners who actively supported and encouraged art making and this group also undertook the greatest share in setting up, packing up, and cleaning activities associated with the project apart from me.

12. I took the primary leadership role within the ‘Safe at Home’ project though leadership was shared with several experienced human service (welfare) practitioners and social workers in various roles across the life of the project. This was important in the face of several key staff changes in core positions involved with the project to ensure a degree of continuity.

On the surface, the disciplines involved in this study appear to be largely interchangeable. The observational findings reveal subtle nuanced differences across the groups. However, these were largely complementary.

**Place**

The findings from the ‘Safe at Home’ project noted in Chapter 9 regarding place suggested the need for greater attention to this aspect of practice. This is relevant for
social workers and artists. However, social workers have much to learn from the existing work of artists and art theorists. The art literature in this area (see, for example, Lippard, 1997b) has a great deal to offer. In social work, by comparison, there is little consideration given to place beyond the work emerging from this thesis (see Gray & Schubert, 2006) and the work of Zapf (2005a, 2005b). In these instances, place has been tied to spirituality. Zapf draws on an Indigenous worldview, whereas the emergent ideas from this thesis stem from a combination of art and philosophy located firmly in Western traditions. The Western traditions, beyond the connection with spirituality, indicate there is also an important relationship between place and identity as well as history. That spirituality has emerged in Indigenous and Western traditions in response to place confirms it as an important factor to be considered in practice. Further, the link to identity and history suggests place may deserve far greater weight than it is currently given in practice. This would suggest it is important to incorporate considerations of place within undergraduate social work, community development, and community art programmes and include Western and Indigenous considerations of place, exploring links between spirituality, identity and history. Further training for practising social workers and artists in this arena is also indicated to enable incorporation of these new considerations into practice.

**Ethics**

Closely related to the considerations of spirituality are issues of morality. Morality, ethics, and values are long-standing areas of concern within social work. As noted in Chapter 3, ethics are less evident within art, where they have only recently begun to emerge as a concern. The limited concern of artists compared to social workers with regard to ethics was reflected within the ‘Safe at Home’ project. Ethics may be an area where artists can draw upon social work knowledge, for Kaprow’s (1993) notion of ‘art as a moral act’ has significant implications for art embedded within it. Social work’s moral concern extends to its value and ethical basis for practice thus, if Kaprow (1993) is correct and the basis of art is moral, it becomes increasingly critical for artists to be aware of and engage in ethical conduct, particularly within the community and social context of art making. This conclusion would suggest the need to incorporate a more
formal ethics component in the undergraduate education of artists, particularly for those students with an interest in pursuing socially engaged practices, as well as for artists engaging in research that concerns people.

**Mechanics of arts-based community development**

In relation to the *who, what, when, where, and how* of arts-based community development as a medium for attitudinal change, this project has identified a range of important considerations with implications for education and practice of those working within arts-based community development.

**Who**

The ‘Safe at Home’ project established neither social workers nor artists as the primary players in the community development aspects of the project. The dominant practitioner group participating in this process was the human service (welfare) professionals who came from a range of disciplines. This was an unexpected finding in a project conceptualised as an art- and social work-oriented one. Shared leadership, discussed above, between social workers, and human service (welfare) practitioners and me also constituted another important *who* element of the project.

It was important to recognise the *who* of this study consisted of three significant communities: the Cessnock Anti Violence Network community, the East Cessnock community located on the Housing NSW estate, and the community of Cessnock LGA (for further discussion, see Schubert, 2011a). Working across these different communities within the one project was complex and challenging. Balancing competing needs and priorities between and across these communities was a constant consideration in the leadership of the project. The Network community and the East Cessnock community dominated the *who* of the project.

**What**

The ‘Safe at Home’ project struggled with the *what* of community development. Working to the clear Network agenda of addressing domestic and family violence meant imposing one community’s view over that of two other communities. The East
Cessnock community would not have chosen to make an artwork addressing domestic and family violence of its own volition. Thus, in my view, what the ‘Safe at Home’ project undertook was not community development with its areas of action derived from the community, but the implementation of a health promotion strategy, which used an art-based community approach to achieve its ends.

**When**

The intervention phase of the ‘Safe at Home’ project, which involved the arts-based community development approach, was a short-term study conducted over a three-year period between 2008 and 2011. There are two important *when* aspects arising from the conclusions of the project. First, the identification of the need to consider art-based community development aimed at changing attitudes to domestic and family violence as an early intervention and prevention health promotion strategy means it must be considered as a long-term rather than a short-term venture. This has important policy and funding implications as it means art-based community development enterprises are inconsistent with short-term funding cycles and long-term evaluation of the outcomes of this and projects like it will remain incomplete.

Secondly, on a more mundane note, not all communities operate according to business hours. The lack of flexibility in the working hours of practitioners (social work, welfare, and non-welfare) were not conducive to supporting community development activities at times when community members were more available such as after school, evenings, and weekends. Artists and artist-social workers were positioned more flexibly and better able to accommodate working at these times within their schedules. This implies the organisations, which purport to support and promote community development, operate in ways that are not adequately flexible, and to a degree incompatible with meeting the needs of the communities in and with which they work.

**Where**

The two most important inferences to be drawn from the study regarding *where* relate to the project’s visibility and organisation. First, the more visible, novel, and widely
advertised the activity, the higher the level of participation. All three factors in combination were needed for higher levels of community involvement.

Secondly, those regular group work activities, organised by agencies that involved their clients on their premises (for example, Cessnock Family Support Service and Family Insight) tended to be the better and more consistently attended compared to the weekly informal, spontaneous workshops conducted at The Cottage. While The Cottage was available and physically situated on the East Cessnock Housing NSW estate, it failed to support good community interaction within that neighbourhood.

How

The ‘Safe at Home’ project offers a number of important suggestions regarding the how of effective arts-based community development, which have applicability for other approaches to community development. In the face of an increasing focus on risk and safety, considerations within the community are driven by neoliberal organisational policies and practices, such as a practitioner buddy system where two practitioners work together. This proved essential in enabling the safe conduct of the ‘Safe at Home’ project. It is important to acknowledge that the safety and risk issues present during the conduct of the project were taken seriously. Hence I served as the second practitioner or buddy in the majority of instances to practitioners from the Network throughout the project. This strategy enabled the Housing NSW Community Development Worker, in particular, to work with an experienced practitioner in new, creative, and safe ways. This has significant practice implications for all practitioners working within community contexts and the organisations they work for. Working in pairs decreased the level of risk workers faced while in the community compared to that of working in isolation as a solo worker. There were no safety breaches during the ‘Safe at Home’ project. However, joint decisions to leave a situation or area were made on a number of occasions by the practitioner buddies, which ensured the safe conduct of the project. It enabled practitioners to conduct home visits which otherwise would not have been possible. This is an expensive strategy, as it would mean two workers are required at all times for good, safe community development. It also means increased costs for community development projects if risk and safety are to be attended to.
As noted in the *who* section above, using shared leadership proved to be an important and productive strategy in achieving the community development outcomes. Working in partnership, where there was clear communication, and substantial follow up of ideas, supported the transfer of potential community development ideas and strategies arising from the community in response to the ‘Safe at Home’ project for action beyond its art-based agenda.

The ‘Safe at Home’ project would not have occurred without funding to support it. While the funding was obtained via small, piecemeal arrangements, and the team of practitioners involved were able to *make do*, single block funding to meet the real costs of the project would have been preferable. Grant writing skills are required for artists and social workers if this is to be successfully achieved.

Ensuring the project’s visibility was also a key *how* factor with the success or failure of a strategy determined by the presence or absence of active media campaigning. The implication for this is the need for the development of skills for artists and social workers in a range of promotional strategies, including the use of the media. It also indicates the need for the incorporation of a media and promotion budget in community development project planning.

Community development programmes, like the ‘Safe at Home’ project, require cooperation between organisations. Ownership and territory disputes between agencies have the potential to serve as significant barriers to developing communities. In this instance, the long-standing difference of opinion between Cessnock City Council and Housing NSW regarding responsibility for funding improvements for the park in Alkira Avenue remains in place, fuelled by a long history of damage to past park equipment, and negative attitudes held regarding the East Cessnock housing estate community. Careful negotiation between agencies was required in order to move beyond this position. Using the Network as a point of common ground to take responsibility for maintaining the park installation, incorporated Housing NSW and Cessnock City Council as Network members. This was a direct example of the role of history in relation to place and the importance of attending to it within practice.

While not the focus of this study, there were glimpses of the impact of restrictive agency practices within the ‘Safe at Home’ project which included:
practitioners having to have the agency car garaged before 5pm; a management decision not to fill a community development position; the requirement of having two workers in place at any time The Cottage was open; not having flexible work arrangements that encourage and support staff to work outside normal business hours; and a risk management protocol which prevented the exhibition of the cut-outs because they were seen as potential weapons within the health context. These kinds of practices do little to support or enhance flexible community practice. In effect, they served to prevent some practitioners from responding to community needs in an appropriately flexible manner. This is a significant issue for organisations which claim to promote and support community development initiatives but engage in counterproductive practices. There is an important implication from this that needs to be addressed through the education of community practitioners of all disciplines, that is, development of realistic understandings and strategies for dealing with the limitations of their agency context upon their future practice. This is also an important consideration in Indigenous social work and a major reason why professional models of practice do not fit Indigenous worldviews and ways of being (Gray et al., 2008).

For policy makers, there are also important implications. While neoliberal management strategies dominate service-delivery agencies, policy consideration needs to be given to counter their negative influence for good community development outcomes to be achieved. If human service agencies are to reach targeted marginalised or socially isolated communities, such as that in East Cessnock, more flexible practices need to be introduced. This especially pertains to Indigenous communities.

The conclusions in this section lend a degree of evidence to support the recently posited position of De Bruyne and Gielen (2011) who suggested that community art surfaced in countries with prominent neoliberal governments as compensation for the breakdown of robust social infrastructure, characteristic of the welfare state. Thus, community art and artistic processes, offered on a project basis, become a less expensive form of social work in the absence of adequate structural investment for the provision of social services.
Implications for research

As anticipated at the outset, this thesis raises more questions than it answers. However, it also opens space for further empirical research in relation to social work and art. The critical areas for further research emerging from this thesis are:

‘Safe at Home’

While the findings indicate the art making process has not had a significant impact upon attitudes or effected change in relation to domestic and family violence, it has confirmed that community members felt positive about this overt attempt to address the issue in some way within the community. The variation evident in the findings regarding effectiveness suggests the need for further long-term research regarding the impact of the art-based interventions, so the impact of the work can be examined over time. Thus a further community-wide survey would be beneficial. Similarly, for the interventions to be considered in health promotion terms, an ongoing project that extends the ‘Safe at Home’ initiatives would be required. Ideally, the Network and practitioners within the community, as well as local government, should work to sustain the small gains made.

Social intervention research

Only the first four phases of the Rothman and Thomas (1994) social intervention research process were completed in this study: problem analysis and project planning; information gathering and synthesis; design; and early development and pilot testing. Completion of the social intervention research cycle indicates a variety of further research is required, particularly in the areas of programme development and the sequencing of relevant programme content. First, gathering views of the Network members and project participants regarding their experience of and views regarding the ‘Safe at Home’ project and the various art interventions would provide a more sound research base regarding the internal workings of the art-based interventions. Further research gathering community-wide views would extend the findings of the study. Both of these aspects of research are required before a formal programme could be formulated and the implementation of further cohort trials with qualitative and
quantitative measures implemented (Fraser et al., 2009). Similarly, more complex data analysis of the community-wide survey might enable further understanding of a link between particular attitudes and other variables, which could further inform intervention choices.

**The art instinct**

Several potential areas for future research flow from the measurement of social work against Dutton’s (2009) criteria. First, further investigation of the notion of social workers having an *art instinct* would take up and extend a new area of knowledge for social work in a similar way as for art. Considering the nature of the art instinct in both disciplines could provide an empirical basis for comparisons between social workers and artists. Such research might consider the degree of art instinct and the relationship of practitioners in each discipline to it. It may also be beneficial to extend such comparisons to a third group – art therapists – to whom only cursory attention has been paid in this thesis but who also share territory across disciplines. This would allow consideration of the therapeutic aspects of practice.

In pursuing this arena of research, it would seem logical to incorporate the Myers-Brigg type inventories on personality traits and the work of Daniel Goleman (1995) on emotional intelligence (described in Chapter 4) to serve as beginning empirical markers, which might or might not indicate a shared art instinct between the two disciplines. Using such an approach would allow for a range of subjective and objective measures within further research in this area. It would also create scope for questions like: Is there some other form of instinct, personality type or intelligence which more empirically-oriented social workers hold or that less socially-oriented artists hold that can account for differences in each of the disciplines? Such research may provide a more soundly grounded empirical basis for the shared territory between the two disciplines presented. For social work it may also invite new ways of thinking about the discipline in terms of the potential it offers for greater sense-making regarding some of the more ethereal elements of the profession, like worker style or the transience of different approaches and models within social work, which to date have been difficult to account for empirically. Thus, further exploration of Dutton’s (2009) criteria relating to
the changing nature of artistic fashions and theories as techniques and art forms develop, may provide a more solid basis for understanding the faddish nature of social work and the profession’s preoccupation with grasping the hottest emerging approaches, regardless of origin, quality, or evidence-base (see for example the discussion on the influences of family work in Wood, 2001). Related to this, but relevant to both disciplines, is the need for further empirical examination of the links between professional culture and the style of the individual artist or social worker.

In conclusion, this study has demonstrated a common mission in social work and art towards social change in a project which sought to investigate the practices of social workers and artists, and in the process, engage community development practitioners and community members in producing artworks to raise awareness of domestic and family violence. It found organisational structures ill-equipped for the task of flexible community engagement and short-term funding cycles unsuited to the long-term interventions required to raise awareness of and to develop effective programmes to counter problems of domestic violence within a marginalised community in Australia. It found that community development was resource and labour intensive and raises serious questions about the viability of this method as an accepted professional intervention within neoliberal, cash-strapped human service agencies. It found social intervention research to be a protracted process equally unsuited to short-term funding cycles and inflexible agency practices in an area which requires long-term sustained community intervention. Nevertheless, the artworks will remain in the community and ever serve as reminders not only to those who were involved in the ‘Safe at Home’ project but also to those whose curiosity is piqued by the presence of a Respect mosaic at the entrance of the Cottage, a Hopscotch mosaic in its driveway, and a six-metre diameter Snakes and Ladders mosaic in the park at Alkira Avenue. In this sense, at least, sustainability through the artworks is ensured, whether or not the Network and other community practitioners sustain the small gains made long term.
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Re: APPROVAL TO CONDUCT HUMAN RESEARCH

Dear Researcher,

Thank you for your recent application to the University of Newcastle Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) for approval to conduct research.

A Certificate of Approval isenclosed.

Please note any comments or conditions related to the approval.

Ensure the HREC Approval No. (or where relevant, the Hunter New England Area Health Human Research Ethics Committee [HNEHREC] Reference No.) is inserted into the complaints paragraph in the approved study information documents before distribution to potential participants.

Where the research is the project of a higher degree candidate, it is the responsibility of the project supervisor to ensure that the candidate receives this approval.

Conditions of approval

The approval has been granted subject to you complying with the requirements for Monitoring of Progress, Reporting of Adverse Events, and Variations to the Approved Protocol as detailed below.

PLEASE NOTE:
In the case where the HREC has "noted" HNEHREC approval (i.e., the Hunter New England Health Human Research Ethics Committee), the progress report schedule on your HREC Certificate of Approval will be shown as "HNEHREC monitoring" in which case you will provide annual reports and reports of adverse events to HNEHREC only. In the case of variations to the approved protocol, you will apply to the HNEHREC for approval in the first instance and then Register that approval with the University's HREC.

Monitoring of Progress

Other than above, the University is obliged to monitor the progress of research projects involving human participants to ensure that they are conducted according to the protocol as approved by the HREC. The Certificate of Approval identifies the period for which approval is granted and your progress report schedule.

Reporting of adverse events

1. It is the responsibility of the chief investigator, or project supervisor, to report adverse events.

2. Adverse events, however minor, must be recorded by the investigator as observed by the investigator or as volunteered by a participant in the research. Full details are to be documented, whether or not the investigator, or his/her deputies, consider the event to be related to the research substance or procedure.

3. Serious or unforeseen adverse events that occur during the research or within six (6) months of completion of the research, must be reported by the Chief investigator to the (HREC) by way of the Human Research Ethics Officer within 72 hours of the occurrence of the event.

continued over...
4. Serious adverse events are defined as:
   - Causing death, life threatening or serious disability.
   - Causing or prolonging hospitalisation.
   - Overdoses, cancers, congenital abnormalities, tissue damage, whether or not they are judged to be caused by the investigational agent or procedure.
   - Causing psycho-social and/or financial harm. This covers everything from perceived invasion of privacy, breach of confidentiality, or the diminution of social reputation, to the creation of psychological fears and trauma.
   - Any other event which might affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

5. Reports of adverse events must include:
   - Participant's study identification number;
   - date of birth;
   - date of entry into the study;
   - treatment arm (if applicable);
   - date of event;
   - details of event;
   - the investigator's opinion as to whether the event is related to the study substance or procedure; and
   - action taken in response to the event.

6. Adverse events which do not fall within the definition of serious, are to be recorded in detail in the annual progress report form which will be sent to you.

Variations to approved protocol

If you wish to introduce variations to, or deviate from, the approved protocol, you will need to submit an Application for Variation to Approved Research Involving Humans. This form is available at:

Variations may include, but are not limited to, changes to investigators, study design, study population, number of participants, methods of recruitment, or participant information/consent documentation.

Variations must be approved by the (HREC) before they are implemented except when registering HNEHREC approval of a variation in which case you may proceed as soon as you receive an acknowledgement of your Registration.

Linkage of ethics approval to a new Grant

HREC approvals cannot be assigned to a new grant or award (ie those that were not identified on the application for ethics approval) without confirmation of the approval from the Human Research Ethics Officer on behalf of the HREC.

For details of the procedure to link an existing approval from the HREC to a new research grant, scholarship, fellowship etc, after ethics approval has been granted please refer to http://www.newcastle.edu.au/research/human/poi.html

With best wishes for a successful project.

Ms Ruth Gibbins
Human Research Ethics Officer (Acting)

Research Services
Research Office
T +61 2 492 16333
F +61 2 492 17154
Ruth.Gibbins@newcastle.edu.au
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Participant Information Statement:
Community Survey on Domestic Violence

'Safe at Home': Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

Short Title: Safe at Home
Researchers: Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert and Anne Graham

Document Version 2; dated 20/10/07

You are invited to be part of the research project described above that is being carried out by Mel Gray, Professor of Social Work, Leanne Schubert, Student (School of Humanities and Social Sciences) and Anne Graham, Professor of Fine Art (School of Fine Art, Drama and Music) at the University of Newcastle. The research is part of Leanne's studies at the University and is supervised by Mel Gray and Anne Graham.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the research is to identify the range of attitudes to and experiences of domestic violence within the Cessnock Local Government Area. The whole of community survey is designed to help us understand the views of the community to domestic violence and is part of a larger project which seeks to strengthen community awareness of domestic violence through using art, such as murals, mosaics, sculpture, bookmaking and photography. It includes community members, in partnership with the Cessnock Anti-Violence Network, to build ways of improving the safety of women, men and children in their homes. The research hopes to help to tackle the high rate of Apprehended Violence Orders (AVOs) in the local area through awareness building. It is based on the ideas that 1. the community has the will and the resources to help itself, 2. it knows what is best for itself, 3. ownership of the strategy should rest within the community, 4. partnerships involving organizations and the community are the most effective awareness building strategy, and 5. the use of strengths in this area will translate to strengths in other areas of community life. Art is a common way that domestic violence is addressed, however, there has never been any significant research conducted that tells us that this idea leads to real change. The research aims to discover if art works in this way. The community survey will give us a starting point for this work.

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking members of the communities within the Cessnock Local Government Area aged 18-95 to participate in this part of the research. People have been invited to participate in the community survey by a mail out to all households within the Cessnock Local Government Area. All adult members of the community are eligible to participate in the research.
What would you be asked to do?

If you agree to participate, simply complete the enclosed questionnaire which explores your understandings and beliefs about domestic violence and return it in the reply paid envelope.

You may complete as much or as little of the questionnaire as you choose. You are not obliged to complete any part that you do not want to.

How much time will it take?

The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

What are the risks and benefits of participating?

Surveys are a common way that the views of communities on various issues are sought in Australian society. On this basis it is unlikely that there will be significant risk of any kind to participants.

The possible benefits of participating in the research will be your contribution to a greater understanding of domestic violence within the community which will help us to develop stronger connections and supports within your community for those in the community experiencing domestic violence; however we cannot promise this benefit for all members of the community who participate.

How will your privacy be protected?

The questionnaire is anonymous and will not be possible to identify you from your answers.

How will the information collected be used?

The data obtained from the study will be presented in a master thesis to be submitted for Leanne Schubert’s PhD research degree. It may also inform an art exhibition which forms part of Leanne Schubert’s degree and therefore enhance the value of her research. Feedback will also be given to the Central Vic Violence Network in relation to Domestic Violence and community attitudes.

Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the questionnaire.

A summary of the results that will be written in plain English will be made available through the local libraries for community members participating in the survey.

What do you need to do to participate?

Please read the Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you complete the survey. If there is anything you do not understand, or if you have questions, contact the researcher. If you would like to participate please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the reply paid envelope provided. If you are interested in participating in other aspects of the study please phone Leanne Schubert on 49212085 to register your interest.

Further information

If you would like further information, please contact Leanne Schubert on 49212085 or Mel Gray on 49218802.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

-----------------------------------------

Mel Gray
Professor of Social Work
Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H-512-1997.

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the research officer, or if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Officer, The Chancellor, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49214353, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au.
Participant Information Statement
Arts Based Project

'Safe at Home': Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

Short Title: Safe at Home
Researchers: Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert and Anne Graham

Document Version 4a, dated 26/05/08

You are invited to be part of the research project described above that is being carried out by Mel Gray, Professor of Social Work, Leanne Schubert, Student (School of Humanities and Social Sciences) and Anne Graham, Professor of Fine Art (School of Fine Art, Drama and Music) at the University of Newcastle. The research is part of Leanne’s studies at the University and is supervised by Mel Gray and Anne Graham. In some cases this invitation may be made to you by one of the workers from a community service that is part of the Cessnock Anti-Violence Network.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the research is to strengthen community awareness of domestic violence through using art, like murals, mosaics, sculpture, bookmaking, and photography. It includes community members, in partnership with the Cessnock Anti-Violence Network, to build ways of improving the safety of women, men and children in their homes. The research hopes to help to tackle the high rate of Apprehended Violence Orders (AVOs) in the local area through awareness building. It is based on the ideas that 1. the community has the will and the resources to help itself, 2. it knows what is best for itself, 3. ownership of the strategy should rest within the community, 4. partnerships involving organizations and the community are the most effective awareness building strategy, and 5. the use of strengths in this area will translate to strengths in other areas of community life. Art is a common way that domestic violence is addressed, however, there has never been any significant research conducted that tells us that this idea leads to real change. The research aims to discover if art works in this way.

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking members of the communities within the Cessnock Local Government Area aged 5-95 to participate in this research. Participants have been invited to join the study via local newspaper advertisements. People have also been invited to participate by member organizations of the Cessnock Anti-Violence network. All members of the community are eligible to participate in the research.

What choice do you have?

Participation in this research is entirely your choice. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you decide to participate, your decision will not disadvantage you in any way. If you do decide to participate in the art based component of the program, you may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and have the option of withdrawing any data which identifies you.
What would you be asked to do?

If you agree to participate, you will be asked to:

Participate with other community members to develop ideas and make decisions about the nature of the artworks that the community will create to raise awareness about domestic violence.

Participate in making artworks, either as a group or individually, that explore ideas about domestic violence and promote the idea of safety at home.

Participation in the arts based component of the research is limited in number to 100 community members and places will be allocated on a ‘first come’ basis.

The whole study consists of two questionnaires, a range of art based activities, and a number of focus groups. These will occur across the Cessnock Local Government Area. The initial community consultations about the nature of the art works for Alkira Avenue Park will occur in the park on:

Saturday 21 March, 2009 11.00am to 2.00pm.

What we learn and the project for the park will be reviewed with the community on:

Saturday 30 May, 2009 11.00am to 2.00pm

Community members interested in participating in the project are encouraged to attend these events to share ideas about the project. Your ideas will help to determine the kind of art that is made, how much time this might take to make and how we might best do this together. Further times and dates for the creation of the artwork will be negotiated with all participants according to their preferences about the nature of the artwork and their level of participation.

We will need your basic personal details in order for you to participate – so that we can let you know about the times and places that the arts based projects are occurring. We will also be seeking your views regarding domestic violence for which we will seek your consent.

Leanne Schubert, Anke Graham and Mel Gray from the research team as well as members of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network (if you were invited to participate by one of the member organizations) may have contact with you regarding the arts based component of the project.

You may participate in as much or as little of the arts based component of the study as you choose. If you choose to participate in the study you are not obligated to complete any part that you do not want to.

How much time will it take?

Participation in the arts based component of the project will be determined by the community members who join the project. You can participate at a level that is suitable for you. Some community members will want to invest large amounts of time and others only a little. There will be lots of flexibility which allows as many people as possible to participate.

What are the risks and benefits of participating?

The arts based component of this project is a common way that domestic violence is addressed in Australian society. On this basis it is unlikely that there will be significant risk of any kind to participants. If you are in a situation of domestic violence there is the possibility that you may become aware of this and as a result bring life changes. Similarly, for participants who have been in a domestic violence situation in the past may find that their involvement triggers memories of those experiences. In each instance, the research partners of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network are available to provide support if this were to occur the member organizations of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network are committed to assisting those in domestically violent situations and will assist participants who find themselves in this situation throughout the duration of the research study if this is needed.
The possible benefits of participating in the research will be a greater understanding of domestic violence and the development of stronger connections and supports within your community, however we cannot promise this benefit for all members of the community who participate.

**How will your privacy be protected?**

Any information collected by the researchers in relation to the arts based component of the project which might identify you will be stored securely at the University of Newcastle and only accessed by the researchers, unless you consent otherwise. Your identifying data will be retained for the purposes of making contact with you about the study. All identifiers will be destroyed at the end of the period for which the research data is legally required to be held after the completion of the project (minimum 5 years). Any information which might identify you will not to be disclosed without your prior consent.

**How will the information collected be used?**

The data obtained from the study will be presented in a in a thesis to be submitted for Leanne Schubert's PhD research degree. It may also inform an art exhibition which forms part of Leanne Schubert’s degree and it is also likely that the information will be presented in a range of Arts, Humanities and Social Science journals. Feedback will also be given to the Crocksneck Anti Violence Network in relation to Domestic Violence and community attitudes.

Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the project. Participants may be identified if they choose to exhibit their own work as part of an exhibition if they wish, in which case specific consent will be sought.

All participants will be offered a summary of the results that will be written in plain English.

**What do you need to do to participate?**

Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher. If you would like to participate, return your consent form to The Cottage 59 Allure Avenue, East Cessnock or to Leanne Schubert, W230 Behavioural Sciences Building, University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghur, 2308

**Parent or Guardian's consent**

If you are consenting on behalf of a child or young person younger than 18 years of age, and they can understand what is being asked of them, please discuss the project with them before making a decision. Where a parent or guardian consents to their child or young person participating, the final decision will rest with the child or young person.

**Further information**

If you would like further information, please contact Leanne Schubert on 49212085 or Mel Gray on 49216302.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

________________
Mel Gray
Professor of Social Work

________________
Leanne Schubert
Student
Anne Graham
Professor of Fine Art

Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H-613-1007.

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chanceller, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au.
Participant Information Statement
For Parents about Children’s Involvement

"Safe at Home": Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

Short Title: Safe at Home
Researchers: Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert and Anne Graham

Document Version 1a; dated 06/06/08

Your children are invited to be part of the research project described above that is being carried out by Mel Gray, Professor of Social Work, Leanne Schubert, Student (School of Humanities and Social Sciences) and Anne Graham, Professor of Fine Art (School of Fine Art, Drama and Music) at the University of Newcastle. The research is part of Leanne’s studies at the University and is supervised by Mel Gray and Anne Graham. In some cases this invitation may be made to you or your child by one of the workers from a community service that is part of the Cessnock Anti-Violence Network. We are asking you and your child if it is okay for your child to take part in this project.

Why is the research being done?

The purpose of the research is to strengthen community awareness of domestic violence through using art, like murals, mosaics, sculpture, bookmaking, and photography. It includes community members, in partnership with the Cessnock Anti-Violence Network, to build ways of improving the safety of women, men and children in their homes. The research hopes to help to tackle the high rate of Apprehended Violence Orders (AVOs) in the local area through awareness building. It is based on the ideas that 1. the community has the will and the resources to help itself, 2. it knows what is best for itself, 3. ownership of the strategy should rest within the community, 4. partnerships involving organizations and the community are the most effective awareness building strategy, and 5. the use of strengths in this area will translate to strengths in other areas of community life. Art is a common way that domestic violence is addressed, however, there has never been any significant research conducted that tells us that this idea leads to real change. The research aims to discover if art works in this way.

Who can participate in the research?

We are seeking members of the communities within the Cessnock Local Government Area aged 5-95 to participate in this research. Participants have been invited to join the study via local newspaper advertisements. People have also been invited to participate by member organizations of the Cessnock Anti-Violence network. All members of the community are eligible to participate in the research. In this information sheet we are specifically looking at information needed for parents to talk with their children’s involvement in the project. We are inviting parents/guardians to discuss the project with their children. We understand that many children will be able to understand the relevant information and make choices about participating. Parents and guardians are generally know their children well and understand their children’s levels of maturity and capacity to consent to involvement in relation to the issue of domestic violence and being safe at home. We believe it is important that that there is agreement about participation by both children and their parents/guardians.
To this end we have designed a number of consent forms relating to children. One for parents/guardians/careers, one for younger children and one for older children. There is also a Participant Information Sheet for Children which is specifically designed for older children and young people. It is an easy to understand version of this statement.

**What choice do you have?**

Participation in this research is entirely the choice of your children and you. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. Whether or not you and your children decide to participate, the decision will not disadvantage you in any way. If your children decide and you provide your consent to participate in the arts based component of the program, your children may withdraw from the project at any time without giving a reason and have the option of withdrawing any data which identifies you or your children.

**What would you be asked to do?**

If your children with your consent agrees to participate, they will be asked to:

- Participate in groups with other community members to develop ideas and make decisions about the nature of the artworks that the community will create to raise awareness about domestic violence.

- Participate in making artworks, either as a group or individually, that explores ideas about domestic violence and promotes the idea of safety at home.

- Participation in the arts based component of the research is limited in number to 100 community members and places will be allocated on a 'first come' basis.

- The initial activities and planning for the artwork will in the Aikins Avenue Park on 21 March, 2009 and 30 May 2009 in conjunction with the Cessnock Anti-Violence Network as part of the design and development phase of the study.

We will need your basic personal details in order for your children to participate - so that we can let you and your children know about the times and places that the arts based projects are occurring.

Leanne Schubert from the research team will have contact with you and your children to conduct the questionnaires and discuss involvement in the art making. The members of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network (if you were invited to participate by one of the member organisations) may also have contact with you regarding the arts based component of the project. The other members of the research team – Mel Gray and Annie Graham - may also make contact with you in relation to the arts based component of the study.

Your children may participate in as much or as little of the arts based component of the study as you choose. If your children with your consent choose to participate in the study they are not obligated to complete any part that they or you do not want to.

**How much time will it take?**

Participation in the arts based component of the project will be determined by the community members who join the project. Your children can participate at a level that is suitable for them. Some community members will want to invest large amounts of time and others only a little. There will be lots of flexibility which allows as many people as possible to participate.

**What are the risks and benefits of participating?**

The arts based component of this project is a common way that domestic violence is addressed in Australian society. On this basis it is unlikely that there will be significant risk of any kind to participants. If you or your children are in a situation of domestic violence there is the possibility that you may become aware of this and as a result bring life changes. Similarly, for participants who have been in a domestic violence situation in the past may find that their involvement triggers memories of those experiences. In each instance, the research partners of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network are available to provide support if this were to occur the member organizations of the Cessnock Anti Violence Network are
committed to assisting those in domestically violent situations and will assist participants who find themselves in this situation throughout the duration of the research study if this is needed. This is also available to children who participate.

The possible benefits of participating in the research will be a greater understanding of domestic violence and the development of stronger connections and supports within your community; however, we cannot promise this benefit for all members of the community who participate.

How will your privacy be protected?

Any information collected by the researchers in relation to the arts based component of the project which might identify you or your children will be stored securely at the University of Newcastle and only accessed by the researchers, unless you and your children consent otherwise. All identifying data will be retained for the purposes of making contact with you and your children about the study. All identifiers will be destroyed at the end of the period for which the research data is legally required to be held after the completion of the project (minimum 5 years). Any information which might identify you or your children will not to be disclosed without prior consent from all relevant parties.

How will the information collected be used?

The data obtained from the study will be presented in a thesis to be submitted for Leanne Schubert’s PhD research degree. It may also inform an art exhibition which forms part of Leanne Schubert’s degree; and it is also likely that the information will be presented in a range of Arts, Humanities and Social Science journals. Feedback will also be given to the Cessnock Anti Violence Network in relation to Domestic Violence and community attitudes.

Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the project. Participants may be identified if they choose to exhibit their own work as part of an exhibition if they wish, in which case specific consent will be sought.

All participants will be offered a summary of the results that will be written in plain English.

What do you need to do to participate?

Please read this Information Statement and discuss it with your children and be sure you and they understand its contents before you and they consent to participate. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher. If you would like to participate, complete a Consent Form for Adults with Children and invite your child to complete the form most relevant to them – Consent Form for a Younger Child (for a younger child – primary school age) or Consent Form for a Child or Young Person (for an older child or young person – secondary school age).

Staple the forms for your family together and return them to The College 58 Akira Avenue, East Cessnock or to Leanne Schubert, W2/30 Behavioural Sciences Building, University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan, 2308.

Parent or Guardian’s consent

If you are consenting on behalf of a child or young person younger than 18 years of age, and they can understand what is being asked of them, please discuss the project with them before making a decision. Where a parent or guardian consents to their child or young person participating, the final decision will rest with the child or young person.

Further information

If you would like further information, please contact Leanne Schubert on 49212085 or Mel Gray on 49216302.

Thank you for considering this invitation.

Mel Gray
Professor of Social Work
Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H - 61/301007.

Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia, telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au.
Participation Information for a Child or Young Person

(Document Version 2.0, dated 06/05/2008)

This is an information sheet to help you decide about taking part in the research project called

"Safe at Home": Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

This sheet is to help you decide whether you want to take part in a research study about domestic violence and being safe at home.

Who is doing the study?

The research is being carried out by Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert, and Anne Graham, from the University of Newcastle. Mel and Leanne are social workers and Anne is an artist. Leanne is also a student at the University and the research is part of her studies. The Cessnock Anti Violence Network is also helping with the research. They help to raise awareness about domestic violence in the community in the Cessnock area.

What is the project about?

We are trying to find out about domestic violence in the community. We want to see if we can use art to help people be more aware of what domestic violence is and share some ideas about how people can be safe at home. Finding out these things will help us know more about what works well in helping the community know more about violence in families and their ideas about staying safe.
What will I have to do if I take part?

- This will depend on your ideas about what kind of art you would like to make and what you decide with the researchers. It's the same with how long the research might take — you might like to meet with us for up to 10 weeks for a few hours a week or you might just want to join us for a whole day. You get to choose how much you want to do. The next part of the research will be held in the Park at Alice Avenue on Saturday 21 March and 30 May where you can learn more about the research and talk with the researchers about the kind of art you might like to make.
- The research will happen with other young people your age, including a group of friends if they also decide to take part.
- You will be asked about your ideas and to make decisions about the kind of art that we might make individually or with other members of the community to help raise awareness about domestic violence.
- You will be asked to make some artworks, either individually or as a group, that explores ideas about domestic violence and put forward the idea of safety at home.

Do I have to take part in the research?

No, you don't. If you don't want to take part, that is okay. It's up to you.

Even if you choose to take part at the beginning, you can change your mind and choose not to take part later on. All you need to do is tell the researcher that you don't want to take part in the research any more. You can also decide not to answer any questions you don't want to. That is okay as well.

Will anyone know that I am taking part or hear about what I tell you?

No, no-one will know what information you gave the researchers. You can tell them whatever you want and no one will know it came from you.

The only times the researchers would have to tell someone is if you tell them that someone has physically or sexually abused or neglected you or that there is a risk that you will be hurt in the future. The researchers would also have to tell someone if you said you might hurt yourself or someone else. If any of those things happened they would tell the Department of Community Services.

You may want your art work to be part of an exhibition that will be held at the end of the project. It will be up to you to decide if you want people to know that it is your work or not. The researchers will ask you about this closer to the time of the exhibition.

Will I be given something for taking part?

No, you will not be given anything for taking part in the research. To say thanks for your time you will be able to keep any individual art works that you make as part of the research.
Is there anything that might make me upset if I take part in the research?

Some people find it hard to talk about some things that happen within their families. Domestic violence can be one of these things and it can sometimes be upsetting for some people to talk about this. If anything you talk about during the research does make you feel upset you can stop the research. Your parents/carers will be told and you will be given the names of people you can talk to about what is making you upset, if that is what you want to do. The researcher can help you do that.

What will happen to the information I will tell you?

The information you tell us will only be used by The University of Newcastle and the Cessnock Anti Violence Network to help us make everyone in the community more aware about what domestic violence is and ways of being safe at home. No-one else will be allowed to use the information. The information could be used with information from other young people in reports or papers about the research. You will not be able to be identified in the reports or papers.

The information you tell us will be stored safely in locked cabinets at The University for at least 5 years and anything that has your details on it will then be destroyed.

What do I do to be involved?

Sign a consent form and return them with one from your parents as well to The Cottage 58 Akika Avenue, East Cessnock or to Leanne Schubert, W230 Behavioural Sciences Building, University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan, 2308.

If you have any questions about the research project or you want to talk about it, please contact us. You can reach us on:

* Ph. 4921 2085. Ask for Leanne Schubert. If she isn’t there leave a message with your first name and your phone number and she will phone you back as soon as she can.

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee. Approval No. H-613-1007.

* If you have any complaints or worries about the research you can contact The Human Research Ethics Officer on ph. 4921 6333
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Participant Information Statement:
Neighbourhood Survey on Domestic Violence

'Safe at Home': Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

Short Title: Safe at Home

Researchers: Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert and Anne Graham

You are invited to be part of the research project described above being carried out by Mel Gray, Professor of Social Work, Leanne Schubert, Student (School of Humanities and Social Sciences) and Anne Graham, Professor of Fine Art (School of Fine Art, Drama and Music) at the University of Newcastle. The research is part of Leanne’s PhD studies at the University supervised by Mel Gray and Anne Graham.

Why is the research being done?
The purpose of the research is to identify the range of attitudes to and experiences of domestic violence within the Cessnock Local Government Area. The neighbourhood survey is designed to help us understand the views of the community to domestic violence and is part of a larger project which seeks to strengthen community awareness of domestic violence through using art, like murals, mosaics, sculpture, bookmaking, and photography. It also community members, in partnership with the Cessnock Anti Violence Network, to build ways of improving the safety of women, men and children in their homes. The research hopes to help to tackle the high rate of Apprehended Violence Orders (AVOs) in the local area through awareness building. It is based on the following ideas: (i) the community has the will and the resources to help itself, (ii) it knows what is best for itself, (iii) ownership of the strategy should rest within the community, (iv) partnerships involving organizations and the community are the most effective awareness-building strategy, and (v) the use of strengths in this area will translate to strengths in other areas of community life. Art is a common way of addressing domestic violence, however, there has never been any significant research conducted to tell us that the use of art leads to real change. The research aims to discover whether art indeed works in this way. The neighbourhood survey will give us a comparison with the community-wide survey conducted at the start of the research.

Who can participate in the research?
We are seeking members of the community within the East Cessnock neighbourhood of the Cessnock Local Government Area aged 18-95 to participate in this part of the research. People have been invited to participate in the neighbourhood survey by a mail out to all households within the East Cessnock neighbourhood. All adult members of the community are eligible to participate in the research.

What choice do you have?
Participation in this research is entirely your choice. If you choose to participate simply complete and return the survey. Please retain this Participation Information Statement for your records. Only those people who give their informed consent will be included in the project. By returning your survey in the reply-paid envelope to the University or putting it in the Safe at Home survey box at The Cottage, 58 Alkira Avenue, East Cessnock you are consenting to be involved only in the survey component of the study.

What would you be asked to do?
If you agree to participate, simply complete the enclosed questionnaire which explores your understandings and beliefs about domestic violence and return it in the reply paid envelope or put it in the Safe at Home survey box at The Cottage, 58 Alkira Avenue, East Cessnock.

You may complete as much or as little of the questionnaire as you choose. You are not obligated to complete any part that you do not want to.

How much time will it take?
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The survey will take approximately 30 minutes to complete.

What are the risks and benefits of participating?

Surveys are a common way that the views of communities on various issues are sought in Australian society. On this basis it is unlikely that there will be significant risk of any kind to participants.

The possible benefits of participating in the research will be your contribution to a greater understanding of domestic violence within the community which will help us to develop stronger connections and supports within your community for those in the community experiencing domestic violence; however we cannot promise this benefit for all members of the community who participate.

If you decide to participate you may also enter the Safe at Home Survey Prize Draw for two Big W gift cards with first prize valued at $150 and a consolation prize valued at $50. To enter simply complete the enclosed entry card, place it in the small envelope, seal the envelope so that your identity cannot be linked to your survey and place your entry in the reply paid envelope with your survey and return it to either The University by mail or put it in the Safe at Home Survey Box at The Cottage, 58 Alkira Avenue, East Cessnock. When your survey and entry form arrive at The University they will be separated to ensure your survey remains anonymous. This gratutious lottery will be conducted in accordance with Section 4G of the Lotteries and Art Union Act 1967. The prizes will be drawn by a University sta2 member who is independent of the researchers during the week following 27 May 2011, the closing date set for the survey. The prize winners will be notified by telephone within two days of the draw and arrangements made for the prize to be given to the winners within seven days of the result being decided.

How will your privacy be protected?

The questionnaire is anonymous and it will not be possible to identify you from your answers.

How will the information collected be used?

The data obtained from the study will be presented in a in a thesis to be submitted for Leanne Schubert’s PhD research degree. It may also inform an art exhibition which forms part of Leanne Schubert’s degree and it is also likely that the information will be presented in a range of Arts, Humanities and Social Science journals. Feedback will also be given to the Cessnock Anti Violence Network in relation to Domestic Violence and community attitudes.

Individual participants will not be identified in any reports arising from the questionnaire.

A summary of the results that will be written in plain English will be made available through the local libraries for community members participating in the survey.

What do you need to do to participate?

Please read this Information Statement and be sure you understand its contents before you complete the survey. If there is anything you do not understand, or you have questions, contact the researcher. If you would like to participate please complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the reply paid envelope provided. If you are interested in participating in other aspects of the study please phone Leanne Schubert on 49212085 to register your interest.

Further information

If you would like further information, please contact Leanne Schubert on 49212085 or Mel Gray on 49216302. Thank you for considering this invitation.

Mel Gray, Professor of Social Work        Anne Graham, Professor of Fine Art        Leanne Schubert, Student

Complaints about this research

This project has been approved by the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H-631-1007. Should you have concerns about your rights as a participant in this research, or you have a complaint about the manner in which the research is conducted, it may be given to the researcher, or, if an independent person is preferred, to the Human Research Ethics Officer, Research Office, The Chancellery, The University of Newcastle, University Drive, Callaghan NSW 2308, Australia; telephone (02) 49216333, email Human-Ethics@newcastle.edu.au.
Individual Consent /Referral Form

Individual Consent /Referral Form for the Research Project:

´Safe at Home´: Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area
Researchers: Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert and Anne Graham

Document Version 2. Dated 21/02/08

This form is to be completed by partner agency staff and their clients who agree to be referred to the ´Safe at Home´ Research Project.

PARTNER AGENCY DETAILS:

Worker’s Name: ____________________________
Partner Agency Name: _______________________
Partner Agency Contact Details: Phone: ____________
                                      Fax: ____________
                                      Email: ____________

PARTICIPANT DETAILS:

Name: ____________________________
Address: ____________________________
Telephone Number: ___________________ Mobile: ____________
Email: ____________________________
Age: ____________________________
Gender: Male □ Female □ (please tick)
Do you have children? Yes □ No □
If Yes how many children do you have? ___________________
What are their ages? ___________________________________
Would you like your children to be involved in the project? Yes □ No □

Please provide brief details in relation to any experience you may have had or are having of Domestic Violence:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
CONTACT WITH THE PARTNER AGENCY

Is the partner agency’s current contact with you related to Domestic Violence?

Yes □ No □

If so what is the nature of your contact / stage of therapeutic process?

Will the partner agency continue to be involved with you and offer ongoing support throughout the process of the project?

Yes □ No □

Are there any risks to you that are likely to arise as a result of participating in the project and if so please provide details of your or your worker’s concerns

Yes □ No □

CONSENT

I agree to give the above named worker permission to release personal details about me to the ‘Safe at Home’ project provided above for the purpose of referral to the project.

I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.

I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand I can withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

I consent to:
- completing a before and after questionnaire (if I have not already done so in the community wide survey) Yes □ No □
- participating in the creation of community art works Yes □ No □
- participating in a focus group and having it recorded Yes □ No □
- contributing my artwork to the building of community awareness activities that may include
  - exhibitions Yes □ No □
  - advertising Yes □ No □
  - the production of posters and coasters promoting anti violence messages Yes □ No □

I understand that if I agree to be identified with any artwork, photographs or quotes created as part of the project further formal consent will be required and that this will be sought from me after I have had an opportunity to review and approve any contribution I may wish to make.

I understand that my personal information will remain confidential to the researchers except as required by law.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Signature of Participant: ___________________________ Date: ___________________________
Consent Form

For the Research Project: ‘Safe at Home’: Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area
Researchers: Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert, Anne Graham
Document Version 2: dated 14/06/07

I agree to participate in the above research project and give my consent freely.

I understand that the project will be conducted as described in the Information Statement, a copy of which I have retained.

I understand I can withdraw from the project at any time and do not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

I consent to:
- completing a before and after questionnaire: Yes [ ] No [ ]
- participating in the creation of community art works: Yes [ ] No [ ]
- participating in a focus group and having it recorded: Yes [ ] No [ ]
- contributing my artwork to the building of community awareness activities that may include:
  - exhibitions: Yes [ ] No [ ]
  - advertising: Yes [ ] No [ ]
  - the production of posters and coasters promoting anti violence messages: Yes [ ] No [ ]

If you agree to be identified with any artwork, photographs or quotes created as part of the project further formal consent will be required. This will be sought from you after you have had an opportunity to review and approve any contribution you may wish to make.

I understand that my personal information will remain confidential to the researchers except as required by law.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Print Name: ______________________________

Contact Details: __________________________

Address: __________________________________________

Phone No. ________________________________

Email _______________________________________

Signature: ____________________________ Date: ____________

NEwCASTLe | CENTrAL COAST | POrT MAlGAuRie | SINGaporE
The University of Newcastle  info@newcastle.edu.au  T +61 2 4921 5000
Callaghan NSW 2308 Australia  OIC03-Prospect-honor-500500  www.newcastle.edu.au
Consent Form for Adults with Children

Consent Form to Participate in the Research Study
Document Version 1a, dated 06/05/2008

'Safe at Home': Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

I __________________________ (please print your name) give consent for __________________________ (please print your child/children’s name) to take part in the 'Safe at Home' research project and give my consent freely.

I have read the information about the project and understand what is involved and kept a copy of the Information Statement. I understand that The University of Newcastle in conjunction with the Cessnock Anti Violence Network is doing the research.

I understand that a researcher will talk to my child/ren about his/her/their participation in the research. I understand that my child/ren also has/have to agree to take part. I have provided my phone number or other contact details so a researcher can contact my child/ren and I.

I understand that my child’s personal information will remain confidential to the researchers except as required by law.

I understand my child can withdraw from the project at any time and does not have to give any reason for withdrawing.

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.
I consent to my child

- participating in the creation of community art works   Yes [ ] No [ ]
- contributing artwork to the building of community awareness activities that may include:
  - exhibitions   Yes [ ] No [ ]
  - advertising   Yes [ ] No [ ]
  - the production of posters and coasters promoting anti-violence messages   Yes [ ] No [ ]
  - the production of tea towels or t-shirts promoting anti-violence messages   Yes [ ] No [ ]

Name: ____________________________________________

Signature: ________________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________

Phone number: __________________________________

Other contact details: ____________________________________________
Consent Form for a Young Person

Consent Form to Participate in the Research Study

'Safe at Home': Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

I ____________________________ (please print your name) agree to take part in a study about domestic violence. My parent/carer has agreed for me to take part in the research. I understand that the research is trying to find about domestic violence in the community and if art can help people be more aware of what domestic violence is and share ideas about how people can be safe at home.

I can choose not to participate in the research at any time, including at the end of the research. If I change my mind I will let the researcher know. I understand that I don't have to answer the questions that are asked if I don't want to. I won't get into trouble if I choose not to answer a question or if I stop taking part in the research.

I understand that the research will take place in the form a simple form about my views about domestic violence at the beginning and end of the research and making art that helps people think about being safe at home.

If anything I talk about during the research makes me feel upset I will let the researcher know and the research will be stopped. My parents/carers will be told and I will be given the names of people I can talk to about what is making me upset, if that is what I want to do.

I understand that my answers are confidential. Nothing that can identify me, like my name or address, will be used in research. That means that no-one will know where the information came from and no-one will be able to connect it to me. I understand I can choose for my work to be in an exhibition but my name doesn't have to be on it unless I choose it to be.

The only times the researchers would have to tell someone is if I told them that someone has physically or sexually abused me or neglected me or that there is a risk I will be harmed in the future. The researchers would also have to tell someone if I said I might harm someone else or myself. If any of those things happened they would have to contact the Department of Community Services.
I understand the information I provide will be kept at the University and locked up for 5 years after which any information which identifies me will be destroyed.

I understand I will be able to keep any of the individual art works I make at the end of the project.

I will be given a copy of this consent form. If I have any questions about the research I can contact Leanne Schubert on ph: 4921 2085.

I know that the project has been approved by the University's Human Research Ethics Committee, Approval No. H-613-1007. If I have any worries or complaints about the research I can contact Genevieve Farrell on ph: 4921 6333.

Name of participant: __________________________________________________________

Signature of participant: ______________________________________________________

(Indicate if verbal consent [___])

Name of researcher: __________________________________________________________

Signature of researcher: ______________________________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________________________________
Consent Form for a Younger Child

Consent Form to Participate in the Research Study

'Safe at Home': Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

I __________________________________________________________________________ (please print your name)
agree to take part in a study about domestic violence. My parents/carers have agreed for me to take part in the project as well.

I know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is okay for me to stop being part of the project whenever I want to.</th>
<th>TICK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A researcher will talk to me by telephone about the research. We will fill out form with some easy questions at the beginning and end of the project. We will make some art works about staying safe at home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If anything we talk about makes me feel upset, the project will be stopped. The researchers will tell my parents/carers. We will be given the names of people I can talk to about what is making me upset. If that is what I want to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I say during the project is special and belongs to me. The researchers won't tell anyone else that I took part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The only time the researchers would have to tell someone else is if they were worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-that I might be badly hurt by someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-that I am not being cared for properly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-that I might hurt myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-that I might hurt someone else.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That I can keep any art works that I make all by my self at the end of the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will be given a copy of this form. If I have any questions about the research I can contact

Leanne Schubert on ph: 49 21 2085

If I have any worries or complaints about the research I can the contact the Human Research Ethics Committee, at the University – [H613-1007] and talk to Genevieve Farrell on ph: 4921 6333.

Name of participant: __________________________________________

Signature of participant: _______________________________________

(Indicate if verbal consent [ ])

Name of researcher: __________________________________________

Signature of researcher: _______________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________________
Individual Consent Form for the Use of Artwork, Photographs or Quotes

Individual Consent Form for the Research Project:

"Safe at Home": Using Art to Build Community Awareness of Domestic Violence in the Cessnock Local Government Area

Researchers: Mel Gray, Leanne Schubert and Anne Graham

Document Version 1. Dated 21/02/08

This form is to be completed by participants who agree to the use of their material in a public context and as a consequence will become identified as a result of the research.

PARTICIPANT DETAILS:

Name:

Address:

Telephone Number: Mobile:

Email

I have indicated an interest in being identified in relation to the ‘Safe at Home’ Research Project through the use of my (please tick the relevant box)

Artwork
Photographs that identify me
Quotes from the things that I have said in a focus group
Other (please specify)

I have had an opportunity to review my artwork, photographs or quotes prior to giving this consent

Yes ☐ No ☐

CONSENT

I agree to participate in the use of my artwork, photographs and or quotes (delete those that are not relevant to you) as part of the above research project and give my consent freely.

I consent to contributing my artwork, photographs or quotes to the building of community awareness activities that include

- exhibitions ☐ ☐
- advertising ☐ ☐
- the production of posters and coasters promoting anti violence messages ☐ ☐
- The production of tea-towels or T-shirts promoting anti violence messages ☐ ☐

I have had the opportunity to have questions answered to my satisfaction.

Signature of Participant: Date:

---
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Appendix B: Community-wide survey
Safe at Home – Community Survey

Please tick one circle unless otherwise specified.

1. Are you ☐ Male ☐ Female

2. Are you ☐ Aboriginal ☐ Torres Strait Islander ☐ Both ☐ Other

3. Which group best describes your age (please tick):
☐ 10-19 ☐ 20-29 ☐ 30-49 ☐ 50-59 ☐ 60-69 ☐ 70-79 ☐ 80+

4. What is your current marital status?
☐ Never Married ☐ Married or de facto relationship ☐ Single ☐ Separated ☐ Divorced ☐ Widowed

5. Which of the following categories best describes your household?
☐ A couple with a child or children at home ☐ A single parent with a child or children at home
☐ A couple whose children have left home ☐ A single parent whose children have left home
☐ A couple with no children ☐ Person living alone
☐ Blended family ☐ Some other sort of household (please specify)

If you have children please go to Questions 6 and 7. If you DO NOT have children please go to Question 8.

6. Number of children living at home:

7. Are your children:
☐ Biological (natural) ☐ Step ☐ Foster ☐ Adopted
☐ Born ☐ Born elsewhere

8. How long have you lived in the Cossack Local Government Area?
☐ 0-2 years ☐ 3-5 years ☐ 6-10 years ☐ 11-14 years ☐ More than 15 years

9. Where do you live within the Cossack LGAs?
☐ Aberdare ☐ Broomeville ☐ Kandakakino ☐ North
☐ Aberman ☐ Cunnamulla ☐ Kurrik Kurri ☐ North Thurlow
☐ Abergowrie ☐ Dalwood ☐ Lagoons ☐ Northham
☐ Ballard ☐ Delong ☐ Leedale ☐ Pastoria
☐ Biloela Bridge ☐ Eton ☐ Millfield ☐ Wellburn
☐ Biloela Bridge ☐ Iluka ☐ Middlecreek ☐ Roebuck
☐ Branscombe ☐ Etherley ☐ Mt. Pleasant ☐ Seaward
☐ Broomeville ☐ Kandakakino ☐ North

10. In your own words, what do you understand by the term ‘domestic violence’?

11. What percentage of people in the Cossack LGAs do you think are affected by domestic violence at present?
☐ 0-5% ☐ 6-10% ☐ 10-15% ☐ 16-20% ☐ 21-25% ☐ 26-30% ☐ 31-35% ☐ 36-40% ☐ 41-45% ☐ 46-50% ☐ 51%+

12. Do you know anyone who has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence? ☐ Yes ☐ No
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13. Please list the behaviours you consider to be 'domestic violence'?

- Pushing
- Slapping
- Kicking
- Choking
- Using a weapon to inflict injury
- Intimidating
- Burning or scalding
- Driving dangerously
- Destroying property
- Smashing objects near the person to frighten or threaten
- Physically assaulting children
- Locking out of the house
- Denying access to medications
- Forcing to use drugs or alcohol
- Abusing sexually
- Exploiting sexually
- Requiring financial support
- Expelling someone
- Limiting access to family
- Limiting access to friends
- Limiting access to community agencies
- Limiting access to places of worship
- Controlling or withholding access to money
- Controlling or withholding access to ownership of goods or property
- Controlling all aspects of food
- Harassing by phone calls
- Harassing by letter
- Harassment by repeated emails, text messages and the like
- Following or stalking
- Continuously photographing
- Watching or waiting for the person at home, work or place of leisure

14. Have you ever experienced domestic violence? (Please tick 'yes' only for each question)

- In your immediate family or relationship
- In your relationship
- In your family of origin parents and siblings
- If you said yes to any of the above, when was the last time you experienced this?

15. Have you witnessed violence towards your pets by a family member?

- Yes
- No

16. Have you witnessed children (including adult children) being violent towards their parents?

- Yes
- No

17. Have you experienced your children being violent towards you?

- Yes
- No

18. Have you ever been pressured for money by another family member due to:

- A family need
- A drug or alcohol problem
- A mental health problem
- A gambling problem
- Other circumstances

19. Who, in general, does domestic violence affect the most? (Please number from 1-10 with 1 being the most affected)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Other Relatives</th>
<th>Courts</th>
<th>Local Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Local families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Who would you turn to for assistance if you were experiencing domestic violence? (Please tick ALL that fit you)

- Court
- Doctor
- Police
- Local services
- Telephone helpline
- Internet
- Don't know
- Other (please specify)
## Attitudes & Views About Domestic Violence

### (Please tell us which best fits your view of each statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Domestic violence tends to become more frequent and severe over time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. A victim must be getting something out of the abusive relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. When it comes to domestic violence both people are equally responsible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The victim has often done something to bring about violence in the relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Domestic violence is a serious issue in our community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Domestic violence is common in our community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Domestic violence can be excused if the victim is blameless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Domestic violence can be excused if the perpetrator is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. In domestic situations where one partner is physically violent towards the other it is entirely reasonable for the violent person to be made to leave the family home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Domestic violence can be excused if, afterwards, the violent person genuinely regrets what they have done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Women going through custody battles often make up or exaggerate claims of domestic violence in order to improve their case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. If it is a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship in order to keep the family together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Domestic violence is a crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Most people who experience domestic violence are reluctant to go to the police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Most people turn a blind eye to, or ignore domestic violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. It is hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Domestic violence is more likely to occur in migrant families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Domestic violence is a private matter to be handled in the family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighborhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Police now respond more quickly to domestic violence calls than they did in the past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Domestic violence can be excused if it results from people getting too angry that they temporarily lose control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. A person would be justified in using physical force against their partner if they:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Argue with or refuse to follow them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Matters money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t keep up with the domestic chores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keeps nagging them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refuses to have sex with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Admits to having sex with another person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t keep the children well behaved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sees not too much with their friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Puts their own career ahead of family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. A person would be justified in using physical force against their partner in the following situations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Refuses to give back to the relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To have contact with their children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trying to harm the children against them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In an unreasonable amount of property settlement and financial issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Starts a new relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Attitudes & Views About Responsibility and Impact of Domestic Violence

### (Please tell us which best fits your view of each statement)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Life-style</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Relationships</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Morale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45. Who carries out acts of domestic violence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Who is more likely to go through physical harm as a result of domestic violence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Who is more likely to go through emotional harm as a result of domestic violence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Who is more likely to go through the most fear as a result of domestic violence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
49. Which of the following would you say are acceptable within the family? (Please tick ALL those that fit for you)

- Being physically assaulted
- Being verbally or emotionally abusive
- Being financially neglected
- Being psychologically or socially isolated
- Being intellectually or educationally neglected
- Being sexually or sexually abused
- Being physically assaulted

50. If you witnessed an incident of domestic violence would you intervene?

51. How would you intervene?

52. Have you ever witnessed an incident of domestic violence?

53. Did you intervene in that incident of domestic violence?

54. How did you intervene?

55. Please tell us why you did not intervene?

56. Is it important to you that domestic violence is addressed within our community?

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.
Appendix C: Neighbourhood survey
‘Safe at Home’ – Neighbourhood Survey

Please tick one circle unless otherwise specified.

1. Are you: 
   - Male
   - Female

2. Are you: 
   - Aboriginal
   - Torres Strait Islander
   - Both
   - Neither

3. Which group best describes your age (please tick)?
   - 18-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60-69
   - 70-79
   - 80 +

4. What is your current marital status?
   - Single
   - Married or de facto relationship
   - Separated
   - Widowed
   - Divorced
   - Other:

5. Which of the following categories best describes your household?
   - A couple with a child or children at home
   - A single parent with a child or children at home
   - A single parent with shared care of children
   - Non-related adults sharing a house, flat or apartment
   - Person living alone
   - Other:

If you have children please go to Question 6. If you DO NOT have children please go to Question 8.

6. Number of children living at home:

7. Are your children: 
   - Biological (natural)
   - Step
   - Foster
   - Adopted
   - Other:

8. In your own words, what do you understand by the term ‘domestic violence’?

9. Do you know anyone who has experienced or is experiencing domestic violence?:
   - Yes
   - No

10. Have you ever experienced domestic violence? (Please tick one circle only for each question):
    - In your immediate family or relationship
    - After a relationship has ended
    - In your family of origin (parents and siblings)
    - If you said yes to any of the above, when was the last time you experienced this?

11. Have you witnessed violence towards your pets by a family member?

12. Have you witnessed children (including adult children) being violent towards their parents?

13. Have you experienced your children being violent towards you?

14. Have you ever been pressured for money by another family member due to:
    - A family need
    - Drug and alcohol problem
    - Mental health problem
    - Gambling problem
    - Other circumstances

Document Version 1: Dated 26.02.11

407
Attitudes & Views About Domestic Violence
(1. Please tick one circle that best fits your view of each statement.

15. Domestic violence tends to become more frequent and severe over time.  
16. A victim must be getting something out of the abusive relationship.  
17. When it comes to domestic violence both people are equally responsible.  
18. The victim has often done something to bring about violence in the relationship.  
19. Domestic violence is a common issue in our community.  
20. Domestic violence is common in our community.  
21. Domestic violence can be excused if the victim is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol.  
22. Domestic violence can be excused if the aggressor is heavily affected by drugs or alcohol.  
23. Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to.  
24. In domestic situations where one partner is physically violent towards the other it is entirely reasonable for the violent person to be made to leave the family home.  
25. Domestic violence can be excused if, afterwards, the violent person genuinely regrets what they have done.  
26. Men are going through so much stress these days they can’t be expected to be pointers in domestic violence.  
27. It is a woman’s duty to stay in a violent relationship in order to keep the family together.  
28. Domestic violence is a crime.  
29. Most people who experience domestic violence are reluctant to go to the police.  
30. Most people have a blind eye to, or ignore domestic violence.  
31. It’s hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships.  
32. Domestic violence is more likely to occur in migrant families.  
33. Domestic violence is a private matter to be handled in the family.  
34. Domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighborhoods.  
35. Police now respond more quickly to domestic violence calls than they did in the past.  
36. Domestic violence can be excused if it results from people getting so angry that they temporarily lose control.  
37. A person would be justified in using physical force against their partner if they:  
   Argue with or refuse to obey their partner.  
   Frighten, annoy, or insult their partner.  
   Rejects or stops helping with domestic chores.  
   Refuses to care for the children.  
   Tries to keep children away from them.  
   Tries to keep the children well behaved.  
   Goes too much with their friends.  
   Does their own thing without their knowledge.  
   Leaves their career ahead of family.  
38. A person could be justified in using physical force against their partner in the following situations:  
   Refuses to go back to the relationship.  
   Is here with their children.  
   Is here with the children.  
   Trying to harm the children against them.  
   Is unreasonable about property settlement and financial issues.  
   Starts a new relationship.  

Attitudes & Views About Responsibility and Impact of Domestic Violence
(1. Please tick one circle that best fits your view of each statement.

39. Who carries out acts of domestic violence?  
40. Who is more likely to go through physical harm as a result of domestic violence?  
41. Who is more likely to go through emotional harm as a result of domestic violence?  
42. Who is more likely to go through economic harm as a result of domestic violence?
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43. Have you heard about the Safe at Home project?
Yes ☐ No ☑

44. Have you seen the Safe at Home logo?
Yes ☑ No ☐ (Go to Q 46)

45. If yes, please tell us where you have seen the logo:

46. Did you participate in the Safe at Home project?
Yes ☑ No ☐

47. Did you attend Art for the Park in the park at Akura Avenue, East Cessnock?
Yes ☑ No (Go to Q 49)

48. If yes, what was your response to Art for the Park?

49. Have you seen the cut-out figures of children that were part of the Down side and Family Violence? Did you like it?
Yes ☑ No ☐

50. If yes, where did you see them? (Please tick all relevant locations)
☐ Cessnock
☐ Akura Avenue
☐ Cessnock Family Support Services
☐ Nino Nino School Community Centre
☐ Cessnock City Library
☐ Prince Park, Myton
☐ In the park on Akura Avenue

51. What was your response to the cut-out?

52. Have you seen posters and stickers promoting anti-violence messages in a local hotel, club or at The Cottage?
Yes ☑ No (Go to Q 52)

53. If yes, where did you see them?
☐ A local club (please tell us which one)
☐ A local hotel (please tell us which one)
☐ The Cottage, 54 Akura Avenue, East Cessnock

54. What was your response to the posters and stickers?
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55. Have you seen the respect mosaic at The Cottage, 58 Akens Ave, East Cressnock? ————Yes  No (go to Q.56)
56. If yes, what was your response to the respect mosaic?

57. Have you seen the Safe at Home Mosaic at The Cottage, 58 Akens Avenue, East Cressnock? ————Yes  No (go to Q.58)
58. If yes, what was your response to the Safe at Home Mosaic?

59. Did you attend the Women's Safe Families Day? ————Yes  No (go to Q.60)
60. If yes, what was your response to the Women's Safe Families Day?

61. Did you see the family activity book made for the Women's Safe Families Day? ————Yes  No (go to Q.62)
62. What was your response to the activity book?

63. Have you seen the Safe at Home Snakes and Ladders mosaic in the park on Akens Avenue, East Cressnock? ————Yes  No (go to Q.64)
64. If yes, what was your response to the Safe at Home Snakes and Ladders mosaic?

65. If you have children, did they participate in the Safe at Home Project? ————Yes  No (go to Q.66)
66. If yes, what was your children's response to the Safe at Home Project?

67. If you saw any of the artworks, did they change your understanding of domestic and family violence? ————Yes  No (go to Q.68)
68. If yes, what was the change you experienced?

69. If you saw any of the artworks, did they change your attitudes about domestic and family violence? ————Yes  No (go to Q.70)
70. If yes, how have your attitudes changed?

71. If there is anything else you would like to tell us about your experience of or response to the Safe at Home Project please use these last few lines to share your thoughts

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey
Appendix D: Community consultation plan
Appendix D: Community Consultation Plan

🌟 **Arrival & registration:** welcome participants as they arrive, give a nametag. Have tea and coffee available. Start promptly.

🌟 **Welcome:** Indigenous welcome - acknowledge the traditional owners, welcome participants and thank them for taking the time to join us.

🌟 **Introduce:** members of the research team and the Network.

🌟 **Address:** SAFETY

  - Acknowledgement that from our survey we know that there are a significant number of people who have experienced or been affected by DV within the community and the likelihood of people present being affected.

  - Therefore to ensure that this space is adequately safe for – for the next 3 hours this is a violence free zone - and ask that we all respect this.

🌟 **Address:** RESEARCH FOCUS & COMMUNITY rather than INDIVIDUAL FOCUS

  - Identify clearly that this is not a place in which we are able to explore individual experiences but to focus on the setting the agenda for the safe at home project and if you came with the hope or need to talk about your experiences then please approach us at the end and we can put something in place.

🌟 **Outline agenda:**

  - Aim & purpose of consultation
  - The Project – history and development
  - Aims of the Project
  - Our ideas for the Project
  - Time frame for the Project
  - Funding arrangements for the Project
  - Seek your ideas for the Project
  - Identify which ideas are of most interest to community members
  - Identify what might suit people in terms of participation – when, where, days, times etc.
  - Invite group to identify anything else they were hoping to add to the agenda and incorporate suggestions where possible and appropriate.

🌟 **Aim & purpose of this consultation:**

  - Aims - The aim of this consultation is to exchange information.

  - We want this process to involve the community in determining what we do – and to not simply be determined by us.
We are also interested in your ideas regarding how together we might do this – individually, in groups, or through broader community work e.g. the park idea in East Cessnock.

**History and development:**
- Network received funding from Community Renewal Funds to run an arts based project raising awareness about DV
- Invited Leanne to do this
- Leanne invited the Network to consider the possibility of joining forces to research the effectiveness of using art to raise awareness of DV
- Became a collaborative venture which is now a 3 phase study:
  - Initial community wide survey and consultation
  - The making of the artworks
  - Evaluation and Dissemination of Findings – Second survey, focus groups with participants involved in the art making, participant observation in exhibition and the writing up and publishing of the findings at the end by the researcher and Network.

**Aims**
- The research aims of this project are to:
  - Establish the nature and extent of public awareness of and attitudes to domestic violence in a defined research site.
  - Gain more accurate knowledge of domestic violence in the research site than is currently revealed by available data.
  - Develop, test, and implement a creative social intervention, with wider applicability in communities with a high incidence of domestic violence, which uses creative intervention as the medium to highlight the problem of and raise awareness of domestic violence in a defined research site with the ultimate goal of increasing safety at home for families.
  - Determine the validity of the intervention in terms of increased community awareness of domestic violence and a drop in domestic violence reports in the community.
  - Establish the value of a community-wide partnership between a network of services working in the area and those directly affected by domestic violence.
  - Evaluate whether this intervention raises awareness of domestic violence, i.e., whether changes in community attitudes to and reports of domestic violence occur as a result of a creative collaborative community awareness and education program.
  - Produce a set of guidelines and recommendations for using creative strategies in social intervention.
- The practice aims for this part of the project:
  - To make a range of artworks and promotional materials that convey antidomestic violence messages with a range of people from the community within Cessnock LGA.
  - To get the materials out into the community in as many and as varied means as we can manage within our budget constraints.
Build connections and have some fun in the process.

**Ideas**
- Share some of the ideas that we thought might be possibilities that have been used to address domestic violence in other areas:
  - Posters and coasters targeting licensed premises
  - T-Shirt campaign with young people as the focus
  - Tea Towel campaign
  - Sculpture and pathways in the park at Alkira Avenue using the Safe at Home theme.
  - Murals
  - Mosaics
  - Art Comp – Sanitarium Weet Bix boxes
  - Individual or group works
  - Community Exhibition

**Time frame**
- The length of the project – depends on the funding we can secure – up to 12 months with no additional funding and up to 2½ years if we are successful with the funding we are currently seeking.

**Funding**
- Network funds
- University funding – Community Wide survey and consultations
- Application for an Australia Research Council Funds
- Applications/Discussions with 3 potential business/industry partners (Coal and Allied Trust, Sanitarium and Housing – perhaps this should not be disclosed if they are not confirmed at the time of consultation)
- Area Assistance Scheme Funding
- Australia Council Funding
- Success at each level will determine the next steps and all will contribute to determining what is possible and how the project will proceed

**Your ideas**
- Invite the community to share their ideas about what they consider to be appropriate in their role as citizens in terms of how art might raise awareness of domestic violence.
- We want you to think about the big picture here.
- What two questions to pose?
  - Q. If we were to successfully raise awareness of DV and support people to being safer in their homes using art as the medium to do this, what would we need to do?
  - Q. What form should the process of how we create the work take – think about what might work for you and for the wider community so things like when, where, times, days, length of involvement, places, how much time and energy you have for your participation.
o Acknowledge different ways of thinking/contributing – discussion / written– some people are comfortable speaking in a group others not. Some of us think better in groups and others alone. Some of us visual and some of us verbal – we want to allow for different ways of contributing that are comfortable for everyone and support a variety of contributions.

o Brainstorm on butcher’s paper in small groups if there are a number of people – stay together if smaller in numbers but allow space for people to speak and /or alternatively people can write or draw their ideas on pieces of paper and stick them up on the wall or in the suggestion box.

BREAK HERE FOR REFRESHMENTS, CONVERSATION, TIME TO THINK

o Feedback from groups and collect the ideas and get them up on the wall / table.

o Review / summarize the ideas.

🌟 Priorities

o Invite group to indicate their priorities based on the list of options generated.

🌟 Other issues identified by participants

🌟 Decision making about the Project:

o Inform the community about how decisions will be made:
   o Ultimate decision-making rests with the researchers driven by the University ethics process for research – in consultation with the Cessnock Anti Violence Network, with priority being given to the information gathered through the community survey and the views gathered at these consultation consultations. Decisions will be framed by our available budget and our ability to attract further funding to the project. At the basis of the decision making process will be the idea of maximum impact in raising awareness about domestic violence within the community using art as our medium.

o We can’t promise the world but will try to maximize the impact of the project and the options available for us to work with. We want to incorporate as many ideas as we possibly can. All ideas are valuable to us. If we are not able to incorporate them in this project they can be transferred to the long-term agenda of the Network to continue to be pursued beyond the life of this project wherever this is also possible,

o We will try to adopt recommendations that emerge from these consultations wherever feasibly possible.

🌟 Evaluation: How will we know if this process has been successful from your point of view?

🌟 Feedback: What is the best way to feedback to the community once our consultations are complete?
indicating your interest to participate.

- Participant Information Sheets – read through it.
- Consent forms – explain why we need one.

The next steps:
- We will collect information from all of the consultations and use it to determine where we might start and select the projects, timeframes and conditions that suit as many as possible.
- Make contact with those people who have indicated an interest in participating – individually, via the local press or other means as determined via the consultations.

Thank participants for attending and sharing their ideas.
Appendix E: Example of maps
Figure 27: Example of conceptual mapping 1
Appendix F: Examples of personal artworks
Figure 29: Initial drawings responding to trauma and violence in practice 1

Figure 30: Initial drawings responding to trauma and violence in practice 2
Figure 31: Initial paintings responding to trauma and violence in practice 1

Figure 32: Initial paintings responding to trauma and violence in practice 2
Figure 33: Considering domestic and family violence in Collage 1

Figure 34: Considering domestic and family violence in Collage 2
Figure 35: From collage to painting 1

Figure 36: From collage to painting 2
Figure 37: Responding to research data narratives 1

Figure 38: Responding to research data narratives 2
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